

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN PARTICIPATORY URBAN DESIGN: HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE TURKISH CASES (1)

Özlem ARSLAN*, Nursen KAYA EROL

Received: 09.09.2020; Final Text: 12.01.2024

Keywords: Urban design; urban design process; participatory approach; participatory projects; public participation.

1. This article is produced from the PhD. thesis of Özlem Arslan, entitled "Participatory Approach in Urban Design: Evaluating the Process in the Case of İzmirdeniz", under supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. Nursen Kaya Erol.

INTRODUCTION

The necessity of effective participation is highly emphasized in urban design literature (Toker and Toker, 2006; Sanoff, 1988; 2006). Particularly since the 1990s the need for more democratic processes in planning and urban design has been stressed (Crewe, 2001; Gardesse, 2015). However, especially in large-scale urban design projects, adopting participation is not common due to its challenges (Calderon, 2019). In projects purported to be participatory, the extent and effectiveness of participation remain controversial (Gardesse, 2015). Integrating participatory approaches to planning and urban design processes presents challenges and opportunities that are absent in conventional practices. In Türkiye, the lack of legislation on urban design and participation brings additional challenges to the adoption of participatory practices.

Reviewing participatory urban design projects to understand the challenges and opportunities of participation helps to describe effective participatory processes that can be integral into the urban design process (Calderon, 2019). This article aims to analyze attempts at participatory urban design in Türkiye. First, participation in urban design is described briefly. Subsequently, case studies examining participatory urban design projects from different parts of the world are investigated. Based on the theoretical literature and international cases, the case studies from Türkiye are analyzed focusing on the participants, methods of participation, and levels of involvement. Findings are then evaluated and discussed in terms of challenges, opportunities, and potential improvement measures.

PARTICIPATION IN URBAN DESIGN

Since the 1960s, centrally directed planning has been criticized for the divergence between the built environment created by professionals and the preferences of the people. This critique coincided with the implementations

* Buca Municipality, İzmir, TÜRKİYE.

of urban renewal, in which the architects needed to question how and to what extent they would consider the wishes, demands, and preferences of future users. These concerns engendered the concept of citizen participation, which eventually evolved into a “demand” in urban projects (Wulz, 1986). “The Participatory Turn in Urbanism” in the 1990s, implied a return to the ideologies of the 1960s; with origins in advocacy planning, equity planning, and transactive planning (Krivý and Kaminer, 2013). Urban design as an instrument of space organization needed to consider how the community perceived the urban environment and interacted with it (Günay, 1999).

Participatory Urban Design

Participation in urban design entails the engagement of all relevant parties in decision-making processes that will influence their lives. It is grounded in the concept that environments function more effectively when citizens are actively involved in their creation and management (Sanoff, 2006). Multiple interactions among citizens and other parties who work collectively and produce outcomes as equal partners make urban design a field where citizens claim rights and responsibilities, and use their knowledge and experience (Innes and Booher, 2004). Planning and urban design are fields where the adoption of participation is most legitimate since decision-making in these fields affect a wider public. However, participation is often associated with challenges since it assigns different tasks and responsibilities than conventional ones to design professionals and institutional structures (Steinø, 2003). Therefore, despite its advantages, it is either completely neglected or applied in formats that involve no creativity or innovation (Cilliers and Timmermans, 2014). Realizing the ideals of participation is easier in small-scale projects with small or homogeneous communities, whereas there is a need to adopt participation in large-scale projects in complex settings with constraints of time and resources (Calderon, 2019).

Challenges in participation are mostly related to the designing and execution of the participation process. Participation is a challenge to existing professional and institutional practices. The complexity and variability of processes and relationships in participation contrast with the prevailing rational decision-making processes (Hou and Rios, 2003). A participation set-up requires rethinking the entire planning system and all aspects of the planning organization, including the interaction between the public, civil society, and private actors (Gardesse, 2015). Large-scale participatory design projects consume significant financial and non-financial resources and are difficult to execute (Garde, 2014; Calderon, 2019). Managing multiple stakeholders and the power dynamics among them are significant challenges. Often, conflicts and disagreements arise among stakeholders regarding the uses and value of public spaces, defining a problem, and proposing possible improvement plan (Hou and Rios, 2003; Calderon, 2019). Locals are generally not considered genuine partners, since it is difficult to go beyond dialogue and achieve a genuine consultation (Gardesse, 2015). When they get involved, those who can participate are mostly the advantageous groups in the community (Garde, 2014). The residents might be reluctant to participate due to time and other constraints (Prilenska and Liias, 2015). Participation becomes a futile and frustrating process if it fails to redistribute power and instead perpetuate the status quo for the powerless (Arnstein, 1969).

Participation arrangements may not substantially alter conventional processes or decision-making systems. If participation is not successfully integrated into the urban design process, conventional urban design processes and participation practices may persist as separate systems with minimal impact on each other (Gardesse, 2015). The participatory design could evolve into a rigid, mainstream institutional process with narrowly defined tasks, problems, and limits to satisfy mandated requirements, contradicting its original ideal of engaging the whole community to promote public good. Disappointments arise when public priorities are not addressed due to increasing costs, choosing shortcuts, or sticking to conventional ways of decision-making (Hou and Rios, 2003).

Citizen input can save time and prevent the disappointment that might arise from imposing design ideas on the public. Participation provides a comprehensive evaluation of local social, environmental, and economic issues, enhancing understanding of the local context better. It fosters better decisions, minimizes costs and delays, facilitates implementation, helps avoid worst-case scenarios, and builds consensus, credibility, and legitimacy. It enhances public expertise and creativity (Sanoff, 2006), promotes belonging to the final product of urban design, and stimulates activism that allows people to care for and protect their environment (Nagashima, 1992; Crewe, 2001). Participation helps to build reconciliation, strengthens community ties, and creates a sense of trust, cooperation, and solidarity (Hou and Rios, 2003). Communication, learning, and action are central to participatory urban design (Innes and Booher, 2004). Effective participation can promote emancipation, education, and socialization (Wulz, 1986), transforming citizens into proactive contributors who acknowledge their responsibility in the development of their city (Arn and Özsoy, 2015). Participation is associated with social innovation for its transformational capacity (Arnstein, 1969; Cox et al., 2014).

Continuous participation, commencing before decision-making and design, extends throughout implementation (White, 2014; Garde, 2014), requires a structured process that is fair, open, and democratic. It makes planning and design legible for all parties. Various communication tools can be employed to inform the public about how to participate and elucidate how their opinions will affect decisions. Different interest groups can be gathered in forums, exhibitions, meetings, workshops, review and advisory boards, and juries, during review and negotiation stages (Sanoff, 2006; White, 2014; Hong, 2018). Establishing dialogue and networks among participants (Toker and Toker, 2006; White, 2014) through innovative technological tools such as digital visualization techniques (Dalsgaard, 2012) and social media (Garde, 2014) improves the participation process. There is need to provide interactive, innovative participatory methods and techniques in addition to the institutionally provided conventional methods (Dalsgaard, 2012).

