



Redevelopment of Karaköy Harbor, Istanbul

Need for a New Planning Approach in the Midst of Change

A. Ögüt Erbil^a and T. Erbil^b

^aDepartment of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, MA 01003, USA; ^bDepartment of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, Sibley Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA

Following the examples in industrial countries, the old inner-city harbors in developing countries have also been subject to revitalization in the last decades. Karaköy Harbor in Istanbul is an example for undergoing transformation in a developing country, Turkey. This article depicts Karaköy Harbor's transformation and the related issues. The goal is to outline the character and condition of the harbor, present dilemmas for its future, while providing a different perspective on the revitalization of harbors both in Turkey and other countries. The research concludes that there is a need for a new planning approach that includes central-local government coordination and public participation. © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved

Keywords: Harbor revitalization, City planning, Istanbul, Turkey

Introduction

Water has been an attraction in establishing and developing cities all around the world. The significance of water was reinforced with the industrial revolution. With increasing trading activities, harbors became important properties for cities. However, today, across the world industrial activities and trade are in dramatic change. As a reflection of these changes, industrial activities relocated either to suburbs or to another country, leaving inner city economic activities in decline. Additionally, the technological developments in transportation, shipbuilding and handling, such as container transportation and super capacity vessels resulted in outmoded facilities. All these developments have changed the comparative advantages of many harbors (Breen and Rigby, 1996; Craig-Smith, 1995; Hoyle, 1996; Mullin and Kotval,

1996). As a result, harbors all around the world have been undergoing changes as an effect of the post-industrial era with most emphasis of market-led policies and initiatives.

The harbor transformation and redevelopment activities are mostly seen in industrially advanced countries, such as the US, Canada, some of the European countries, Japan and Australia. However, as their economies grow rapidly, the newly industrializing countries are also affected by this worldwide phenomenon. As a middle-income developing country, the Republic of Turkey has also begun to face a similar phenomenon in some of its harbors. Among them, Karaköy Harbor, one of the inner city harbors in the Istanbul harbor system, has been undergoing a transformation since the mid-1980s. This change might have important consequences for the harbor itself as well as for Istanbul city.

In this article our goal is to outline the character and condition of the Karaköy Harbor area in the context of Istanbul city, and to present dilemmas for the

*Corresponding author. Tel: +1-413-545-6627; fax: +1-413-545-1772; e-mail: aerbil@larp.umass.edu

future of the harbor. The research investigates the case of Karaköy Harbor that exhibits the need for a new planning approach that includes, central and local government coordination and public participation. The uniqueness of the case is that, although there is no decline in the vitality of the city, there is an economic decay in the harbor itself. Therefore, the issue of transformation of the harbor creates discussions and conflicts within the local and central government bodies and the public. This article aims to frame a clear understanding of the Karaköy Harbor case, while providing a different perspective on the revitalization of the harbor and harbor communities both in Turkey and some other countries in the world. By examining the Karaköy Harbor in detail, we compare and evaluate the characteristics of the transformation to the other harbor revitalization, or in a commonly used term waterfront development examples in the world.

The city of Istanbul and Istanbul Harbor

Istanbul is located northwest of Turkey where the Asian and European continents are separated by the Bosphorus sea canal. Through the centuries, Istanbul city benefited from its advantageous location and retained its importance as the administrative and education center in Byzantium, Roman, Ottoman and the Republic of Turkey eras (Kuban, 1996). Because of this advantageous location, Istanbul Harbor has been a trading and transit center since Byzantines (Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, 1994, p 7).

However, after the 1950s, the main economical activity, trading, shifted over to industrial and service sectors in Istanbul city (Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, 1994, p 7). Besides this change, the harbors in the historical core of the city lost their importance for three reasons. First reason was the emergence of other harbors in the nation (Müller-Wiener, 1998). Second cause was the decentralization policy of the Turkish government for Istanbul city's industry towards the Marmara Region. Third reason was a change in the ownership of the harbors in Istanbul city, and the building of new private harbors in the peripheries of the city after the 1980s. Owing to this, old harbors lost their competitive capabilities, and regressed to secondary and tertiary harbors in Istanbul city (Can, 1999).

