DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF NATURAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES

CONNECTING THE CITY WITH WATER: WATERFRONT PLACEMAKING IN CASES OF MANAVGAT, TURKEY AND BAR, MONTENEGRO

by Melisa KALAČ

September, 2016 İZMİR

CONNECTING THE CITY WITH WATER: WATERFRONT PLACEMAKING IN CASES OF MANAVGAT, TURKEY AND BAR, MONTENEGRO

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences of Dokuz Eylül University In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of City and Regional Planning, Urban Design Program

> by Melisa KALAČ

September, 2016 İZMİR

MLSc THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

We have read the thesis entitled "CONNECTING THE CITY WITH WATER: WATERFRONT PLACEMAKING IN CASES OF MANAVGAT, TURKEY AND BAR, MONTENEGRO" completed by MELISA KALAČ under supervision of ASSOC. PROF. DR. ŞEBNEM DÜNDAR and we certify that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

ASSOC. Prof.Dr. Şebnem DÜNDAR

Supervisor

EDGI GUBLIKEN Jury Member

Assoc. Dr.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe OKUR Director Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give my profound thanks firstly to my supervisor ASSOC. Prof.Dr. Şebnem DÜNDAR who unselfishly transmitted me the knowledge in the field of urban design during my studies, inspired me to research the topic of waterfronts and supported me all over the preparation of this Msc thesis.

Secondly I have the pleasure to thank my family who supported me unconditionally during my studies.

Melisa KALAČ

CONNECTING THE CITY WITH WATER: WATERFRONT PLACEMAKING IN CASES OF MANAVGAT, TURKEY AND BAR, MONTENEGRO

ABSTRACT

"Placemaking principles" are tools developed in urban design to give the directions for creating places for people, in general and in waterfront redevelopment, in particular. If not properly applied in the design, the identity and the image of the waterfront and the city as a whole lack urban quality.

The theoretical approach (the history of the waterfront development, the sustainability dimensions, design elements and principles) and the practical approach (two small-scale cities from two different countries as case areas) make up the main framework of the thesis. While the main point of the theoretical part is the analysis of successful European waterfront redevelopment examples and a critical analysis of different sets of principles suggested by some authors; the second part aims to make a parallel analysis of the two case studies through the principles discussed in the first part. The differences as well as the similarities between the case studies areas of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro have been clearly stated through the analysis of their backgrounds.

The two cases (Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro) share the same aim to make the waterfront for people and to use it as a tool for developing tourism in the region. Having taken into account the individual social, economic, environmental and cultural dimensions, the analysis of the two examples further questions the significance of the waterfronts, the principles adopted and the role of urban design in waterfront redevelopment in Turkey and Montenegro.

The role of urban design in waterfront redevelopment involves waterfront placemaking, which includes principles respecting the spatial, economic, social and cultural qualities of the given site, the water edge, in order to transform it from edge to an attraction point.

Keywords: Urban design, waterfront placemaking, places for people, tourism

SU İLE KENTIN BULUŞMASI: MANAVGAT (TÜRKİYE) VE BAR (KARADAĞ) KENTLERI ÜZERİNDEN KIYI ALANLARINDA YER OLUŞTURMA İLKELERİ

ÖZ

"Yer oluşturma ilkeleri "genel olarak ve özelikle kıyı alanlarının geliştirmesinde, insan ölçeğinde mekan yaratımı için kullanılan kentsel tasarım ilkeleridir. Bu ilkeler gereğince kullanılmadığı takdirde, kentsel mekanların ve kıyı alanlarının imajı ile kimliği kentsel kalite eksikliğine maruz kalacaktır. Kuramsal yaklaşımlar (kıyı alanların gelişim sureci, sürdürülebilirlik boyutları, tasarım öğeleri ve ilkeleri) temelinde güncel uygulamaların sorgulanması (iki farklı ülkeden iki farklı şehir inceleme alanı olarak) tezin ana çerçevesini oluşturmaktadırlar.

Kuramsal kısmın ana noktasını Avrupa şehirlerinde kıyı alanlarının gelişimi anlamında başarılı olan örneklerin analizi ve kimi yazarlar tarafından önerilmiş farklı ilke setlerinin kritik analizleri oluşturmakta iken; ikinci bölüm, birinci kısımda tartışılan ilkeler aracılılığıyla, iki inceleme alanının paralel analizi amaçlamaktadır. Türkiye'de Manavgat ve Karadağ'da Bar şehirleri olarak seçilen inceleme alanlarının farklılıkları ve benzerliklerine arka plan analizi bölümlerinde yer verilmiştir.

Her iki örnekte (Türkiye'de Manavgat ve Karadağ'da Bar) insan olçeğindeki kullanımları içeren kentsel alanların yaratılması ve bölgede turizmin geliştirilmesi amacıyla kıyı alanlarının nasıl tasarlanabilecegi sorgulanmıştır.Bireysel, sosyal, ekonomik, çevresel ve kültürel boyutlar her iki örnekte dikkate alınmış olup, kıyı alanların önemi, benimsenen ilkeler ve örnek alanlar (Türkiye ve Karadağ) temelindeki (Türkiye ve Karadağ) analizler üzerinden kentsel tasarımın rolü sorgulanmaktadır.

Kıyı alanlarının gelişiminde kentsel tasarımın rolü sonuç itibariyle kıyı alanlarında yer oluşturma (waterfront placemaking) eylemini içermekte olup, kıyı alanının bir sınır olmaktan çıkıp bir çekim noktasına dönüştürülmesi için kıyı alanlarının mekansal, ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel niteliklerinin yer oluşturma ilkeleri temelinde ele alınması gerekmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kentsel tasarım, kıyı alanları, yer oluşturma ilkeleri, insan ölçeğinde yerler, turizm

CONTENTS

Pages

THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	V
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER ONE-INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aim	2
1.2 The Method	3
1.3 Structure of the study	4
CHAPTER TWO- CITY AND WATERFRONT RELATION: THE	ORETICAL
BASE OF URBAN WATERFRONT DESIGN	5
2.1 Defining the Urban Waterfront	5
2.1.1 Consideration of the Waterfront from Past to Future	6
2.1.1.1 Emergence of the Waterfronts	6
2.1.1.2 Growth of the Waterfronts	7
2.1.1.3 Deterioration of Trade Uses and Shift to Recrea	ation at the
Waterfront	8
2.1.1.4 Regeneration of the Waterfronts	9
2.1.2 Scope of Development through Urban Waterfront Design	11
2.2 The Sustainability Dimensions of an Urban Waterfront	14
2.2.1 Social Dimension	15
2.2.2 Economical Dimension	19
2.2.3 Environmental Dimension	
2.2.5 Environmental Dimension	20
2.2.4 Cultural Dimension	20 21

2.4 Chapter	Summary					24
CHAPTER T	HREE-CITY	Y AND WAT	ERFRONT	RELATIO	N: THE DF	ESIGN
OF WATERI	FRONTS IN 1	BETWEEN.				25
3.1 Urban V	Waterfront Ca	tegories				25
3.2 Waterfr	onts Design	ed or Not? De	esigned for W	'hat?		29
3.2.1 Th	e Image of the	e Waterfront	•••••			29
3.2.2 Wa	aterfront Func	tion and Desi	gn Elements.		••••••	30
3.2.2.	1 Waterfront	Function				30
3.2.2.	2 Design Eler	nents				34
3.3 The Cri	teria for Evalu	ating the Suc	cess of a Wa	terfront Des	ign	43
3.1.1. A	ccess and Linl	kages				43
3.1.2 Co	mfort and Ima	age				43
3.1.3 Us	es and Activit	ies				44
3.1.4 So	ciability and I	Livability				44
3.3.5 Anal	yses of Euro	pean Waterfi	ont Design	Examples	in the Cont	text of
Eva	luation Criteri	a				46
3.4 Urban V	Waterfront Pla	cemaking Pri	nciples			56
3.5 Chapter	Summary	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				65
CHAPTER	FOUR-WA?	FREFRONT	DESIGN	FROM	THEORY	ТО
PRACTICE:	TWO	CASES	FROM	MONTE	NEGRO	AND
TURKEY	•••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	•••••	66
4.1 Backgro	ound: Waterfr	onts in Manav	gat and Bar			66
4.2 Analysi	s of Case Stud	ly Areas Acco	ording To Mo	ontgomery's	Conditions.	70
4.2.1 Ac	cess and Link	ages			•••••	74
4.2.1	.1 Movement.					74
4.2.1	.2 Streets: Cor	ntact, Visibilit	y and Horizo	ntal Grain		76
4.2.2. Us	ses and Activi	ties	•••••			82
4.2.2	.1 Developme	nt Intensity ar	nd Fine Grain			85

4.2.2.2 Mixed Use and Adaptability	87
4.2.2.3 Green Space and Water	89
4.2.3 Comfort and Image	91
4.2.3.1 City Blocks-Permeability	91
4.2.3.2 Architectural Style and Image	93
4.2.3.3 Landmark, Visual Stimulation and Attention to Detail	96
4.2.4 Livability and Sociability	97
4.2.4.1 Human Scale and Public Realm	98
4.3 General Perception of Case Areas	
4.4 Chapter Summary	