Measuring the level of participation

Different engagement practices correspond to different levels of participation. Public participation can range from passive public information to the level of individuals having the right to control the entire process (Arnstein, 1969; Wulz, 1986). At the highest level, communities or community-based organizations (CBOs) develop the project idea, they design, implement, and even fund projects. Differentiating real participation from pseudo-participation, Sanoff (2000) argues that in a genuine participation process, participants evolve into active decision-


Active Participation  Passive Participation	Arnstein (1969)	Wulz (1986)	IAP2 (2018)
	Citizen Control	Self-design	Empower
	Delegated Power	Co-design	Collaborate
	Partnership	Alternative	Involve
	Placation	Dialogue	Consult
	Consultation	Regionalism	Inform
	Informing	Questionary	
	Therapy	Representation	
	Manipulation		

Table 1. Participation levels according to Arnstein (1969), Wulz (1986) and IAP2 (2018) classifications.

makers who control decisions and actions, as opposed to passive recipient of what is planned or designed for them. However, uncertainty and doubt may persist regarding the attainment of the stated goal of participation. Different spectrums of participation are used to eliminate skepticism in measuring the level of participation and assessing its quality (Davis and Andrew, 2017). Three pivotal studies by Arnstein (1969), Wulz (1986), and IAP2 (2018) classify the levels of participation.

Arnstein’s (1969) “Ladder of Participation” defines eight steps that differentiate whether participation is just an ostensible goal or has the real power to influence the outcome of the process. The first two steps of “manipulation” and “therapy” are associated with non-participation. The next three steps of “informing,” “consultation,” and “placation” are referred to as degrees of tokenism. The top three steps of “partnership,” “delegated power,” and “citizen control” represent degrees of citizen power. The goal of manipulation and therapy levels is to enlighten and provide solace to the target audience of the programs. Information and consultation steps allow the weak to have a say but not the power to have their views considered. Furthermore, participation does not involve a “follow-through” phase. It is not consistent and continuous, so it is incapable of changing the system. In the fifth step of placation, the powerless are allowed to give advice, yet the right to make decisions remains the prerogative of the powerful. The top three steps represent increasing levels of citizen power where citizens negotiate and make trade-offs with the powerful. In delegated power and citizen control steps, citizens have substantial or full management power in decision-making.

Wulz’s (1986) participation continuum, created specifically to describe levels of participation concerned with participation efforts in architecture and planning, presents seven stages ranging from the control of professionals to the control of the users. Starting from passive participation stages of “representation,” “questionary,” and “regionalism”, the continuum reaches stages of active participation, which are “dialogue,” “alternative,” “co-decision,” and “self-decision”. The first three stages of representation, questionnaire, and regionalism are dominated by professional expertise. In the representation stage, the architect makes decisions for the user. In the questionnaire stage, the focus is on statistical information about the characteristics, needs, and demands of an anonymous user. In the regionalism stage, the historical and cultural heritage, and qualities of specific places are emphasized. The dialogue stage involves informal conversations between the architect and the users. In the alternative stage, users are allowed to choose one of the alternatives presented to them. Co-decision involves the direct and active involvement

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
Participation Goal	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and /or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the Public	We will keep you informed	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision. We will seek your feedback on drafts and proposals.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide
Example tools	Fact sheets, websites, open houses, citizen advisory committees	Public comment, focus groups, surveys, community meetings	Workshops, deliberative polling	Consensus building, participatory decision-making	Citizens' juries, ballots, delegated decisions

Table 2. Stages of IAP2’s Spectrum of Public Participation. (Adapted from Davis and Andrew, 2017)

of users throughout the design process. In the self-decision stage, the user controls the whole design and construction process (Toker, 2007).

IAP2’s Spectrum of Public Participation involves five stages of participation, starting with the “inform” level, followed by the “consult,” “involve,” “collaborate,” and “empower” levels. It is widely used in planning, defining participation goals and articulating them by declaring “the promise to the public” at each stage of participation (IAP2, 2020). Davis and Andrew (2017) identify “example tools” for participation at each stage of the IAP2 spectrum. Fact sheets, websites, open houses, and citizen advisory committees are examples of participation tools for the inform stage. Public comments, focus groups, surveys, and meetings are commonly used at the consult stage. Workshops and deliberative polls are tools of participation at involve level, while consensus building and participatory decision-making are tools for the collaborate stage. Empower stage involves citizens’ juries, ballots, and delegated decisions. Stages in IAP2 follow Arnstein’s Ladder. However, the IAP2 spectrum is primarily focuses on the planning and strategies of participation, whereas Arnstein’s Ladder is based on the effects and evaluation of participation outcomes. The IAP2 spectrum may not adequately capture the various processes described by Arnstein’s Ladder. A discrepancy may arise when assessing planned versus actual outcomes; therefore, using both spectrums simultaneously helps to describe the level of participation more accurately.

METHODOLOGY

The first step of inquiry for this study involved reviewing twenty studies that analyzed participatory urban design cases from different parts of the world. These studies were selected through a systematic search of

databases. The reviewed case studies were subjected to content analysis to determine participants, participation methods, and techniques employed in the projects. Frequencies regarding the involvement of different types of participants and the use of participation methods were determined. Achieved levels of participation were taken from the studied cases when indicated, and approximations were made concerning the organization of participation when not explicitly indicated. IAP2 spectrum and Arnstein's (1969) Ladder were used simultaneously to determine the levels of participations more accurately. Wulz's (1986) participation continuum was also used to determine the levels of participation in the reviewed urban design cases since it was created specifically to describe participation efforts in architecture and planning. In this study; "informing," and "consultation" steps of Arnstein's (1969) ladder, "representation," "questionary," and "regionalism" stages of Wulz's (1986) participation continuum, and "inform" and "consult" levels of IAP2's Spectrum of Public Participation are accepted as lower levels of participation. "Placation" and "partnership" steps of Arnstein's (1969) ladder, "dialogue," and "alternative" stages of Wulz's (1986) participation continuum, and "involve" level of IAP2's Spectrum of Public Participation are accepted as mid-levels. Consequently, the steps of "delegated power" and "citizen control" in Arnstein's (1969) ladder, "co-decision," and "self-decision" stages of Wulz's (1986) participation continuum and "collaborate," and "empower" levels of IAP2's Spectrum of Public Participation are accepted as higher levels of participation.

