Conceptual challenges on urban transformation

Nuran ZEREN GÜLERSOY[1-2]**, Ebru GÜRLER**[3]
[1] *Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul, TURKEY*
[2] *ITU, Urban and Environmental Planning and Research Centre, Istanbul, TURKEY*
[3] *ITU, Institute of Science and Technology Istanbul, TURKEY*

Abstract:
This study discusses the complexity of the concept of urban transformation and urban change in planning history by focusing on the urbanization processes. The purpose of this study is to resolve the changes in theory and practice of urban transformation, and to reconsider diversified approaches in urban transformation by explaining it in an inter-disciplinary manner. Therefore; the objective of this study is threefold: (1) to explain conceptual evolution of urban transformation in planning history with reference to paradigm shifts, (2) to categorize theoretical developments and changes of urban transformation in planning theory, (3) to mark the spatial manifestation of urban transformation in planning practice. In view of that, a typology on the periods related with urban transformation is characterized by evaluating paradigm shifts in planning history by means of historical analysis. In conclusion, similarities and differences regarding theories and practices of urban transformation are debated as well as the possibilities and opportunities in advanced studies on urban transformation are proposed.

Introduction: Concept of urban transformation

There is a complexity within the concept of urban transformation, in that planning history encapsulates the issues of urban development, urban change and urban conservation. The issues of urban development and change in the urbanization processes are ignored without considering their content and are taken for granted under a general term of urban transformation. The definition of the concept of urban transformation in planning theory changes in each period and the approach to urban transformation in planning practice differ from each other with reference to the paradigm shifts in planning history. Therefore, an in-depth reconsideration for urban transformation in urbanization processes is required in order to resolve the change in its conceptual definitions in planning theory, and the difference of approaches that have emerged in planning practice. A holistic framework could be set up by resolving the changes in the theory and practice of urban transformation in order to

formulate strategic approaches which integrate the theory, practice and method used for urban transformation as a paradigmatic model in the planning system. Paradigm shifts in urban planning both persistently reform the content of theory and practice and reconfigure the context of the concept of urban transformation.

Urban transformation could be reconsidered according to three major categories: heritage conservation, urban regeneration and redevelopment/ renewal through the ages.

- **Heritage conservation-based Urban Transformation:** Urban areas which have a historical and cultural significance in the city are generally engaged in heritage conservation-based urban transformation in which the protection of heritage is a fundamental concern. Consequently, it focuses on historic preservation and urban conservation as well as urban restoration, restitution, renovation and reuse as methods in the process. It develops plans, programs and policy-based frameworks by public and institutional leadership models for producing international systems in planning theory.
- **Regeneration-based Urban Transformation**: Existing urban areas having economic and functional potential, derelict industrial areas and docklands are examined according to regeneration-based urban transformation which endorses hedonic restructuring as a hallmark. Consequently, it focuses on urban regeneration as well as reconstruction, redevelopment, restructuring and land-use change as methods in the process. It develops policy and strategy-based frameworks by agent-based entrepreneurial models for producing a multi-paradigmatic agenda in planning theory.
- **(Re)Development-based Urban Transformation:** Squatter/*gece-kondu* areas, devastated and/or deteriorated urban spaces in the city require redevelopment-based urban transformation that focuses on urban upgrading and socio-economic restructuring. Consequently, it focuses on an urban renaissance as well as renewal, revitalization, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse as methods of its process. It develops plans, programs and policy-based frameworks by public and private partnership models for producing global strategies in planning theory.

These categories show that changes in the theories of urban transformation are related with the planning system regulating at the organizational level whereas changes in the practices of urban transformation are related with the urban space epitomizing the spatial level of urban planning and design.

Urban transformation until the end of 19th century

Establishing ancient settlements for sheltering purposes, medieval closed cities for military defense, agricultural cities and pre-modern industrial cities caused an urbanization process which was a dominant paradigm that instigated urban formation and growth until the end of 19th century. Dogmas and practices of urban formation and urban growth inevitably converged on urban transformation in urbanization processes in which spatial form and organizational system of urbanization are achieved by authoritarian principles through urban design (Rykwert, 1976).

From Antiquity to the Early Renaissance, urban design models focusing on physical form and function produced Urban Formation approach (Mumford, 1961), i.e.: organic urban pattern in ancient settlements, Hippodamian

(gridiron) planning principles, Vitruvian architectural principles in ancient cities, narrower streetscapes in medieval cities (Rykwert, 1976). Conserving the ancient urban patterns of historical significance was an ideological principle in urban formation approach; i.e.: conservation of the burnt urban area after Nero's great fire in Rome in the 1st century, conservation of the Athenian temples, acropolis and city walls destroyed by the Persians in the 5th century (Jokilehto, 1986). Therefore, preserving the historic heritage became an initial strategy at urban scale in the heritage-based urban transformation before the Renaissance.