CHAPTER FIVE-CONCLUSION......107

REFFERENCES	
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1	
Appendix 2	
Appendix 3	

LIST OF FIGURES

Page	S
Figure 2.1 Stages in the evolution of port-city interrelationship	5
Figure 2.2 Sustainability dimensions1	5
Figure 3.1 Cliff edge20	5
Figure 3.2 Perforated edge in case of a Fishing village20	6
Figure 3.3 Natural beache2	7
Figure 3.4 Dockside quay2	7
Figure 3.5 Bay2	8
Figure 3.6 The docks	3
Figure 3.7 Design principles	5
Figure 3.8 The Blue Square; Architect Kristine Jensens Tegnestue; Drammer	ı,
Norway	5
Figure 3.9 Erie Street Plaza; Stoss Landscape Urbanism; Milwaukee, Wisconsir	ı,
USA	8
Figure 3.10 Mangfallpark Rosenheim, A24 Landschaft Robel Swillus un	d
Partner)
Figure 3.11 Different sections of the Promenade40)
Figure 3.12 Old/New Harbour Bremerhaven; Latz + Partner; Bremerhaver	۱,
Germany4	1
Figure 3.13 The City Deck Phase I; Stoss Landscape Urbanism; Green Bay	/,
Wisconsin, USA4	1
Figure 3.14 Hamburg and Barcelona waterfronts4	2
Figure 4.1 Movement and area attendance maps, Manavat7	8
Figure 4.2 Movement and area attendance maps, Bar79	9
Figure 4.3 Waterfront promenade sections in Manavgat and Bar80)
Figure 4.4 Atatürk Street, Manavgat and Vladimir Rolović Street, Bar	1
Figure 4.5 Service street cases in Manavgat and Bar82	2
Figure 4.6 Water-dependency related classification of uses in Manavgat and Bar8	3
Figure 4.7 Activities in the waterfront area84	1
Figure 4.8 Block patterns and areal pictures of Manavgat and Bar8	6
Figure 4.9 Fine Grain	7

Figure 4.10 Mixed-use examples in Manavgat and Bar
Figure 4.11 Green areas' distribution in Manavgat, Turkey and Bar,
Montenegro90
Figure 4.12 Block pattern and building form in Manavgat and Bar92
Figure 4.13 a), b) Traditional houses in Manavgat, Turkey and c), d), e) Actual
design and architectural style of Manavgat94
Figure 4.14 Interpretation of tradition in Manavgat94
Figure 4.15 Pristan before the destruction in 1976. a) and Pristan square in 1970
b);the image before the destruction in order to build new high-rise
residential buildings; c) The actual architectural style in Bard) King
Nicola's castle e) Home of Culture "Vladimir Popović
Španac"95
Figure 4.16 Landmarks in Manavgat and Bar96
Figure 4.17 Public art in Manavgat and Bar97
Figure 4.18 Human scale99
Figure 4.19 Public Realm
Figure 4.20 "How would you describe the actual waterfront characteristics?"
according to the surveys' subjects
Figure 4.21 Weaknesses of case areas104
Figure 4.22 Strengths of case areas105

LIST OF TABLES

Pages

Table 2.1 The social dimensions of urban waterfront planning according to Sairinen
(2004)
Table 3.1 PPS principles45
Table 3.2 Qualitative and quantitative characteristics of waterfront regeneration
examples (cited and adapted from Erkök (2009) Waterfronts: Potentials
for improving the quality of urban life)47
Table 3.3 Logic and Institutional Context of Waterfront regeneration examples
(based and adjusted on Taşan Kok (Exploring Innovative Instruments for
Socially Sustainable Waterfront Regeneration in Antwerp and
Rotterdam) in Desfor (2011) for Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Antwerp
and Remesar (2004) for Barcelona - Port
Vell
Table 3.4 Access and linkages
Table 3.5 Activities and uses
Table 3.6 Comfort and image

Table 4.10 Satisfaction from outdoor activities	83
Table 4.11 Waterfront area convenience for special groups of visitors	85
Table 4.12 Permeability	93
Table 4.13 Age group distribution	97
Table 4.14 Income groups	98
Table 4.15 Visits in summer and during the rest of the year	98
Table 4.16 Waterfront potential	101
Table 4.17 Design potential of case areas	102
Table 4.18 Design preferences	103



CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Water is deemed as one of the crucial elements in urban design: it has a number of functions and can take a number of specific forms. An understanding of the potential of water in the planning and design of cities, particularly its use in streets and squares, is based on an analysis of the set of generic forms. It can take and the suitability of those forms in serving the functional and aesthetic requirements of any given situation (Dreiseitel, 2005).

The water edges have always been lines of fronts full of diversity in terms of human activity. Through centuries, they have been changing their role from providing food, defense, trade to the widely-recognized recreational and leisure activities of the current times. According to its uses, the image of the waterfront has been changing, giving different perceptional experiences to adjacent areas.

Cities and settlement areas along the water have always been considered as specific places both in terms of environmental characteristics and design principles of the neighboring areas. The identity of those cities is mainly defined by the design decisions on the water edge. That is why the design of those areas represents a big challenge not only in the field of urban design, but also in fields of other social and environmental sciences (economy, sociology, ecology, psychology, history etc.) and related research topics (feasibility research; social impact assessment research; environmental impact assessment research; history of the development of human settlements etc.).

Waterfront redevelopment is considered to be one of the main topics of Urban Design research. The role of Urban Design has in the process of redevelopment the topic that questions its place temporally and spatially, in different scales of different scientific fields that are not only related to design (sustainability dimensions, placemaking principles etc.).

1.1 The Aim

Waterline was one of the first places to be settled through history, regarding the fact that the closeness to water provided main human needs as well as for transportation and exchange of goods. That way the port became the focal point of the developing settlements.

The ideology of 1960's when the shift in technology of transportation in ports and shipping industry changed is expressed in the two citations of Hough (1984) and Sert (1942):

In the port city, the public's access to other urban open space was drastically reduced during the early years of the Industrial Revolution: the migration from rural areas to the industrial cities and the rapid expansion of the latter consumed the internal open spaces and severed the urban from the rural (Hough, 1984).

"It is necessary that the important industrial areas are contiguous to railway lines, the navigable rivers or the ports and to the main routes of terrestrial transports" Sert (1942).

The need for regeneration and redevelopment after the abandonment and deterioration of waterfronts was obvious. Those years were the transformation point of waterfronts from industrial to leisure and recreation uses. Many successful examples of placemaking were made on the water edge of old port cities like Amsterdam, Barcelona, Rotterdam, and Antwerp etc. The success of such regeneration projects in developed countries as a practical base leads to further research of waterfronts in developing countries.

The aim of this research is to decipher the role of urban design in waterfront redevelopment in general and the placemaking principles and their adaptability in Bar, Montenegro and Manavgat, Turkey as case studies, in particular. In other words, it's permeating theory and practice in order to locate urban design in redevelopment and regeneration processes and its connection to other disciplines, focusing on waterfronts as field of research.

1.2 The Method of Research

The methodology suggests a close relationship between research, theory and practice. The theoretical background of the study is divided into several stages that are individually observed through different principles related to history, sustainability, and placemaking. The connection between these components is important for the analytical process of the thesis. The theoretical and practical parts of the thesis support each other. The theoretical base draws out the framework for the analysis of case areas and the comprehensive analysis aids in discussing the role of urban design in waterfront development in return.

In this study, a combination of different research methods is used in the practical part of the thesis dealing with the case study areas of Manavgat and Bar: comparative analysis, visual research method and online surveys of for the perception of case areas.

The visual research (unobtrusive observation) had and aim of making an on-site analysis and photographs that can be used as the material for further graphic representation of the analysis. Further on, the online survey has been done from July 1st, 2015 until July 15th, 2015 both in Manavgat and Bar. The online survey respondents are the full-time and part-time working members of the Municipalities of Manavgat and Bar that are between twenty and thirty years old. The aim of the survey was to get professional people's view of the case study areas that would support the conclusions from the unobtrusive observation part of the research. Results of the online survey have been presented in two ways. The first one is the tabulated, numerical and graphic representation of the open-ended questions related to the weaknesses and strengths of the waterfront areas, the activities etc.

1.3 Structure of the Study

The study includes theoretical and practical research of the waterfronts with particular reference to urban design. The spatial framework of the study consists of successful European examples of regeneration and analysis of waterfronts in Bar, Montenegro and Manavgat, Turkey as examples of small-scale cities as case study areas. The temporal framework of the study is based on the historical development of the waterfronts from the emergence of principal settlements, industrial revolution, until the contemporary regeneration projects.

The second chapter of the thesis deals with the theoretical base of waterfront development. It defines the urban waterfront and its characteristics and considers the waterfront through its historical development. It finally discusses the perception of the waterfront as an edge or an attraction point.

The third chapter examines the city-waterfront relation and the design in between. By examining the natural form of the water edge, the research is developed through the examination of design elements, evaluation criteria and the successful European regeneration projects. The main purpose of the chapter is to define the most suitable placemaking principles for design of waterfronts.