In the second part of the inquiry, the same analysis was applied to twenty participatory urban design case studies from Türkiye. Since the participatory urban design cases and literature on them were rather limited in Türkiye, case studies in which participants, participation methods, and techniques were explicitly described, and participation levels could be approximated, were chosen for the analysis. The results from the two inquiries were evaluated and compared to identify similarities and differences, and improvement measures are proposed for future participatory urban design projects.

AN OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPATORY URBAN DESIGN CASES

The selected twenty cases were diverse in terms of their scale, scope, and organization of participation. Five small-scale projects involved the urban design of apartment courtyards and neighborhood public spaces in Riga (Prilenska and Liias, 2015), a neighborhood park in Dublin (Relational Urbanism, 2018), a shared courtyard in Helsinki (Saad-Sulonen and Horelli, 2010), and a caravan settlement in Malta (Bianco, 2016). Fifteen large-scale projects included urban design of public spaces in the revitalization (Sanoff 1988; Nagashima 1992; Biddulph 1998; Torres, 2011; Stangel and Szóstek, 2015), renewal (Hong, 2018; Calderon, 2019), and redevelopment (Gardesse, 2015) of neighborhoods, districts, towns, and a village. These projects included urban design of city parks (Hou and Rios, 2003; Garde, 2014), a public open space with transport infrastructure (Crewe, 2001), a waterfront (White, 2014), an agro-industrial urban fringe (Cox et al., 2014), and a new architectural development (Dalsgaard, 2012). Seventeen of the projects were implemented, while three were research projects that investigated various aspects of participation.

Title/ Type/ Initiator/ Date/ Location of the project	Participants	Participation methods and techniques	Participation levels Arnstein 1969/ Wulz 1986/ IAP2 2018
Pagalmu Renesanse/ Urban design of apartment courtyards/ The Latvian Landscape Architecture Union/ 2014/ Riga- Latvia	Local government, professional chambers, housing associations, non-profit organizations, private sector, neighborhood residents, students, activists	Direct participation of residents, field visits, meetings	Citizen Control/ Self-decision/ Empower
Labas Vietas Talka/ Revitalization of neighborhood public spaces/ NGOs/ 2014/ Riga-Latvia	Local government, city council, non- profit organizations, private sector, neighborhood residents, activists	Brainstorming, warm- up, opening events, workshops, meetings	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate
Urban design of a shared courtyard/ Community at a local forum meeting/ 2008-2009/ Helsinki-Finland	Local government, local project representatives, neighborhood associations, researchers, city administration units, youth centre and kindergarten staff	"Learning-based network approach", field walk, workshops, meetings, digital information tools	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate
Design of Le Fanu Park/ Urban design of a neighborhood park/ The Irish Architecture Foundation/ 2015/ Dublin- Ireland	Professional chamber, city council, private sector, citizens	Consecutive design events, digital models, workshops	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate
Urban design of a bungalow- caravan settlement/ Caravan owners' association/ 2009/ Ghadira-Malta	85% of settlement residents, owners' association, design team	One-on-one meetings with residents, meetings with association members, field surveys, questionnaires	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate
Media-space/ Development of a new municipal library/ 2005-2015/ Local government/ Aarhus-Denmark	Local government, local institutions and organizations, executive committee, project management team, researchers, politicians, library staff, residents	Group sessions, workshops, project information points, media laboratories, video-sound recording installations, special events	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Sewoon Renewal Promotion Project/ Urban renewal/ Local government/ 2012-2021/ Seoul- Korea	Local government, local urban renewal units, public corporation, citizens, experts	Public meetings, screenings, exhibitions	Informing/ Representation/ Inform
Kwun Tong Town Centre Project/ Urban renewal/ Urban Renewal Authority/ 2012-2021/ Hong Kong	Local government, local urban renewal units, urban renewal agency, city council, NGOs, association of residents, local people, researchers, experts	Group sessions, forums, meetings, screenings, exhibitions, brochures, booklets, newspaper bulletins, public consultations, resident education programs	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Urban design of Union Point Park/ CBO/ 1997-2003/ California-USA	Central, regional, local governments, community development corporation, local institutions, University of California-Berkeley, CBOs, neighborhood and youth associations, experts	Collective petitions, public presentations, surveys, workshops, special events	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate

Table 3. Participants, Participation Methods and Techniques, and Participation Levels in the Case Studies from the World.

Revitalization of Gibson Town/ CBO/ 1988/ Gibson-USA	Town residents, community development corporation, experts	Town walk, workshops	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate
Neighborhood revitalization (research project)/ Local government and local university/ 2005/ Montreal, Canada- Guadalajara, Mexico	Researchers, UNESCO Chairs, City of Montreal, non-profit organizations, employees from participating schools, students	Neighborhood tours, focus group discussions, workshops, exhibitions	Consultation/ Dialogue- Alternative/ Involve
Urban design of Orange County Great Park/ CBO/ 2005-2007/ California-USA	Local and federal governments, Orange County Great Park Corporation, local government planning unit, CBOs, private consultants (specialists), citizens, special interest groups	conference, surveys, telephone surveys, focus group discussions, presentation of alternatives to stakeholders	Placation/ Dialogue- Alternative/ Involve
Urban design of Toronto’s Waterfront/ Private sector task force/ 2006-2009/ Toronto- Canada	Local, federal, central governments, planning commission, Toronto Coastal Revitalization Company, CBOs, private sector, citizens	Roundtable meetings, preparation of the competition booklet	Placation/ Dialogue- Alternative/ Involve
Boston Southwest Corridor/ Urban design with transport infrastructure/ Local government/ 1976-1986/ Boston- USA	Local and federal governments, local government transportation unit, coordinators and planners, neighborhood associations and task groups, CBOs, experts, Boston residents (10%), special interest groups	Stakeholder meetings, surveys, project newspaper, project offices, telephone info line, social programs	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
The “Thought for Food” Project/ Urban design of agro-industrial urban fringe (research project)/ Local government and local university/ 2011/ Flanders- Belgium	Local people, agro-industrial sector representatives, local farmers, local policy makers, researchers, environmental activists	Adapted “Netzstadt/ Synoikos” method, bike tour, interviews, workshops, panels, meetings, group sessions, special events	Delegation of Power/ Co-decision/ Involve
Village revitalization (research project)/ Regional government, researchers/ Mstów-Poland	Regional government, European Social Fund, researchers, experts, citizens, local leaders, local authorities	Field visits, stakeholder meetings, interviews, surveys, workshops	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Town revitalization/ Local government/ 1995/ Stoke-Britain	Central and local governments, city council, landowners, experts, students	Stakeholder meetings, workshops, public exhibition	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Redevelopment of Les Halles District/ Local government/ 2002-2010/ Paris-France	Local government, private sector, private participation company, contractors, advisory groups, design teams, CBOs, citizens	Stakeholder meetings, focus groups, interviews, public voting, thematic group work with the advisory board, workshops	Placation/ Dialogue- Alternative/ Involve
Urban design in Yokohama’s Minami Ohta District/ Local government/ 1988-1992/ Neighborhood revitalization/ Yokohama-Japan	Local government, researchers, neighborhood schools, neighborhood residents	Surveys, interviews, presentations, collective discussions, public voting, workshops, discussions, workshop- related events, observation walks	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Renewal of La Mina neighborhood/ Consortium of local and metropolitan government agencies/ 2002- 2006/ Barcelona-Spain	Local government, private housing corporations, European Commission, researchers, neighborhood residents	Workshops, open house events, public hearing	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve/

Table 3. (continued) Participants, Participation Methods and Techniques, and Participation Levels in the Case Studies from the World.