Although some of the harbors in Istanbul city have been losing their importance as cargo processing centers for the last three decades or so, they face new possibilities in their function as city's economic structure changes. Once a busy cargo and passenger port, Karaköy Harbor is now one of these harbors in the middle of transformation that is subject to various future scenarios originating from some public and private groups. Which scenario is chosen will be critical for the city in many respects.

The harbor district and the harbor

Karaköy Harbor area is located at the European side of Istanbul, where the historical core of the city surrounds it. The main functions of the surrounding area are finance, wholesale and retail trade, small workshops, office and residential use. Along with the harbor, the Mimar Sinan University campus is also an important education and fine arts institution in the area.

The harbor itself stretches along the southwest shore of the Bosphorus Strait. It is one of the ports of the Istanbul Harbor System, which includes several harbors in various sizes (Istanbul Ansiklopedisi, 1994, p 5; IBB, 1995). Karaköy Harbor area is a medium sized port with a size of 8.5 ha (nearly 21 acres). Today, the harbor serves mainly as a passenger port for foreign and domestic cruise ships, and when it is necessary, can handle and store limited quantities of cargo. The passenger saloon and administration buildings are located at the south edge of the port and there are four main warehouse buildings covering approximately 1.7 ha (nearly 4 acres).

The harbor had an important role in the trading activities for centuries, however, after the 1850s, Istanbul Harbor, and consequently Karaköy Harbor began to see hard times with the beginning of a series of wars and the decline of the Ottoman Empire. After a big fire in 1863, one-storey workshops were built and the Istanbul Chamber of Trade and Industry used these buildings as warehouses after World War I. In 1928, the buildings were given to Ford Inc. to be used as car assembly factories. Between 1956 and 1958 all the old buildings were replaced with new warehouses which still exist today (Müller-Wiener, 1998).

The mid-1960s were Republic of Turkey's rapid industrialization years. Between 1965 and 1975, the growth of the economy averaged between 4 and 7%. In the same period the average annual increase in export earnings and import expenditures were 20 and 30% (Kazgan, 1994). This increase in trade required larger ports with more advanced handling and storage capacity. Built in 1914, Haydarpaşa Harbor gradually became the largest harbor in Istanbul and took over the major portion of handling activities of Karaköy Harbor.

Karaköy Harbor continued to serve as a cargo and passenger port until the mid-1980s. However, its proximity to the historical peninsula and to the downtown retail trade area created increasing problems with heavy vehicle traffic. In order to solve this problem, the central and metropolitan governments intended to rearrange the functions of the harbor and give preference to tourist oriented activities. Thus, in 1988, state-owned harbor was closed to loading/unloading trucks and began to serve mainly as a passenger port. Its function as a passenger port was reinforced by the early 1990s, when the Soviet Union was dissolved. As the visitors from the former Soviet Union began to visit Istanbul to shop for basic

consumer goods such as food, textiles and household products, the number of passenger ships with small cargo sections from the former Soviet Union countries increased dramatically. For example, between January 1994 and November 1999, the total share of ships from these countries ranged from 70 and 80% of the total annual number of ships. In their each visit to the Karaköy Harbor area, these ships bring 90–120 passengers who mainly shop for consumer goods that are not subject to custom duty. Since these goods can be loaded on ships with minimum bureaucratic paperwork, and since they are considered personal shopping items of passengers, this trade process is called as “luggage trade”. According to some unofficial estimates, these expenditures annually range between 7 and 8 billion US dollars. This exceptional function of the harbor brought many small retailers to the shops around the building blocks near the port.