Finally, the fourth chapter is concentrated on background information of case studies, including analysis of the two cities in terms of placemaking principles defined in third chapter, the twelve conditions of Montgomery. The aim of the chapter is to connect the main conclusions from the previous theoretical chapters with the cases.

CHAPTER TWO

CITY AND WATERFRONT RELATION: THEORETICAL BASE OF URBAN WATERFRONT DESIGN

2.1 Defining the Urban Waterfront

In history, there have been many big cities built along the waterline. Waterfronts are the most ideal living area for human beings, providing for food, settling, defense, learning etc. Given that most waterfront cities are port cities, the port is called as "a city within the city"(Hoyle, 1997). Accordingly port-cities are responsible for finding a new balance between the water and its adjacent natural area, the public domain of the urban system and the infrastructures of the port systems. The ports are the nodal points on the waterfront, which create an interaction between the water and the land. Compiling the advantages of these two mediums, waterfront spaces gained prominence, which encouraged people to build cities along. The first phase of waterfront development was created in the way that the sea, lake or the river and lake was used for a food supply, serving more than land and also providing easy transportation, which created the first real phase of waterfront development (Hoyle, 1997).

The evaluation and use of water edge varied through time. Waterfronts kept changing their roles through history, but water was always the element that served as an attraction point for humanity for different purposes. In the course of its development, the coastline changed from natural borders to ports and first points of attraction and connection with the settlements. Port cities are among the oldest and largest urban settlements worldwide, and in both developed and developing countries, many have experienced complex patterns of growth and decline, sometimes over several centuries, yielding today a substantial urban pattern. From natural borders to ports, from underestimated land to points of connection with other settlements, they have undergone various complex patterns of growth and decline both in developed and developing countries (Hoyle, 1988).



Figure 2.1 Stages in the evolution of port-city interrelationship (Hoyle, 1988)

Not all the waterfronts had the same opportunity. Some of them have never had the destiny to become a port due to their characteristics, some of them have lost that functions while the others still exist both as places of public life and port function. In developing countries, depending on the intended use, the waterfront is recognized as one of the priorities and potentials. However, the lack of economic support and mismanagement led to underdeveloped and improperly used facades and gates of the cities on the waterfront.

2.1.1 Consideration of the Waterfront from the Past to Future

The waterfront was usually the focal point of the urban settlement as well as port. Wrenn (1983) defined four different periods of waterfront development according to the relation between the port and the city:

- Emergence of Waterfront Cities
- Growth of Waterfronts
- Deterioration of Waterfronts
- Regeneration of Waterfronts

2.1.1.1Emergence of the Waterfronts

Urban settlements and their ports were closely related in functional and spatial terms from ancient times until recent decades. Water transport and trade made the origin and prosperity of many of those human settlements. Urban services in the city ports were developed to promote maritime trade, organized in the manner to serve as gates where the exchange of goods was facilitated and the ships equipped (Hoyle, 2002).

It is unknown when exactly the port settlements were started to be built, but it has always been considered that they are the beginning of the effective relation between the water and land. According to Remesar (2002), Plato said; "Build the city ten miles away from the sea" to prevent its moldy, salty breezes. It means that the settlements avoided building near water if it wasn't the source of fresh water, but still they needed the ports and warehouses which were apart from the cities for transportation and exchange of goods.

The vicinage of water affected the formation of the cities. Huge walls between the city and water isolated the city from potential attacks that would come from the ports. Later on, during the Roman and Greek periods, great port cities were developed for recreation, protection and trade caused by the expansion and improvement of the transportation systems. Since the port settlements were located at a substantial distance from the major city, it would take a day's march after arriving on the shore before one could prepare an attack (Remesar, 2004).

2.1.1.2 Growth of the Waterfronts

The next great step in waterfront development, the growth of the waterfronts, took place in 16th and 19th centuries. The early projects in Western Europe express the idea of port rather than having social implications so the focus was on developing the port infrastructure.

In the sixteenth century, the balance of political, social ideas and design concepts created the idea of an "Ideal City". The city was meant to contain a canal, river or harbor and the design was made specifically for that geographical site by preserving the characteristics of harbor cities by connecting the canal, river or sea to the rest of the city. The port infrastructure included drainage systems and was used as the main

structure for urban fabric in cities as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Dordrecht, Vlissingen, Hoorn, Harlingen etc. By the time when the accessible waterways were made, people in Amsterdam developed a sense of creating recreational waterfronts in a way that no one thought of the waterfronts that way before. Cities were developed on the border line of the harbor as they were the main transportation points at that time. In 17th century, port cities were transformed to express the maritime culture. The most successful example was Amsterdam because of its regulations of land use and construction methods that were led by the municipality (Konvitz, 1978).

The development of the infrastructure between the port and the rest of the city turned valuable waterfront ground into transportation area. Since the ports and their hinterlands were surrounded by railroad and motorway connections, industrial plants took the advantage and were spread over the waterfront's valuable lands that isolated them from the city. The relation between the port and the rest of the city was interrupted with the railroad that was used for the distribution of goods from the port.

2.1.1.3 Deterioration of Trade Uses and Shift to Recreation at the Waterfront

The shift from the port function to city slums was the point when the waterfronts were used as shipyards and hinterlands in order to gain as much commercial profit as possible. By the time, when the commercial use was over, the ruins were abandoned and created a negative image on the water edge. So in a few decades, waterfronts turned into abandoned ruined places that were forgotten even by their own citizens.

The breaking point to turn away the port functions was The Promenade Law in Spain. In 1918, according to Remesar (2004), the legislation of promenade law in Spain affected many waterfronts around the world. It aided in transforming the relationship between the port and the city. Waterfronts began to be designed as recreational areas with water-related activities and growing popularity (Remesar, 2002). Recreational waterfront design continued to develop per se with more facilities, water related activities and harbor life. The docks evolved into marinas, the warehouses were converted into restaurants and cafes. Industrial sites through the Western World became post-industrial, consumer-oriented and gentrified spaces. The aim was to present the waterfronts as symbols of wealth and success to tourists, investors or future residents.

2.1.1.4 Regeneration of the Waterfronts

The evolving process began in 1960's when technological advances in the shipping industry resulted in older port facilities to become abandoned places (Pinder and Hoyle 1992). In the second half of 20th Century, the waterfront regeneration meant a redevelopment process of a devoid part of a city into commercial and recreational areas. That is the moment when gentrification started to be present at the water edge due to the fact that the facilities for recreation were only available to high-class community and tourists. All those facts add to the theory that water edges should not be left as non-functioning areas with concrete ruins of abandoned ports. Thus, they should be considered as recreational areas with identity and heritage.

Through the end of 20th Century, a dilemma regarding the use of the waterfronts was created. On one side, the economic advantages of the port activity could not be ignored. On the other side, the redevelopment projects included moving the port activities to another location where it would not interrupt the connection of the city with its water edge.

During the last decades of the 20th century, the attraction of the urban coastline was recognized and efforts have been made to preserve what was left of it. It can be said that contemporary urban waterfront redevelopment and regeneration projects represent an international undertaking in urban planning and politics (Feldman, 1999).

In the last three decades, major waterfront development appears to have been arising, as the public demanded its ports back. The real solution came in recent years: using the nature as a shelter made everything easier and more efficient. Combined with the technological developments, the new trends for the waterfronts were created. The emphasis is given mostly on sustainability and preserving the heritage that the city had. For the last few decades, with the re-discovery of these topics, alternative solutions for abandoned ports and industrial zones are produced. The regeneration efforts affected waterfronts all around the world in desire to work, play, rest etc. near the water's edge.

Many examples of regeneration in Western Europe (Netherlands, Germany, Spain and France) in the 1990s analyzed in further chapters (Chapter 3.3.5) had a more public approach to the regeneration process. The example of Barcelona is the typical one with a public event as an initiator of the regeneration process (Olympic games in 1992). In broader European terms, the objectives and aims of the Barcelona regeneration had a good experience in policy goals and objectives contained in the European Union's green paper on Urban Design. It can be useful to take Barcelona as an innovative regeneration scheme for other recreation-oriented waterfronts. Such projects are providing new directions and a basis for re-focused waterfront development models (European Commission Report, 1990).

Urban tourism is considered to be a major developing industry of 21st century with waterfronts as the gathering areas between maritime and urban environments (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2011). Based on the experience of the developed countries where recreation and tourism have been the moving powers for the urban waterfront redevelopment, a similar situation occurs in the developing countries where cultural tourism was neglected in comparison to other elements of tourist industry (Craig-Smith and Fagence, 1995). That's the point where a lot of factors make the waterfronts to develop in a unique way instead of using a ready formula from other examples of successful waterfronts. New waterfront redevelopment projects should be used as prescription for developing countries in which way design, environmental, social and economic issues can be effectively accomplished.

