



A Look At The Problem Of Slums And Urban Transformation Studies In The World Through The Analysis Of Some Examples In Ankara

Ankara'daki Bazı Örneklerin Analizi Üzerinden Dünyadaki Gecekondu Sorunu Ve Kentsel Dönüşüm Çalışmalarına Bir Bakış

Varol KOÇ¹

Öz

Kentsel nüfus oranı, son yıllarda hızla artan bir eğilim göstererek kırsal nüfus oranını geride bırakmıştır. Bu artışın çoğu, nüfusun önemli bir kısmının enformel kentsel yerleşimlerde yaşadığı Küresel Güney ve Doğu'dan kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu nedenle kentlerin rehabilitasyonu için kentsel dönüşüm kaçınılmazdır. Ancak gecekondu, devletlerin genellikle görmezden geldiği ve bu nedenle onlarca yıldır zimnen desteklediği bir yerleşim türüdür. Aynı devletler, özellikle büyüyen şehirlere yakınlıkları oranında değer kazanan gecekondu mahallelerini bu kez dönüştürmeye çalışmaktadır. Ancak kentsel dönüşümde konutun finansallaşması, mülksüzleştirme ve gecekondu sakinlerinin insani barınma hakları arasındaki denge dikkatli ve adil bir şekilde kurulmalıdır. Bu çalışmada Ankara özelinde dünyadan ve Türkiye'den bazı gecekondu ve kentsel dönüşüm örnekleri üzerinden sorunun nedenlerine yönelik tespitler yapılmaya ve çözüm önerileri getirilmeye çalışılmıştır. Ankara ve Türkiye'de gecekondulaşmanın ilk başladığı yer olduğu için Altındağ-Bentderesi Bölgesine, Türkiye'de kanunla gerçekleştirilen ilk kentsel dönüşüm olması nedeniyle Ankara Protokol Yolu çevresine ve ekolojik önemi açısından Dikmen Vadisine yönelik gerçekleştirilen Kentsel Dönüşüm Projeleri ele alınmıştır. Bu projeler kısmen başarılı, genellikle başarısız sonuçlar oluşturduklarından konuyla ilgili öneriler geliştirmek açısından da önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kentsel dönüşüm, gecekondu, kayıt dışılık, küresel güney ve doğu, konut inşaatı

ABSTRACT

Due to the accelerating urban population growth, the urban population rate has exceeded the rural population rate worldwide. Much of this increase is due to the Global South and East, with a significant portion of the population living in urban informal settlements. Therefore, urban transformation is inevitable for the rehabilitation of cities. However, squatting is a type of settlement that the states generally to ignore, and thus implicitly support for decades. The same states, this time, are trying to transform the same slums, which gained value especially in proportion to their proximity to growing cities. However, it should not be forgotten that in urban transformation, the balance between the financialization of housing, dispossession and humane housing rights of slum settlers must be carefully and reasonably maintained. This study, has tried to make determinations about the causes of the problem and to bring suggestions for solutions through some examples of slums and urban transformation from the world, particularly, in Ankara, Türkiye. Urban Transformation Projects carried out for the Altındağ-Bentderesi Region, as it is the first place where slums started in Ankara and Turkey, around Ankara Protocol Road, as it is the first urban transformation carried out by law in Turkey, and for the Dikmen Valley in terms of its ecological importance, are discussed. Since these projects produce partially successful, often unsuccessful results, they are also important in terms of developing suggestions on the subject.

Keywords: urban transformation, slums, informality, global south and east, housing construction

¹ Corresponding Author | Yetkili Yazar: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Mühendislik Fakültesi İnşaat Müh. Böl Atakum/ SAMSUN
kvarol@omu.edu.tr



INTRODUCTION:

The world is experiencing rapid urbanization. As a result of the accelerating increase in the urban population, the urban population exceeds the rural population (UN-Habitat, 2016). Most of this population growth is occurring in the Global South and East. Future projections also show that urban population growth will be much higher in these parts of the World (UN-Habitat, 2016). For example, while the African population was 15% urbanized in the 1950s, it became 40% urbanized in the early 2000s. Africa is estimated to have a 50% urbanization rate by 2030 (United Nations, 2014). International Organizations, as well as countries and local governments, the challenge of implementing policies that will provide affordable housing for the growing urban population. A substantial portion of the millions of urban populations worldwide has limited access to infrastructure and essential services. They reside in unsafe housing, in precarious and overcrowded conditions (Braathen, Dupont, Jordhus-Lier & Sutherland 2016 ; Deboulet 2016 ; Gilbert 2016 ; Turok, Budlender & Visagie 2018)

In Kenya, corrupt land allocation practices work together with an illegal, exploitative, and profitable landlord system that shapes slums (Mangi, 1997). This situation exacerbates the temporarily postponed problems. Informal settlements in South African cities occupy undeveloped areas. Inconsistent policies are followed between condoning and intervening in this occupation (Huchzermeyer 2009). However, slums in South Africa are relatively benign and uncommodified compared to Kenya. On the contrary, Brazilian cities exhibit distinct characteristics shaped significantly by informal processes influenced both by individuals experiencing poverty and market forces. This is because the Brazilian state has adopted a policy of informal occupation of land distribution and use as a response to the market-driven fragmentation of cities, although this is not ideal (Huchzermeyer, 2009). Continuity and change in Indonesia's urbanization were examined by T. Firman et al. (2007). In Indonesia, the urban population is also concentrated in a few major cities, particularly in the capital, Jakarta. The most significant factor in this is the integration of the Jakarta Metropolitan Region with the global economy. As in most developing countries, intercity inequality between large and small cities is deep in Indonesia. Population grows rapidly around major cities, while in inner cities, it increases at prolonged rate of growth. Urban spatial development in Java shapes the belts that connect many major cities.

The high rate of illegal construction in the world makes urban transformation activities inevitable. The concept of urban transformation can be briefly defined as the rehabilitation of buildings and the creation of new residential areas (Görün ve Kara, 2010). In the context of the urban transformation project, it is essential to assess the ground conditions and risk values of either a specific area or a significant portion of the city. For transformation, it is required to rehabilitate the structures that are at the rehabilitative level and to demolish and reconstruct the structures that cannot be rehabilitated. As a result, urban transformation refers to all the work done to create new settlement areas within the scope of urban planning (Koçak and Tolanlar, 2008). In addition, urban transformation can also be done in the regions that are not risky in terms of ground and structure, to increase socio-cultural and economic gains, to rehabilitate and renew old, deteriorated, or corrupt urban areas, and to realize improvements. Few urban transformation practices worldwide successfully strike a balance between the financialization of housing, dispossession, and the humane housing rights of slum settlers. Several instances of urban renovation and growth initiatives in Thailand (Boonyabanha, 2009) and Pakistan (Hasan, 2008), along with certain land restructuring and property ownership procedures in Mexico (Lombard, 2016) and Brazil (Fernandes, 2011), serve as illustrations. Despite of various challenges, a recent favorable illustration involves the identification of a particular planning zone for Mukuru's informal settlement in Nairobi, the capital city of Kenya. This move has eliminated official protocols, paving the way for novel development pathways to the surface (Lines & Makau, 2018). Specific to Turkey, especially after the 1950s, when industrialization increased, the intensification of urban populations has led to changes in living conditions, the gaining weight of reinforced concrete buildings, which are industrial products, and the disappearance of the traditional architecture of cities (Yardimli, 2020). Especially in big cities, the unplanned and unlawful structuring of the city, devoid of traditional architectural culture and reinforced concrete construction techniques, has been triggered.