In the Early Renaissance period – from the 12th to the 14th century – intellectual revitalization on a philosophical and scientific basis created social, political and economic transformations. The revived interest in antiquity provoked some nostalgic concepts to be used in the arts (Jokilehto, 1986). In this period; the concept of urban conservation and transformation was identified by a political regulation configured in the "Overseer over the protection of all Antiquities", that bypassed the kings and the popes (Birabi, 2007). This regulation created a formal basis for urban conservation.

From the Renaissance until the end of 18th century, urban design, development and transformation models concentrating on urbanization system and structure produced an "Urban Growth" approach (Mumford, 1961), i.e.: the geometric urban pattern, monumental architecture and wider streetscapes of Renaissance cities. By the time of the Renaissance, scientific revolutions and cultural rebirth encouraged a new cultural attitude for protecting ancient monuments through the methods of restoration and conservation (Jokilehto, 1986). In the 15th century, ancient monuments and works of art were protected against destruction by papal measures (Jokilehto, 1986) on one side, and adaptive reuse of historic monuments and simple restoration of ancient monuments were achieved (Jokilehto, 1986) on the other. In the 16th century, existing church buildings were reformed by the guidelines of the Council of Trent (Jokilehto, 1986). In the 17th century, the protection of historic urban fabric was decreed in the Swedish Antiquities Ordinance of 1666 (Birabi, 2007). In 1770s, the first institution for protecting the historic urban fabric was established under the title of "Ober-Bau-Department" by the Prussian Monarchy (Birabi, 2007). During the Renaissance; the preservation, architectural restoration, reuse of ancient monuments and urban conservation were managed by a political regulation set up in the pro-heritage protection Decree that was ratified by the French Revolutionary Government (Jokilehto, 1986). Thus, conserving the cultural heritage and restoring the historic monuments became a pioneering strategy for urban conservation and transformation at the architectural level.

The shift from pre-industrial agricultural cities to pre-modern industrial cities resulted from industrialization movement which induced a dominating paradigm based on the urban development process in the 19th century. This situation formed a pre-modern system shaped by conventional philosophy and comprehensive planning approach in classical urban planning (Choay, 1969). The theories and practices of urban transformation concentrated on urban development and change as a unified entity in order to configure and systematize the urbanization processes on organizational and spatial levels. In addition, approaches for urban transformation provided an operational procedure for historic heritage and urban (re)development. Therefore, the paradigms for urban development created challenging traditions such as heritage conservation versus urban (re)development for modernization in the

orthodoxy for urban transformation. In this period, existence of contradictory traditions rise as a critical challenge in urban transformation.

First tradition focuses on heritage-based urban transformation in order to protect the historic character of the city in urban development process. Two significant strategies, influenced by "city beautiful" ideology, were used in the Urban Conservation approach. Restoring the historic monuments of memorial value through the methods of conservation, renovation and restoration is used as a strategy at architectural scale; i.e.: the Collesseum in Rome, the Temple of Athena Nike in Athens (Jokilehto, 1986). Preserving the historic urban pattern by redevelopment policies is put into practice as another strategy at the urban scale. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) Manifesto of 1877 initiated a formal basis for conservation by encouraging architectural restoration programs (Rodwell, 2007) and urban heritage conservation (Birabi, 2007).

Other traditions focus on development-based urban transformation in order to modernize the city's urbanization processes. In other words, the approaches of Urban Renewal and Urban Reconstruction are utilized as contradictory traditions for urban transformation. Development-led ideology for upgrading the urban quality created Urban Renewal approach in the form of clearing problematical areas and rebuilding a new urban pattern. Urban development policies for public and social housing programs and sanitation projects were included in the UK's Housing Act of 1851, and provided a basis for property-led renewal in Europe i.e.: Lewisham social housing in London and other social housing projects in Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Edinburgh and Glasgow (Fainstein, 1983). Modernization-led ideology regarding the recovery of urban areas produced the Urban Reconstruction approach in the form of demolishing the existing areas and rebuilding a new urban pattern. Legislation for massive expropriation and restructuring based on urban scenarios and urban development operations is used as a tool in practice (Fainstein, 1983), i.e.: the renovation scheme in Haussmann operations between 1851 and 1873 in France (Hall, 1998).

Urban transformation in the 20th century: Multi-dimensional challenges in urban development and change

The 20th century embraced a variety of progress-related debates and multi-dimensional challenges that evolved from capitalist industrialism and liberalism (Hillier & Healey, 2010). The shift from modernist industrial cities to post-modernist and post-industrial global cities put an emphasis on the process of urban change (Freestone, 2000) as a dominating paradigm. In parallel with this, the planning and management of urbanization processes have been reconfigured, and the concept of urban transformation became diversified in both the theory and practice of urban planning (Ward, 2004) at organizational and spatial levels. The typology of urban transformation ranged from heritage-based to development and regeneration-based approaches as a result of paradigm shifts shaped by the post-world war recovery, the (post)modern movement and the globalization process. Therefore, the paradigms for the process of urban change created a fundamental tradition of heritage and sustainable development through multi-dimensional frameworks for urban transformation. In the 20th century, heritage conservation and spatial response of politico-economic restructuring were revealed as a basic challenge for urban transformation.

