



# An Evaluation of the Applicability of Management Plans with Public Participation

\*

Dilek Erbey  
Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University

## Abstract

*The main problems for cultural heritage are the negative attitudes of the people who use or live in historic areas. They are unaware of these areas, do not embrace and share them and are unable to actively participate in their planning processes. Zoning plans for conservation are prepared in meetings with the participation of municipalities, governorships, relevant institutions, professional chambers and non-governmental organizations and the citizens affected by the plan. Management plans, which have emerged as an important conservation tool to solve the problems of cultural heritage, include an approach based on governance and participation by bringing together the relevant parties in decision-making processes. The UNESCO International Guide and Turkish national legislation require identifying and bringing together these actors when producing management plans. However, insufficient experience about how to ensure participation in Turkey and uncertainty due to insufficient definition of the principles of participation in legislation for conservation planning has negative effects on the applicability of the plans. Arnstein initiated an important discussion on participation in planning and identified the summit of active participation as citizen control. Achieving citizen control, an important factor in implementing the management plans for cultural heritage, is a significant criterion to increase plans' effectiveness. Models should be developed to ensure the active participation of the relevant actors and required by legislation and guides. Evaluation of the İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan, an important example for management plans in Turkey, will serve as a guide for the principles to be developed in the future for the public to embrace cultural heritage areas and for the applicability of management plans.*

**Keywords:** Cultural Heritage Sites, Conservation, Management Plans, Public Participation



## Katılım Bağlamında Yönetim Planlarının Uygulanabilirliği Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

\*

Dilek Erbey  
Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi

### Öz

Kültürel miras alanlarındaki en temel sorunlar; tarihi alanlarda yaşayan veya alanı kullanan kesimlerin farkındalık, sahiplenme, benimseme, paylaşma konularında kültür mirası ile ilgili olumsuz tutumları ve plan süreçleri içine etkin olarak katılımın sağlanmamasıdır. Koruma amaçlı imar planları, mevzuatın belirlediği şekilde, belediyeler, valilikler ve ilgili kurumlar, ve alanla ilgili meslek odaları, sivil toplum kuruluşları ve plandan etkilenen hemşehrilerin katılımı ile toplantılar düzenlenerek hazırlanmaktadır. Kültürel miras alanlarının sorunlarının çözümünde önemli bir koruma aracı olarak ortaya çıkan yönetim planları, karar üretme süreçlerinde alanla ilgili kesimleri bir araya getirerek, yönetişim ve katılımı temel alan bir yaklaşım içermekte, UNESCO uluslararası rehberi ve ulusal mevzuat da yönetim planlarının üretilmesi süreçlerinde aktörlerin tanınlanması ve bir araya getirilmesini zorunlu kılmaktadır. Ancak her iki koruma aracı bağlamında da, koruma planlaması alanında, Türkiye’de katılımın nasıl sağlanacağı konularında tecrübe sahibi olunmaması, mevzuatta katılım ilkelerinin yeterince tanımlı olmamasından kaynaklanan belirsizlik, planların uygulanabilirliğinde olumsuz etkiler yaratmaktadır. Planlamada katılım üzerine önemli bir tartışmayı açan Arnstein, etkin katılımın en üst aşamasını “vatandaş kontrolü” olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Kültürel miras alanlarına yönelik yönetim planlarının hayata geçirilmesinde önemli bir etken olan katılımın sağlanmasında vatandaş kontrolü basamağına ulaşmak, planların etkinliğini artıracak önemli bir kriterdir. İlgili kesimlerin süreçlere etkin olarak katılmasını sağlayacak modellerin üretilmesi ve bu modellerin mevzuatta ve rehberlerde belirlenmesi gereklidir. Türkiye’de yönetim planı süreçlerinde katılımın ilgili mevzuat çerçevesinde ve İstanbul Tarihi Yarımada Yönetim Planı’nın etkin katılım bağlamında Arnstein(1969) ve Tekeli’nin(2009) yaklaşımları açısından değerlendirilmesi, gelecekte oluşturulacak yönetim planlarının uygulanabilirliği yönünde halkın kültürel miras alanlarını sahiplenmesi için geliştirilecek ilkelere ışık tutacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kültürel Miras Alanları, Koruma, Yönetim Planı, Katılım

## Introduction

While participation methods have been discussed in urban planning since the 1970s, until recent years the plans produced for protected urban areas in Turkey has remained limited to objections raised in the public display period except for meetings held with the non-governmental organizations and university representatives and the institutions' opinions obtained in the preparation processes of the plans.