Consequently, it has become necessary to solve the accumulated problems with urban transformation projects. Because although it is normal for the mechanism to transform just like a living organism, it is essential to provide controlled positive changes to this mechanism. If this cannot be achieved, sharp interventions with urban transformation will be inevitable. The legislation closely related to the subject in Turkey can be specified as the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216 (2004), the Municipality Law No. 5393 (2005), and the Law No. 6306 on Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk (2012). The institutions authorized to make urban transformation interventions are determined by the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change, especially the Mass Housing Administration and Local governments (Sadioğlu and Ergönül, 2020).

1. A Brief Overview Of The History Of Slums And Urban Transformation In Turkey

The Ottoman Empire ensured that the architectural structures and reconstructed areas of the conquered cities were used by repairing and renovating as much as possible, instead of being plundered, and it was to transform and enlarge these cities with the establishment of new neighborhoods by the immigrants who came after the conquest (Gençer, 2017a). During the Ottoman period; The word "enjoyment" was used to express all of the urbanization and urbanization activities such as the development of cities, their population, and the provision of peace and security (Gençer, 2017a). With the declaration of the Tanzimat Edict in 1839 and the Reform Edict in 1856, various regulations were made regarding the living standards of foreigners and non-Muslims in the empire. In the 19th century, the influence of foreign states on the Ottoman economy and the advancing technology with industrial developments were important in transforming Ottoman cities (Gençer, 2017a). The fires that broke out constantly in the Ottoman cities caused severe damage due to the typical common wooden construction, and it was desired to find solutions to these with legal regulations. With the regulations of 1848, 1849 and 1863 and the Ebniye Law enacted in 1882, it was demanded that the buildings damaged in the fire be developed and the places to be reconstructed should be arranged by the principles, thus reducing the damages to be caused by the fire. In this period, zoning laws were applied only due to natural disasters and fires, the regulation of cities according to laws was limited to these areas, and a holistic urban transformation application could not be implemented. There is a similar situation in Ottoman port cities. While arranging the port area, the transformation was limited to the port and its immediate surroundings. The buildings that were not near the port were not transformed, which created an irregular and unplanned appearance. Examples of this situation are the cities of Izmir and Thessaloniki. Large-scale transformations could not be achieved in these cities until the 1917 Thessaloniki and 1922 Izmir fires (Gençer, 2017b).

With the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the first slums in Turkey began to be seen in the new capital Ankara in the 1920s. Over the next decades, small settlements have emerged in forest areas around the world and in restricted hill areas within city limits. The first slum area in Ankara is a hilly area close to the city. In those years in Ankara, slums and informality were tolerated as a result of not being able to keep up with the speed and demand of urbanization. In the following decades, examples of official structures condoning illegal construction will be widely seen all over the world. For example, protected areas in India are classified as National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries, and Forest Areas. The latter of these is not well protected and is, therefore, often vandalized. In the forest areas within the borders of the Metropolitan City, rape is predominantly carried out by the urban poor. (Pawe and Saikia 2018). Rapid urbanization has also created a housing shortage in all of Ghana's major cities (World Bank 2015). This has forced low-income residents to seek housing in neighborhoods with high population density and low municipal services (Danso-Wiredu 2018). Thus, according to Catherine Farvacque-Vitkovic, Madhu Raghunath, Christian Eghoff, and Charles Boakye (2008), more than half of the urban population in Ghana has become living in slums and under poor housing conditions in informal settlements (Yakubu et al. 2021).

The problem of squatting, which started in Ankara, could not be overcome with zoning plans and practices. The problem grew exponentially with each passing day. With the acceleration of the transition to industry in the 1950s, it spread to big cities throughout Turkey. Although the Ankara

Zoning Department was established in 1928 and the Municipality Law No. 1580 was enacted in 1930, new planning faculties were brought to the municipalities, these initiatives were insufficient to meet the needs of the city (Adam et al., 2009). Jansen Plan (1933), Uybadin-Yücel Plan (1957), Ankara Metropolitan Zoning Bureau Plan (1982) are legally sanctioned zoning schemes aimed at reshaping Ankara from 1933 to 1982. In addition, Ankara 2015 Zoning Plan, which was prepared in 1985, and Ankara 2025 Master Plan Proposal, prepared in 2002, are plan studies that have not been officially and definitively approved (Tekeli, 2005). While there were around 240,000 slums in Turkey in the early 1960s, 21% of the population in Istanbul and 45% in Ankara lived in slums. The number of slums approached 430,000 in 1965 and exceeded this in the 1970s. The number of slums, which was around 850,000 in the 1980s, reached 4 million in the 2010s. In today's Turkey, approximately 30% of the population lives in unlicensed illegal buildings (Genç, 2014). Turkey's rapidly increasing population is transforming the building stock. By the 2020s, there were 9.1 million buildings in the country, 87% of which were residential (NEEAP 2018). More than 100,000 new buildings are added to the building stock every year. According to the Turkish Standards Institute, 92.4% of these residences are privately owned and 20.9% are located in Istanbul (TSI 2017). According to TSI data, more than 100 km² of building floor area is added every year in Turkey and this rate is increasing gradually. Similarly, worldwide, 230,000 km² is expected to be occupied by new construction sites within 40 years (IEA 2017).

In 1984, Turkey introduced fresh legislation that granted more independence to regional administrations, permitting the formation of metropolitan municipalities in major cities. The objective of this law was to eliminate administrative hindrances by substantially augmenting the financial support allocated to regional administrations. This innovative legislation, essentially a restructuring and simplification initiative, has streamlined the land development procedure for emerging properties and facilitated extensive urban-level infrastructure ventures (Topal et al., 2019)._With the bitter consequences of the 1999 Great Marmara Earthquake and the effect of the European Union Harmonization Laws of 2004 and later, the problem of slums has been tried to be solved by urban transformation projects, mainly in the 2000s. Recently, the reorganization of Turkey's urban landscape has highlighted urban rent as a crucial asset for both families and investors. Diverse governmental strategies have been instrumental in easing this restructuring effort. Notably, significant amnesty regulations paved the way for the complete legalization and commercialization of informal settlements (Buğra, 1998; Uzun, Çete, & Palancıoğlu, 2010). Enlivened by rising housing prices, these settlements have witnessed a lively restructuring activity that quickly replaced slum houses with multi-story buildings, resulting in significant gains for their owners (Yeşilbağ 2020).