In all cases, the participatory process engaged citizens who would be affected by the projects. In seven cases, the process involved special interest groups including students, activists, or staff of certain institutions. Local governments were involved in the process in thirteen cases, while federal and/or central governments also supplied funding in five cases. Local government councils participated in four cases, and local public organizations participated in five cases. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), CBOs, and/or associations were involved as initiators or partners in ten cases. The private sector was involved in five cases, financing four projects, initiating one, and sharing ownership in another. Professional chambers were participants in two cases, initiating small-scale projects. In one case, the process involved a university. Researchers participated in eight cases, and experts were involved in seven cases. Researchers initiated projects in three cases, and in twelve cases, researchers and/or experts specializing in participation collaborated with public or private agencies managing the projects.

Although the scales, scopes, and types of projects differed significantly, conventional participation methods and techniques were used in 85% of the projects. A brainstorming session in one case and field tours in five cases served as the starting points of participation. Surveys, telephone surveys, polls, collective petitions, interviews, focus group discussions, public hearings, debates, meetings, forums, and conferences were used to inform and/or consult the public. Workshops, often directed at specific interest, age, or stakeholder groups were used in thirteen cases for activities like brainstorming, drawing, mapping, photographing, analyzing, and designing. In three cases, innovative “project-specific” techniques such as digital platforms, digital installations, and digital models were used. Additionally, in two cases, pre-designed participation methods were adapted to the specific conditions of the projects. In 15% of the projects, innovative methods and techniques such as interactive digital installations, digital models, and methods specifically designed for particular projects were used in conjunction with conventional participation techniques.

The progress of the project and participation were communicated to the public through exhibitions, brochures, bulletins, project websites, online platforms, e-mail lists, and social media accounts. In two cases, on-site project offices or information points scattered throughout the city provided direct communication with residents. In two cases, special educational programs were designed for neighborhood residents. Seven cases benefited from special events such as receptions, celebrations, cocktails, and informal dinners. Although these events were not directly related to participation, they strengthened it by fostering and reinforcing stakeholder connections and increasing the promotion of projects.

It was common for large-scale projects to be presented with an emphasis on maximum viable participation or urban-scale participation. However, this goal was not always realized due to difficulties in the participation processes. Yet, all residents could participate in small-scale projects. Eight of the cases reached high levels of participation. Participation levels in seven cases corresponded to delegation of power (Arnstein, 1969), co-decision (Wulz, 1986), and collaborate (IAP2, 2018) levels. In one case involving a small-scale project, the highest levels of citizen control (Arnstein, 1969), self-decision (Wulz, 1986), and empower (IAP2, 2018) were reached. All small-scale project cases reached higher levels of participation. Twelve cases reached the “involve” level in the IAP2

classification, corresponding with the levels between consultation and placation in Arnstein's (1969) Ladder and between questionnaire and alternative in Wulz's (1986) classification. Only in one case did participation level remain in the informing step of Arnstein's (1969) Ladder, corresponding to the representation stage in Wulz's (1986) classification and the inform level in the IAP2 classification. Participation in 40% of the world cases reached the degrees of citizen power.

Diverse actors including communities, CBOs, professional chambers, private sector task forces, researchers, and local governments, initiated participatory projects in world cases. Both conventional and innovative methods of participation were used in the projects, with 95% reaching middle and higher stages of the participation spectrums.

ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPATORY URBAN DESIGN CASES FROM TÜRKİYE

Twenty participatory urban design cases from Türkiye included five small scale projects, involving urban design of Mediterreanean Youth, Culture and Art Park, East Terminal and Market Square, Konyaaltı City Square, renewal of Sobaçılar Bazaar and Business Center in Antalya (Esengil, 2009), and urban design of a city park in Bursa (Arın and Özsoy, 2015). Other projects encompassed the urban design of city districts (Esengil, 2009; Cankurt, 2015), regeneration, redevelopment, regeneration, and restructuring of districts and neighborhoods (Esengil, 2009; Ünlü, 2009; Kentsel Strateji, 2010; Alpan, 2013; Sertbaş, 2013; Başaran Uysal, 2013; Şahin, 2013). Three cases involved the urban design of new developments (Çavdar, 1978; Başak, 2016; Polat and Arslan, 2019), and one case involved historic conservation (Aydoğan, 2017).

Citizens participated in 85% of the projects, while 25% involved special interest groups. Local governments participated in 95%, and the central government in 20% of the projects. At the national level, ministries and government agencies, and at the local level, metropolitan and/or district municipalities were among the stakeholders. City councils participated in seven projects, and a local government corporation participated in two projects. City directorates and Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Boards participated in the projects located in their jurisdiction. Professional chambers participated in 65% of the projects, while CBOs, NGOs, and associations participated in 35%. Universities, researchers, and experts were among stakeholders in 45% of the projects. The private sector participated in one project.

