

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Public - Private Partnerships in Urban Regeneration: the Case of Turkey

Dr. Ozge Uysal Sahin

Lecturer, Biga FEAS, Department of Public Finance, Canakkale Onsekiz, Mart University, Turkey

Dr. Mehmet Sahin

Associate Professor & Lecturer, Biga FEAS, Department of Public Finance,
Canakkale Onsekiz, Mart University, Turkey

Abstract:

Urban regeneration emerged from the unsustainability of fast and unplanned urbanization in Western European countries in 19th Century. Today, on the other hand, urban regeneration projects are applied not only due to justifications like fast and unplanned urbanization but also because of some areas being unable to cover the requirements of modern life and being susceptible to natural disaster risks. In our modern age, the urban regeneration practices that started in developed countries have become a requirement in developing countries for most of the time. In addition to this, urban regeneration is a complex and costly process. For this reason, public and private sector partnerships have emerged as a proper solution in urban regeneration processes. As a developing country, Turkey has been guided to urban regeneration in an intense manner in recent years due to problems brought by fast and unplanned urbanization as well as natural disaster risks. In the case of Turkey, the public and private sector practices have come to the forefront in recent years. Current practices have successful aspects as well as missing points; and a more successful model may be applied by considering these points.

Keywords: Public-Private Partnerships, Urban Regeneration, Turkey

1. Introduction

Urban regeneration is a concept that came into the agenda in 19th Century in Western Europe. This situation is fairly understandable, because these countries had a fast urbanization process with the Industrial Revolution, and by the 19th Century the reality was faced showing that then-present cities could not be sustained with their situations. In these countries, which developed in a fast and proficient manner with the industrial revolution, it became clear that the cities -at least some parts of them- were not suitable for living. The inhumane conditions in which the people living in these areas and the restructuring of the urban areas that were shaped in accordance with then-present conditions brought the concept of urban regeneration into agenda in those times. In time, with the influence of socio-economic and political changes experienced in those times, urban regeneration evolved to an integrated structure that included social, economic and environmental problems rather than being a mere physical intervention. In this process, an inclination emerged from the urban regeneration that was performed with the hands of the state towards an urban revival performed with the hands of the public-private sector partnerships. Of course, globalization, dominant neo-liberal understanding and the weakening in social state concept all played important roles in this evolution that was experienced in urban regeneration.

2. Theoretical Background of Urban Regeneration Concept

With the industrial revolution, a fast urbanization movement, which was never experienced before, was observed in European countries. The European cities were caught unprepared in this sudden and intense migration movement, and as a result, housing areas with low life quality, inadequate infrastructure services, and industrial areas structured in an unplanned manner, and increasing environmental pollution led to the development of unhealthy cities. When it was understood that the low-quality housing areas with intense population threatened the health of the people living in such areas together with epidemic diseases, the issue of demolishing and clearing these areas came into the agenda (Akkar, 2006: 30). In time, the political and economic structure of the urban regeneration was directed towards global integration rather than national development. In this context, the urban planning process was also influenced by these developments; and different approaches emerged in different periods in urban regeneration practices (Gürler, 2003). The valid economic and political approach in today's world is the neo-liberal approach, which takes the market as its basis. The reflection of neo-liberal mentality brought with it the public-private partnerships. In this basis, the majority of public works are performed through these partnerships. In the end, urban regeneration practices seem to have adapted to this inclination.

Urban regeneration is a comprehensive and integrated action based on the works intended to resolve urban problems in the area that is the epicenter of regeneration and to ensure constant improvement of economic, psychical, social and environmental conditions in this area (Roberts and Sykes, 2000: 17). It aims to reorganize the slum areas of cities, the demolished areas in cities that appear when former industrial areas are abandoned, which are susceptible to the biggest damage during a possible earthquake for public benefit.

With a broader sense, urban regeneration means that the problems that disrupt the tissue of a city are eliminated and the city is turned to a healthy and livable place (Boyras and Hoş, 2014: 45). Urban regeneration, which has stemmed from the aim to increase the life

quality in a city, may also be expressed as the re-design of a residential area in economic, social and physical terms. In this context, considering urban regeneration as a mere physical change would be inadequate and lacking definitions. In this context, urban regeneration involves different problem areas other than considering the social and spatial exclusions. These areas may be classified as follows (Keleş, 2004: 436):

- Slum areas, illegal apartment block areas with high-intensity,
- Historical housing areas,
- Industrial areas that have lost their functions,
- Old urban centers,
- Residential areas that have the risk of disasters,
- Unhealthy urban areas that have lost their functions and that produce problems.