Post-war economic restructuring in social, economic and spatial domains and modern planning were the most important issues before the 1960s. The classical rationalist philosophy of science and modern movement gave rise to positivist planning philosophy and comprehensive planning approach in planning theory (Camhis, 1979). Therefore; models for community development and public policy for urban transformation became major concerns in planning practice. Consequently, planning paradigms on urban change produced International Concerns for Historic and Cultural Heritage in Urban Transformation. In this period, modernist idea-oriented urban transformation focused on public policies for providing post-war urban restructuring and community development as well as the protection of heritage by means of leadership models and urban policies (Gürler, 2009). Before the 1960s, heritage-based approaches of urban revitalization and conservation gained international character and the development-based approaches of urban renewal and reconstruction were used for post-war recovery.

Post-war Reconstruction-I and the Bauhaus movement in 1920s correlated with an Urban Renewal approach to development-based rebuilding. Property-led urban renewal and large-scale urban redevelopment were utilized as basic methods through public and social housing programs in downtown and industrially de-centralized areas within the city center to capture a share of regional development and international competition (Fainstein, 1994). Inter-war renewal and international concern for protecting the historic heritage of the modern city in the 1930s described the Urban Revitalization approach in the form of heritage-based redevelopment. The Athens Charter of CIAM in 1933 produced rules for protecting the inner-city historic heritage of a functional city and endorsed historic preservation in the urban development process in which social cohesion and economic development were targeted (Hall, 1998). The Roeich Pact in 1935 provided regulations for protecting cultural heritage in times of war (Birabi, 2007). Heritage-led urban revitalization was used as a method for advancing conservation programs and functional segregation on historic urban areas at urban scale.

Post-war Reconstruction-II, economical revival and development of the modern city in 1940s converted the Urban Reconstruction approach into heritage-based redevelopment. The united politics regulated by the United Nations in 1942 (UN, 2011) and the European Community in 1945 (EU, 2011) formulated principles for redeveloping CBD, downtown and decentralized areas. The community renewal program of 1946 was utilized to upgrade the historic city center and for the clearing of the peripheral pattern (UNESCO, 2011). The European Recovery Program of 1947, known as the Marshall Plan, supported post-war economic recovery through reconstruction and encouraged European integration (OECD, 2011). Property-led, commerce-led and service-led urban redevelopment were used as universal methods for creating infrastructural and social development, i.e.: the post-war reconstruction of Warsaw from 1945 to 1953 (Jokilehto, 1986), the post-war renewal of Berlin, London and Rotterdam (Freestone, 2000). The preservation framework in the European Cultural Convention of 1954 and the UNESCO New Delhi Resolution of 1956 for the recovery of the cultural heritage of the modern city in the 1950s (Birabi, 2007) reformulated the Urban Conservation approach by regulating heritage-based reconstruction. Cultural heritage programs gained an institutional structure in the international context. Heritage-led urban development was

used as an intergovernmental method for conserving and restoring cultural property at the architectural scale, i.e.: the historic preservation program in Chicago in the 1950s and 1960s (Hall, 1998).

Before the 1960s, international frameworks for urban transformation approaches were produced by public leadership models and urban policies. Heritage-based urban transformation was regulated by institutional programmes for conserving the historic and cultural heritage of cities. The comprehensive planning approach focused on long-term public-benefits and heritage protection in restructuring-based planning practices, whereas the incremental planning approach focused on short-term public benefits and urban redevelopment in community-based planning practices (Camhis, 1979).

The globalization movement and restructuring processes put emphasis on the political dimensions of planning processes in which strategies and partnership models gained importance in a world system approach from 1960 to 1980 (Campbell & Fainstein, 1996). Liberal rational philosophy and the post-modern movement gave rise to neo-positivist planning philosophy and communicative, advocacy and equity planning approaches in planning theory (Alexander, 1984). The decision-making process, participation and strategic programming in urban transformation became major concerns in planning practice. Accordingly, planning paradigms regarding urban change produced Global Frameworks for Historic and Cultural Heritage in Urban Transformation. In this period, post-modernist idea-oriented urban transformation focused on urban regimes for providing global restructuring and socio-economic development as well as the protection of historic heritage by leadership models (Gürler, 2009). From 1960 to 1980, the approaches of urban conservation and urban revitalization gained global character whereas urban renewal was limited as a redevelopment strategy in the US.