2.1.2 Scope of Development through Urban Waterfront Design

The word meaning of waterfront gets through as "the part of a town or city adjoining a river, lake, harbor, etc." in the Oxford American Dictionary of Current English in English Dictionaries and Thesauruses (Dong, 2004). According to Moretti (2008), the word "waterfront" means "the urban area in direct contact with water". According to Breen and Rigby (1994), waterfront identifies the water's edge in cities and towns or urban area of all sizes.

The varied physical context and multiplicity of needs make design both a challenge and an opportunity. By urban waterfront, we mean the water's edge in cities and towns of all sizes. For our purposes a waterfront project may include buildings and areas that are not directly on the water, but are tied to it visually, historically or ecologically or are linked to it as part of a larger scheme.

The perceptions on the term "waterfront" are different in some parts of the world. In North America according to Hoyle (2000), the waterfront is considered to be part of the urban renewal process in North America, whereas according to Hoyle (2000), (2001a) in Europe, it is regarded as a mere side-effect of the changes in maritime transportation. The American waterfront regeneration consists of mixed uses including residential, recreational, commercial, retail, service and tourist facilities. Mainly residential, recreational and tourist-related uses were often the predominant than the others in this model. In time, this largely became the typical development model within the US and was widely accepted by other countries as well. The experience of American waterfront regeneration, especially Baltimore's Inner Harbor regeneration, influenced many in Europe (from Scandinavia, UK and the Netherlands to Spain and all southern Europe) and worldwide (Australia, Japan, Latin America, the Middle East and South Africa (Papatheochari, 2011; Jones, 1998).

Further on, the difference and meaning of urban redevelopment and urban regeneration will be explained as those two terms are often been understood as synonyms (for example the explanation of those terms in Wikipedia.org has been given in that way). Waterfront redevelopment involves a set of trends that are in the process of changing the face of port cities, and other cities on water, in many countries around the world, not of course for the first time. Given their impact upon the local, these global trends, create attractive urban waterfront environments of the 21st century, whilst responding to wider demands for urban renewal and to changes in the technology of maritime transport. In administrative terms, waterfront redevelopment cannot proceed to best advantage unless there exists,, a common set of objectives and an agreed framework of methods between the various organizations and authorities involved.

Urban waterfront redevelopment as we know it today embodies the historic alteration of land and water uses along the edges of thousands of cities, large and small, throughout the world. The current complex waterfront redevelopment stream is attributable to different factors, notably:

-Technological changes in the post-World War II, which led to abandonment and/or deterioration of industrial land across waterfronts,

- The historic preservation movement,

- Heightened environmental awareness and water cleanup,

- Consistent pressure to redevelop central city areas,

- Public (state, federal and municipal) urban renewal and related assistance (Fieldman, 1999).

Urban waterfront redevelopment, in port cities and other cities on water, is still largely confined to advanced countries. However, it currently gains impact upon developing countries as cities seek to revive their spatial environments mostly via tourism development. In order to make abandoned or under-designed places work again for the communities, all factors have to be taken into account and different professions have to interfere.

The ideas of regeneration meant an introduction of broader idea of environmental sustainability containing also the social dimension and community targets. In the 1970s and 1980s, attention centered mostly on North America and Europe, and on

the spread of the waterfront redevelopment movement to Australasia and Japan. By the end of 1980s and 1990s, substantial literature of urban waterfront redevelopment emerged – notably in geography, planning and environmental studies – closely linked with the increasingly independent processes of urban planning and port development, and largely derived from the experience of advanced countries.

Some certain characteristic modes of behavior when considering the waterfront regeneration can be distinguished (Lorens, 2014):

-The entire regeneration process is based solely on individual ventures; in this instance, there is no common idea to link them. As a result, we obtain a rather haphazard set of investment projects, often conflicting with each other in function and space. Therefore, the success of such a venture is rather doubtful. A classic example of this is the Manhattan waterfront of New York.

-Comprehensive revitalization programmes are prepared and they assume the considered transformation of the entire post-harbour areas. This has a double dimension: the revitalization (in the sense of organizational and financial structures, along with the working mode) and the design. In this particular case, entire districts are subject to an all-embracing design, which tackles the whole of the architectural and urban form. This is the case with Amsterdam.

- The entire process is divided into smaller autonomous investment tasks within the framework of a general concept. This is an intermediate type of regeneration, assuming a common general regeneration scheme, embracing the realization of necessary infrastructure investment within the entire area (financed from public funds) and then, individual schemes are applied to defined projects, financed and designed according to their own schemes. Examples: London, Genoa and Barcelona.

Considering the utility of the programme introduced into post-harbor areas, one can distinguish at least two situations in the world, where:

-The goal of revitalization is to regenerate degraded spaces into new downtown functions of a diversified character. Such is the case of, for example, London Docks or Kop van Zuid in Rotterdam.

-The revitalization programme delegates a part of the area to various port functions-both cargo handling and passenger service. As examples, one can refer to passenger terminals and ferry terminals in Genoa and Barcelona or the new port structures in the old docks of Antwerp.

When talking about urban waterfront regeneration, one cannot forget the strategies of urban densification. One of the leading policy strategies of growing cities is to increase the density of the urban structure in order to advance sustainable development by minimizing investments in infrastructure, energy consumption and emissions from private car traffic (Jenks et al., 1996). These urban densification processes have intensified the planning and building of waterfront areas near the city centers. On the other side, while making efforts to raise the density the urban structure of the cities, tendencies to save either the natural environment or the industrial heritage identity of the waterfronts leads to urban waterfront conservation programmes that put the cultural dimension of the waterfronts in front of needs for urban densification. Urban waterfront conservation involves a variety of cultural dimensions and needs that give rise to development opportunities, but simultaneously constrain progress.

2.2 The Sustainability Dimensions of Urban Waterfronts

Urban waterfront regeneration, which indeed can be deemed as a global phenomenon, has social, economic and environmental benefits to the community (Timur, 2014). The planning of the waterfronts is usually in the scope of interest of various social groups since it has a direct or indirect impact on the image of the city and social equity. In terms of the image of the city, it is mainly based on the idea that they are often places with majority of green areas in the city while in terms of social equity they attract attention because they are quite often both high-price residence and gentrification areas (Sairinen, 2004).

According to the Land Use and Building Decree (1999) in Finland environmental impacts are understood to have direct and indirect effects on:

-people's living conditions and environment;

-water, air and climate;

-flora and fauna, biodiversity and natural resources;

-regional and community structure, community and energy economy and traffic;

-townscape, landscape, cultural heritage and the built environment (Sairinen, 2004).

Further on, the roles of each of four dimensions of sustainability (social, economic, environmental and cultural dimension) in urban waterfront planning are going to be presented.



Figure 2.2 Sustainability dimensions

2.2.1 Social Dimension

Growing wealth of societies consequently leads to increased interest in tourism and recreation that create the development of cultural tourism. There is need for experiencing different customs and cultures that present the identity of local communities including those that have relation with water, the port and the sea (Dündar *et al*, 2014). According to Sairinen et al. (2005), not enough attention is paid to the social dimension in land use planning and urban waterfront planning. He defines social dimensions of urban waterfront planning and regeneration as "different ways of experiencing and using the edges of the water to make an understanding of their qualities for the community".

Four different dimensions of social impacts in sustainable urban waterfront planning are presented by Sairinen to refer to the different uses of the water edge:

-resources and identity,

-social status,

-access and activities, and

-waterfront experience.

Social impact assessment (SIA) provides valuable information both for land-use planning practices of urban waterfront areas and the management of the urban natural areas in general. It does not provide information only about the social effects but also social inputs for appropriate designs of conservation, preservation and changes of waterfront areas for mixed use (Waterfront Urban Development, 2002).

The SIA is based on causal relations between design and social impacts of the designed area on communities. It is important to emphasize that it includes, first of all, multiple causality, as there can be many factors of the built environment that affect human behavior. On the other hand, social impacts refer not only to causal relations, but also to social meanings and subjective values. In addition, one of the key elements of SIA is that it revises the social sphere of different community groups. Thus, it operates with different factors and takes into account the most important social differences among the groups inhabiting and visiting the waterfront area.

Public participation and SIA should be clearly interactive in a planning process. Many questions are raised about the extent and validity of knowledge of the local communities and their right to have role in decision-making in the process of planning. The aim of SIA is to define the factors that affect the design process. When its integration is accomplished, both social and environmental factors become a part of that process rather than being treated as external and after effects. In order to be able to achieve such integration, it is necessary that some basics are known by the local community so that it can fit into real and usable framework of the modern planning procedure Sairinen et al. (2005).

People who use waterside areas for residence, place of work, or recreation are associated with waterside areas for housing, industry, commerce, transport, and a variety of leisure and recreational facilities. Even if they themselves may not directly use or benefit the resource, those people who view waterside areas as a public resource are concerned about the quality and use of waterside areas (Craigh-Smith, 1995).