In the scholarly exploration of urban transformation in Turkey, a multifaceted analysis has emerged through various lenses. Güzey's 2016 examination sheds light on the legal regulations governing this transformation, providing insights into the legislative frameworks that guide the process. Additionally, literature frequently investigates policies shaped by power dynamics, market-oriented strategies, and top-down approaches, as elucidated by Türkün (2011), Elicin (2014), and Tansel (2019). Saraçoğlu and Demirtaş-Milz's 2014 contribution delves into the intricate aspects of the transformation process, including the discourse surrounding it and the underlying intentions. Karaman's 2013 work contributes significantly by exploring factors related to resistance and opposition, bringing attention to the complexities of societal responses to urban transformation initiatives. Furthermore, Balaban's 2019 examination delves into the challenges posed by difficulties, risks, and consequences associated with urban transformation, offering a comprehensive perspective on the multifaceted nature of this evolving phenomenon in Turkey. In essence, these studies collectively contribute to a nuanced understanding of the legal, policy-oriented, social, and practical dimensions of urban transformation in the Turkish context. However, in general, the studies, are partial case studies and a holistic analysis and suggestions for improvement are rarely made. Most of the studies in the literature have not proposed a model embedded in the legal framework that identifies the problems and potentials of urban regeneration processes, key elements, and issues that will lead to better practices (Gün et al. 2021). Only Yıldız et al. (2018) models by determining various design elements that can be applied to

urban transformation, and Gün et al. (2021) also developed models and suggestions to ensure participation in urban transformation.

2. The Relationship Between Space And Finance And Formality And Informality: Anarchy Or Order?

The financial combination of state and space can strengthen the hegemony of the state. Space can become not only a part of production and finance but also a tool of control, domination, and power (Lefebvre, 1991). The state begins to construct everyday life in and through space. Urban space becomes the agent and element of social relations of production. Thus, a space is created for the construction of hegemony. Since the 1960s, authoritarian, democratic regimes began to rise in many countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. There was a re-entry into the era of powerful and oppressive states. One of the common features of these regimes can be emphasized as giving greater importance to capital accumulation than labor and preferring urbanization to rural. National and international finance has been diverted to use subsidies to fuel this urban capital policy (Davis 2016). In these systems, the local governments of the cities were kept weak, and the urban development was tried to be shaped by strong national governments. Although this model has been applied in general, it was most effective in the big cities of the countries, which are the industry and investment centers (Davis 2016). Along with these, Hegemonic place activities are also the Achilles heel of capital (Kipfer, 2008). "So, if they succeed in fetishizing the state-space offered by the interventions, community mobilizations can hit the heel" (Gündoğan 2019). This area may be desired to be evaluated by the state through capital centers. Depending on the attitude of the state, either capital centers and state hegemony gain power, or social state principles are put into practice. In general, governments will argue that in a gray area between these two extremes, they have implemented policies that prioritize the implementation of welfare state principles. However, the shade of gray can change according to each look.

Urban revolts that can hit the Achilles heel overturn the calm modern life and tear the abstract space that covers deep existential anxieties (Kipfer et al., 2008). According to some, these revolts are moments of revelation or an explosion of purification or self-existence of the individual who gains emotional clarity and blessings for self-realization (Shields, 2004). As a result, destructive situations may require state restructuring and the construction of a new common sense. The fault lines of the commodified space have now emerged (Dikeç and Swyngedouw, 2017). For these reasons, no government wants to leave the low-income population completely helpless. It tries to strike a balance between social state principles and political and economic rent.

The most important method of protecting the state from anarchy is to ignore informality. The socio-economic and political difficulties of properly fulfilling the social state principles push the states to be indifferent to informality. Otherwise, it may lead to an uprising of those who think they are completely helpless. Informality is, by its very nature, a broad concept. It applies to all areas of commercial life as well as to all forms of illegality related to real estate (land, building, planning, and construction activities): Slums, refugee camps, urban abandoned dwellings, structures realized without planning permission (ie built for sale by speculative builders); unauthorized constructions on public land, etc. (UNECE, 2009). Banks et al. (2020) analyzed the conceptual understandings of urban informality in the literature. By making critical analyses on the historical development of informality, they proposed different understandings of informality. There are many studies in the literature on how and by what methods non-state power centers such as organized crime groups and the business world create informal spaces for themselves (Agbiboa, 2018 ; McFarlane, 2012 ; Ranganathan, 2014 ; Weinstein, 2008). According to these studies, it is understood that informality, which is a form of housing and commerce that apparently operates outside of official and legal procedures, is not outside of official systems in practice; on the contrary, it is a structuring style that is produced by official structures and strengthened by establishing close relations of interest with the official authority (Porter et al., 2011).

Alongside the UN-Habitat report, the latest report of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe deals with the unplanned nature of slums. The lack of planning, which is the character of squatting, is the opposite of the planned structuring that provides regular and efficient land use and is seen as an irregular, uncontrolled, scattered, and inefficient settlement and use of the land. Thus, informality becomes the “other” of the orderly, clean spaces of planning and is thus created as a policy issue (UNECE, 2009). In the UNECE report, informality is treated as a deviation from the urban environment. Self-made Cities characterize informal settlements as “spatial manifestations of social inequality” (UNECE, 2009). Ownership of the land and the structure on it is under weak assurance in these areas. Neighborhoods are created without any planning arrangement. The residences and businesses that make up the neighborhoods are built without complying with the construction techniques and engineering rules (UNECE, 2009). With this, according to Ananya Roy (2009), informality can not go beyond planning. Planning demolishes some slums, it can give legal status to equally illegal suburban developments. It may designate some activities as authorized and equivalent others as unauthorized. It is planning that realizes all these contradictory situations.

Under normal circumstances, central and local institutions are expected to properly perform their redistribution and management functions. However, today, it is claimed that policies for urban areas and their transformations create new urban regimes through privatizations and property changes. These policies are based on restructuring towards an authoritarian state apparatus freed from public accountability (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). When urban transformation activities are carried out by the state in a hegemonic way, urban space becomes commodified and housing becomes excessively financialized. The space commodified by the power of the state can lead to the erasure of the existing textures in the spaces and the displacement of the population, leading to the highest level of appreciation of urban lands (Lovering & Türkmen 2011). While the wealth of the capital centers increased, subaltern communities were expropriated. Property owners want to seize distribution opportunities created by urban transformation enrich themselves. This situation highlights the exchange value of the residence (Gündoğan 2019, Çavuşoğlu and Strutz 2014, , 2014 ; Karaman 2013, , 2013 ; Penbecioğlu 2013, 2013 ; Türkün 2011) , 2011). Even less formal property ownership, makes informal construction a bargaining chip. As slums increase, property rights granted to slums turn them into a marketable asset. Because owning property is a prerequisite for gentrification and entrepreneurship and the dynamo of economic growth (Hsing, 2010). For these reasons, as seen in urban renewal activities in Turkey, slum owners conclude that their main interest is increasing the value of their homes. They move away from the concern of protecting the neighborhood and their communities. After all, they can use the money of the shanty houses they sell to build a better shanty house in another area (Kuyucu & Ünsal, 2010:15). Thus, the squatters 'upgrade' and become de facto 'noble riches' who have been recognized as property owners. Family homes turn into apartments with rooms to rent. Slum settlements are now evolving into suburbs where finance and service turn (Lovering & Türkmen 2011). This situation may be a driving force that creates a sense of injustice among those who have not built slums and encourages them to build slums.