In these areas, *Improvement, Renewal, Rehabilitation, Revitalization, Redevelopment, Infill development, Clearance, Refurbishment, Conservation-Preservation* and beyond these, *Gentrification* processes constitute the contents of the urban regeneration. In this context, urban regeneration refers to different renewal works with different justifications in different urban areas. In this context, each practice has to have a different logic.

Urban regeneration stems from the need to understand urban disruption processes and refers to a consensus on the results that may be received from the regeneration to be performed. In other words, urban regeneration means the re-development and revival of a lost economic activity; refunctioning of a lost social function; ensuring the social integration in areas where there is exclusion; and re-establishing the balance in areas where the environmental quality or environmental balance are lost (Roberts, 2000: 22).

In this context, the real purpose of urban regeneration is performing the establishment of four basic criteria. Depending on the quality of the problems and potentials of the region, one or several of these targets may come to the forefront. It is possible to name these criteria as follows (Polat and Dostoğlu, 2007: 62):

- To stop the physical demolition, and ensuring that the historical tissue is sustained,
- Revival of the economic life,
- To increase the quality of architecture and urban life quality, and activate the dynamics that are based on culture,
- To ensure the participation of the relevant actors to project cycle in any scale.

Roberts determined five comprehensive topics about the targets of urban regeneration that try to realize these criteria. According to Roberts, the urban regeneration process in general must target the following items (Roberts, 2000: 7):

- Establishing a strong relation between the physical conditions and social problems of the local area;
- Changing many elements of housing and industrial areas in physical terms and covering continuous needs for such a change,
- Emphasizing economic success as a connection between social development and urban progressing;
- Ensuring that urban area is used in the best manner, and avoiding unnecessary pile-ups in order to ensure that the areas are used in the most productive manner in urban areas;
- Ensuring that the urban policies are shaped with a cooperative planning process sustained with a multiple-agent approach.

In order to reach these targets, it is necessary that the economic model, which is supposed to realize urban regeneration, is fictionalized and planned well. A regeneration model that is proper for the quality of the project and to the expectations of the project must be formed as well as considering the socio-economic and political conditions of the country and the city. In recent years, the public-private sector partnership model has emerged in this context. On the other hand, it would not be realistic to claim that this model is totally good or bad on its own. Even, when the public-private sector partnership model is adopted as a principle, the type of such a partnership must be considered in detail, because the application styles of the public-private sector partnership model may show variations.

3. Public Private Partnerships in Urban Regeneration

The public-private partnerships are formed when several of the companies or institutions from the public and private sector come together to form a partnership. The Non-Governmental Organizations, which are known as the non-profit 3rd sector, are also added to these institutions. The most distinctive property of these partnerships is the existence of two parties, which are the public and private sectors, and sharing the revenues and risks. Each of the partners undertakes one or several of the roles like finance, presentation or surveillance-auditing. Depending on the role or roles of the partners and on several reasons, public-private partnerships may have different shapes. The partners form a legal basis by establishing an institutional agreement, which includes common finance, transfer of authority, bidding and similar activities they will perform within this partnership defining the type of the partnership and then realize their activities. The public-private partnership model in urban regeneration first emerged as based on an agreement between political interests in England. The logic of the partnership is established on the necessity of direct participation of local people and on a closer connection between the public and private sector in order to realize efficient urban regeneration strategies (McCarty, 2005: 101). Bailey et al. (1995) claimed that the partnership concept and applications in England have been changed a lot in recent years. In post-war years, it was observed that the urban development and planning was government-focused, and the public and private sectors were given different roles in operational terms. As of late 1970s when the idea of partnership first emerged, partnership was considered as the struggle to improve the coordination and presentation of central and local management services; however, as of 1980s, the conservative government considered partnership as a tool for transferring the responsibility of urban regeneration to private sector. In the United States of America, the broadest use of public-private partnerships started with the common public-private enterprises for urban regeneration purposes in 1960s (Yescombe, 2007: 2-3). Similarly, the broadest public-private partnership

practices in European countries are the projects applied for the purpose of urban regeneration. Public-private partnerships in urban regeneration are planned works developed to aim the public-private-people partnership; to work for the improvement and reclamation of the triple form of *construction-environment-equipment* and to improve the economy with the help of living areas of people and to make city centers to have a quality that is proper for the life in today's life (Turok, 2004: 63).