Resources and identity	-Main characteristics and strengths of the area		
	-Opinions of the environmental, cultural and		
	historic values		
	-Significance to the visual, social and cultural		
	identity (city, image, community identity)		
Social status	-For whom (social, age or ethnic groups) are		
	the service planned and built?		
	-Segregation and gentrification processes		
Access and activities	-Are the waterfronts accessible to the public?		
	-What kinds of activities are possible? "Water dependency"		
	-Easy or difficult approach to waterfront?		
	Traffic and parking questions; waterfront routes		
Waterfront experience	-Presence of water (sea, lake, river etc.)		
	-Restorative experiences, importance of visual		
	messages, physical touch, tastes, voices,		
	moving in the space, sense of transition		

Table 2.1 The social dimensions of urban waterfront planning (Sairinen, 2004)

In the first category of the social dimension of urban waterfront planning, questions related to <u>the resources and identity</u> deal with the main characteristics of the waterfront area; the resources that can be considered as strengths in the area; the environmental; cultural and historical values of the area; the visual, social and cultural identity of the community; the attitude of the local community towards the waterfront as a part of a local identity and the resources that contribute to the image of an area.

The second category, <u>the social status</u>, of the social dimension of urban waterfront planning is related to the community groups that the waterfront areas are planned and built for; the role of social and private housing in the social status of the area; prevention of social segregation and the possibilities of producing gentrification by planning the waterfront (Sairinen, 2004).

The third dimension of the social urban waterfront planning, the <u>access and</u> <u>accessibility</u>, is defined by following questions: the accessibility of the waterfronts to the public; the presence of the water in the urban structure; the ease of approach to the sore for vehicles and pedestrians; existing barriers that block the way to the waterfront; access facilities provided (ramps to the beach, trails, picnic facilities, fishing, boating, viewing, etc.); traffic and parking problems; clearly marked routes to the waterfront and the possibilities of using the recreational potential on the waterfront (Sairinen, 2004).

<u>Waterfront experience</u> is the last social dimension of urban waterfront planning. In the fourth category, the priority is given to the experience of waterfront environments; the importance of the visual messages, physical touch, smells, voices and moving in the space; the sense of the transition on the way to the waterfront and the perception of the existing resources on the waterfront area (Sairinen, 2004).

The SIA of urban waterfront planning examines the opportunities of water edges. The objective of SIA is to increase the awareness of different groups (planners, decision-makers and the community as a whole) about the spatial, social and cultural aspects of waterfront areas and the recreational, cultural and physical relationships between the community and the waterfronts. It further leads to the scale of the relation between natural and human-modified (built) environments (Sairinen, 2004).

2.2.2 Economic Dimension

Port areas were always the hotspots of economic activity (Girard *et al*, 2014). The transformation of waterfront in both visual and economic terms occurred by the relocation of traditional industrial port activities (caused by introducing contemporary production techniques) and carrying out new projects related to waterfront regeneration that created new work places in various sectors of newly established mixed-use facilities (Dündar, 2014).

It can be said that in the era of globalization, the relationship between urban economy and urban design, as established throughout history of urban forms, is getting reversed: while for centuries the quality of urban environment has been an outcome of economic growth of cities, nowadays the quality of urban space has become prerequisite for economic development of cities; and urban design is consciously used a means of enhancing the development prospects of cities (Gospodini, 2000).

The key tools guaranteeing the success of a waterfront transformation process can be defined in a few points (Falk, 1993):

-The development strategy, as the most important one, makes it possible to avoid many spatial and organizational problems, allows the division of the project into stages and public participation. The port history of the waterfront usually gives a unique image to the site that makes it more attractive and gives new vision of possibilities to gain in a way that does not harm the image of the waterfront itself, for example, developing the areas for local artisans and art.

-Emphasis on the adaptation of existing structures that gives a unique identity to the sites,

-Social research and consultations that insure public participation and avoid social resistance,

-Cooperation with the local community that both avoids conflicts and gains community participation (Falk, 1993).

Morena (2011) states that urban waterfront regeneration may also have some negative effects and risks in terms of economy. As the "common good " and the property interests are on opposite sides, it may happen that the final outcomes do not correspond to the initial concept of the regeneration project as public spaces, enjoyment and access can be partly neglected in favor of commercial use interests. High level profit is considered to be more important than the quest for high quality (Giovinazzi & Moretti, 2010). The access to the waterfront is sometimes reserved just for a few categories of people in order to fulfill the profitability condition (Morena, 2011). The domination of commercial-tourist functions over the residential ones leads to the use of these areas just for a few hours a day and in the weekends instead of the long term use being provided (Morena, 2011).

All the fact given above can be summed up in a few key elements in revitalization programmes of post-harbor areas. Defined operations in infrastructure and public spaces, varied scale and character of investment programmes and coherent financial and organizational modes for the realization of particular tasks can transform the waterfront design to a community- used and led area.

2.2.3 Environmental Dimension

Since the 1970s, along with the growing interest in removing pollution from degraded waterfront sites, the need to protect environmentally valuable places has been increasing, too. Among the best examples of that urge are the projects for the purification of the reservoirs in industrial harbors. Purity of water is an important factor in the waterfront revitalization as well as the purity of soil which can determine its success. These factors must be examined and the optional problems solved as a prerequisite for continuation of the revitalization process. Usually an autonomous public agency fosters such kind of processes. The well-known examples include Boston and Baltimore Harbour place.

A persistent need for integration of built and natural environment is one of the goals of urban sustainability. Waterfront edge designs should deal with the protection of existing aquatic habitats and make use of environment-friendly design elements, materials and alignments, which would improve the ecological function of the coastal edge and be consistent with the regional ecological goals. An ecologically productive environment is achieved through cherishing the habitat and paying attention to creating ecological diversity. The biomass of the project site should be formed of native plants which add up to the identity of the place and its integration with the adjacent regions (WEDG guide,n.d.).

The waterfronts are supposed to be affected with floods, and storms. If not properly chosen, they can give an unpleasant image to the zone and harm the usual activities on the waterfront. Plants that are salt-, flood-, and drought-tolerant, wind-resistant, and can stand local temperature changes should be used in order to decrease eventual damage and costs of reparation (WEDG guide, n.d.).

Human recreational activities can harm sensitive habitats on the waterfront by producing excessive noise, trash, waste oils from motorized vehicles etc. This way the attractiveness of the waterfronts is affected by the fact that those are the edges where the natural and built environment meet and the inhabitants feel the closest to the nature.

2.2.4 Cultural Dimension

This aspect refers to the cultural life of the area. Festivals, celebrations and other cultural events represent an opportunity for citizens to share feelings, traditions and all kinds of activity with other people living or visiting the district. From the other side, it refers to the historic heritage of the city. It also includes the activities common for those regions. Altogether, combined with the urban design of waterfronts, they are related to their identity that has an increasing interest of the public sector and urban communities (Edwards, 1992). A cultural district should

offer different facilities in order to allow people to enjoy concerts, go out for sports and gather for traditional celebrations. People should feel safe walking around the district and trust other visitors. Associations should cooperate with institutions and residents to build trust and participation (Gravanguolo, 2013).

In terms of the cultural dimension of waterfront design, creative industries play a big role nowadays. A new development perspective can be given to abandoned harbor areas by locating creative industries in historic revitalized waterfronts that can lead to potential investments and the involvement of local governments. Various cultural events (art exhibitions and performances, festivals, design shops, cafés, and bars) and innovative business places (business technology services, new media firms) hosted in restored port facilities, can form a new place-making principle that would attract visitors and citizens, a creative cosmopolitan urban culture space to attract citizens and visitors by its cosmopolitan concept.

The cultural dimension of waterfront design is particularly related to preservation of maritime tradition, expressed by the respect shown to historical sites with the local use by the refashioning them for actual use interpolated with the tradition and local identity. These buildings, when suitably incorporated into the new urban structure, can even work as the conceptual base for new design. Open-air museums, the development of educational institutions (like museums or marine aquaria), and finally, the creation of new objects that develop relations with the former ones express the culture and values of the former port areas in scale and character (Edwards, 1992).

To sum up, waterfront areas can notably be not only areas that can bring economic benefits from tourism and other uses but also represent the identity of the city and its culture through its image.

2.3 Waterfront-Edge or an Attraction Point

As discussed in previous chapters, waterfront areas were intensely used and the relationship between the waterfront and the city was tight in pre-industrial cities. With the emergence of huge ports, warehouses and transportation modes, which were

dependent on water, this relationship was interrupted. As the transportation and containerization technology went through evolution, port activities are moved out of the city centers and the city waterfronts left underutilized and abandoned (Wrenn, 1983). As the environmental awareness and the need for gathering places with a meaningful design were in demand, the waterfronts began to be perceived as potential attraction points instead of being meaningless edges.

The need for waterfront accessible to the public increased as recreation on the water edge emerged as a way to come closer to the water, in other words to the nature. Instead of having physical and psychological barriers, they were envisioned as visible, walkable and attractive. According to Karvinen (1997) the urban waterfront acts as a borderland between the controlled urban structure and the uncontrolled nature. Karvinen states that nowadays waterfronts have become "an object of visual aesthetics" due to the increased consciousness of the presence of nature and visual connection to water.