3. Examination of Several Urban Transformation Projects in Slum Areas of Ankara Province

The projects discussed in this article are examples of urban redevelopment projects that aim to transform slums into new built environment modalities. The first of these examples is the urban transformation implemented for the Altındağ-Bentderesi Region (ABUTP), where squatting first started in Ankara and Turkey in the 1920s. The other one is the transformation application for the slums around Ankara Protocol Road (APRUTP), which was chosen because it is the first urban transformation realized with a law in Turkey. The most recently examined examples are the Dikmen Valley Slum Transformation Project (DVSTP), which is considered in terms of ecological importance, and the Cankaya District 903 Parcel South Park Project (CDSPP), which is a parcel in this valley. Atıfbey – Hıdırlıktepe – İsmetpaşa settlements in Altındağ- Bentderesi Region within the scope of ABUTP were included in the scope of Urban Transformation in 2006. However, at the end of 2011, it was accepted to implement the project with the Ankara Metropolitan Municipality (AMM) Assembly Decision to

carry out the project from a single source. At the end of 2012, within the scope of Law No. 6306 enacted in 2012 (TCRG, 2012) for the transformation of areas under disaster risk, the region with 5,797 slums was declared as Risky Area. The transformation zone covered an area of 116 Ha in total and approximately 11 thousand independent sections including public service and education buildings, foundation structures, private residences and workplaces (Sönmez, 2020). According to the AMM Annual Report prepared for 2018, agreements were made with approximately 67% of the beneficiaries of the slums in the Region. Approximately 48% of privately owned lands have been transferred to AMM through payment or contract. "Within the scope of the Urban Transformation Project, efforts to conclude contracts with other right holders and resolve disputes are continuing." (AMMAR 2019) Projects that would attract the attention of the private sector, which do not see the region as a profitable investment area, could not be developed. The entire project is being tried to be implemented with public resources.

In the Ankara Altındağ Gültepe Gecekondu Neighborhood urban transformation project part of the ABUTP, which was started in 2006, the beneficiaries were very low, and those who settled by buying flats from outside consisted of families with upper-middle income. There were also great differences between them in terms of education, culture, profession and jobs.

In the survey studies, it has been seen that these two sections have almost no social communication with each other in the same site, there are frictions and fights between them from time to time, and from this point of view, both sections are not very satisfied with the housing areas (Bektaş and Türkün, 2017). It was understood that the slum owners were more satisfied with the results of the project than those who settled later by buying an apartment, and this satisfaction was mostly due to the fact that this area, which was a crime zone before, became safer. However, approximately 40% of this segment could not benefit from the project in terms of payment difficulties, and most of them left the project area by selling, leasing or transferring their movable properties before the end of five to ten years. The satisfaction of those who settled down by buying flats was due to the proximity of the site area to the city center and workplaces and the safety of the site. However, the continuation of crime problems in the settlements around the site created great dissatisfaction both for the beneficiaries and for those who came later. In addition, the satisfaction of the later arrivals increased in proportion to the decrease in the number of beneficiaries. All these situations show that the urban transformation in the area is not done with an integrated planning and project that will cover all regions and the main problems continue. In addition, all these are indications that the solution has not been implemented in real terms, that physical arrangements are based, not socioeconomic concerns, and that the project cannot be considered successful according to the universal urban transformation criteria. Almost half of the beneficiaries and tenants in the area have settled in the surrounding areas under worse conditions. In this respect, the problems could not be solved and were postponed to the immediate environment (Bektaş and Türkün, 2017).

The environs of the Esenboğa Airport road, which includes the Ankara North entrance, started to become shantytowns long after the Altındağ-Bentderesi Region, with the further growth of the city. This environment, where the APRUTP is carried out had become a development area of squatters that lasted from the 70s to the 90s. Providing transportation from the airport to the city via a winding road surrounded by slums created a bad judgment especially in the eyes of foreign statesmen. With a 2004 law (TCRG, 2004), which is the first law on urban transformation, 10.500 slums and 1.520 Ha. The region on which the total area is located has been made an urban transformation area. TOKİ and AMM were appointed for the project management and the financing was provided from public resources. New residences and workplaces have been given to beneficiaries to a large extent, infrastructure and education, social-commercial facilities and protocol road have been completed. The planned construction of new residences and workplaces and the sale of existing residences and workplaces continue (Sönmez, 2020). "APRUTP summarizes the close-knit relationship between local government, central government agencies, large-scale private contractors and the financial sector, as well as new forms of housing financing, thus becoming a showcase of urban transformation." (Topal et al. 2019).

Like the northern entrance of Ankara, Dikmen Valley in the southern part was subjected to intense squatting. The valley starts near the city center and extends to the forested area south of the city, which is the provincial border. It covers a large area. Its width is 300 m. and its length is 6 km. The valley naturally includes Ankara's air circulation corridors and water basins. For this reason, it is specified as a natural protected area in all development plans (Türker-Devecigil 2006). Despite this, the valley has been a site of shanty settlements since the 1960s, due to its proximity to the city center and leaving it unsupervised. Although Dikmen Valley settlements are close to the strategic points of Ankara, it was an area of approximately 158 Ha where there was a neglected and unplanned urbanization. In the settlement areas in the valley, 1,916 slums were reached with a population of nearly 10,000 in the 1980s (Metropol Development 1991). In the 1990s, there were 4,092 shanty houses where 18,415 people lived in five neighborhoods (Karayalçın, 2009). A part of the valley is within the southern borders of Çankaya district, which hosts the most prestigious districts of Ankara.

Çankaya district contains residences for upper and middle-income families, large business and shopping centers and offices, the Prime Ministry residence, the Supreme court building, foreign embassies buildings, university and cultural centers. A large part of the valley is within the borders of Dikmen district, which is predominantly a residential area, which houses the houses of low and middle-income families. In other words, the valley is associated with 2 densely populated districts that separate 2 different income groups (Topal et al. 2019).