Mackintosh (1992) suggested three basic partnership models, which are Synergy Model, Budget Enlargement Model and Transformational Model:

- *Synergy Model*: Synergy Model is based on the claim that the whole is bigger than the sum of its parts, and defends a collective approach based on Regeneration. All the partners in this model collect their resources, information, operational cultures and approaches rather than their individual efforts.
- *Budget Enlargement Model*: Budget Enlargement Model is the struggle of providing additional finance, which cannot be reached individually by the partners without forming a partnership.
- *Transformational Model*: Transformational Model defends the idea that each partner will benefit from the different working styles, suppositions and methods of the other partners with the help of cooperation. This kind of opportunity encourages innovation throughout the change process, and a conversion will be obtained as a result of a successful partnership.

When the size of urban regeneration projects is considered, the traditional models (flat for land basis, pre-sale, etc.) are inadequate in financing point. For this reason, it is clear that there is a need for alternative and diversified finance tools. In this context, a great many partnership models may be applied. Different models may be applied according to the socio-economic conditions and philosophy of urban regeneration desired by each country or city. Urban regeneration contains different processes from renewal to gentrification. The properties that characterize post-urban regeneration partnerships may be classified as follows (Reuschke, 2001: 13):

- Sharing the development risk and financial liabilities,
- Subvention, credits, credit guarantees and similar creative finance techniques and complex regulations on public and private finance,
- Equal participation of public sector to common development projects,
- Increasing the trust on tax encouragements for private sector investments in cities,
- The municipalities' indebtedness with tax-free securities, and
- Entrepreneurial development together with public and private sector entrepreneurs.

Public-private partnerships express the cooperation types between the business world and public authorities, which aim to finance, construction, renewal, sustaining or maintenance and present service. The most proper one among these cooperation models must be used. In this sense, it is not right to say which model is the best one. An accurate balance must be established between the expectations from the partnership, the costs of the partnership and probable roles of the public and private sectors.

The partnership that has a role in urban regeneration has three basic roles. These are facilitating, coordinating and applying the urban renewal of the relevant place/area, partnerships carry these three roles in a major scale in their structures (Stewart and Snape, 1995).

- The partnerships that facilitate regeneration activities consider partly the controversial issues that stem from different perspectives of partnerships or the issues that stem from politically sensitive topics. The stakeholders in the partnerships are inclined to be very influential. For this reason, the power balance is very important. This organizational model of partnership must be focused on parallel to comprehensive targets.
- Partnerships running the coordination issues, act in a distant manner and audit the actions started by various partners come together. The cooperation is generally run by one of the members since the power balance is equal or insignificant. They help to resolve new and non-contentious questions in an environment that is insensitive to the nature.
- The partnerships that apply urban regeneration plans work within a certain timetable. In addition, they also have clearly-defined certain targets and outcome sets. The relation between various partnerships is generally simple, and there is no battle for power. Such a partnership is a *submission tool* for regeneration projects that involve finance and acquiring of renewable energy sources.

As Harvey (1989: 7) defended, public-private sector partnerships are a part of the new entrepreneurship that reflects the urban regeneration in late-capitalism. Meanwhile, urban regeneration functions as a testing area for the evolution of partnership approach (Critchley, 2004: 199). The partnership model in the neoliberal global economy has evolved to a new stage. This model is accepted generally by right and left political environments. Especially the conflict that is caused by inadequate resources and high-level investment requirements in developing countries has brought these partnerships to the agenda more than ever. In this context, the success of these partnerships will define the future direction of the economy.

Today, these kinds of partnerships are accepted as a tool of sustainable urban development. In global scale, partnerships will define the fate of urban regeneration, because in fact the investments in poor quarters of a city are not attractive for private sector entrepreneurs. The investments being made in these areas is also a major success in one sense. It must be ensured that this situation is sustained. The benefits and important reasons of private sector investing in poor areas in cities may be mentioned as follows (Froessler et al., 2009: 29):

- Supermarkets with low budgets may benefit from being a part of a poor area where generally customers with poor incomes live. On the other hand, local people will also benefit because they will access to cheap food, have the opportunity of being employed and will acquire vocational experience.