Recreation is usually considered as one of the optional urban activities. It is often the one that is being sacrificed in the process of the city development in order to fulfill the growing needs for more commercial uses. Instead of the mere understanding of recreation as a sport-oriented use, the contemporary one gathers a much wider range of different activities. The contemporary active urban lifestyles imply it as a cult that does not include only healthy way of living, but also all the activities that provide distraction from daily routines and stress. Walking down a promenade, talking to people, sitting near water etc. can also be considered as recreation. When combined with the environmental and location- based constrains, different places are designed to serve for those purposes. If designed in order to serve all community groups and their different needs, they can also be considered as sustainable and protected from being observed as underused and unnecessary parts of the city pattern.

What is that turns waterfronts from a bare edge to an attraction point? First of all, activity. Even though designed, many waterfront regions have been left abandoned because of lack of activities. The design itself does not guarantee long-term livability
and use if not properly planned in terms of including different age groups, income groups, variety of activities and adaptable design and functions. What is usable and attractive now may not be in a distant time point. For the waterfront activities to be successful, a company or group of companies, individuals and other stakeholders have to persuade in creation of an adaptable, in step with technology and market requirements facilities and public places.

2.4 Chapter Summary

The attractiveness of a waterfront depends as much from a fetching design as much as from the management and market requirements, land use and property division. If left entirely to the private sector, it may develop with an accent of profit much more than environment, sustainability and livability of the waterfront. In other words, the economy factor would have priority over the other sustainability factors. Recreation areas and other water-independent land uses would be either omitted or given a small role on the waterfront edge. As a result, the visitor profile would be changed from the waterfront attracted to facility and use attracted visitors who would otherwise visit any other place that would give them the same service with no relation to the site or waterfront edge. The breaking moment when the water's edge is led to risk of being only an edge, instead of an attraction point.

CHAPTER THREE CITY - WATERFRONT RELATION: THE DESIGN OF WATERFRONTS IN BETWEEN

3.1 Urban Waterfront Categories

Wrenn (1983) defines the shoreline shape as a major influence on how the location of the city in reference to the water affects the city-water interface. Longer waterfronts at a short distance from the city center are characteristic of cities located on small islands, peninsulas and hinterlands as well as intersecting rivers, deltas and estuaries. This fact increases the possibility and variability of creating different public spaces that are connected both with the water edge and the public spaces in the inner parts of the city (Al Ansari, 2009).

According to Moughtin (2003), there are seven generic waterfront forms. The first takes its form from the vertical cliff edge. It comprises buildings rising from the water's edge. The second main type the 'perforated water edge', which is derived from the fishing village sheltered from the coastal winds. Access to the sea is along narrow tunnels or passageways. The others are a bank or a beach with soft edges; a dockside quay with constructed edges; a wide open bay and a pier constructed over the water level. The final type is the 'turning a back' to the water, treating it as sewer ground or a culvert.

The 'cliff edge' waterfront treatment is most commonly associated with the nineteenth century canal lined by the faces of multi-storied warehouses (Figure 3.1). There was no public access to the waterside for the length of the warehouse's facade as the warehouse had a private ownership of the front facade. Openings in the canal façade of the warehouse are for the purpose of loading and unloading goods into and out of the building. The history of this building type is long. Many of frontages in Venezia, for example, have only private access and public access in exceptional circumstances as a result of conservation.



Figure 3.1 Cliff edge (Moughtin, 2003)

The 'perforated edge' that has for its model the traditional fishing village, can be characterized as having high permeability due to the fact that frequent fingers of narrow public pathways lead to the quay and seafront (Figure 3.2). The form when used for a stretch of waterfront does secure good access to that waterfront for the public. The long narrow Piazza Degli Uffizi in Florence can be classified as a perforated water edge. The long narrow gallery of the Piazza connects the banks of the River Arno with the central place of the Piazza Degla Signoria giving public access to the Palazzo Degli Uffizi.



Figure 3.2 Perforated edge in case of a Fishing village (Moughtin, 2003)

The natural bank or beach is the condition of the waterfront usually associated with a river as it meanders through the city or the shape of many parts of the sea coast (Figure 3.3). It can have various functions in the city watercourses, from the environmental pollution control to the recreational landscape use as a city park, green corridor or touristic place.



Figure 3.3 Natural beach (Moughtin, 2003)

Buildings arranged along a dockside quay make up a common water edge treatment for port settlements (Figure 3.4). The main characteristic of the water's edge facade is a long wall parallel with the sea line. Passageways, which lead to the inner districts of the town or city, are the main aspect. The small town of Lamu on the Kenyan coast is the typical form of this development.



Figure 3.4 Dockside quay (Moughtin, 2003)

The curved canals in Amsterdam are the typical example of this development as they are followed with a promenade along each side of the canal parallel with the four or five storied terraced buildings. The canal in Amsterdam is often in the form of a curved street, with its enclosing frontages reflected in the water and its length punctuated by a series of bridges spanning the canal: it is an elegant use of a double quayside along both sides of the watercourse. The fifth model for waterside treatment is the bay (Figure 3.5).



Figure 3.6 The docks (Moughtin, 2003)

The sixth type is the pier that breaks the water edge at certain angles (Figure 3.6). The use of piers and building onto water is becoming more popular in contemporary architecture and urban design as waterside structures that are usually used for recreation. When considered as an extension of the seaside street, the pier can have various uses (cafés, boutiques, stalls etc.) that provide a closer contact with water and gain a different experience of the sea. The cost of the maintenance for the continued utility raises critics on the profitability of floating structures. Still, the building of floating structures competes favorably with the costs of building on land (Bentley, I. et al., 1985).

3.2 Waterfronts... Designed or Not? Designed for What?

This chapter is dedicated to the image of the waterfront in general and its function and design elements in particular. It deals with the characteristics of the uses and design elements that are site specific.

3.2.1 The Image of the Waterfront

Water can be used both as a material and an area. New parks, plazas and promenades from one side and waterfalls, pools, fountains etc. from the other side allow the visitors to have real contact with water instead of leaving it just as some scene/object/area to be looked at. The image of the waterfront area is what is perceived as a form designed either to attract or to discourage the visitor.

The image of many waterfronts around continents is assimilated with the identity of the cities they belong to. A strong relation between the city and its waterfront makes it one of the main city symbols. The water itself plays an enormous role in all the scales of a built environment, from the building scale over the neighborhood to the entire city form. It gives an input to the visual and mental perception of the surrounding environment both. Colour, sound, reflection, movement from one side and the soil edge formation role from the other side are both conditioning and completing factors.

'Take thought, when you are speaking of water, that you first recount your experiences, and only afterwards your reflections.' This piece of advice comes from Leonardo da Vinci. Instead of being just a vital element, water can also be experienced in other ways. It can be evaluated both as an aesthetic element and a recreation resource. According to the fact that water shapes edges, it gives inputs for the design of adjacent areas and design elements as squares, parks, promenades and facilities that should differ from the design of the inland located ones (Dreiseitel et al, 2005).

The main dilemma is how to incorporate all of the elements of design with water and get a successful example of waterfront place-making. Which way should it be done? Which principles should be implemented? In which way and according to which principles should the survey maps of the case study locations be made? How does a waterfront gain its identity instead of falling into the group of globalized design examples? The answers on these questions are what makes the image of the waterfront an inclusive, symbolic, unique, or successful part of a city, in other words, exactly a place in human measure.

3.2.2 Waterfront Function and Design Elements

The chapter is dedicated to the function and design elements of waterfront projects with examples explaining their main characteristics.

3.2.2.1 Waterfront function

Use of the waterfront has been changing according to the transformation of industry and modes of transportation of goods. The 19th century has been the period when attention was paid to public access to the waterfront in order to improve the colonial image and enhance the social order. The 20th century was marked as a period of transforming the waterfront areas into tourist attraction points still used by the local citizens, while further expansion of leisure and recreational activities were shaped the waterfront in the 21st century in order to attract the tourists into inner waterfront region and the other users to the outer waterfront region. Residential leisure followed by festivals and special events was a common theme between 1970s and the 1980s (Johnson, 1984). In 1990s, waterfront redevelopments transforming the unlivable coastal areas into livable places became a common ground.

In order to make a classification of the uses on the waterfront in an organized and group-interrelated manner Wrenn (1983) defines three groups of land uses related to water dependency:

1. Water-dependent uses (waterfront location is indispensable)

- 2. Water-related uses (maximizing the advantages of waterfront location)
- 3. Water-independent uses (neither dependent nor related to waterfront).

Through defining the land use of the waterfront region, affecting the design of the area, the image and the identity of the waterfront is partly limited by those decisions. That definition is a huge challenge for many of the waterfront cities. The treatment of the waterfront in terms of land use vary from one-dimension uses like private residential developments, fields and grassy lawns to highways and car-oriented uses that disallow public access. Even though many of them have lost their initial purpose of ports and tend to develop in any way possible, if one particular use is dominating, the long-term potential of the waterfront is degraded (Project for Public Spaces).

The role and opinion of many stakeholders are included in defining the appropriate use of the waterfront region. As explained by Wrenn (1983), policy makers stand for the attitude that the waterfront should be preserved only for water-dependent uses which could not exist in any other location. A more common policy is to allow water-related uses while private developers tend not to place any special restrictions on the waterfront land use due to the market conditions and suitable factors.