International charters and conventions on heritage allowed the Urban Conservation approach to become a dominant paradigm. The Conservation Programs of Europa Nostra in 1963 (EU, 2011) and the Venice Charter of 1964 (UNESCO, 2011) established a policy framework for cooperation between (inter)national authorities and provided conservation principles and techniques. The 1966 National Historical Preservation Act in the US provided a legal framework for the protection of historic places by complex strategies under sustained leadership (Fainstein, 1983). The World Heritage Convention of 1972 (UNESCO, 2011), and the European Heritage Convention of 1985 (EU, 2011) endorsed universal frameworks and policies for conserving historic heritage at architectural and urban scales. The Urban Renewal approach became a popular paradigm in the U.S as a result of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. This Act produced radical urban regulations for inner-city historic areas and a socio-economic redevelopment agenda for CBD and downtown areas by a proactive- strategy of urban renewal under supervised partnership (Fainstein, 1983). The Model Cities program was utilized for the regeneration of cultural heritage by demolishing devastated peripheral areas and rebuilding with reference to the historic pattern. Commerce-led urban renewal and preservation-led urban revitalization were used as methods to develop downtown areas, i.e.: Atlanta, Georgia; Seattle, Washington; and Dayton, Ohio in the US (Fainstein, 1983). International charters and declarations raised the Urban Revitalization approach as a progressive paradigm in the World. The

ICOMOS Charter of 1971 produced planning regulations on the rehabilitation of historic towns and urban areas. The Nairobi recommendations of 1976 strengthened urban rehabilitation and social development by establishing institutional and legal frameworks (UNESCO, 2011). The Vancouver Declaration of 1976 provided a regulatory agenda for sustainable development in social, economical, ecological and environmental arenas as well as for the conservation of historical and cultural heritage (UN-HABITAT, 2011). All these international concerns targeted socio-economical development by heritage conservation. Heritage-led urban revitalization was used as a method by plans, programs and policies for transforming and redeveloping historic inner-city areas.

From the 1960 to the 1980s, public leadership models and urban regimes for heritage-based and development-based urban transformation were advanced by means of international frameworks. The communicative planning approach focused on social benefit in investment-based planning practices for urban transformation in the 1960s (Camhis, 1979). The Advocacy planning approach focused on pluralistic benefit in negotiation based planning practices in whereas Equity planning approach focused on social justice in mediation-based planning practices for urban transformation in the 1970s (Healey, 1995). This shift denotes the rise of community participation to the processes to solve social problems in the urban transformation process. Furthermore, paradigm shifts in planning practice provided advances in international frameworks for heritage-based and redevelopment-based urban transformations by public leadership models and urban regimes. In the 1960s, concentrating on structure-side factors and society-based redevelopment strategies in urban transformation process allowed historic preservation and urban conservation programs for inner-city areas. As a result of criticism regarding the modern movement and character of urban space, innovative new planning principles and methodology for urban revitalization within a social and cultural ideology emerged. In the 1970s, concentrating on agency-side factors and regime-based redevelopment strategies in the urban regeneration process allowed heritage conservation for post-industrial inner-city areas. As a result of the effects of time on character and identity of urban space in historic preservation and conservation, new urban policies for urban conservation within a politic and economic ideology emerged autonomously (Gülersoy, 2010).

The Political-economy approach in the globalization movement put emphasis on land use plans in the strategic models for liberal processes in the 1980s (Gray, 1986) and competitive strategies in the management models for neo-liberal processes in the 1990s (Gray, 1996) from 1980 to 2000. The radical rational philosophy and globalization movement gave rise to a post-positivist planning philosophy and collaborative and strategic planning approaches in planning theory. Models for process planning, partnerships and strategic management for urban transformation became major concerns in planning practice (Roberts & Sykes, 2000). Therefore, planning paradigms of urban change produced Global Strategies for Heritage and Restructuring in Urban Transformation. In this period, liberal idea-oriented urban transformation encountered politico-economical strategies for providing post-industrial restructuring and development of competitive advantage as well as the protection of historic heritage by partnership models and urban strategies (Gürler, 2009). From 1980 to 2000, the urban regeneration approach became a leading type in urban

transformation over the approaches of urban development and urban renaissance.