- Telecommunication and Information Technology companies may benefit from providing service to poor quarters in a city because even in poor areas many residents use landline/mobile phones, and in return, they can expand their influential areas and increase their competition power.
- Local grocery stores, pastry shops, ethnical businesses and similar enterprises are important opportunities and values for poor urban areas; small-scale businesses, investors and companies in such areas may find important assets and opportunities.
- The investments encourage positive sides of different ethnical cultures, provide opportunities for tourism areas, and contribute to the city.

As it may be observed above, private sector somehow being directed to poor areas in a city will bring with it serious socio-economic contributions. Meanwhile, by doing so, social divisions and exclusions may be minimized. In the long term, this will ensure that the society is also empowered in political terms. In this sense, partnerships may provide more important contributions in the long term with urban regeneration.

4. Public Private Partnerships as an Urban Regeneration Model in Turkey

In Turkey, urban regeneration first came into the agenda with the “Law 5218 enacted on the allocation of the Fields that belong to the State and to the Municipalities to those who will Build Residence” enacted in 1948 to resolve the slum areas problem in Ankara. As of 1950s, Turkey experienced a fast urbanization process. When fast urbanization was followed by a fast increase in population, unplanned urbanization became a problem. Slum areas spread in a fast manner and are one of the major problems of metropolitan cities.

In the period after 1980, urban regeneration policies came to the forefront with the transfer of services that were the subject matter of re-production (Baydoğan, 2013: 109). In this period, the globalization-localization process, which was experienced with the influence of neoliberal policies, affected both urban life and urban areas in a major scale (Özden and Kubat, 2003: 78). In 1984, Public Housing Administration (TOKI) was established under the jurisdiction of *Collective Housing and Public Partnership Management*, and emerged as an important actor of urban regeneration when this concept became to the agenda in an intense manner after 1999 Marmara Earthquake. In 2003, TOKI was connected to the Prime Minister’s Office directly, and became active in ensuring urban regeneration with the cooperation of private sector and local administrations in urban areas that needed regeneration throughout the country.

The *Northern Ankara Entry Urban Regeneration* Project, which was the first partnership project of Turkey, started with the partnership of TOLI and municipalities in 2004. In 2005, new duties were assigned to municipalities and their authorities were extended. By so-doing, the road was opened for municipalities to play more active roles in urban regeneration. In 2007, the TOKI and private sector cooperation started, and *Parkoran Houses* project was initiated (Zamanov and Bahçelioğlu, 2013: 7).

After 2003, the government made new legal regulations, and tried to direct and accelerate the urban regeneration with cooperation of the municipalities, TOKI and private sector. Especially as of the earthquake in 2011, urban regeneration projects are spreading all over the country. In this period, the urban regeneration concept was accepted as a strategy, and it was aimed that the slum areas and the areas that were unprotected against disasters were renewed with municipality/TOKI/private sector partnerships. With the municipality and private sector partnerships, urban regeneration projects are designed, and the development right is consolidation in the context of these projects, and residence owners are given alternatives with developing rights transfer methods. In this context, with the Law 5366, the aim was opening SIT areas to construction in urban regeneration context. Item 73 of the Municipality Law 5393 provides municipalities with opportunities in this context. With this item, municipalities are given authority for urban regeneration and development project. The latest development in jurisdiction in urban regeneration field came with the Law 6306, which was enacted in 2012 with the name “*Regeneration of Areas that are Under Risk of Disasters*”. The aim of the law is determining the improvement, settlement and renewals in order to provide healthy and safe residential areas that are suitable for science and art norms and standards in areas and fields where there are risky structures and where there is the risk of disasters. In the 6th Item of this law, it is mentioned that the Ministry has the authority to apply methods that are based on public and private sector cooperation, performing or making performed constructions including flat for land basis or revenue reserves methods, and to define the field shares. The urban regeneration applications applied so far may be stated as follows:

- *Slum Areas Prevention Areas*: With these areas, the purpose is to prevent unplanned construction.
- *Regeneration Areas*: With these areas, the purpose is re-handling the neighborhoods where the worn and torn historical and cultural assets of a city intensify.
- *Urban Regeneration Areas*: The aim is to establish new living quarters that cover modern needs in areas, which are declared as the Urban Regeneration Areas.
- *Special Areas*: Urban regeneration projects are also performed with special laws.
- *The Areas under the Risk of Disaster*: The aim is to renew risky structures by strengthening or demolishing and rebuilding.