However, the changing economic, political and social world order has obligated people living in and embracing cultural heritage areas to have a voice in the determination and implementation of the principles of conservation to increase the applicability of plans. Theoretical studies and examples including innovative models in conservation also indicate that participation is needed to ensure the sustainability of cultural heritage.

Strategic spatial planning, which was developed as a solution for rapid urban development and has been actively used in national legislation since 2005 in the discipline of urban planning, identifies and solves problems quickly, defines and facilitates implementation with action plans within the framework of its vision, objectives and strategy and is based on ensuring integration and actors' participation.

The site management approach, on the other hand, is an innovative tool involved in conservation approaches intended to ensure sustainability. Site management plans, which are increasing in number and variety, adopt a bottom up approach in which decisions are made locally to suit the principles adopted by strategic spatial plans. However, there are still uncertainties about methods for participation of the relevant actors in decision-making and implementation processes, and some problems are caused by these uncertainties both in cultural heritage areas managed with the traditional conservation planning approach and in management areas. These problems arise from the lack of an effective public participation mechanism in the decision-making process and holistic conservation, the conflicting interests of various stakeholders, power imbalances and the relevant groups' lack of knowledge about the conservation of cultural heritage.

This article analyzes the concept of participation in the context of the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (1993-2015)" and the "Regulation Regarding the Procedures

and Principles for Determining Foundation, Duties and Management Areas of the Site Management and Board of Monuments" (Official Gazette, November 27, 2005) included in the legislation. It indicates basic principles and makes recommendations by examining the importance of participation in the applicability of site management plans using the participation approaches of Arnstein (1969) and Tekeli (2009).

### **The Right to Speak and Participation in the Management of Cultural Heritage Areas**

Management plans are the tools recommended by UNESCO for the management of cultural heritage areas (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2006). Management Plans are advisory, non-statutory drafts that determine strategies for the conservation of World Heritage Sites in line with the needs of their users and visitors and are intended to inform people about decisions concerning their management (Gülersoy and Ayrancı, 2011). They are the guiding documents for protected resources and the development of supportive opportunities for their use and management. These plans help to guide and implement development and management activities (Thorsell, 1995).

Management areas and management plans were first included in national legislation with articles added to the Code for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Properties No. 2863 in 2004. This made it obligatory to prepare management plans not only for the World Heritage Sites, but for all protected areas in Turkey.

This code defines management areas as: "places created to ensure coordination between competent authorities, local governments and non-governmental organizations in planning and conservation to conserve and maintain the natural integrity of protected areas, archaeological sites and interaction fields, develop them based on specific visions and themes and pair them with the cultural and educational needs of society. Their borders are determined by the Ministry upon receiving the opinions of the relevant governors." The code defines management plans as: "plans reviewed every five years, which also include the annual and five-year implementation stages and the budget of the conservation and development project by taking into consideration business projects, excavation plans, landscape projects and protective zoning plans" (Code for the Protection of Cultural

and Natural Properties, 1983: Article 2863/1) (Annex: July 14, 2004–Article 5226/1). With this code, "The Regulation Regarding the Procedures and Principles for Determining the Foundation, Duties and Management Areas of Site Management and the Board of Monuments" No. 26006 entered into force in 2005. In 2006, the İstanbul Site Management Directorate, the İstanbul Site Advisory Board and the İstanbul Site Coordination and Inspection Board were founded. With the initiation of studies in this field, new conservation approaches have become national. While new concepts have been included in the national legislation, new national institutions have also been established.

Planning and site management in protected areas also revitalizes them, and they are redefined within urban development. Legal infrastructure for conservation policies to comply with the regional policies is also prepared except for the strategic planning required for the conservation of cultural heritage. They are intended to eliminate the unhealthy use of tools and resources that arises from the lack of coordination between the national government and regional governments (Gulersoy, 2003). Management plans are also defined as strategic plans that ensure the conservation of cultural and natural properties and protected areas with all relevant stakeholders in a permanent, sustainable and holistic relationship, the preservation of their development, vitality and universal value, and the balance between stakeholders and future generations. Management plans are not physical plans like conservation plans. They include action plans.