Dikmen Valley settlements are among the first examples in Turkey in terms of exhibiting clear indicators of the damage caused by the slums caused by urban growth to the ecosystem. One of the key reasons for the intense air pollution that occurred in Ankara in the 1980s was the damage to the green areas and water basins in the valley by squatting activities. There was an ecological problem that required urgent intervention. In 1984, AMM, initiated the Dikmen Stream Green Area Project, which aims to relocate the slum owners to another part of the city and to transform the valley into a city park. However, high expropriation costs were incurred for the realization of the project. There was also intense opposition from the slum settlers. The slum owners, who organized to stop the project, received the support of the prime minister with community actions. The project implementation could not be started. "Thus, communities struggling for livability were able to stop the actions of decision makers who pursue sustainability interests." (Turker-Devecigil 2006). Similarly, in Delhi, India, lands hosting ecologically sensitive floodplains for the Yamuna River had become densely populated slums. In 2004, the Supreme Court of India ordered the demolition of more than 150,000 slum houses. Behind the scenes of this decision, however, was the government's aim to clear space for the Games Village to be built on the same site. Because the 2010 Delhi Commonwealth Games Village was built on this land. The Delhi Development Authority's (DDA) request for approval to halt construction for ecological reasons proved fruitless and the construction was soon completed. This essentially informal government practice was accomplished by using the legislature as a tool for government activities (Ghertner 2010).

Five years after the project, which could not be implemented, the first Urban Transformation project for slum areas in Turkey was started in 1989 in Dikmen valley settlements. The fact that it was implemented for the first time in Turkey and its size caused the beneficiaries and investors to approach the project cautiously at the beginning. For this reason, the opinions of the squatter owners were received for DVSTP and their participation was ensured. One of the reasons why the first project could not be implemented was the extreme opposition of the squatters. Companies established outside the municipality were given the opportunity to use foreign loans. Thus, DVSTP was carried out part-by-part with the private sector-public partnership. Because, again, another reason why the first project could not be implemented was that it would increase the public cost a lot. The fact that the existing slum area is inside the city center was an advantage in terms of ensuring the participation of the private sector. Thus, it was aimed to transform the area into prestigious areas with large-scale projects. "DVSTP, which requires the participation of large-scale private construction companies, revealed qualitative changes in financing and the participation of new actors." (Topal et al., 2019). For this

reason, a combination of high-rise buildings, green areas that will preserve the character of the valley, and social service facilities has been sought (Dündar, 2001).

In light of these circumstances, conflicting interactions among metropolitan administrative bodies, land proprietors, and policymakers, coupled with external influences, have significantly altered the original project objectives. Preserving the valley, initially a primary focus, receded to a secondary aim, losing its balance between environmental conservation and economic pursuits. The Dikmen Valley, envisioned as a natural habitat and flood control mechanism, now bears impermeable surfaces due to the presence of cultural parks, cafes, and restaurants (Türker-Devecigil, 2006). Throughout the initial 13-year period of implementation, the project principles and contractual terms underwent revisions. The construction rates surged from 1.26 to 2.00 in the third implementation area and from 1.42 to 2.55 in other regions. These decisions have led to an increase in the settlement and population density in the valley (Türker-Devecigil 2006). The first stage was completed in 1994, the second in 2002, and the third in 2009, and work on Stages 4 and 5 continues.

The 902 parcel, which is the part of Dikmen valley within the borders of Çankaya district, has also been subjected to squatting and has been tried to be rehabilitated through urban transformation. 902 parcels of approximately 160 Ha in the south of Çankaya district, near Turan Güneş Boulevard and Oran district, which are among the residential areas of the upper income group in Ankara, were declared an Urban Transformation area with the decision of the AMM in early 2005. Although squatting has started in the region since the 70s, the fact that most of the parcel consists of steep slopes and a partial landslide zone has kept the number of slums limited. It was thought to carry out development and improvement works for the region in the periods before 2005, but no progress was made. Since the beginning of the 2000s, large public contractors, investment companies, politicians and high-level bureaucrats, who are contractors of dams, highways and airports, have started to collect land from the region. Most of the property owners, who have been waiting for the development of the region for years, have left the region by selling their lands to these investors. This situation gave rise to suspicions of unfair rent creation. Because the problems that have accumulated in the period of about 40 years after the entry of new investors have been tried to be solved quickly by declaring the area as an urban transformation area. In 902 parcels with 2200 shareholders, a contract was made with the shareholders in return for housing, and 478 slums were agreed and demolished. Within the scope of CDSPP, it is planned to build a total of 6 thousand residences, including 4,500 flats, 500 terrace houses and 1,000 villas, in multi-storey blocks with 22 and 32 floors. Among the houses to be built, it has been accepted that 2,380 houses, whose areas vary between 120 m² and 270 m², will be given to the beneficiaries upon completion of the contract. Among the beneficiaries, 120 m² housing will be given to those with the lowest gross share of 500 m², and 270 m² housing to those with the highest gross share of 1,350 m². It has been accepted to make a one-time payment to the beneficiaries with a large share over the determined price, and it has been made possible for the deficient beneficiaries to pay the municipality for the missing portion over the determined price, with a maturity of 24 months. Due to the physical structure of the parcel, only 20% can be constructed. All kinds of infrastructure works in the area where the construction will be done have been completed and the tender has been made. The first tender was held in 2007, and many companies applied to the tender for flat. Due to the large size of the work, CDSPP was divided into stages and tendered to different contracting companies. In the project, which was planned to start construction in April 2008, the construction could not start due to the stay of execution and plan cancellation lawsuits filed by the professional chambers, and the tenders were canceled due to the prolongation of the process. Until 2011, tenders were made again in various periods, but no result could be reached. Ankara 5th Administrative Court annulled the AMM Assembly Decision on the subject. In the reasoned decision; It has been stated that it is not suitable for urban planning principles, planning techniques and public interest. Within the scope of CDSPP, 500 terrace houses and 1000 villas planned to be built for the purpose of fundraising are currently unable to be built due to the cancellation of the plan (Sönmez, 2020).

CONCLUSIONS:

As in some examples discussed in this study, important problems occur in Ankara and in most parts of Turkey regarding urban transformation projects and applications. With the delayed projects and their spread over many years, there may be an increase in grievances or dissatisfaction of the beneficiaries with the projects that have been interrupted and the new owners or tenants in the project. One of the important indicators of unsuccessful urban transformation projects is that some of the problems that require transformation in the transformed area and surrounding region cannot be solved at all. It is possible that some of the unresolved problems may be further expanded by being transferred to neighboring areas. When the projects that attract the private sector cannot be realized, the private sector does not participate in the transformation projects. This situation increases the public resource expenditure and increases the costs of the beneficiaries. However, the way to create unfair rent in order to ensure the participation of the private sector causes socioeconomic injustice. In this case, the process remains in the process with the lawsuits filed.