It is estimated that nearly 6,7 million houses will be demolished and re-built within the next 20 years in Turkey. This corresponds to nearly 334.000 units in annual scale. Such a major restructuring will certainly have a major cost. According to the calculations, nearly 23 billion US Dollars will be needed for only the demolition and construction of buildings (Cushman & Wakefield Research Paper, 2014: 1). Central Government is creating various funds in this context. In this respect, up to 90% of the revenues that will be obtained from the sales of the areas that are excluded from the Treasury Areas, which are also known as 2B Areas, may be transferred to the regeneration account. Of course, the finance of the regeneration in the whole country will not be possible with this. For this reason, 50% of the environmental fines, 5% of the investment budgets of the municipalities that will be participating in the regeneration, 50% of their legal fee revenues, 50% of some activities of Provincial Banks and the revenues that will be transferred by Ministry of Finance

will be used for this purpose. Of course, these revenues will not be adequate as well. It seems difficult that the public sector undertakes this burden solely. For this reason, it may be foreseen that public-private sector partnerships will be referred to more in Turkey in the future. Of course, when the partnerships are considered, the roles of public sector, private sector, municipalities and TOKI must be understood well.

4.1. *The Role of Public Sector*

After the adoption of the understanding as of 1980s, the central administration, local administrations and private sector have been included in the process of urban regeneration projects. Public resources are limited, and for this reason, the participation of the private sector is crucial in order to make use of new expertise and to reach adequate resources. The public sector has the regulatory and auditing role in this partnership model. In addition, it also has the mechanisms of encouragement and subvention in this process. It is possible to re-build the risky buildings that have completed their service lives and that cannot resist to disasters by making use of the *Urban Regeneration Credit* in this process. If the building is suitable for flat for land basis, house may also be purchased by using *Urban Regeneration Credit*. The tenants in the risky buildings may also make use of this credit and purchase houses (Kale: 22).

4.2. *The Role of Private Sector*

New urban policies are formed with neoliberal policies. In this context, regeneration practices have been experienced in urban policies. This regeneration is called as the togetherness of the private sector and local administrations. The private sector rather constitutes the financial element of the urban regeneration. For this reason, it is one of the most important actors in the regeneration. Among the private sector included in urban regeneration projects, there are construction companies, companies that will perform the building, marketing companies, real estate companies that are contracted, institutions that provide finance, the owners of the property, and private investors.

When the urban regeneration projects are considered in terms of private sector, the forthcoming element is the economic dimension. Different targets require that different private sector is included in the process. The contribution of private sector to urban regeneration process is the in the steps like process-concept formation and projecting, providing finance, realization and application of the projects (Kuzu, 2004: 253). The participation of the private sector plays roles in financing the inadequate public resources and it is also important in providing expertise in management and entrepreneurship, ability and experience (Stan, 2014: 146). Investors, real estate developers and companies and other groups contribute to the partnerships in accordance with their expertise.

Private sector companies have a unique information and instinct on the market, which will be beneficial for the regeneration process. The ability of the private sector in real estate development and activating funds exceeds that of the public sector. In addition, employment is provided for the residents of neighborhoods and capital financing for social opportunities and vocational training facilities is provided (Tsenkova, 2002: 74-75). Some urban regeneration applications have the quality of bringing revenues after the projects are completed. Participating in these projects creates an appetizer effect for the private sector, because such projects constitute a new market for "obtaining profit" factor (Solmaz, 2013: 124).