The relationship between (re)development and competitive advantage shaped by policies and strategies for urban transformation revolutionized the Urban Redevelopment approach for inner-city revitalization. Public leadership as a partnership model was institutionalized under Redevelopment Agencies in the US and Regional Development Agencies in the UK by launching an Urban Development Fund in which regional policies were utilized for developing a multi-functional land-use development programme for revitalizing inner-city areas (Fainstein, 1994). In contrast, private entrepreneurship as a partnership model was institutionalized under the Urban Development Companies in the US and Urban Regeneration Companies in the UK by the 1978 Inner Urban Areas Act in which urban policies were utilized for redevelopment (Fainstein, 1983). The Settlement Revitalization Program of 1982 provided an institutional strategy for revitalizing historic neighbourhoods and districts by partnership and community participation models (UNESCO, 2011). Property-led and commerce-led urban redevelopment, as well as heritage-led urban regeneration, was used as methods by post-industrial policy-oriented urban redevelopment projects and programmes, i.e.: property-led and commerce-led redevelopment in New York and London (Fainstein, 1994). Heritage programs at architectural and urban scales, as well as funding policies for urban transformation, were used as tools for initiating an interconnection between heritage and tourism through the Urban Renaissance approach to provide conservation and socio-economic development. The Washington Charter of 1987 triggered socio-economic development strategies and multi-disciplinary studies for planning the conservation process for historic towns and areas (UNESCO, 2011). The 1991 Economic Development Administration in the US (Fainstein, 1994) promoted the establishment of funding programmes to provide financial resources for projects having employment potential in urban areas. The historic-preservation-led renaissance for creating festival market places and urban conservation-led urban renaissance for creating tourist-historic cities were used as methods for the urban transformation process (Roberts & Sykes, 2000). This method could also be identified as post-industrialist market-oriented urban renaissance (Gürler, 2009), i.e.: Ghirardelli Square, San Francisco in the US (Fainstein, 1983) and Ortaköy Square and Istiklal Street, in Istanbul, Turkey (Gürler, 2009). Integrating policies and strategies on heritage, tourism and culture initiated the Urban Regeneration approach. The EU-funded research projects of CORDIS in 1990 produced politico-economic strategies and framework programs to (re)develop urban areas and heritage sites under collaborative partnership models (EU, 2011). The ICOMOS Cultural Heritage Program of 1992 provided cultural principles for the restructuring of historic inner-city areas and increased the importance of the tourism industry for the conservation process (UNESCO, 2011). The Urban Policies of the 1990s concentrated on integrated actions and strategies for the conservation and rehabilitation of urban heritage under collaborative partnerships and participatory models (EU, 2011). The Barcelona Declaration produced conservation programs for the preservation of historic and cultural heritage around the Mediterranean by legislation and partnership models (EU, 2011). The Istanbul Declaration of 1996 outlined a regulatory agenda for sustainable development as a global strategy (UN-HABITAT, 2011). Tourism-led urban regeneration was used as a method by projects and programmes. This method could also be identified as post-industrialist rent-

oriented urban regeneration (Gürler, 2009), i.e.: revitalization of city center of the French Quarter in New Orleans, US (Fainstein, 1983).

From 1980 to 2000, collaborative models and (neo)liberal strategies for heritage-based and regeneration-based urban transformation were developed by the new politico-economic regime. The Equity planning approach focused on public interest in mediation-based planning practices for urban transformation in the 1980s. The Collaborative planning approach focused on partnership interest in strategy-based planning practices for urban transformation both in the 1980s and 1990s. The Strategic planning approach focused on partnership interest in policy-based planning practices for urban transformation in the 1990s. As a result, partnership interest to the processes was increased in order to profit from heritage and to provide economic restructuring in the urban transformation process. Moreover, paradigm shifts in planning practice provided advances in global frameworks for historic and cultural heritage-based urban transformation by institutional partnerships, community participation models and politico-economic programs. In the 1980s, concentrating on the issue of urban inequalities in urban regeneration process allowed the heritage conservation and global-scaled restructuring of declined industrial (historic) inner-city areas. As a result of the effects of post-industrial society on urban change by regarding urban form and image in urban renaissance, new urban strategies, principles and partnership models emerged within a social and economic ideology in a liberal manner (Gülersoy, 2010). In the 1990s, concentrating on the issue of restructuring and programmatic tasks in urban regeneration process provided heritage conservation and the locally-scaled restructuring of cultural and historic inner-city areas. As a result of the effects of post-industrial society on urban change by regarding public space and contextual history in urban regeneration, strategic and management plans and sustainable principles emerged within a political and economic ideology in a neo-liberal manner (Gülersoy & Ayrancı, 2011).

Urban transformation in the 21st century: Multi-paradigmatic challenges in integrated urban regeneration
The 21st century has incorporated poly-centric debates and multi-paradigmatic challenges that move forward from liberalism to neo-liberalism and post-liberalism. The shift from post-industrial global cities to sustainable cities, competitive regions and knowledge cities has enforced the process of urban regeneration as a dominating paradigm in urban studies. Regarding this progress, urbanization processes have been reformulating the cities and the concept of urban transformation has started to be redefined. Approaches for urban transformation focus on integrated urban regeneration resulting from developing strategic models both on organizational and spatial levels. Neo-liberal and post-liberal debates focus on the conservation of historical and cultural heritage, integrated sustainable urban development, and cultural creativity in urban transformation. Therefore, the paradigms for the process of urban regeneration create an innovation on heritage and integrated themes through multi-paradigmatic frameworks for urban transformation. In the 21st century, development of a method correlating heritage conservation with approaches for smart green cities and creative cities has been accepted as a basic challenge in urban transformation.

The multi-paradigmatic structure of urban transformation focused on integrated urban regeneration in the 2000s. Liberal radical philosophy and

the neo-liberal movement gave rise to post-positivist planning philosophy (Allmendinger, 2002) and the strategic planning approach in planning theory (Hillier & Healey, 2008) Therefore; models on regulating the land and property markets (Gray, 1996) as well as managing the process of urban transformation by agent-based partnerships (Diamond & Liddle, 2005) became major concerns in planning practice. Also, integrated strategies for competitiveness, sustainability, historic and cultural heritage became part of the debates (Roberts & Sykes, 2000). Therefore, planning paradigms on urban change produced Global Strategies for Heritage, Competitiveness and Culture in Urban Transformation. In this period, neo-liberal market-oriented urban transformation focuses on neo-liberal restructuring and multi-paradigmatic frameworks and strategies in order to achieve integrated urban regeneration.