In four cases where projects were acquired through competitions, various methods were employed to ensure public participation. These included pre-competition public opinion surveys, the establishment of competition advisory boards with representatives from interest groups, collective preparation of the competition brief, a public meeting where competition jury members engaged with the citizens, and a competition colloquium. Surveys, polls, interviews, focus group discussions, and oral histories were used for communication with the public. To facilitate communication with the public, methods such as citizen consultation committees, panels, meetings, and exhibitions were organized. In three cases, project offices were set up to inform the public. Projects were advertised through websites, brochures, local newspapers, and various media channels, including billboards, in three cases. To reach the public in one case, the

Title/ Type/ Initiator/ Date/ Location of the project	Participants	Participation methods and techniques	Participation levels Arnstein 1969/ Wulz 1986/ IAP2 2018
Urban Design of Mediterranean Youth, Culture and Art Park/ Local government/ 1993/ Antalya	Local government, chamber of architects, competition advisory board, competition jury, and participants, citizens	Survey, competition colloquium	Consultation/ Questionary/ Consult
Renewal of Sobacilar Bazaar and Business Center/ Local government/ 2001/ Antalya	Local government, chamber of architects, competition advisory board, competition jury, and participants, citizens, business owners	Competition colloquium, public meeting	Placation/ Dialogue/ Consult
Urban design of East Terminal and Market Square/ Local government/ 2005/ Antalya	Local government, chamber of architects, competition jury, and participants, museum directorate, Akdeniz University, citizens, market business owners	Competition colloquium	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Consult
Urban Design of Konyaalti City Square (idea project)/ Local government/ 2005/ Antalya	Local government, city council, professional chambers, citizens	Collective preparation of competition brief, competition colloquium, acts of reactionary participation	Informing / Representation/ Inform
"Game Without Handicaps" / Urban Design of a City Park/ City council/ 2013-2014/ Bursa	Local government, Nilüfer District National Education Directorate, universities, professional chambers, selected primary school	Workshops, surveys, exhibitions, meetings	Delegation of Power / Co-design/ Collaborate
Urban Design of Kalekapısı and Environs/ Local government/ 1990/ Antalya	Local government, chamber of architects, competition advisory board, competition jury, and participants	Competition colloquium, acts of reactionary participation	No citizen participation
Regeneration of Kalekapısı and Environs/ Local government/ 2005/ Antalya	Local and central governments, CBO, chamber of architects, project coordination committee, municipal corporation, citizens	Acts of reactionary participation	Consultation/ Representation/ Consult
Urban Design of Antalya Textile Factory (unrealized)/ Local government	Local and central governments, city council, professional chambers, CBOs, Antalya Bar Association, citizens, artists	Acts of reactionary participation (project canceled by a lawsuit)	No citizen participation
Urban Restructuring of Antalya Walled-Town/ Local and central governments/ 2005/ Antalya	Local and central governments, diverse institutions, local and national consultation councils, Yacht Harbour Planning Team, Middle East Technical University, Yacht Harbour and walled-town coordination office, professional chambers, conservation of walled-town and tourism development cooperative, diverse associations, neighborhood residents and businesses	Exhibitions, panels, polls, public meetings, workshops, negotiations with the local people, acts of reactionary participation	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Consult
Regeneration of Antalya Kepez-Santral Neighborhood/ City council/ 2014/ Antalya	Local government, city council, city directorates, professional chambers, experts, CBOs, NGOs, municipal corporation, neighborhood headpersons, and residents	Workshops, polls, interviews, project coordination center, fieldwork to reach citizens, project brochures and website	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve

Table 4. Participants, Participation Methods and Techniques, and Participation Levels in the Case Studies from Türkiye.

Sakarya Neighborhood Public Space Revitalization (research project)/ Local government/ 2013-2015/ Denizli	Local government, city council, "Planning for Real" Coordinator, experts, Pamukkale University, reserachers, citizens, children	Education program for facilitators, project banners and posters, meetings, workshops	Delegation of Power/ Co-design/ Collaborate
Revitalization of Zafer Square and Environs/ (research project)/ Local government/ 2012/ Çanakkale	Local government, Çanakkale Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Board, public institutions, Çanakkale University, researchers, professional organizations, NGOs, citizens, neighborhood residents and businesses	Survey, interviews, focus group discussions, workshops	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Regeneration of Tarsus Traditional Shopping District/ Local government/ 2012/ Mersin	Local government, city council, researchers, commercial city center tradespeople	Survey, oral history studies with the business owners	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Conservation of İzmir Kemeraltı Historical City Center/ Local government/ 2004/ İzmir	Local government, city council, İzmir No.1 Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Board, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir Chamber of Commerce, NGOs	Two obligatory meetings held according to law 2863	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Consult
Urban Design of İzmit New Urban Settlements/ New Development/ Local government/ İzmit	Local government, design team, bureaucrats, political parties, sociologists, technocrats, citizens	Surveys, questionnaires, interviews, discussions with street groups, cooperative neighborhood unit	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Urban Design of Düzce Hope Homes/ New Development/ CBO/ 2012-2015/ Düzce	Central government, Mass Housing Administration of Türkiye, Düzce Solidarity Housing Cooperative for Homeless and Tenant Earthquake Victims, Düzce Earthquake Victims Association, One Hope Association, Düzce Hope Studio, Düzce Hope Association	Meetings, focus group discussions, workshops, participatory game-playing	Delegation of Power/ Co-design/ Collaborate
Revitalization of Yeldeğirmeni Neighborhood / Local government/ 2010-2020/ İstanbul	Local government, Ministry of Culture and Tourism directorate, Conservation High Council, İstanbul Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Board, KUDEB (Bureau for Conservation, Implementation, and control), NGO, private sector	Meetings, social and cultural programs, a "neighborhood house" for the project	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Redevelopment of Odunpazarı Industrial Market (idea project)/ Local government/ 2010/ Eskişehir	Local government, experts, right holders	Workshops	Consultation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Yıldıztepe Social Life Center/ New Development (research project)/ Local government/ Bursa	Local government, Uludağ University, researchers, professional chambers, Foundation for Developing Tourism Culture, private sector, local newspaper, professionals, users, residents, business owners, students, directorates of political parties, citizen consultation committee	Project website, project news at the local media, project billboards, workshops	Placation/ Dialogue/ Involve
Urban Design of Bursa Atatürk Stadium and Environs/ Local government/ 2013/ Bursa (unrealized)	Local government, city council, professional chambers, Bursa Cultural and Natural Heritage Conservation Board	Acts of reactionary participation (project canceled by a lawsuit)	No citizen participation

Table 4. (continued) Participants, Participation Methods and Techniques, and Participation Levels in the Case Studies from Türkiye.

project field was visited by participation facilitators. Five cases involved “top-down” projects; two of which were canceled due to public and civil society reactions, a phenomenon that could be described as “reactionary participation.”

One case involved the “informing” step in Arnstein’s (1969) ladder, corresponding to the representation level of Wulz’s (1986) classification and the inform level in IAP2’s classification. In eleven cases, the consultation step in Arnstein’s (1969) ladder was involved. Among these, one corresponded to representation, and others corresponded to either questionnaire or dialogue levels in Wulz’s (1986) classification. Six cases in this group reached the consult and five cases reached the involve levels in the IAP2 classification. One case involved placation in Arnstein’s (1969) ladder, corresponding to dialogue and involve levels in Wulz’s (1986) and IAP2’s classifications, respectively. Three cases reached the delegation of power step in Arnstein’s (1969) ladder, corresponding to co-decision in Wulz’s (1986) continuum and collaborate levels in IAP2’s classification. Three cases lacked citizen participation, relying solely on collaboration among specialists and bureaucrats, thereby exemplifying forms of reactionary participation.