In these cases, the urban transformation project can have the opposite effect on the issues of increasing safety, social life standard, city image and economic benefit. These are some of the summary results, namely the diagnoses, illustrated by the examples discussed in this article. However, if urban transformation is considered as a treatment, first of all, it is necessary to take the necessary precautions to prevent the disease from occurring. At this point, first of all, informal settlements, which have been seen in many countries for decades and are tolerated by governments for the reasons discussed in this study, must be prevented. Legislation in this regard should be regulated fairly and applied seriously. Citizens should be provided with socioeconomic support, such as low-interest long-term loans and job opportunities, without being pushed into informal settlements.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The suggestions derived from the projects examined in the article for a healthy treatment of the problems can be listed in a wide range as follows, in the light of the information obtained from the literature:

1-) While urban transformation is considered mostly for outdated legal urban areas in Europe and applied to improve socioeconomic parameters in these areas (Gradinaru et al., 2015), it is considered for illegal settlement areas in metropolitan areas in Turkey (Görgülü, 2009). However, from the point of view of urban transformation philosophy, regions that have become depressed areas in terms of population and economy, which are important criteria, are in some less developed Anatolian cities of Turkey rather than metropolises. Urban transformation should not be seen only as a struggle against squatting, strategies should be developed on a regional scale to revive the socioeconomic situation in Anatolia, thus that irregular agglomerations to metropolitan cities can be reduced at the same time. In other developing countries, urban transformation has also focused on big cities. The recommendations given specifically for Turkey and Anatolia are also valid for these countries.

2-) In large cities in developing countries, illegal construction areas, which were periphery from the city center at the time, have become valuable areas with the growth of the city over time. This situation causes urban transformation to be considered as fragmented projects and to be seen as an unfair income source when it is not implemented with a careful and holistic planning (Görgülü, 2009). However, urban transformation should not be perceived as physical construction by focusing only on real estate, it should be compatible with urban identity and architecture, and should not be alienated from the spirit of the city.

3-) Throughout the historical process, urban transformation practices have also been shaped by natural disasters and fires (Dhyani et al., 2018). However, if the urban transformation practices only cover the transformation of the risk area, the integrity and aesthetics of the city may be damaged, and the sociological distinction is clearly evident. What needs to happen is to ensure total urban transformation.

4-) As it can be seen when all the legislation that has come into force in this process from the past to the present is examined, there has been no regulation to prevent personal interests from taking precedence over public interests. In addition, it is clear that urban transformation practices in Turkey are carried out only at the regional level. Only if the urban transformation projects are carried out actively in a systematic and planned process, the psychological, sociological, economic and cultural harm of the people can be prevented. Moreover, the welfare level of the people increases. For this, it is clear that the public interest, which is the main purpose of urban transformation projects, should be observed by avoiding projects that provide personal benefit. For these reasons, legal legislation and urban transformation practices need to be regulated quickly and effectively within the framework of determined rules and carried out with a planned control mechanism.

5-) In addition to all these, urban transformation projects should be planned in a way that creates added value, so that the participation of the private sector in the projects should be ensured and the costs of the public and beneficiaries should be reduced. The surplus value to be generated should be shared fairly and in line with the public interest. In this respect, practices that have been carried out around the world (McCormick, 2013) should be thoroughly examined in terms of financing models and experiences and should be internalized in the conditions of the country and urban transformation region.

6-) It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the citizens who will reside in the urban transformation areas are not clustered in the extreme income groups, and that the middle income group families are also present in considerable proportions as a balancer. Siteization can be considered in resettlement activities. Each site should accommodate families from the extreme income group in proportions appropriate to the area and number of blocks, and each block in proportion to the number of independent units. With this, as the site area and the number of blocks increase, the negative interaction of the edge income groups will decrease.

7-) Before the legal proceedings of the area to be transformed into urban transformation are started or the official announcement about the plan is made, activities that will lead to the purchase of land, residences and workplaces from the area through leaking information should not be allowed. The usual suspicious situations should be examined and necessary legal sanctions should be established and applied.

8-) Urban transformation projects should also be expected to have positive effects on revitalizing economic life (Kuyucu and Ünsal, 2010). In the area to be converted, hotel, shopping and business centers, resting-entertainment places, etc. editible (Wood, 2006). In this way, the participation of the private sector in urban transformation activities will increase, which will reduce the cost of the public and beneficiaries. In addition, the socio-economically problematic areas of the city will be rehabilitated, and an income-generating and refreshing contribution to the city's social life will be made.

9-) It is very important for the participation and support of the stakeholders in the projects that citizens and especially beneficiaries are included in the process and that projects and plans are explained to them well. It should ensure mutual exchange of views with them, take into account their demands and try to realize them. (Muir, 2004). In this respect, transformation projects should be considered not only as plans that will provide physical renewal, but also as processes that will increase socioeconomic welfare (Liu et al. 2014; Leo et al., 2019). Depending on the status of the project, a certain level of expense may be required by the beneficiaries and the public. In such cases, beneficiaries should be able to obtain loans on favorable terms. This will increase the sincere participation in the project.

10-) The historical studies of urban transformation from the past to the present clearly show that urban transformation applications are not sufficient without considering the needs of the cities and the peace and welfare of the people (Stapper and Duyvendak, 2020; Moglia et al., 2018). In this context, limited transformations cannot meet the needs of the city unless a total urban transformation is implemented.

11-) Ensuring that the projects are carried out in partnership with the public and private sector will create more successful results in every sense compared to only public or private sector projects. Projects should be carried out under the leadership of the public, with the participation and support of right holders, civil societies, professional chambers, universities and the private sector, not only with political powers such as the Ministries and Municipalities. There should be no unfair advantage or loss of rights of any party over another. Legal and technical infrastructure planning of these basic objectives should be established. The more broad-based community participation is achieved, the higher the success can be. For example, the Hiroshima Danbara project, which was realized in Japan and is one of the world's successful urban transformation projects, was realized by the fact that 12 of the 21 organizations established by the local people for this project were effective in the preferences of the project options (Li and Neill, 2018).

12-) Multi-faceted and accumulated problems should be handled with multi-dimensional planning and analysis. The understanding of classical zoning legislation should be made multidimensional. It is necessary to ensure a high level of efficiency and productivity in the design and implementation of the areas to be transformed (UNEP, 2011). Because the need for transformation arises from urban areas that are not currently used effectively and efficiently, uncontrolled overflow of urban life to areas far from the center or infiltration into urban areas unplanned. In this case, it is essential that the treatment does not conflict with the diagnosis, and that the sources of the problem become effective in possible solutions and prevent recurrence.

13-) In urban transformation projects and applications, care should be taken not to create new problems while solving problems, and harmony with architectural aesthetics and urban texture should be sought while avoiding irregular architectural designs that will create problems especially against earthquakes in terms of security and functionality.

Author Contributions

This article is single-authored

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declare that they do not have a conflict of interest with themselves and/or other third parties and institutions, or if so, how this conflict of interest arose and will be resolved, and author contribution declaration forms are added to the article process files with wet signatures.

Statement of Research and Publication Ethics

Research and publication ethics were complied with in the study.

Ethical approval

In this article, ethics committee approval is not required, and a consent form affirming that a wet-signed ethics committee decision is not necessary has been added to the article process files on the system.