However, as of November 1999, a new port (Zeyport) was opened to serve exclusively to the “luggage trade” ships. This port used to service small bulk ships carrying cargo such as sea sand and salt. Zeyport has more convenient land transportation linkages and loading capacities than the Karaköy Harbor does. In an interview with the officials at Turkish Maritime Company (TDI), a state owned enterprise responsible for the operation of major ports in Turkey, it was stated that this new port would take over the load of the Karaköy Harbor area luggage trade in the next couple of years (Reyhanoğlu, 1999). This decision will probably decrease the traffic congestion in the Karaköy Harbor area and the surrounding retail trade area.

Karaköy Harbor area has an important location advantage in terms of proximity to tourist attractions of the city. The harbor is located close to the historical peninsula that is only minutes away from the harbor, where the Topkapı Palace and Saint Sofia Museum are found among many tourist sites. As its location allows transferring the cruise passengers through both land vehicles and boats/ferries, it can exploit this advantage by utilizing an organized effort from the public and private sides.

Issues facing the harbor

The Karaköy Harbor area has been undergoing transformation since the early 1980s. In this transformation there have been several issues affecting the harbor. We investigated that transportation, changed function of the harbor, contesting future projects, and the tension between local and central government are the main issues that the Karaköy Harbor area faces today.

Transportation

Similar to other big metropolitan areas, one of the major problems of Istanbul city is traffic. The already overwhelmed mass transportation does not offer an alternative to the 10-million population. In the city,

there are several problematic nodes where traffic flows very slowly; Karaköy District is one of them. Since there is no direct connection to a major highway or railway, it can be expected that any additional function or facility in Karaköy Harbor area will negatively affect already dense traffic in the district. Therefore any future project for the harbor must consider the transportation issue in this area.

Changed function of the harbor

Although harbor’s function changed toward more passenger-oriented services since 1988, so far the contesting projects about its future have not reached to an end. In an interview with an official from TDI, it was mentioned that the management of the harbor was not economically efficient. In the view of the TDI official, the potential of the harbor as a passenger port is not fully used. In order to utilize harbor’s full capacity as a passenger port, a rearrangement is necessary (Reyhanoğlu, 1999). The future of Karaköy Harbor area now depends on the cruises from various European and the Black Sea Region countries. Since the ships coming for luggage trade were taken over partly by the new port, Zeyport, and the performance of the luggage trade has a very fluctuating structure, related to economic downturns of former Russian countries, expectations have gradually shifted to the cruises.

Contesting future projects

Since the harbor lost its function as a cargo harbor after 1988, the owner of the harbor, TDI, has tried two different approaches to increase harbor’s efficiency. The first one is an attempt toward privatization of the harbor. At the interview with an authority in TDI, it was mentioned that the state is not flexible in effectively managing the harbor, and in order to prevent the loss of public money, privatization is crucial (Reyhanoğlu, 1999). Although there have been attempts to privatize this harbor or to hand over its management to the private sector, this has not happened yet. The second approach aims to improve the hinterland environment in order to attract more cruises. Therefore, since 1983, TDI has been working to restructure the harbor as a tourism center. In 1990, TDI invited international firms to prepare an urban design concept, where, besides advanced passenger port facilities, a hotel complex, business offices, parking and recreational areas would exist (Cumhuriyet, 1990). Following project’s requirements, the harbor district was officially declared by the prime ministry as a “special tourism area”, where all planning and decision making authority could be transferred from local governments to related agencies in the central government.

These attempts of the TDI, especially the rearrangement of the harbor as a tourism center, are controversial for the public in mainly two aspects. First point is the expected benefit of the future project.

Building a multi-purpose complex might bring financial benefit to the harbor and the developers. Yet, the public will not have financial benefit at the first hand while they have to face problems that new arrangement brings, such as loss of open and public space, and increasing traffic. Second issue is intertwined closely to the planning system in Turkey. Since the urban planning process still exhibits a top-down approach, participation to the decision-making process is limited, if not impossible. Thus, as the privatization process and the preparation of new design project of the harbor continue, officials were reluctant to discuss about the project.