In 85% of Turkish cases, local governments initiated and carried out participatory urban design projects, whereas in cases around the world, NGOs, CBOs, communities, professional chambers, and a private sector task force initiated projects. Federal and/or central governments were involved in funding large-scale projects in world cases. Conversely, in Türkiye, the involvement of the central government was in making and/or revising upper-scale plans in three cases and allocating land for the project in one case. Projects carried out by public-private partnerships were prominent in world cases; however, such partnerships were absent in projects from Türkiye. The private sector played an active role in participation, supporting 25% of the projects in world cases compared to 5% of the projects in Türkiye. Participation was managed by a specialized firm or an organization in 35% of world cases, compared to 10% of Turkish cases. Universities participated in 35% of the Turkish cases, in contrast to 10% in world cases. Researchers participating in Turkish cases were associated with universities, while in world cases, independent researchers also participated. Professional chambers participated in 65% of the projects in Türkiye, and opposed top-down projects in five cases. They prevented the implementation of two projects by filing lawsuits. In Türkiye, 15% of the projects that purported to be participatory excluded citizen participation.

Cases studied revealed that in Türkiye, participation methods and techniques presented less variation. While public meetings and workshops were the most frequently used techniques in both groups, they were employed in 75% of world cases and 50% of Turkish cases. Besides, the functions and scopes of meetings and workshops were more diversified in world cases. The use of conventional methods was similar in both groups, whereas new technologies, digital tools, innovative, pre-designed, project-specific participation methods, brainstorming sessions, field tours, and special events were absent in the Turkish context. In all world cases, continuous participation throughout the urban design process was evident, in contrast to 30% of the cases from Türkiye.

Cases from Türkiye accumulated at lower levels of participation spectrums, while world cases reached higher levels. In Türkiye, 60% of the cases remained at the levels of informing and consultation, and 10% remained

		World cases	Cases from Türkiye
Participants	No citizen participation	-	3
	Citizens	20	17
	Special interest groups	7	5
	Local government	13	19
	Local government council	4	7
	Local government corporation	-	2
	Upper levels of government	5	4
	Local institutions and organizations	5	7
	Private sector	5	1
	Independent researchers and experts	15	2
	NGOs / CBOs/ Associations	10	7
	Boards, committees	2	6
	Universities	2	7
	Professional chambers	2	13
Participation methods and techniques	Direct participation of residents	1	-
	Workshops	13	8
	Meetings	14	9
	Surveys, polls, interviews, focus group discussions	9	8
	Project exhibitions, screenings	3	2
	Project offices and information points	2	3
	Project news papers, posters, banners and brochures	3	2
	Digital information tools	2	2
	Public voting	3	1
	Special programs	2	2
	Field tours	5	-
	Brainstorming sessions	1	-
	Predesigned participation methods	2	-
	Innovative-digital participation methods	3	-
Special events	7	-	
Participation levels (Anstein 1969) (Wulz 1986) (IAP2 2018)	No citizen participation	-	3
	Informing /Representation/ Inform	1	1
	Consultation- Placation/ Questionary-Alternative/ Consult	-	6
	Partnership/ Dialogue/ Involve	12	7
	Delegation of power/ Co-decision/ Collaborate	7	3
	Citizen Control/ Self-decision/ Empower	1	-

Table 5. Comparison of Participants, Participation Methods and Techniques, and Participation Levels in World Cases and the Cases from Türkiye.

in placation sections of Arnstein's (1969) ladder. Compared to 15% of the Turkish cases, 40% of the world cases reached higher levels of collaborate

and empower, whereas none of the Turkish cases reached the empower level.

One of the significant differences between the world and Turkish cases was concerned with the initiation and management of the projects. In world cases, 35% of the projects were initiated by local governments, with city councils, residents, CBOs and NGOs, professional chambers, and the private sector also initiating projects. In Turkish cases, local governments initiated 85% of the projects, city councils initiated another 10%, and a CBO initiated one project. In world cases, projects were carried out by local governments, CBOs, professional chambers, and researchers. In 35 % of the world cases, participation was managed by private firms, and/or public and private corporations specializing in participation. In Turkish cases, local governments carried out 60% of the projects. In world cases, the initiation and management of the projects were less dependent on local governments, and participation was managed by specialized entities, especially in large-scale projects.

Incidents of reactionary participation were significant in the participatory urban design experience in Türkiye. Professional organizations, CBOs, and/or special interest groups opposed “top-down” projects that excluded citizen participation. Press briefings, protest marches, informing the public through local media and meetings, collecting signatures, urging other institutions to take action against the project, preparing feedback reports for project initiators, negotiating plan alterations, imposing sanctions, hindering or preventing planning and design works of the institutional stakeholders, filing lawsuits, and resignation of the advisory board due to opposed revisions in the implementation project were among the acts of reactionary participation (Esengil, 2009; Alpan, 2013). The participation efforts of organized groups were apparent in these cases, yet the absence of participation resulted in the inability to resolve conflicts. Implementations of two projects were canceled due to acts of reactionary participation. In the world cases, continuous participation facilitated resolving conflicts, and all projects were implemented.

CONCLUSION

Urban design is increasingly associated with “public policies” and “community action” in the Western world (Günay, 1999, 26). In Türkiye, conventional top-down decision-making hinders central and local governments from having sufficient knowledge and experience in participatory planning and design. Besides, users and other actors lack the awareness to request participation and play active role in the formation of their environments (Polat and Vural Arslan, 2019). Participatory projects from Türkiye were dependent on local governments in terms of initiation and management, whereas participation of the private sector was insufficient. Dependency on local governments lacking experience and knowledge about participation, the absence of experts specializing in participation, the use of conventional methods and techniques, and the discontinuity of participation in the projects contributed to lower levels of participation in cases from Türkiye.

There is a need to diversify participation methods and techniques used in participatory urban design projects in Türkiye. Furthermore, innovative digital participation methods, pre-designed methods, and project-specific methods, which were absent in cases from Türkiye should be incorporated

in participation arrangements. Field tours and brainstorming sessions, effective methods for initiating overall participation procedures, along with special events that reinforce stakeholder relations, should be utilized in continuous participation schemes.

The absence of a legal participation framework in the Turkish planning system is a serious impediment for adopting participation in urban design projects. To build a knowledge and experience base for participatory urban design, legislative and regulatory frameworks need to be defined to include participation arrangements in planning and urban design practices. Initiation and management of participatory projects should be made less dependent on local governments by enabling different actors to initiate and manage them. Involvement of the private sector in urban design projects can be facilitated by including the urban design of large public spaces in the public-private partnership frameworks. Participation possibilities within public-private partnership frameworks need to be explored to understand the procedures and possibilities for incorporating participatory approaches into planning process, as Gardesse (2015) proposed.