In the conservation of cultural heritage sites, unlike traditional planning methods, site management plans are intended to create platforms where all relevant stakeholders can have a voice with in governance and the decision and implementation processes. Site management adopts an approach based on governance that prioritizes participatory planning and management, increases the role of local governments rather than the national government, addresses the area as a whole with its social and economic objectives rather than being restricted to physical protection and considers the needs of local people, visitors and tourists.

The literature includes significant discussions of participation, the basic concept of this approach. Arnstein (1969) defined citizen participation as a power distribution intended to give a voice to economically and politically disadvantaged groups in particular and identified eight different levels of participation.

**Table 1:** Arnstein's Ladder of Participation

<b>8. Citizen Control</b>	
<b>7. Delegated power</b>	<b>CITIZEN POWER</b>
<b>6. Partnership</b>	
<b>5. Placation</b>	
<b>4. Consultation</b>	<b>TOKENISM</b>
<b>3. Informing</b>	
<b>2. Therapy</b>	<b>NON-PARTICIPATION</b>
<b>1. Manipulation</b>	

**Source:** Arnstein, 1969

In ascending order, the steps of Arnstein's ladder are: manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power and citizen control. The first two steps are categorized as non-participation, the next three steps as tokenism, and the last three steps as citizen power.

In the steps of manipulation and therapy, categorized as non-participation, powerful people 'educate' or 'improve' the participants rather than ensuring their participation in planning. These methods are generally applied to prove that there is participation in projects; however, the participants or participating committees do not have power to affect decisions. In the second category, tokenism, the steps of informing and consultation may allow participants to express their opinions. Nevertheless, it is not guaranteed that powerful actors will take their opinions into consideration. Although informing is the basis of participation, participation process that does not go beyond a one-way information flow—from professionals to citizens—is not true participation. Media, brochures and posters are commonly used to inform people. Although attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings and panels are prominent methods of consultation, it is not certain that the information obtained by them is taken into consideration in planning, and the participants are only numbers in consultation. Placation means that selected participants are placed among the decision-making authorities. Thus, the participants are one step closer to affecting decision-making processes, but the initiative is still in the hands

of the powerful. Criticisms of this step include how successfully the selected participants or the people affected can express their opinions and desires.

The last category, citizen power, differs from the others because it involves a redistribution of decision-making power. In this category, participants are involved in various partnerships, and can even be dominant in decision-making processes or have full power in management in the next steps. In the step of partnership, it is important that citizens have a powerful leadership, economic resources to make payments to these leaders for their time and effort, and resources sufficient for employing or dismissing their own technicians, lawyers or organizers for them to be able to impose real sanctions on the powerful people and the plan. The organization and institutionalization of participation may have an important effect in this category (Akyol, 2014, p. 41).

The literature also contains planning studies that include approaches based on Arnstein's work and a consensus that achieving the upper steps of the ladder of participation in decision-making processes is required for the applicability of projects.

Tekeli (2009) identified five different approaches to participation:

1. Selling the plan to the public
2. Informing planners through participation
3. Public participation in planning decisions
4. Ensuring participation to enable critical rationalism
5. Ensuring that participants join in the excitement of creating rather than experiencing division.

The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) has also identified five different participation levels that resemble Arnstein's ladder: informing, consulting, involvement, collaboration and empowerment. These levels start with objectively informing the public about problems, alternatives and solutions and continue with the consulting level in which the public can express their opinions of the analysis performed and subsequent decisions. On these two levels, the public has no or very limited power to affect decisions. On the involvement level, the public is only involved in the decision-making processes in the analysis phase. On the collaboration level, decisions are made with the public in all phases, including the development of alternatives and decision-making. Finally, on

the empowerment level, all decisions are made by the public. The solutions and decisions created by the public are directly implemented (Akyol, 2014, p. 20).