The residents and the non-governmental organizations together lead an opposition to the project because of their exclusion from the decision making process while observing the major social and economic setbacks for the public. Therefore, besides TDI's proposition, neighborhood associations and non-governmental organizations have proposed alternative projects that are beneficial to the public as well. Among these non-governmental organizations, the Chamber of Architects took the first legal step and opposed the authority transfer from local government to the central government by claiming that the project would diminish the opportunity for using this area as an urban recreational area for the entire city. The chamber went to court to stop the legal process of the authority transfer in 1995, but lost the case in 1998.

Other groups interested in this area are the community associations of neighboring residential areas. Cihangir and Galata Neighborhood Associations are willing to open the waterfront to public use, and connect their neighborhoods with the sea (Nüvit, 1999; Göktuğ, 1999). The Cihangir Neighborhood Association in particular has been active in order to make changes in the decision of TDI's project to bring new tourist facilities to the harbor area. Both of the associations consider TDI's project an inefficient use of the valuable waterfront area. They state that bringing more shopping facilities to the area will not bring more tourists, for this reason the investment will be unprofitable, and besides this precious area will be wasted. They claim that since there are major historic and attractive shopping centers minutes away from the Karaköy Harbor area, the tourist will go to these classic shopping areas, anyway. Moreover, this area is more important for the communities living there, rather than the tourists (Nüvit, 1999; Göktuğ, 1999).

The Cihangir Neighborhood Association also claims that this densely populated and built-up neighborhood area needs open and recreational spaces, especially along the waterfront. For the Cihangir residents, the harbor area is the only possible opening to the sea. The association does not want to lose this possibility, and they propose a mixed function with more public use (a less restricted use of the area). According to their proposal the waterfront should be used for the public for walkways, museums, cafés, restaurants and other types of recreational

facilities instead of a shopping center for tourists. In their view, this type of organization will be more attractive to the tourists, since they come in contact with the communities of the neighborhood and have a lively place that welcomes them. It is also Cihangir Neighborhood's concern that this new development will ruin the cityscape with its separated character from the historic neighborhood. They claim that "contemporary" high-rise buildings will block the waterfront as well as impair the view of an important historic building (Tophane Building) that takes place right behind the harbor area (Nüvit, 1999).

At the north side of the harbor the Mimar Sinan University campus extends along the Bosphorus. In the early 1980s, as a fine arts university, it wanted to own a part of the harbor area to expand its facilities by using the old warehouses as studios. However, this contested area was too valuable to be left to the university. Thus, the university has given up lobbying for it, although they still want to use the old warehouses.

The tension between central and local government

A major issue in the debate of the future development of Karaköy is the division of authority at the decision making level. In the 1995 Istanbul Metropolitan Area Master Plan, the harbor was planned as a cruise port and related tourism center. However, by declaring this area as a "special tourism area" in 1993, the central government became the only authority able to execute the final decision. This way, all the local government agencies and communities have been excluded from the decision making process. There are previous examples of special tourism areas in Istanbul where many public and private lands, including a public park previously a part of Dolmabahçe Palace, have been enabled to have land use rights that are in contrast to the related master plan decisions of the local government. These special tourism areas included five star hotels and business skyscrapers. The various negative effects of these "nodal" areas have been visualized in the over-loaded capacity on the infrastructure, such as additional traffic load, loss of public/open spaces, forest areas and impaired artificial built environment that are not intertwined to the neighborhood, both socially and aesthetically. Through these authority takeovers in planning, local opposition, regarding the possible negative consequences of centralized planning decisions at the local level, was ignored, and these areas developed as nodal/individual places disregarding local needs and problems. Since the central government's decision excluded local opinion, needs, and the overall context of the place, local governments opposed this practice. Under these conditions, there is a tension between the local government and the central government.