An iterative urban design process can be instrumental for effective participation. Introducing participation manuals that describe such participatory processes for authorities intending to undertake participatory projects can promote higher levels of public participation. Designing training courses on participation for municipal staff and establishing citizen participation units in municipalities might help implement more effective participatory projects.

Since the capacity and abilities of public project developers might be highly limited in terms of citizen participation, the inclusion of independent agencies or experts with the specific task of organizing participatory procedures can increase the quality of participation (Gardesse, 2015; Hong, 2018). Therefore, organization and management of participation should be assigned to specialized entities, especially in large-scale projects. Participatory arrangements could be involved in the organization of urban design competitions, which are important instruments for project acquisition in Türkiye. Multi-phase urban design competitions in which citizens can present their opinions, inform competition briefs, and choose among alternatives (Garde, 2014) could help establish an understanding of participation in urban design in Türkiye.

Reviewing more cases concerning different aspects of participation in different contexts would enable a more comprehensive evaluation of participatory projects. Further research on participation might include exploring the possibilities and potentials of integrating participatory experiments in urban planning and design practices and education. Rethinking overall urban planning and design organization in terms of participation possibilities, specifically reconsidering the roles of public, private, and civil society actors and their interactions, holds the potential to innovate urban projects.

Designers and city administrations would recognize the potential of the participatory approach with the emergence of successful projects with effective participatory processes. As communities demand more democratic development processes, sufficient time, resources, and political support should be provided to integrate participation into urban design processes. Reinterpreting the urban design process, and proposing new methods and perspectives in which users can participate in the design process without

losing the focus of professional knowledge and design is essential for improving living environments.

REFERENCES

- ALPAN, A. (2013) *Urban Restructuring Process of Antalya Walled-Town and the Roles of Stakeholders*, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, City and Regional Planning Department, ODTÜ, Ankara.
- ARIN, S., ÖZSOY, A. (2015) Kentsel Mekan Tasarımında Çocuk Katılımı, *İDEALKENT* 6(17) 182-201.
- ARNSTEIN, S. R. (1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of planners* 35(4) 216-224.
- AYDOĞAN, M. (2017) Türkiye’de Tarihi Çevrelerin Korunmasında Katılımcı Planlama Olasılığı: İzmir Örneği, *Ege Mimarlık Dergisi* 30-34.
- BAŞAK, M. (2016) *Participatory Urban Design: The Case of Düzce Hope Homes Project*, unpublished Master’s Thesis, City and Regional Planning Department, ODTÜ, Ankara.
- BAŞARAN UYSAL, A. (2013) Katılımcı senaryo tekniği yardımıyla tarihi kentsel alan için iyileştirme stratejisinin belirlenmesi, *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 30(2) 137-162.
- BIANCO, L. (2016) Participatory Engagement in Urban Design Process: The Case of an Urban Settlement in Malta, *Spatium* (35) 71-78.
- BIDDULPH, M. J. (1998) Choices in the Design Control Process: Learning from Stoke, *Town Planning Review* 69(1) 23-48.
- CALDERON, C. (2019) Unearthing the Political: Differences, Conflicts and Power in Participatory Urban Design, *Journal of Urban Design* 25(1) 50-64.
- CANKURT, S. N. (2015) *Açık Kamusal Kent Mekanlarının Tasarımında Katılım: Bursa Atatürk Stadyumu ve Çevresi Kentsel Tasarım Projesi’nin İrdelenmesi*, unpublished Master’s Thesis, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- COX, V., GOETHALS M., DE MEULDER, B., SCHREURS, J., MOULAERT F. (2014) Beyond Design and Participation: The ‘Thought For Food’ Project in Flanders, Belgium, *Journal of Urban Design* 19(4) 412-435.
- CREWE, K. (2001) The Quality of Participatory Design: The Effects of Citizen Input on the Design of the Boston Southwest Corridor, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 67(4) 437-455.
- ÇAVDAR, T. (1978). Toplum Bilinçlenmesinde Araç Olarak Katılımsal Tasarım: İzmit Yenilikçi Yerleşmeler Projesi. [*Participatory Design as an Instrument in Raising Social Consciousness: İzmit Reformist Settlements Project*], *Mimarlık*, 78(1) 55-60.
- DALSGAARD, P. (2012) Participatory Design in Large-Scale Public Projects: Challenges and Opportunities, *Design Issues* 28(3) 34-47.
- ESENGİL, Z. (2009) *Planlama ve Tasarım Sürecinde Katılımın Kamusal Projeler Bağlamında İrdelenmesi: Antalya Kent Merkezi Örneği*, unpublished Master’s Thesis, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

- GARDE, A. (2014) Citizen Participation, Design Competition and the Product in Urban Design: Insights from The Orange County Great Park, *Journal of Urban Design* 19(1) 89-118.
- GARDESSE, C. (2015) The Fraught 'Menage À Trois' of Public Actors, Private Players and Inhabitants: Problems of Participation in French Urban Development Projects, *Urban Studies* 52(16) 3035-3053.
- GÜNAY, B. (1999) *Urban Design is a Public Policy*, METU Faculty of Architecture Press, Ankara.
- HONG, Y. (2018) Resident Participation in Urban Renewal: Focused on Sewoon Renewal Promotion Project and Kwun Tong Town Centre Project, *Frontiers of architectural research* 7(2) 197-210.
- HOU, J., RIOS, M. (2003) Community Driven Place Making: The Social Practice of Participatory Design in the Making of Union Point Park, *Journal of Architectural Education* 57(1) 19-27.
- KENTSEL STRATEJİ (2010) *Odunpazarı Sanayi Sitesi Vizyon ve Fikir Projesi Çalıştayı Eylül, 2010.* [https://www.kentselstrateji.com/wp-content/uploads/T-15_EskisehirOdunpazarı.pdf] Access Date (01.05.2020)
- NAGASHIMA, C. (1992) User Participation in Urban Design in Yokohama's Minami Ohta District, *Ekistics* 59 (354/355) 180-188.
- ÖZDEMİR, A. (2019). Katılımcı Planlama için Yöntem Yaklaşımı: Sakarya Mahallesi Parkı örneği, *Denizli-Türkiye, Iğdır Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 9(1) 233-243.
- PALANCI SERTBAŞ, C. (2013) *Kentsel Planlama Süreçlerinde Katılımcı Yaklaşımlar; Kepez-Santral Mahalleleri Yeniden Yerleşim Projesi Örneği*, unpublished Master's Thesis, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- POLAT, S., VURAL ARSLAN, T. (2019) Kamusal Kıyı Alanlarını Katılımcı Tasarımla Geliştirebilmek Mümkün mü? Bursa Mudanya'da Yıldıztepe Sosyal Yaşam Merkezi Projesi, *Kent Akademisi*, 12(3) 531-545.
- PRILENSKA, V., ROODE L. (2015) Challenges of Recent Participatory Urban Design Practices in Riga, *Procedia Economics and Finance* (21) 88-96.
- RELATIONAL URBANISM (2018) Design-Led Participation: A Relational Approach to the Development of Le Fanu Park, Ballyfermot. *Building Material* (21) 77-102.
- SAAD-SULONEN, J., HORELLI, L. (2010) The Value of Community Informatics to Participatory Urban Planning and Design: A Case-Study in Helsinki, *The Journal of Community Informatics* 6(2) 1-22.
- SANOFF, H. (1988) Participatory Design in Focus, *Architecture and Behavior* 4(1) 27-42.
- SANOFF, H. (2006) Multiple Views of Participatory Design, *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 23(2) 131-143.
- STANGEL, M., SZÓSTEK, A. (2015) Empowering Citizens through Participatory Design: A Case Study of Mstów, Poland, *Architecture Civil Engineering Environment* 8(1) 47-58.