Feilden and Jokilehto's study, "Management Guidelines for World Heritage Sites," which was prepared in 1993 and published by ICCROM, is a primary resource for World Heritage Sites. The study emphasizes that academicians, professionals and artists should be given responsibilities to activate their historical, artistic and scientific abilities in order to protect sites' cultural resources and transmit them to future generations and that bringing the problems faced in the preparation process up for discussion among the experts is necessary to produce creative solutions that increase the importance of the site, but this takes a long time.

Article 7 of the Regulation Regarding the Procedures and Principles for Determining the Foundation, Duties and Management Areas of Site Management and the Board of Monuments defines participation in site management plans as: "The draft management plan is prepared by a team of experts and consultants from different professional groups in cooperation with the area chief assigned by the competent administration as per the principles of this regulation and depending on the nature of the site. The competent administration holds at least two meetings before and during the preparation of the draft plan with the participation of the relevant institutions and organizations, local people, non-governmental organizations, professional chambers, universities, the representatives of private sector deemed to be necessary and owners of the site in order to inform them and determine the issues for the management plan. These meetings are announced by local administrations to the public through notices and notified in writing to the others by the competent administration."

Participation forms the basis of the plans as an important component of national and international legislation. However, both the UNESCO Guide and the national legislation describe participation methods and criteria insufficiently and unclearly.

## **Participation Models and the İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan**

The examples of site management plans from abroad and in Turkey analyzed during the preparation of this study show that each plan developed

a specific participation model. English management plans for urban cultural heritage sites addresses participation within the tradition of planning and urban management. The opportunities created by the institutional system ensure that the public has a say in decision-making processes and form a basis for producing management plans.

Analysis indicated that the general purpose of the Liverpool World Heritage Site Management Plan (2003) is to ensure sustainable development and heritage-based innovation with the determined objectives. The management plan includes many organizations responsible for management in addition to the building and land owners, building users and, in particular, Liverpool's City Council. Liverpool First is an organization specialized in managing projected works to ensure public participation in the preparation and implementation of plans. These works are conducted under the leadership of the director of Liverpool First (Gülersoy and Ayranç, 2011). Liverpool's City Council, which coordinates the site management plan, increases the participation level in the management plan by holding monthly meetings that are open to all participants. These meetings are intended to enable information exchange and include the desires of different groups in the preparation of the site management plan. In the context of Arnstein's ladder, this is participation at the top level, citizen power, since it includes a system where different groups can directly communicate their wishes and expectations. However, the level of participation in the management plan attained in practice should be re-evaluated by monitoring it.

The 2016 Revision of the İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan (2011) is a management plan that is conducted transparently and in cooperation with all relevant institutions and organizations with the participation of those who use and live in the historic peninsula. The plan is intended to protect its rich historic background and universal value and transmit its social, economic, spatial and cultural identity to future generations.

In 1982, Turkey approved the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage. In 1985, Turkey offered Sultanahmet Archaeology Park, Süleymaniye Mosque, the neighborhood of Zeyrek and the Walls of Constantinople to the World Heritage List as Historic Areas of İstanbul. The historic and geographic potentials of İstanbul were emphasized by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee,

and it was highlighted that the city is a metropolis with a rapidly increasing population and exposed to population pressure that affects the conditions of conservation when Turkey's offer was accepted. This rapid population growth has increased even more since the 1980s, and since 2003 UNESCO monitoring reports that the historic and natural heritage of the city is being threatened. The most commonly cited reason for including İstanbul on the List of World Heritage in Danger is that the World Heritage Areas are not managed well. A 2004 Committee meeting about this issue first decided to prepare a management plan for the historic peninsula. Since then, reconstruction works have been conducted by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality. The first step was a 2004 legal amendment that added the concepts of site management and management planning to the Code for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Properties.

The regulation entered into force in 2005, and the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality founded the İstanbul Site Management Directorate in 2006. In this period, UNESCO repeated its warnings about the preparation of a management plan in World Heritage Committee meetings. In 2008, an Advisory Board was founded as a fundamental body of the Site Management Directorate in which the representatives of different groups come together in the preparation period of the management plan. Finalization of the borders of the management sites and a general framework for the plan were completed in 2009.