With the Karaköy Tourism Center project, the Ministry of Tourism wants to create a business, tourism and passenger harbor complex similar to models in

some of the European and North American cities. The plan proposes a hotel complex with a capacity of 1100 beds, a parking garage for 3600 cars, a shopping mall and office buildings and recreational facilities (Milliyet, 1991). Although this project proposes a “profitable” transformation of the harbor land, it does not provide conceivable options for transportation into and out of this area. The existing land transportation capacity to the area is limited to the public transportation service (bus) and private transportation on a second-degree arterial road with no direct connection to major highways. With a project with these kinds of dimensions in economic and physical capacity, it is necessary to provide a workable solution for the transportation problems in the historical downtown areas.

One of the most important issues that the harbor is now facing is the authority conflict over the decision about its future function. The central government (the Ministry of Tourism in particular) continues to use its constitution-based legal authority to intervene in the process of local planning in Istanbul. While doing this, it claims that its intervention is to guarantee the maximum economic return to the public in an area with very strategic location values, such as touristic, retail trade and finance. However, this judgment was independently created from the participation of the local government agencies, which are responsible for the supply of goods and services to local business and residents in the nearby area. Although the local government has no specific opposition toward the Karaköy Harbor project, there has been an ongoing opposition over the authority take over in general. Especially the Istanbul Metropolitan Area Municipality brings this issue frequently to the public and declares their opposition in the exclusion of their existence in the decision-making process, while they are expected to solve the problems that come along with these intense developments.

Other waterfront development examples and reflections to Karaköy Harbor

In other examples of waterfront development, there was a need to take an initiative to rehabilitate the site and the harbor, as in the case of Karaköy Harbor. These other cases, mostly in the industrially advanced countries, provide examples for waterfront development initiatives. There are successful and unsuccessful examples, and successful examples with pitfalls. For an example of the latter, Baltimore was declared as a successful development, but with downsides as indicated by many social scientists. Harvey (1990, p 90) among them, notes that Baltimore is an outstanding success in the institutionalization of commercialization by building a impressive harbor place “...though the impact upon city poverty, homelessness, health care, education provision, has negligible and perhaps even negative”. Harvey continues that “imaging” cities by designing and creating spec-

tacular urban spaces is a successful way to attract capital and people in urban entrepreneurialism (Harvey, 1990). Following Harvey’s idea, Meyer points out that industrially advanced countries discovered that old harbor areas are “...ideal sites for the development of new urban milieus [and]...the urban waterfront became an international formula for success...[however], on close examination, not every formula for success is as successful as it once appeared to be” (Meyer, 1999, pp 13–14).

The most controversial example, the redevelopment of the London Docklands, especially the Canary Wharf specifies another important point in waterfront development. Fainstein (1994) indicates that there was nothing wrong in the redevelopment of a huge vacant land in the heart of the London Metropolitan Area. Yet, government’s role and attitude in the implementation process of the plan caused a sizeable negative effect on the results; a financially failed project that could not attract the targeted group and bankrupted the famous developer who also developed New York’s Battery Park (Fainstein, 1994, p 226).

In some of the examples the pitfalls were diminished in the planning process as in the Barcelona case. Although it was once declared as an unsuccessful waterfront development because it was separated from the city, the Barcelona waterfront development was later indicated as a successful project as it placed the broad cultural and political aspects as primary sources for the redevelopment. Meyer explains that “here the design of urban space has not produced just one kind of cultural identity, but has allowed the creation of various interpretations of the city, and various ways of forming a sense of identity” by ongoing attempts, and with the help of city council’s reformist politics (Meyer, 1999, p 180).

Among successful examples, Seattle is called as an unique example in waterfront development with its still-functioning modernized harbor, and the integration of new functions into the existing cityscape and life. As in the case of San Francisco, Seattle’s waterfront development exemplifies the type of design that fulfills the purpose of creating public space in a successful way (Meyer, 1999). New York’s Battery Park provides another example of successful waterfront development, especially in terms of the financial success that brought back the New York city, which was undergoing financial problems in the mid-1970s. Through the development of an abandoned harbor area with a strong financial framework and a flourishing design that connects the newly developed area to the existing pattern and urban structure, New York’s Battery Park is listed as one of the noteworthy waterfront developments (Fainstein, 1994; Meyer, 1999).