Providing integrated frameworks for urban development and change resulted in the reformulation of the direction in the Urban Regeneration approach. The economically and socially sustainable strategies for creating competitive advantage of inner-cities (Porter, 1995) were considered as a key potential for reviving distressed urban communities under entrepreneurial partnerships. The EU Lisbon Strategy of 2000 supported this competitive advantage to achieve "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" until 2010 (EU, 2011). The ICOMOS International Charter on Cultural Tourism in 1999 formulated sustainable plans and policies to manage the process by creating a dynamic interaction between cultural heritage conservation and cultural tourism (UNESCO, 2011). The Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 (UNESCO, 2011) and the Cultural Heritage Counts of Europa Nostra in 2005 produced cultural policies, strategies and partnership models as catalysts for creativity in preservation of heritage. Conservation-led, competitiveness-led, service-led and culture-led urban regeneration were used as methods by agent-based partnership models. This method of integrated urban regeneration could also be identified as neo-liberal market-oriented urban regeneration.

In urban transformation, the approaches of strategic planning and management planning become important in the 2000s. The progression of Globalization movement supported the development of Sustainable Urbanism and Smart Cities, as well as Heritage Management, by concentrating on the ecological and historical protection of the urban environment in the planning paradigm of the 2000s (Gülersoy & Ayrancı, 2011). In addition, the management planning approach focused on managerial interest in regulation-based planning practices. Furthermore, paradigm shifts in planning practice provided a new direction in urban transformation. Integrated urban regeneration, as a method for urban transformation, gained importance resulting from neo-liberal strategies for heritage, competitiveness and culture. Agent-based partnership models and management strategies shaped the planning practices for urban transformation. Changes in the urban development regime that were aimed to regulate the land and property market and specific implementation instruments formulated land and property markets as key players in urban regeneration provided the emergence of new instruments in terms of land and property market, urban design, urban policies and economics in the planning agenda (Tasan-Kok & Beaten, 2011). Therefore, market-oriented spatial planning and revival of profit-driven changes in land-use emerged

during this period (Jessop, 2002). In the 2000s, concentrating on the issue of regulative tasks in urban regeneration process allowed the restructuring of potential urban spaces. As a result of the effects of informational society on urban change by concerning quality of urban life and ecology in urban regeneration, management plans and smart principles emerged within a politic and economic ideology in a post-liberal manner (Gülersoy & Gürler 2010).

The Multi-paradigmatic approach for urban transformation concentrated on integrated strategies for historic and cultural heritage, sustainability, competitiveness, creativity and knowledge in the 2010s. Liberal radical philosophy and post-liberal movement gave rise to the post-positivist planning philosophy (Allmendinger, 2002) and the sustainable planning approach in planning theory (Hillier & Healey, 2008). Therefore, models for regulating the economy (Gray, 1996) as well as manipulating the process of urban transformation by entrepreneurship-based institutional stakeholders (Tasan-Kok & Beaten, 2011) have become a major concern in planning practice. Consequently, planning paradigms on urban change are producing Global Strategies for Heritage, Sustainability and Knowledge in Urban Transformation. In this period, post-liberal rent-oriented urban transformation focuses on post-liberal restructuring and multi-paradigmatic guidelines and policies for integrated urban regeneration.

The Urban Regeneration approach gained an advanced direction for change-based urban transformation to provide integrated guidelines and policies for urban development and change. The Resolution on Millennium Development Goals in 2000 (UN, 2011) and the Agenda and Global Action Plan in 2003 (UN-HABITAT, 2011) produced programmes for conservation and rehabilitation of historic and cultural heritage as well as for socio-economically sustainable development strategies and participation models in the decision-making process. MDGs and Habitat Agenda converge on integrated sustainable development in urban transformation. The Mapping Document of Creative Industries Task Force-CITF in 1998 in the UK (Couch, Fraser & Percy, 2003) promoted integrated creative strategies to develop cultural industries by creative programmes and to support creative entrepreneurship in an urban process (Jarvis, Lambie & Berkeley, 2009). The Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 provided a global cultural strategy for protecting cultural diversity and providing sustainability in creative processes (UNESCO, 2011). The creative tourism strategies of the Creative Cities Network in 2008 initiated an integrated heritage strategy for promoting local heritage and enriching cultural identity through sustainable projects (UNESCO, 2011). Finally, the Leipzig Charter and the Toledo Declaration put emphasis on integrated sustainable development and integrated urban regeneration in order to support mixed policies and strategies to create intelligent, sustainable and smart green development as well as to produce social renewal and eco-economy (EU, 2011). Finally, the Europe 2020 Strategy in 2010 formulates a new economic strategy based on a digital agenda and competitiveness for achieving smart, sustainable and inclusive growth by institutional networks and stakeholder models (EU, 2011). Heritage-led, competitiveness-led, creativity-led, knowledge-led urban regeneration are being used as methods by agent-based partnership models. This method of integrated urban regeneration could also be identified as post-liberal rent-oriented urban regeneration.