The management plan, first mentioned by UNESCO in 2004, began to be prepared in 2009, and the draft plan was submitted to the Coordination and Inspection Board in 2011. The draft plan was revised in line with their opinions and accepted by the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality on December 16, 2011 with Act of Parliament No. 2896. Its main objectives of the plan are:

- To identify the interaction areas and the connection points historically, socially, culturally, geographically, naturally and artistically related to the site for its evaluation, conservation and development;
- To balance the need for conservation, access and sustainable economic development and the interest of local community;
- To develop strategies, methods and tools to increase the value of the site and to identify and create financial resources to bring it to international prominence;

- To create an activity network to ensure international cooperation and sharing in order to improve cultural tourism;
- To generate implementation plans to develop regional cultural systems in sites with the potential to create a sector in a certain area by being associated with each other;
- To ensure cooperation among public institutions and organizations, non-governmental organizations, owners, volunteers, organizations and the local people;
- To conserve and maintain the sites, archaeological sites and interaction areas under the international principles of conservation and the provisions of the convention in line with the site management objectives by doing maintenance, repair, restoration, exhibitions and and landscape planning and to determine their borders and the principles for their use and development,
- To ensure high standards in the management of cultural properties, in the conservation of the site, in design and implementation and in expertise and equipment.

The plan, prepared according to the principles of the regulation and the UNESCO Guide, is intended to take the opinions of different parties on the site into consideration. The Coordination and Inspection Board evaluated and approved the plan and inspected its implementation while the Advisory Board, which represents different groups, were informed in meetings and asked for their opinions about the level of participation specified in the regulation. The Advisory Board consists of the representatives of relevant institutions and organizations, universities and non-governmental organizations.

Except for the participation and advisory board meetings, the "project on the development and implementation of functional participation mechanisms in the conservation, planning and implementation processes in the historic peninsula" within the Education, Consciousness-Raising and Participation Project package included in the action plans of the Historic Peninsula Management Plan was developed to encourage participation. This project includes strategies such as providing an education plan for the stakeholders, founding information offices, creating web sites, publishing and founding an organization to ensure sustained participation.

However, participation was limited to an informative website and a training program for teachers and students in the management plan's 5-year duration before its revision.

The revised Historic Peninsula Management Plan also included focus group meetings about participation. The stakeholders described the institutions and organizations, universities and non-governmental organizations in the focus group meetings. The inferences from these meetings indicate works have been carried out to raise the consciousness of the public; however, the method of public participation is still uncertain.

The İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan is in the second category of Arnstein's ladder of participation, tokenism, including the steps of informing, consultation and placation.

According to Tekeli's participation approach, however, the participation model of the İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan is limited to informing planners through participation.

### **Recommendations for Achieving Citizen Power in Site Management Plans**

The difference between approaches that achieve citizen power and those that lead to non-participation is important for the applicability of site management plans. The main problems for ensuring the applicability of plans for the conservation of cultural heritage areas are:

- The lack of an effective public participation mechanism in the decision-making process,
- The lack of a sense of holistic conservation,
- The conflicting interests of various stakeholders,
- Power imbalances, and
- The relevant groups' lack of knowledge about the conservation of cultural heritage.

While the relevant parties are expected to play an active role in decision-making processes, refreshing these parties' knowledge about site conservation and sustainability should be a first priority. All parties related to the site—large and small groups, powerful and weak groups, interest groups, leaders, all social classes—should be determined during the anal-

yses. In Turkey, organization has not been adopted by all social classes, there is a lack of rich social experience in participation, and the planners and project teams that generate plans either develop personal models or do so according to the characteristics of the site. Participation models should be site-specific instead of being standard and uniform. However, complying with some international and national standards will make it possible to create objective criteria for their evaluation.

The participation meetings, advisory board meetings, focus group meetings and the participation steps of management plans are unclear in the legislation. Their nature, content and how to add meeting results to the plan are undertaken at the initiative of the groups generating plans, and how to incorporate feedback from the evaluations in planning is left to planning institutions.

Inviting the representatives of the institutions and organizations to participation meetings, ensuring the participation stipulated by legislation and holding the meeting are deemed sufficient even if the invitees do not participate in the meetings. Powerful groups have their say in participation or focus group meetings while the representatives of the excluded, minority or weak groups are unable to do so.