From the experiences of waterfront development in the world, a number of issues emerged: the connection to the existing cityscape; the importance of public space; intertwining the existing social mosaic to the new development; government’s and developer’s

roles and approaches in the redevelopment process; and the concern for creating gated communities for the sake of financial benefits.

Considering the concern for creating gated communities, Fainstein notes that in some developments, "to ensure the safe pursuit of profit within their reconstructed city, designers intentionally set projects off from their surroundings so as to create defensible space..." (Fainstein, 1994, p 226), and permeable borders are replaced with internal walls to create a separated site (Sennett, 1990). To make sure only *certain people* have access to these new developments, a number of measures are taken such as: the isolation of projects behind highways; raised plazas or actual walls; extensive deployment of security measures; high prices for renting quarters; and for buying goods sold within the new stores (Fainstein, 1994). The danger of creating gated communities in redeveloped areas causes the exclusion of a part of the public and the separation of the new site from the existing physical and social mosaic of the city.

The importance of public space emerges as another important issue, especially the relation between public space and design/organization approach. The design and organization underscore the question of "...whether a true renewal of public area-one that reinforces and renews public life-is taking place, or whether this renewal is nothing more than a 'beautification' meant to reinforce city's *corporate identity*. The frequently artificial character of organized activities in new public areas and the influence of commerce on this trend have led to the development being referred to in the United States as variations on a theme park" (Meyer, 1999, p 45). Relating to the same point, Stevenson argues that "...many cities around the world-in particular de-industrialising cities-have adopted strategies of reimagining and urban regeneration which were shaped by dominant perceptions of the symbolic and imagined form of the city" that encourages adaptation of a certain built form based on global urban discourses, rather than endorses the local urban discourses represent to local cultural identity and difference (Stevenson, 1999, p 106).

Before reaching the conclusions for Karaköy Harbor, we would like to scrutinize some differences and similarities of the harbor with the other examples we mentioned. The Karaköy Harbor exhibits two major differences from the harbor revitalization examples industrial countries. First point is the differences in the physical and economic scale of the harbor. Karaköy is one of the ports of the Istanbul Harbor, and compared to the examples we mentioned above, the abandoned land in the harbor is smaller. The Istanbul Harbor, consisting of several ports, is the biggest harbor in Turkey, and according to today's indicators, it will sustain its importance in the near future. Unlike to the other country examples, the decline is localized in Karaköy Harbor itself; it is not the decline in the Istanbul Harbor. Thus, the ongoing transformation of the harbor has limited negative

effects on the surrounding residential and commercial parts of the inner city.

The second difference is the character of the urbanization in industrially advanced and developing countries. Meyer argues that the US and European city centers are no longer "essential concentration of activity and facilities". The activities have been moved to the other places within metropolitan regions (Meyer, 1999, p 44). Thus, in order to offset this trend, cities in these countries have followed a planning approach aiming to revitalize the abandoned areas by creating cultural, commercial, and recreational attraction points such as museums, galleries, shopping areas, and amusement parks.

In developing countries, however, the character of urbanization is different because there is an over-urbanization in the city centers rather than a decline. In the last four decades, the Istanbul Metropolitan Area has followed a pattern of growth in which residential and other urban land use modes have densely settled in the urban core. The relatively high dependency on the public infrastructure of transportation and communication has kept the demand high for the land in the city center until very recently. Thus, despite the suburbanization trend and decentralization attempts, the city center in Istanbul still functions as a lively place for shopping, meeting, and business purposes. As part of the city center, Karaköy Harbor is valuable site as a business and residential area. Therefore, a decline in land value is not a consideration here; it is rather the question of *who would* take the advantage and use the abandoned land of the harbor.