REFERENCES:

Adam, M., Altaban, Ö., Ateş, T., & Keskinok, Ç. H. (2009). Housing Policies from the Republic to the Present (from 1923 to 1980s). In S. Kayasü, O. Işık, N. Uzun, & E. Kamacı (Eds.), *Slum, Transformation, City: A Gift to Tansı Şenyapılı* (pp. 243–268). Ankara, Turkey

Agbibo, D. E. (2018). Informal urban governance and predatory politics in Africa: The role of motor-park touts in Lagos. *African Affairs*, 117(466), 62-82.

Ammar (2019) Ankara Metropolitan Municipality 2018 Annual Report, April 2019, 211 p.

- Balaban MŞ . 2019. Hazard-prone cities and recent challenges in the case of urban transformation experience of Turkey. In: Ozdemir Sarı OB, Ozdemir S, Uzun N, editors. Urban and regional planning in Turkey. Cham: Springer; p. 235–259.
- Bank, W. (2015). Rising through the cities of Ghana: Ghana Urbanization Review Overview Report. World Bank Group, Washington, DC., viewed March, 11, 2018.
- Banks N., Lombard M. & Mitlin D. (2020) Urban Informality as a Site of Critical Analysis, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 56:2, 223-238.
- Bektaş Y., Türkün A. (2017) Mixed Income Housing Strategy in Urban Transformation and Turkey-Specific Dynamics: Ankara Altındağ-Gültepe Case, *Megaron*, v. 12, p. 2 H. 263-279.
- Braathen, E., Dupont, V., Jordhus-Lier, D., & Sutherland, C. (2016). Introduction: situating the politics of slums within the 'urban turn'. In *The Politics of Slums in the Global South: Urban Informality in Brazil, India, South Africa and Peru*, 1 – 29 . New York :Routledge .
- Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism". *Antipode*, 34(3), 349-379.
- Boonyabanha, S. (2009). Land for housing the poor—by the poor: experiences from the Baan Mankong nationwide slum upgrading programme in Thailand. *Environment and Urbanization*, 21(2), 309-329.
- Buğra, A. (1998). The immoral economy of housing in Turkey. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22(2), 303–307.
- Çavuşoğlu, E., & Strutz, J. (2014). Producing force and consent: Urban transformation and corporatism in Turkey. *City*, 18(2), 134-148.
- Davis D.E. (2016) Reflections on the relations between development and urbanization: past trajectories and future challenges, *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 20:1, 1-14.
- Deboulet, A. (2016). Introduction, Rethinking precarious neighbourhoods. Knowledge and recognition. *Rethinking precarious neighbourhoods*, 9-35, Paris : Agence Française de Développement
- Dikeç, M., & Swyngedouw, E. (2017). Theorizing the politicizing city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 41(1), 1-18.
- Danso-Wiredu, E. Y. (2018). Housing strategies in low income urban communities in Accra, Ghana. *GeoJournal*, 83(4), 663-677.
- Elicin Y . 2014. Neoliberal transformation of the Turkish city through the urban transformation act. *Habitat Int.* 41:150–155.
- Farvacque-Vitkovic, C., Raghunath, M., Eghoff, C., & Boakye, C. (2008). Development of the cities of Ghana: challenges, priorities, and tools (No. 44871, pp. 1-170). The World Bank.
- Fernandes, E. (2011). Regularization of informal settlements in Latin America, Policy Focus Report, Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Firman T., Kombaitan B. & Pradono P. (2007) The Dynamics of Indonesia's Urbanisation, 1980–2006, *Urban Policy and Research*, 25:4, 433-454.
- Gençer, C.I. (2017a) Urban Transformation in İzmir and Thessaloniki in the 19th Century: Construction of Docks and Harbors, *Meltem İzmir Mediterranean Academy Journal*, vol.1, pp.1, pp.33-51 (in Turkish).

- Gençer, C.I. (2017b) Urban transformation dynamics in the 19th century: İzmir and Thessaloniki (1840-1910) Architecture, vol.394, pp.50-55 (in Turkish).
- Genç, F.N. (2014) Urbanization Policies in Turkey from Fight Against Slums to Urban Transformation, Adnan Menderes University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute, Vol: 1, Issue: 1, P: 15-30.
- Ghertner, A. (2010) Commonwealth Games, failure of “just in time” planning, New Statesman, Oct. Available at <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/the-staggers/2010/10/commonwealth-games-planning>.
- Gilbert, A. (2016). Informality, renting and housing in the Global South. Precarious Neighborhoods, 119-134.
- Görün M., Kara M. (2010) Increasing the Quality of Urban Life in Turkey in the Context of Urban Transformation and Social Entrepreneurship, Journal of Management Sciences (8: 2) p. 137-164 (in Turkish).
- Gün A., Pak B., Demir Y. (2021) Responding to the urban transformation challenges in Turkey: a participatory design model for Istanbul, International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development, 13:1, 32-55.
- Gündoğan A.Z. (2019) Divergent responses to urban transformation projects in Turkey: common sense and state affinity in community mobilization, Urban Geography, 40:7, 893-917.
- Güzey Ö . 2016. The last round in restructuring the city: urban regeneration becomes a state policy of disaster prevention in Turkey. Cities. 50:40–53.
- Hasan, A. (2008). Financing the sanitation programme of the Orangi Pilot Project—Research and Training Institute in Pakistan. Environment and Urbanization, 20(1), 109-119.
- Hsing, Y. T (2010) The Great Urban Transformation: Politics of Land and Property in China, Oxford University Press
- Huchzermeyer M. (2009) The struggle for in situ upgrading of informal settlements: a reflection on cases in Gauteng, Development Southern Africa, 26:1, 59-73.
- IEA. 2017. International Energy Agency (IEA). Global Status Report 2017. [https://www.worldgbc.org/sites/default/files/UNEP_188_GABC_en\(web\).pdf](https://www.worldgbc.org/sites/default/files/UNEP_188_GABC_en(web).pdf).
- Karaman, O. (2013). Urban neoliberalism with Islamic characteristics. Urban Studies, 50(16), 3412-3427.
- Karayalcin, M. (2009). Conceptualization Suggestions for Urban Transformation Projects and Dikmen Valley Project Experience. Housing Symposium ITU Taşkışla, 4(12), 2009.
- Kipfer, S. (2008). Lefebvre Gramsci'yi nasıl kentleştirdi: Hegemonya, gündelik yaşam ve farklılık . Kanishka Goonewardena'da , Stefan Kipfer , Richard Milgram ve Carl Schmid'de (Ed .), Uzay, farklılık, gündelik yaşam: Henri Lefebvre'yi Okumak (s. 193 – 211). New York, NY : Routledge .
- Kipfer, S., Goonewardena, K. , Milgram, R. ve Schmid, C. (2008) On the production of Henri Lefebvre, Kanishka Goonewardena'da , Stefan Kipfer , Richard Milgram, & Carl Schmid'de (Ed .), Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre, 1-24, Londra; New York : Routledge.
- Koçak, H., Tolanlar M. (2008) Urban Transformation Applications (Examples of Aydın and Afyonkarahisar), Afyon Kocatepe University, İ.İ.B.F. Journal, C.X ,S II, p. 397-415 (in Turkish).