- ŞAHİN, A. S. (2013) *Kültürel Miras Alanlarının Dönüşümünde Katılımcı Modeller: Yeldeğirmeni Örneği*, unpublished Master's Thesis, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kültür Yönetimi Yüksek Lisans Programı, İstanbul.
- TOKER, Z., TOKER, U. (2006) Community Design in its Pragmatist Age: Increasing Popularity and Changing Outcomes, *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 23(2) 155-166.
- TORRES, J. (2012) Participation as a Pedagogy of Complexity: Lessons from Two Design Projects with Children, *Urban Design International* 17(1) 62-75.
- ÜNLÜ, T. (2009). Kentsel Dönüşüm Sürecinin Tasarlanması: Tarsus Tarihi Ticaret Merkezi, *Planlama* 3(4) 145-157.
- WHITE, J. T. (2014) Design by Competition and the Potential for Public Participation: Assessing an Urban Design Competition on Toronto's Waterfront, *Journal of Urban Design* 19(4) 541-564.
- WULZ, F. (1986) The Concept of Participation, *Design studies* 7(3) 153-162.

Alındı: 09.09.2020; Son Metin: 12.01.2024

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kentsel tasarım; kentsel tasarım süreci; katılımcı yaklaşım; katılımcı projeler; halk katılımı

KATILIMCI KENTSEL TASARIMDA ZORLUKLAR VE FIRSATLAR: TÜRKİYE ÖRNEKLERİNDE ÖNE ÇIKAN NOKTALAR

Etkin bir katılımı kentsel planlama ve tasarım süreçlerinin parçası haline getirmek, planlama ve tasarım pratiklerinin demokratikleştirilmesi için gereklidir. Ancak, katılımın bu süreçlere entegrasyonu geleneksel süreçlerde bulunmayan zorluklar barındırır. Bu makale, kentsel tasarımda katılımcı yaklaşımları ele alırken, örnek çalışmalar üzerinden, katılımcı kentsel tasarım projelerindeki katılımcıları, katılım yöntem ve düzeylerini ortaya koymakta, süreçteki zorlukların ve fırsatların belirlenmesine odaklanmakta ve etkin katılımcı kentsel tasarım sürecine ilişkin öneriler sunmaktadır.

Çalışma bulguları Türkiye'deki katılımcı kentsel tasarım örneklerinde aktörlerin ve katılım yöntemlerinin daha az çeşitlilik gösterdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Örneklerin çok azında katılım tüm kentsel tasarım süreci boyunca devam etmektedir. Yenilikçi, önceden tasarlanmış ve projeye özel katılım yöntemleri kullanılmamakta, katılımı destekleyen özel etkinliklere yer verilmemekte ve katılım düzeyleri dünya örneklerine göre düşük olmaktadır. Türkiye'de katılımcı kentsel tasarım deneyiminin önemli bir özelliği, katılımı dışlayan kentsel projelere karşı itirazları ve müdahaleleri içeren "tepki katılımı" durumlarıdır. Kentsel tasarım ve katılımı ilgili yasal çerçevelerin yetersizliği, katılımcı yaklaşımın uygulanması için önemli bir zorluktur. Katılımın başarısı için kentsel tasarım sürecinin, her aşamada yeni girdilere ve geri bildirimlere izin veren açık ve esnek bir sistem olarak tasarlanması gerekir. Bu sistemde kullanıcının tasarım sürecine profesyonel bilgi ve tasarım odağını kaybetmeden katılabileceği yeni perspektifler önermek, yaşam çevrelerini iyileştirmek için gereklidir.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN PARTICIPATORY URBAN DESIGN: HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE TURKISH CASES

Integrating an effective participation into planning and urban design processes is necessary to democratize planning and design practices. However, integrating participation into these processes presents challenges which are not found in conventional planning and design processes. This article deals with participatory approaches in urban design, revealing the participants, methods, and levels of participation in participatory urban design projects through reviewing case studies. It focuses on identifying the challenges and opportunities in the process, and proposes improvement measures for the effective participatory urban design process.

Findings of the study reveal that actors and methods of participation are less diverse in participatory urban design cases in Türkiye. In very few cases, participation continues throughout the urban design process. Innovative, pre-designed and project-specific participation methods are not used, special events that support participation are not included, and participation levels remain low compared to world cases. An important feature of the participatory urban design experience in Türkiye is the incidences of “reactionary participation” that involve objections and interventions against urban projects that exclude participation. The inadequacy of legal frameworks regarding urban design and participation is a significant challenge for the implementation of the participatory approach. For participation to be successful, the urban design process must be designed as an open and flexible system that allows new input and feedback at each stage. In this system, to improve living environments, it is necessary to propose new perspectives in which the user can participate in the design process without losing professional knowledge and design focus.

ÖZLEM ARSLAN; B.Arch., MSc., PhD.

Received her B.Arch. from METU, MSc. in architecture from Dokuz Eylül University, MSc. in urban management and development from IHS, Erasmus University, and PhD. in City Planning from İzmir Institute of Technology. Research interests include urban design, housing, gender and urban space. mim.ozlem@gmail

NURSEN KAYA EROL; B.CP., MSc., PhD.

Received her B.CP. in city planning from METU, MSc. in urban design from Dokuz Eylül University and PhD. in city planning from İzmir Institute of Technology. Research interests include urban design, urban history, planning theory. nursenkaya@gmail.com