Besides the differences, we find similarities between Karaköy Harbor and the other examples. The main similarity is the fact that the harbor is undergoing a change, and this transformation is causing the abandonment of a part of the harbor area. So, there is necessity to take initiative accordingly, both for the harbor and the city. The second similarity comes with the central government's proposal for the harbor. The proposal aims to create a "fun-shopping" mall for tourists from cruises, like in other festival markets, and to build a "business center" for a certain target group that will provide considerable economic benefit. The context of the proposal is similar to the other examples of waterfront developments in terms of the creation of differentiated attraction points to generate the most demand from potential users.

Evaluation and conclusion

Since Karaköy Harbor lost its cargo port function a decade ago, today it is still trying to find an efficient way to continue its life. Although there are many possibilities for the rearrangement of the harbor and its area, the last choice should consider the best possible planning alternative for Karaköy Harbor area, Istanbul city, and the communities.

Today, there are attempts to reorganize the harbor.

However, these attempts are ill-structured in three points. The first important issue is the necessity of a careful planning approach for the future of Karaköy Harbor and its surrounding area. Although Karaköy Harbor is placed in an important and problematic area of Istanbul city, the reorganization of the harbor is seen as a nodal, partial development. Lack of a comprehensive planning approach or underestimation of the value of this area for the nearby communities and for the whole city could create major setbacks in the organization and operation of the harbor. A holistic and comprehensive planning approach is necessary to delineate the harbor's future since this development will affect the historical core of the city, and vice versa. Comprehensive analysis, which looks into trading activities, transportation problems, and aesthetical dimensions in the harbor and surrounding area, is crucial. It should be agreed that the development or the reorganization of the harbor as a separate unit would not be beneficial to the harbor or to the city.

The second problematic point is the exclusion of the local government from the decision-making process by the declaration of this area as a "special tourism area". Local governments provide and maintain many services, such as infrastructure and waste collection. Disregarding their opinions and considerations will bring new problems to the situation, rather than solving the existing ones. In the future the Karaköy Harbor area should be a place for the people of Istanbul, not just visiting tourists. Thus there is a clear necessity for a collaboration between the local and central government agencies in the realization of the project and the consideration of the urban context. Throughout the world there are numerous examples of revitalized harbors with mixed-use, such as Seattle in the US, and Sydney in Australia. Adapting the strengths of these examples into the specific conditions of Karaköy Harbor and Istanbul might create the most viable solution to the planning and functioning of the harbor.

The third issue is the lack of public participation in the decision making process. The harbor area is one of the last potential areas for waterfront activities in the city. The city as a whole and especially neighboring communities have expectations of the harbor as a recreational public place. The public saw that abandoned warehouses, which occupy a large area along the waterfront, could be used for different public purposes. For example, two of these four warehouses were temporarily used as art exhibition centers during the UN Habitat II-Istanbul Summit in the summer of 1996. Today, they are still used as centers for trade fairs and art exhibitions. Yet, since there is no clear decision about how the overall area will be used in the future, the buildings have not been sufficiently remodeled.

Although the local residents want to see open space and recreational facilities in this area, they do not object to having a passenger harbor. With an organized and consensual decision, both the harbor

facilities and the surrounding area could be efficiently rearranged. Preferably the surrounding area with its precious Bosphorus view would be accessible to the public, while the passenger harbor and its facilities would be extensively reorganized to serve as an exquisite and efficient entry point for the cruise passengers. Without doubt, there is a need for a more participatory approach in the decision making process. This kind of approach will ensure not only the international economic value of the area but also its recreational value for local residents.