4.3. *The Role of Municipalities*

In urban regeneration projects, which are realized with public-private sector partnership method, and which achieve success, in case local administrations undertake the pioneering role, it has been observed that the support of people is received more, the costs of nationalization decrease, trust is formed in long-term projects, and the durations of the projects are decreased. Based on this fact, it is accepted that the pioneering role of local administrations in urban regeneration projects is important on the road to success (Smalley, 1996: 283). In urban regeneration projects in Turkey, municipalities have undertaken important duties in recent years. Municipalities have been assigned with duties like building, selling, renting collective housing projects, re-building and restoring old urban areas. With the Municipality Law 5393, municipalities were given the following authorities for the purpose of covering the needs for housing, industry and commerce within the municipality and urban areas; producing zoned fields with infrastructure; building, selling, renting houses, collective houses; and purchasing and nationalizing fields for these purposes; exchanging fields; cooperating with banks and other public institutions, and developing projects with them when necessary; and establishing companies for the purpose of building houses. In addition, the road for the municipalities to allocate field and houses has also been opened. The basic principle is that local administrations make the investments become attractive and profitable for private sector in order to bring forth the possible major benefits of urban regeneration projects and form the necessary conditions (Kyvelou and Karaiskou, 2006: 601). In this context, local administrations must target to create attractive conditions for private sector and provide special finance. The participation of local people in the urban regeneration process brings legality, reliability, local information and belonging to the process, and this is an important factor that ensures that local people adopt the programs. In this context, the participation of local administrations in the process has another importance.

4.4. *The Role of Public Housing Administration (TOKI)*

TOKI was established in 1984, and at first, it had the role of producing houses for low-income families. In time, it moved away from this purpose, and started to build houses for the market. It even moved towards the field of building luxurious houses. As of 2003, with the regulation of central administration, TOKI has had an important mission in urban regeneration. The opportunities for establishing partnerships with municipalities have been facilitated. The municipalities that want to have the power of being active in building houses aimed to make use of the TOKI factor. Similarly, major improvements have been achieved in the renewal of public buildings that seem to be incapable of resisting natural disasters. The chief actor has been TOKI in urban regeneration applications in

2000s. With the law 5162, TOKI was given the authority to make plans at any scale, prepare and apply urban regeneration projects in areas where it will be active.

5. Conclusion

Urban regeneration applications have been applied widely as of early 2000s in Turkey. An urban regeneration model is based on the regulatory role of the central government together with the municipalities, private sector and TOKI cooperation. The main element of this system is TOKI. With the “Flat for Land Basis System”, an urban regeneration based on the public-private sector partnership expresses the Turkey case. The urban regeneration projects that are either realized or that will be realized are applied generally in areas where the poor live. The criticism of making the poor leave their original places in favor of the rich to take their once-owned places is frequently being mentioned in this context.

The physical area organization of urban regeneration is coming to the forefront in Turkey case, and the social and economic revival dimensions are left in the background. The participative structure of urban regeneration process foresees that all the groups that have the right to speak in this process participate in the decision-making processes. There are several missing points in Turkey case. The participation of the people in the decision-making processes is limited. This endangers the sustainability of the system.

One of the major criticisms is that the newly-produced areas in the context of urban regeneration are alienated to the spirit of the city and to the areas. the regeneration applications that do not fit the urban tissue, that do not have adequate infrastructure, lacking a proper identity, without a certain shape and quality creates areas that will soon need another regeneration.