The scenario and arguments between the stakeholders is formed as in the following (Wrenn, 1983):

1) Conservationists: cargo shipping terminals, ferry and passenger terminals, marine construction and repair facilities, marinas and moorage facilities, and tug and barge companies should not have to compete with residential, retail, and office uses for waterfront sites. They potentiate to capitalize on the full potential of the water resource. By giving place to a non-water related use on the waterfront, an opportunity to develop one more water-dependent use on the same site is lost. Optionally, water-related uses can be allowed if the real cost savings and revenue advantages can be attributed to a waterfront location (single-user terminals, seafood plants, petroleum processing plants, waterfront parks, public aquariums, and

restaurants). This option is considered to enhance the functional attachment of the city to the water edge (Wrenn, 1983).

2) Private developers: They give advantage to the site characteristics and market forces to determine the waterfront land uses. Regarding the fact that because of technological innovations many water-dependent uses are no longer economically tenable in the central city locations, use restrictions may lead to underutilization and deterioration of waterfronts. As in some cases, office, retail and residential uses generate secondary water-related uses that otherwise would not be feasible (Wrenn, 1983).

Another reason for not accepting only water-related uses along the waterfront edge is the exclusion of mixed-use principles and projects of redevelopment. The risk of including only water-related uses is that the percent of low feasibility than when they are developed within a mixed-use concepts. They produce necessary variations of developments that attract people to the water's edge and provide facilities and services to support the water-related maritime uses (Wrenn, 1983). Mixed-use facilities can only be regarded as viable with a sufficient density of people and activity as well as properly planned spatial and temporal distribution of activities and land uses (Carmona, 2003).

In response to the sterility and underutilization produced by the industrial waterdependent uses concept, the mixing of land uses has become a widely used concept. There are two ways of mixed-use formations: by having a mix of single-use buildings or by having buildings which each contain a mix of uses (e.g. living over the shop). Mixed-use facilities may either be created by integrating residential areas in non-residential ones or versa vice, for example suburbs (Carmona, 2003).

The benefits of mixed-use developments are identified by Llewelyn-Davies (2000) as follows:

• More convenient access to facilities.

• *Minimizing travel-to-work congestion.*

- Greater opportunities for social interaction.
- Socially diverse communities.
- A greater feeling of safety through more 'eyes on the street'.
- Greater energy efficiency and more efficient use of space and buildings.
- More consumer choice of lifestyle, location and building type.
- Greater urban vitality and street life.
- Increased viability of urban facilities and support for small business.

On the other hand, several interrelated factors that support aversion to mixed-uses within the same building are classified by Carmona (2003) as given below:

• *Development*: the additional costs of developing mixed-use buildings (for different fire escape requirements, etc.); and the institutional structure of the development industry, with developers tending to specialize in a particular development type (residential, commercial, etc.).

• *Management*: incompatibility and security reasons for non-acceptance of other users by occupiers; and additional costs involved in having multiple users, due to different leasing, safety or environmental health requirements.

• *Investment*: different leasing periods reducing the liquidity, and therefore the value, of the development (Carmona, 2003).

To sum up, a use is only appropriate if it reflects the special characteristics of a waterfront site and responds adequately to community needs. This way both water dependency and economic viability are considered to be accomplished (Wrenn, 1983). As the appropriate solution, depending on site characteristics, the mixed- use type of land use is widely accepted and efforts have been made to find design concepts that would reduce the reasons of aversion towards them. The solution is to find ways to mixed-use developments through persuasion, regulation or financial incentives while planning polices, master plans and urban design frameworks take them into account while developing the concepts (Carmona, 2003).

3.2.2.2 Design elements

The elements of urban design combined with the place-making principles are what make a place from a space. When making a design and placing elements near water, both building elements and open spaces should have characteristics that give a sense of a water presence and build the image and identity of the waterfront in a that way.

One aim of urban design is to create stimulating city spaces for public use. Water offers the designer an opportunity to introduce a reflective and aural dimension to the city landscape, together with light and color. Venice is the exemplar for those concerned with studying the ways of introducing water into the spatial composition of the city (Moughtin, 2003).

Open spaces should provide opportunities for public enjoyment and use of the water and add value to public and private development. The waterfront is taken as the main public space of waterfront settlements. It is a linear open-space system. New public spaces should be seeked in void areas to strenghten the public space system with additions of micro-open systems.

New public parks, promenades, streetscape improvements and privately-owned parks should be combined to form a coherent, publicly accessible pedestrian and bicycle green space system. New mixed-use buildings that are related to their environment can offer livable and necessary activity points in the region. If designed and combined properly and perceived as activity elements, they can be considered as successful examples of place-making.

a) Active square and plaza design

Potential or existing open spaces should be categorized in order to achieve a level of hierarchy (Figure 3.7). Squares and minor gathering spaces should be surrounded by commercial land uses. At least one side of a square should include ground floor commercial activity. The waterfront squares should not have strictly defined borders. They should be integrated with surrounding elements, especially the promenade and the dock (Moughtin, 2003).



Figure 3.7 Design principles (Moughtin, 2003)

Ten principles for successful squares were defined by Project for Public Spaces (n.d.) after analyzing and observing hundreds of examples. Not only the design, but all the following factors should be taken into account:

1. Image and identity

- As centers of communities, squares usually shape the identity of the whole city. If placed near water, by gaining different relations with the water and other nearby elements, the square may perceived as a main visual point towards water.

2. Attractions and destinations

- As activity is what makes a place livable, in order to attract people to the waterfront, squares may have varieties of water-dependent, water-related and water-independent uses that would give them the attribute of a destination and attraction point.

3. Amenities

- As well as making a logical placement of the urban furniture, lightening and public art one towards each other, all of those elements should make a sensible arrangement which allows activity and water observation.

4. Flexible design

- The use of a square changes during the course of the day, week, and year. If set on the water edge, it also depends of the seasonal changes of the water level. To respond to these natural fluctuations, flexibility needs to be built in.

5. Seasonal strategy

-The use of the open spaces near water usually depends on the climate and site characteristics. Due to that fact, they should be adapted in terms of use and activities from one season to the next.

6. Access

- In order to be successful, a square needs to be easy to get to. Instead of being cut off by traffic axes, it should have pedestrian access both from the water-side and the enclosed sides (Figure 3.8). Accessible for pedestrians, by bike or waterways it builds up on its essential use: being visited as much as possible.



Figure 3.8 The Blue Square; Architect Kristine Jensens Tegnestue; Drammen, Norway (Fang, 2011)

7. The inner square & the outer square

- Visionary park planner Frederick Law Olmsted's idea of the "inner park" and the "outer park" is just as relevant today as it was over 100 years ago. The streets and sidewalks around a square greatly affect its accessibility and use, as do the buildings that surround it. The promenade connecting the system of squares along the waterfront plays is as much important as the access ways from the inner waterfront region and the active "outer square" facades that overview the water area.

8. Reaching out like an octopus

- Just as important as the edge of a square is the way that streets, sidewalks and ground floors of adjacent buildings lead into it. The transition from adjacent square area to the square itself should gradually decrease the vehicle oriented ways to pedestrian-oriented paths oriented to the waterfront.

9. The central role of management

-The best places are ones that people return to time and time again. Water adjacent and water-related squares are in advance of inner-region squares due to the fact that the water already makes the advantage on the livability. On that basis, if well-managed, the activities can be considered as long-term viable solutions.

10. Diverse funding sources

-As well as waterfront redevelopment projects as a whole, a well-managed square can be managed by public-private partnerships, which add up to its beneficial fund raising from diverse sources, including but not limited to rent from cafés, markets or other small commercial uses on the site; taxes on adjacent properties etc.

According to Kevin Lynch (1981), the urban plaza is intended as an activity focus, at the heart of some intensive area. It is greatly paved, enclosed by high-density structures and surrounded with streets or in contact with them. It contains features meant to attract groups of people and facilitate meetings. With the aim of keeping people instead of letting them pass through, it is usually a place for strolling, sitting and eating.

As stated in the Al Batten Design Guideline (2009), the plaza design should engage following design principles to the guidelines:

- Locate plazas in busy areas in order to be accessible to variety of people

-Offer them a variety of activities in order to encourage them to stay with minimum of confliction on the pedestrian ways

-Create a variety of color, texture and landscape elements (Figure 3.9)

- Provide as much sunlight as possible and in the same time shade areas either through structures and/or tree canopies

- Offer a variety of type, arrangement and variety of seating providing opportunities for public/semi-private gatherings.