Harbor's economic future is closely related to its ability to attract the increasing numbers of cruise ship passengers worldwide. Thus, any future project must put the provision of cutting-edge passenger port facilities at the core of the design and management concept. Other than this function, the suggested facilities in the area must be carefully selected and designed. During the authors' field research, it appeared unwise to suggest additional car-traffic-generating facilities, such as shopping malls, hotel and office complexes on the scale of the central government's project. This is due to the area's unfavorable transportation connections. As was mentioned elsewhere in this paper, the area has a road service with no major connections to highways and no possibility to be physically improved to serve higher volumes of car traffic than that of today. It is likely that this complicated waterfront project will require devotion of a considerable amount of land to car parking facilities. This is one of the major setbacks in the suggested project, which will decrease the usable area for pedestrian facilities. Thus a new function in this area requires the consideration of alternative public transportation systems, such as more effective use of water transportation and trams.

An "imported" waterfront development is not a solution for Karaköy Harbor. Although the dynamics and current situation is not exactly same as compare to other ports that undergone waterfront development, the existing proposal seeks a similar type of development that industrially advanced countries have realized in order to provide an enhancement in the harbor and its area's economic effectiveness. Our concern lies in the nature of the planning process and the context of the proposals. It is a challenge to come up with a proposal that will provide benefits to all interested parties in this case. In doing this, the key to success is to increase the communication between different planning levels and the communities that directly effected from the project.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr John R. Mullin, faculty of LARP-UMass and the director of Centre for Economic Development at LARP, who mentored and funded this research. Besides his support, his valuable comments helped to improve the earlier draft of this

article. Leslie Porterfield, Cornell University, put her valuable time and effort in reviewing the draft.

References

- Breen, A and Rigby, D (1996) *The New Waterfront: A Worldwide Urban Success Story*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Can, H T (1999) Interview by Authors. Istanbul, Turkey (Turkish Maritime Company, Section of Customs and Trading), 14 December.
- Craig-Smith, S J (1995) The importance and problems of city waterside regions. In: Craig-Smith, S J, Fagence, M (Eds.), *Recreation and Tourism as a Catalyst for Urban Waterfront Redevelopment: An International Survey*. Praeger, Westport, CT.
- Cumhuriyet (1990) Istanbul Yolcu Limanı Kompleksi için Virademi, 31 May.
- Fainstein, S S (1994) *The City Builders: Property, Politics and Planning in London and New York*. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Göktuğ, M (1999) Interview by Authors. Istanbul, Turkey, 14 December.
- Harvey, D (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Hoyle, B (1996) Ports, cities and coastal zones: competition and change in a multimodal environment. In: Brian, H. (Ed.), *Cityports, Coastal Zones and Regional Change: International Perspective on Planning and Management*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Istanbul Ansiklopedisi (Istanbul Encyclopedia) (1994) Tarih Vakfı, Istanbul.
- Kazgan (1994) *Yeni Ekonomik Düzendeki Türkiye'nin Yeri*. Altın Kitaplar, Istanbul.
- Kuban, D (1996) The growth of a city. *Istanbul (Biannual)* **1996 Selections**, 10–42.
- Milliyet (1991) Salıpazarı'na 500 Milyon Dolarlık Proje, 29 June.
- Meyer, H (1999) *City and Port*. International Books, Rotterdam.
- Mullin, J and Kotval, Z (1996) The harbour at Viana do Castelo in Portugal: planning in a vacuum. *European Planning Studies* **4**(2), 131–146.
- Müller-Wiener, W (1998) Bizanstan Osmanlıya Istanbul Limanı (Erol Özbek, Trans.), vol. 66. Tarih Vakfı-Yurt Yayınları, Istanbul.
- Nüvit, M (1999) Interview by Authors. Istanbul, Turkey, 13 December.
- Reyhanoğlu, M (1999) Interview by Authors. Istanbul, Turkey (Turkish Maritime Organization-Section of Construction and Project), 24 December.
- Sennett, R (1990) *The Conscience of the Eye*. Knopf, New York.
- Stevenson, D (1999) Reflections of a “great port” city: the case of Newcastle, Australia. *Environment and Planning D: Space and Society* **17**(1), 105–119.