Therefore, the nature of the analyses and surveys carried out before participation and focus group meetings is very important. Different, and particularly weak groups should be represented, informed before meetings and included in training programs. Founding information offices to ensure all the relevant parties are actively involved in this process, informing weak parties about the project and raising their consciousness about participation may increase participation. These information offices should be places where all groups can express their worries, opinions and expectations and get answers to their questions.

Participation meetings provide input for the management plan and the opinions are freely discussed. Along with determining the representatives to participate in these discussions and ensuring that they are prepared for the meetings when they participate, moderation of the meetings and the evaluation of their results are also important. Considering that discussions create ideas for the action plans, both dissent and consensus should be acknowledged in these meetings. Sharing their results with the public and the other actors in a variety of media will increase transparency and raise awareness about participation.

Participation should not only be part of the generation of management plans, but should continue in the implementation of action plans and even in the monitoring process that lasts for the duration of plans, and action plans should be flexible enough to allow for interventions in and reorganization of their execution.

Although site management planning is emerging as a strong planning tool, the uncertainty that arises from insufficient experience about how to ensure participation and insufficient definition of the principles of participation in the legislation lead the planners to determine their own principles and seek their own solutions for participation. However, this leads to the possibility of differences between management plans in terms of the quality and effectiveness of participation.

The İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan was prepared within the framework of the legislation and embodies the principles of planning and conservation. However, the 2016 revision report of the plan that was approved in 2011 shows that the majority of the action plans have yet to be implemented. One way to ensure the applicability of management plans, a design process, is to produce models that ensure the active participation of the relevant parties in the processes. Managing cultural heritage areas should involve continuously seeking effective tools and models since these places have sensitive cultural and environmental value.

## References

- Akyol, İ. (2014). *Açık alan tasarımda katılım yöntemlerinin etkinlik düzeyi değerlendirilmesi. Evaluating the effectiveness of participation methods in open space design.* (Master's Thesis). İstanbul Technical University, Graduate School of Science, İstanbul.
- The Regulation Regarding the Procedures and Principles for Determining Foundation, Duties and Management Areas of the Site Management and Board of Monuments (2005). *R.T. Official Gazette*, 26006, November 27, 2005.
- Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of participation. *Journal of the American Institute Planners*, 35, 216-224, United States.
- Gülersoy, N. (2003). Sit koruma ders notları (site conservation lecture notes). Unpublished Work, İ.T.Ü. Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, İstanbul.

- Gülersoy, N. and Ayrancı, İ. (2011). Koruma alanlarında yönetim planı (management plan in conservation areas). İ.T.Ü. Urban and Environmental Planning and Research Center, İstanbul.
- İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan (2011). İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality.
- İstanbul Historic Peninsula Management Plan (2016). İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality.
- Code for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Properties (1983). *R.T. Official Gazette*, 18113, Saturday, July 23, 1983.
- ICOMOS, (2005). Management of the historical environment.
- IUCN, (2003). Guidelines for management planning of protected areas.
- Tekeli, I. (2009). *Akılcı planlamadan bir demokrasi projesi olarak planlamaya (from rational planning to the planning as a democracy project)*. İlhan Tekeli Toplu Eserler-7 (İlhan Tekeli Collective Works-7), History Foundation Yurt Publications, İstanbul.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, (2005). Operational guidelines for the implementation of the world heritage convention.

**Asst. Prof.Dr. Dilek Erbey,**

Dilek Erbey has graduated from Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Urban and Regional Planning. Her master and doctorate studies are on urban conservation, cultural heritage and urban regeneration.

She participated educational programmes on cultural heritage and conservation in Roma La Sapienza University, Lisbon Technical University ve ICCROM. She has been giving lectures in planning studios, graduate and postgraduate courses on urban conservation, urban regeneration and management of cultural heritage at MSGSU since 1992.

She has been a part of conservation and management plan project teams and also has various publications on this subject. Dilek Erbey is a member İstanbul Site Management Plan Advisory Board.

**E-mail:** dilekerbey@gmail.com



Amasya

Kaynak: <http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/>