- Kuyucu, T., & Ünsal, Ö. (2010). 'Urban transformation' as state-led property transfer: An analysis of two cases of urban renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 47(7), 1479-1499.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (N. Donaldson-Smith, Trans.). Massachusetts : Basil Blackwell .
- Lines, K., & Makau, J. (2018). Taking the long view: 20 years of Muungano wa Wanavijiji, the Kenyan federation of slum dwellers. *Environment and Urbanization*, 30(2), 407-424.
- Lombard, M. (2016). Land conflict in peri-urban areas: Exploring the effects of land reform on informal settlement in Mexico. *Urban Studies*, 53(13), 2700-2720.
- Lovering J. & Türkmen H. (2011) Bulldozer Neo-liberalism in Istanbul: The State-led Construction of Property Markets, and the Displacement of the Urban Poor, *International Planning Studies*, 16:1, 73-96.
- McFarlane C. (2012) Rethinking Informality: Politics, Crisis, and the City, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13:1, 89-108.
- Metropol Development (1991) Dikmen Valley Project Implementation Zoning Plan Report, Ankara: Unpublished Zoning Plan Report.
- Mwangi, I. K. (1997). The nature of rental housing in Kenya. *Environment and urbanization*, 9(2), 141-160.
- Nations, U. (2014). *World urbanization prospects: The 2014 revision, highlights*. department of economic and social affairs. Population Division, New York: United Nations, 32.
- NEEAP. 2018. National Energy Efficiency Action Plan 2017-2023. www.yegm.gov.tr.
- Pawe C. K. & Saikia A. (2018) Unplanned urban growth: land use/land cover change in the Guwahati Metropolitan Area, India, *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, 118:1, 88-100.
- Penbecioglu, Mehmet . (2013). Urban development projects and the construction of neo-liberal urban hegemony: The case of İzmir. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 30(1), 165 – 189.
- Porter L., Lombard M., Huxley M., Ingin A.K., Islam T., Briggs J., Rukmana D., Devlin R. & Watson V. (2011) Informality, the Commons and the Paradoxes for Planning: Concepts and Debates for Informality and Planning Self-Made Cities: Ordinary Informality? The Reordering of a Romany Neighbourhood The Land Formalisation Process and the Peri-Urban Zone of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Street Vendors and Planning in Indonesian Cities Informal Urbanism in the USA: New Challenges for Theory and Practice Engaging with Citizenship and Urban Struggle Through an Informality Lens, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 12:1, 115-153.
- Ranganathan, M. (2014). 'Mafias' in the Waterscape: Urban Informality and Everyday Public Authority in Bangalore. *Water Alternatives*, 7(1), 89- 105.
- Roy, A. (2009). Strangely familiar: Planning and the worlds of insurgence and informality. *Planning Theory*, 8(1), 7-11.
- Sadioğlu, U., Ergönül, E. (2020) The Meaning, Actors and Aims of Urban Transformation in Turkey, *Journal of Ideal City Urban Studies*, P. 30, Vol. 11, p. 878-908 (in Turkish).
- Saraçoğlu C, Demirtaş-Milz N . 2014. Disasters as an ideological strategy for governing neoliberal urban transformation in Turkey: insights from Izmir/Kadifekale. *Disasters*. 38(1):178–201.

- Shields, Rob . (2004). Henri Lefebvre, Phil Hubbard , Rob Kitchin ve Gill Valentine (Ed.), *Fundamental thinkers on space and earth* (s. 208 – 213). Londra: Sage.
- Sönmez H. (2020) *The History of Urban Transformation in Turkey and Some in Ankara Urban Transformation Applications*, Consultant: Koç, V., Y.L. Graduation Term Project, OMU Science know Institute of Real Estate Valuation and Development, Samsun, 38 p.
- Tansel CB . 2019. Reproducing authoritarian neoliberalism in Turkey: urban governance and state restructuring in the shadow of executive centralization. *Globalizations*. 16(3):320–335.
- TCRG (2004) *Kuzey Ankara Entrance Urban Transformation Project Law*, Law no: 5104, 12 March, No: 25400, p. 8743- 8746.
- TCRG (2012), *Law on the transformation of areas under disaster risk*, Law no: 6306, 31 May 2012, No: 28309, p. 11579- 11590.
- Tekeli, I. (2005). *A New Paradigm Proposal for Urban Historiography*. In T. Şenyapılı (Ed.), *Ankara of the Republic* (pp. 152–171). Ankara, Turkey: METU Development.
- TSI. 2017. *Building Permits January-June, 2017*. Turkish Statistical Institute. Accessed October 10, 2019. <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=24722>.
- Topal A., Yalman G.L. & Çelik Ö. (2019) *Changing modalities of urban redevelopment and housing finance in Turkey: Three mass housing projects in Ankara*, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41:5, 630-653.
- Turok, I., Budlender, J., & Visagie, J. (2018). *Urban “slums” and social mobility*. *Development Policy Review*, 36(6), 703-725.
- Türker-Devecigil, P. (2006). *The role of local actors in transforming informal settlements in Turkey for sustainable urban development: The Ankara–Dikmen valley case*. *International planning studies*, 11(3-4), 167-186.
- Türkün, A. (2011). *Urban regeneration and hegemonic power relationships*. *International planning studies*, 16(1), 61-72.
- UNECE. 2009 . *Self-Manufactured Cities: Seeking Sustainable Solutions for Informal Settlements in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Region*, New York: UNECE.
- Un-Habitat. (2016). *World cities report 2016: Urbanization and development—emerging futures*, Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
- Uzun, B., Çete, M., & Palancıoğlu, H. M. (2010). *Legalizing and upgrading illegal settlements in Turkey*. *Habitat International*, 34(2), 204–209.
- Weinstein, L. (2008). *Mumbai's development mafias: globalization, organized crime and land development*. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 32(1), 22-39.
- Yakubu I., Spocter M.& Donaldson R. (2021) ‘I Cannot Stand up to my Chief nor the State’: Reflections on Development-Induced Housing Mobility in Pro-Poor Housing Systems in Tamale, Ghana, *African Studies*, 80:2, 207-229.
- Yardımlı, S. (2020) *Neolithic Age Buildings and Common Building Techniques and Details Detected in Today's Ahievren Village Houses*, *International Journal of Eastern Anatolia Science Engineering and Design*, Vol. 2, P. 1, pp. 134 – 154 (in Turkish).

Yeşilbağ M. (2020) The State-Orchestrated Financialization of Housing in Turkey, Housing Policy Debate, 30:4, 533-558,

Yildiz S, Kivrak S, Arslan G . 2018. Contribution of built environment design elements to the sustainability of urban renewal projects: model proposal. J Urban Plann Dev. 145(1):04018045.