Cultural interest in self-regulating practices and normative planning approach has created certain threats for urban transformation in the 2010s (Allmendinger, 2002). Normative theories have created dualism in traditional planning theory as the procedural-substantive distinction and the theory-practice gap (Allmendinger, 2002) as a result of interpreting the experiences in a more contextualized and historically appreciated manner (Gray, 1996). Furthermore, paradigm shifts in planning theory has been providing a new direction in urban transformation. Integrated urban regeneration as a method for urban transformation has gained an enhanced importance resulting from post-liberal strategies for heritage, sustainability and creativity. Agent-based stakeholder models and hedonic strategies have been shaping the planning practices of urban transformation. Changes in urban redevelopment regime that aim to manipulate the market economy as a key player in urban regeneration has been providing the emergence of specific frameworks, guidelines and policies in the planning agenda. Therefore, rent-oriented spatial planning and self-autonomous hedonic changes in land-use have emerged during this period. As a result of the rise of creative society in cities, innovations and entrepreneurial principles have emerged within a political and economic ideology.

Conclusion

Urban Transformation, grounded on the intersection of urban development, and urban change are diversified by evolving in urbanization processes and the methods of evaluating urban transformation in urban studies are also changed. Urban transformation is explained by urban development and urban change by outlining urbanization processes in planning history (Roberts & Sykes, 2000) and paradigm shifts (Alexander, 1984) resulting from the non-existence of a single explanatory theory on the concept of urban transformation (Hillier & Healey, 2010). Paradigm shifts, which arise from an interaction between the philosophy of science and the philosophy of planning, not only make up the concept of urban transformation but also set up different theories, practices and methods on urban transformation in consecutive paradigmatic periods. Therefore, urban transformation is reconsidered according to differentiating criteria within a general framework, both internationally and within Turkey.

The organizational level of urban transformation could be considered as a basic difference resulting from urban processes shaped by the planning system and contingent spatial dynamics (Gürler, 2009). Planning and management of the urban regeneration process are identified in the diverse planning systems of the World (ENSURE, 2011) whereas the urban regeneration process is encountered as a disjointed issue resulting from an existing confusion on the concept of urban transformation and lack of identification of the process in the planning system of Turkey. In addition, urban regeneration approaches have continued to be questioned in both the content and context of the planning system in Turkey while integrated urban regeneration approaches have been developing on a more innovative content and collaborative structure in different planning systems around the World.

The spatial level of urban transformation could be considered as a basic similarity as a result of restructuring-oriented economic development shaped by politico-economic frameworks (Gürler, 2009). The shift from a modern to a liberal paradigm puts emphasis on integrated urban regeneration

approaches both internationally and within Turkey (UN-HABITAT, 2011; EU, 2011).

Reconsidering the theories and practices of urban development and change under the framework of urban transformation is inevitable as a result of the continual paradigm shifts in planning history. In addition, each period produces remarkable conceptual challenges while each planning system and each potential urban space have contingent responses within the general framework of the urban transformation process. Therefore, the concept of urban transformation is required to be redefined both at the organizational and spatial levels by an interdisciplinary framework. It also could be possible to manage advanced studies into urban transformation by focusing on the unifying theory of the strategic approach, and the practice and method for urban regeneration process with reference to the multi-paradigmatic agenda in urban planning and conservation. Moreover, the bridge between heritage and other contemporary issues, such as sustainability, competitiveness and creativity, could be built by using multi-paradigmatic approaches for the urban transformation process. In conclusion, integrated urban regeneration, which has strategic approaches, provides opportunities for planning, managing and sustaining the urban transformation process for future cities.

References
Alexander, E.R., (1984). After Rationality, What? A Review of Responses to Paradigm Breakdown, **Journal of American Planning Association**, Vol. 50, No.1, 62-69.
Allmendinger, P., (2002). Towards a Post-Positivist Typology of Planning Theory, **Planning Theory**, Vol. 1, No.1, 77-99.
Birabi, A.K., (2007). International Urban Conservation Charters as Catalytic or Passive Tools of Urban Conservation Practices among Developing Countries?, **City & Time**, Vol.3, No.2, 39-53.
Camhis, M., (1979). **Planning Theory and Philosophy**, Tavistock,London.
Campbell, S. and Fainstein, S.S., eds., (1996). **Readings in Planning Theory: Studies in Urban and Social Change**, Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.
Choay, F., (1969). **The Modern City: Planning in the 19ᵗʰ Century**, Brazillier, New York.
Couch, C., Fraser, C. and Percy, S., eds., (2003). **Urban Regeneration in Europe**, Blackwell, Oxford; New York.
Diamond, J. and Liddle, J., (2005). **Management of Regeneration: Choices, Challenges, and Dilemmas**, Routledge, London; New York.
ENSURE, (2011). Integrated Urban Regeneration: International Experience, **Brief**, http://www.ensure.org/u_regen/index.html
EU, (2011). Complete List of the Council of Europe's treaties, **Online Materials**, http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ListeTraites.asp?CM=8&CL=ENG
Fainstein, S.S. (1994). **The City Builders: Property, Politics and Planning in London and New York**, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
Fainstein, S.S., (1983). **Restructuring The City: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment**, Longman, London and New York.
Freestone, R., ed. (2000). **Urban Planning in a Changing World: The Twentieth Century Experience**, E&FN Spon, London; New York.