6. References

- i. Akkar, Z. M. (2006). Kentsel dönüşüm üzerine batıdaki kavramlar, tanımlar, süreçler ve Türkiye. *Planlama Dergisi* (TMMOB Şehir Plancıları Odası Yayını), 2006/2, 29-38.
- ii. Bailey, N., Barker, J. & Macdonald, J. K. (1995). *Partnership agencies in British urban policy*, London: UCL Press.
- iii. Baydoğan, M. Ç. (2013). Talas'taki kentsel dönüşüm eleştirel bir bakış. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 35, 95-130.
- iv. Boyraz, Z. & Hoş, B. Y. (2014). Türkiye’de kentsel dönüşüm uygulamaları, *Journal of World of Turks*, 6 (3), 45-63
- v. Critchley P. (2004). *The city of reason vol 5- the economic concept of the city*, e-book.
- vi. Cushman & Wakefield. (2004). Araştırma raporu: kentsel dönüşüm Türkiye, Haziran, www.cushmanwakefield.com/knowledge [21.10.2016].
- vii. Frossler, D. R., Gorm-Petersen T. & Wiemken, T. (2009). Good practice reader: public private partnerships in integrated urban policy, Düsseldorf: RevGov Fast Track Network (Regional Governance of Sustainable Integrated Neighbourhood Development), December.
- viii. Gürler, E. (2003). Kentsel yeniden üretim süreci üzerine karşılaştırmalı çalışma: İstanbul örneği. *Kentsel Dönüşüm Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı*, İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Basım Yayın Merkezi.
- ix. Harvey, D. (1989) From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71 (1), The Roots of Geographical Change: 1973 to the Present. (1989), 3-17.
- x. KALE. Kentsel dönüşüm rehberi. Türkiye İnşaat Malzemesi Sanayicileri Derneği, <http://www.kale.com.tr/i/Assets/katalog/kale-pdf/kentsel-donusum-rehberi.pdf> [10.10.2016]
- xi. Keleş, R. (2004). *Kentleşme politikası*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- xii. Kuzu, S. (2004). Özel sektör perspektifinden kentsel dönüşüm, İstanbul 2004 Uluslararası Kentsel Dönüşüm Sempozyumu Kitabı, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayını, 267-269.
- xiii. Kyvelou, S. & Karaiskou, E. (2006). Urban development through PPPs in the euro-mediterranean region, management of environmental quality. *An International Journal*, 17 (5), 599-610.
- xiv. Mackintosh, M. (1992). Partnership: issues of policy and negotiation. *Local Economy*, 3 (7), 210-224.
- xv. Mccarthy, J. (2005). Kentsel dönüşümde ortaklık pratiği. İstanbul 2005 Uluslararası Kentsel Dönüşüm Uygulamaları Sempozyumu Küçükçekmece Belediyesi Atölye Çalışması. İstanbul: Küçükçekmece Belediyesi Yayını, 99-107.
- xvi. Özden, P. P. & Kubat, A. S. (2003). Türkiye’de şehir yenilemenin uygulanabilirliği üzerine düşünceler. *İTÜ Dergisi Mimarlık, Planlama, Tasarım*, 2 (1). 77-88.
- xvii. Polat, S. & Dostoğlu, N. (2007). Kentsel dönüşüm kavramı üzerine: Bursa’da kükürtlü ve Mudanya örnekleri. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Mühendislik-Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*. 12 (1), 61-76.
- xviii. Reuschke, D. (2001). Public-private partnerships in urban development in the United States, NEURUS Program University of California in Irvine.
- xix. Roberts, P. & Sykes, H. (2000). *Urban regeneration: a handbook*, London, England: Sage Publications.
- xx. Roberts, P. (2000). The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration. In P. Roberts & H. Sykes, (Eds.), *Urban regeneration a handbook*. London: SAGE Publications.
- xxi. Smalley, J. W. (1996). *City challenge: derby’s winning bid*, Unpublished Dissertation, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK
- xxii. Solmaz, E. (2013). Kentsel dönüşüm finansman yöntemleri. In Melikşah Yasin ve Cenk Şahin (Eds), *Kentsel Dönüşüm Hukuku* (pp. 113-142), İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi S.S.ONAR İdare Hukuku ve İlimleri Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Yayınları, No:2013/1.

- xxiii. Stan, M. I. (2014). Public-private partnership - a solution for sustainable urban development of cities. *Curentul Juridic*, 56 (March), 139-147
- xxiv. Stewart, M. & Snape, D. (1995). Keeping up with the Momentum: Partnership Working in Bristol and the West of England. Unpublished Report from the School for Policy Studies to the Bristol Chamber of Commerce and Initiative, Bristol, England
- xxv. Tsenkova, S. (Ed.) (2002). Partnerships in urban regeneration: from 'top down' to 'bottom up' approach, urban regeneration: learning from the British Experience. Calgary: Faculty of Environmental Design University of Calgary.
- xxvi. Turok I. (2004). Urban regeneration: what can be done and what should be avoidant. İstanbul 2004 Uluslararası Kentsel Dönüşüm Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi.
- xxvii. Yescombe, E. R. (2007). Public private partnerships principles of policy and finance. Oxford: Elsevier.
- xxviii. Zamanov, A. & Bahçelioğlu, İ. (2013). Türkiye'de Kentsel Dönüşüm aktörleri ve Ortaklık Modeli. *Institutional Aspects of Urban and Regional Planning*, No: CRP488, https://www.academia.edu/6161065/T%C3%BCrkiyede_Kentsel_D%C3%B6nüşüm_aktörleri_ve_Ortaklık_Modeli [20.11.2016].