Friedmann, J., (1998). Planning Theory Revisited, **European Planning Studies**, vol.6, no.3, 245-253.

Gray, J., (1996). **Post-Liberalism: Studies in Political Thought**, Routledge, New York.

Gray, J., (1986). **Liberalism**, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.

Gülersoy, N.Z. (2010). Lecture Notes of **"UD 518–Contemporary Approaches to Urban Design"** at the Department of URP, Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul.

Gülersoy, N.Z., Gürler, E., (2010), "Smart Cities in a Sustainable World" IAPS-CSBE Network, Culture and Space, **2nd National Symposium in the memory of Prof.Dr.Mete ÜNÜGÜR**, 2-3 March 2010, ITU Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul.

Gülersoy, N.Z., Ayrancı, İ., (2011), **Management Plan for Conservation Areas**, ITU, Urban and Environmental Planning and Research Center, Cenkler Publishing, Istanbul.

Gürler, E. (2009). **A Comparative Study in Urban Regeneration Process: The Case of Istanbul**, (published M.Sc. Diss. accomplished in 2002 at Middle East Technical University, Ankara), Verlag Dr. Müller-VDM, Saarbrücken.

Hall, P.G. (1998). **Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century**, Blackwell, Oxford; UK, New York; USA.

Healey, P., et al., (1995). **Managing Cities: The New Urban Context**, John Wiley, Chichester, UK; New York, USA.

Hillier, J. and Healey, P., eds. ,(2010). **Research Companion to Planning Theory: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning**, Ashgate, Farnham; Surrey, UK.

Hillier, J. and Healey, P., (2008). **Critical Essays in Planning Theory,** vol.1-Foundation of the Planning Enterprise, vol.2-Political Economy, Diversity and Pragmatism, vol.3-Contemporary Movements in Planning Theory, Ashgate, London.

Jessop, B., (2002). Chapter 5 – Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective, **Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe**, edited by N. Brenner and N. Theodore, Blackwell, Malden, MA, US and Oxford, UK.,105 – 124.

Jarvis, D.; Lambie, H. and Berkeley, N., (2009). Creative Industries and Urban Regeneration, **Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal**, Vol. 2, No.4, 364-374.

Jokilehto, J. I., (1986). **History of Architectural Conservation: The Contribution of English, French, German and Italian Thought towards an International Approach to the Conservation of Cultural Property**, PhD Dissertation, Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies, The University of York, UK.

Khun, T.S., (1962). **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Mumford, L. (1961). **The City in History: its orgins, its transformations, and its prospects**, Harcourt, Brace & World, New York.

OECD, (2011). The Marshall Plan Speech at Harvard University; 5 June 1947, **Text of the Speech**, http://www.oecd.org/document/10/0,3746,en_2649_201185_1876938_1_1_1_1,00.html

Porter, M. E., (1995). *The Competitive Advantage of The Inner City*, **Harvard Business Review**, vol. 73, no. 3, pp: 55-71.

Roberts, P. and Sykes, H., eds., (2000). **Urban Regeneration: A Handbook**, SAGE, London.

Rodwell, D., (2007). **Conservation and Sustainability of Historic Sites**, Blackwell, Oxford, UK.

Rykwert, J., (1976). **The Idea of A Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and The Ancient World**, Princeton University Press, Prineceton, New Jersey.

Tasan-Kok, T. & Baeten, G., eds., (2011). **Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies and Politics**, Springer, Berlin; New York. (*http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/population+studies/book/9 78-90-481-8923-6 , due: August 31, 2011*)

UN, (2011). Offical Document Search System – General Assembly, **Online Materials**, http://www.un.org/en/documents/index.shtml

UN-HABITAT, (2011). Reference Library – Reports, Guides, Best Practices, Declarations, Resolutions, General Assembly Resolutions, *Online Materials*, http://www.unhabitat.org/list.asp?typeid=25&catid= 491&start=11&page=2&AllContent=1

UNESCO, (2011). Legal Instruments – Conventions, Recommendations, Declarations, **Online Materials**, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=12025&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=-471.html

Ward, S.V. (2004). **Planning and Urban Change**, Thousand Oaks, London; UK and SAGE, California, USA.