Figure 3.9 Erie Street Plaza; Stoss Landscape Urbanism; Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA (Fang, 2011)

b) Green corridors and parks

Through nearly three decades of observation and analysis, Project for public spaces has identified nine strategies that help parks achieve their full potential as active public spaces that enhance neighborhoods and catalyze economic development. Project for public spaces (n.d.) defines some of the strategies for a successful park design that can also be considered as design principles of waterfront parks:

-Use transit as a catalyst for attracting visitors

-Make management of the park a central concern

-Develop strategies to attract people during different seasons

-Acquire diverse funding sources

-Design the park layout for flexibility

-Consider both the "inner park" and "outer park"

-Provide amenities for the different groups of people using the park

-Create attractions and destinations throughout the park

-Create an identity and image for the park

Plants used in landscaped areas should be of highest quality and of sufficient quantity and scale to make a visual impact. Plantings should be selected and located so that their functional and aesthetic qualities can be maximized. Trees of reasonable caliper should be installed at a density adequate to provide shade, habitat, and visual interest to public open space and care should be taken that appropriate species should be selected for the soil conditions. Adequate space should be given to each planting and adequate irrigation and drainage should be provided (Master Plan for Redevelopment of the Eastern Waterfront, 2002).

Due to the different functions, context, and physical and geographical constraints of the open space areas, a distinct planting list should be determined based on design requirements and the soil, horticultural, and microclimate conditions of the specific sites. Selected plants should tolerate conditions including salts, wind, and local soil conditions where planting areas are overexposed to water (LA Waterfront Design Guidelines, 2011).



Figure 3.10 Mangfallpark Rosenheim, A24 Landschaft Robel Swillus und Partner (Fang, 2011)

c) Promenade, piers, ports and docks

The public rights-of-way, including sidewalks, paths, and the waterfront promenade, provide essential connections while also providing meaningful public spaces. Rights-of way will be well-designed spaces with public amenities such as seating, lighting, art, and interpretive panels. These spaces will not be barriers, but rather function as a seam that connects the waterfront to the neighboring communities (LA Urban Design Guide, 2011).



Figure 3.11 Different sections of the Promenade (Moughtin, 2003)

The main design aim of the promenades is to ensure maximum human comfort, use and enjoyment on the promenade (Figure 3.11). Special pavement, street trees, pedestrian scaled lighting, weather protection, public art, clocks, information signage and well-designed furniture are the elements that act together in forming a good image and atmosphere on the water edge (Figure 3.12). Sustainable and drought resistant landscape elements should be provided with variation to improve disease tolerance and reduce urban heat effect (Moughtin, 2003).

As defined in the Master Plan for Redevelopment of the Eastern Waterfront produced by The City of Portland Planning Office (2002), promenade furnishings should not obstruct the sidewalk. Promenade furnishings should be carefully located relative to features such as trees, landscaping, adjacent land uses and signs. Promenade lighting should be designed to reduce and minimize light pollution and glare. The lighting coverage should not be interrupted by trees and canopies.



Figure 3.12 Old/New Harbour Bremerhaven; Latz + Partner; Bremerhaven, Germany (Fang, 2011)

Piers and decks are created to provide continuity and more public use (Figure 3.13). Anyway, they should be avoided from non-accessible waterfront. Direct access to the sea and facilities on it, is what makes them connected to the rest of the waterfront design elements.



Figure 3.13 The City Deck Phase I; Stoss Landscape Urbanism; Green Bay, Wisconsin, USA (Fang, 2011)

d) Infrastructure and building design

The aim of this part is not to give an overall view of design principles of infrastructure and architectural style in general, but the ones that are site-specific. They are directly related and cannot be observed separately since related design principles depend on the concept of the design project of the given site. In order to be able to depict what is said above, the examples of waterfronts from Hamburg (Figure 3.15a) and Barcelona (Figure 3.15b) may be used as examples of successful waterfronts with different design concepts and principles. Those principles are explained further on in the conditions defined by Montgomery (1998) in Chapter 3.4 and in the analyses of successful European waterfront regeneration examples in Chapter 3.3.5.



3.14. a) Hamburg (Followtheflammias, 2013) and b) Barcelona waterfronts (Inzumi, 2016)

The relation of the building with water, the architectural style and building heights that are decreased away from the water edge all give identity to the waterfront. On the other side, these morphological elements define the approach to the water edge. Generally accepted rules in previously mentioned design guidelines for the infrastructure are:

-priority should be given to pedestrian access, rather than the vehicular access, to the water edge

-the hierarchy of the street network should be respected in the way that the traffic density when approaching the water edge is calmed down ("traffic calming") (LA Waterfront Design Guideline, 2011; Portland Waterfront design guideline, 2002).

3.3 The Criteria for Evaluating the Success of a Waterfront Design

The following criteria have been defined by the Project for Public Spaces in order to be able to systematically evaluate successful examples of waterfronts in Europe.

3.3.1 Access and Linkages

You can judge the accessibility of a place by its connections to its surroundings, both visual and physical. A successful public space is easy to get to and get through; it is visible both from a distance and up close. The edges of a space are important as well. For instance, a row of shops along a street is more interesting and generally safer to walk by than a blank wall or empty lot. Accessible spaces have a high parking turnover and, ideally, are convenient to public transit (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.).

3.3.2 Comfort and Image

Whether a space is comfortable and presents itself well – has a good image – is key to its success. Comfort includes perceptions about safety, cleanliness, and the availability of places to sit – the importance of giving people the choice to sit where they want is generally underestimated. Women in particular are good judges on comfort and image; because they tend to be more discriminating about the public spaces they use (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.).

3.3.3 Uses and Activities

Activities are the basic building blocks of a place. Having something to do gives people a reason to come to a place – and return. When there is nothing to do, a space will be empty and that generally means that something is wrong (Project for Public Spaces, n.d).

Principles to keep in mind in evaluating the uses and activities of a place:

-The more activities that are going and that people have an opportunity to participate in, the better.

-There is a good balance between men and women (women are more particular about the spaces that they use).

-People of different ages are using the space (retired people and people with young children can use a space during the day when others are working).

-The space is used throughout the day wrong (Project for Public Spaces, n.d).

-A space that is used by both singles and people in groups is better than one that is just used by people alone because it means that there are places for people to sit with friends, there is more socializing, and it is more fun.

-The ultimate success of a space is how well it is managed wrong (Project for Public Spaces, n.d).

3.3.4 Sociability and livability

This is a difficult quality for a place to achieve, but once attained it becomes an unmistakable feature. When people see friends, meet and greet their neighbors, and feel comfortable interacting with strangers, they tend to feel a stronger sense of place or attachment to their community – and to the place that fosters these types of social activities (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.).

Project for Public Spaces Principles				
Principles	Access and linkages	Comfort and Image	Uses and Activities	Sociability
Questions to be considered	 -Can you see the space from a distance? Is its interior visible from the outside? -Is there a good connection between the space and the adjacent buildings, or is it surrounded by blank walls? Do occupants of adjacent buildings use the space? -Can people easily walk to the place? -Do sidewalks lead to and from the adjacent areas? -Does the space function for people with special needs? -Do the roads and paths through the space take people where they actually want to go? -Can people use a variety of transportation options – bus train, car, bicycle, et to reach the place? -Are transit stops conveniently located next to destinations such as libraries, post offices, park entrances, etc.? 	 -Does the place make a good first impression? -Are there more women than men? -Are there enough places to sit? Are seats conveniently located? Do people have is a choice of places to sit, either in the sun or shade? -Are spaces are clean and free of litter? Who is responsible for maintenance? What do they do? When? -Does the area feel safe? Is there a security presence? If so, what do these people do? When are they on duty? -Are people taking pictures? Are there many photo opportunities available? -Do vehicles dominate pedestrian use of the space, or prevent them from easily getting to the space? 	-Are people using the space or is it empty? -Is it used by people of different ages? -Are people in groups? -How many different types of activities are occurring – people walking, eating, playing baseball, chess, relaxing, reading? -Which parts of the space are used and which are not? -Are there choices of things to do? -Is there a management presence, or can you identify anyone is in charge of the space?	 -Is this a place where you would choose to meet your friends? Are others meeting friends here or running into them? -Are people in groups? Are they talking with one another? -Do people seem to know each other by face or by name? -Do people bring their friends and relatives to see the place or do they point to one of its features with pride? -Are people smiling? Do people make eye contact with each other? -Do people use the place regularly and by choice? -Does a mix of ages and ethnic groups that generally reflect the community at large?

Table 3.1 Placemaking principles, questions to be asked (Project for public spaces, n.d.)

3.3.5 Analyses of European Waterfront Design Examples in the Context of Evaluation Criteria

In order to be able to define the place-making principles to examine the success of the waterfront experience, a research on best cases in Europe is essential. Barcelona, Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Antwerp have been chosen as successful examples by many authors and in many researches as Desfor (2011); Erkök (2009); Akköse (2007); Smyth (2012); Remesar (2004; Wang (2008); Cadell (2008); Marshall (2001). In addition to the ones previously mentioned, the chosen waterfront regeneration projects have also been listed as Great Waterfront Examples by Project for Public Spaces (Project for Public Spaces). All of the examples are port cities. The main focus of the thesis are the placemaking principles of waterfront design and the case study areas are different from the given examples (Bar is a port, Manavgat is not a port). According to that, the **aim of this chapter is not to use these examples as prescriptions for a port future of the case studies but to get a clue about the main driving forces of the success on their waterfronts that are considered to be applicable on any scale.**

When compared, all of the above listed developments are mixed-use, master-plandeveloped waterfronts (Table 3.2). The listed examples are regeneration projects which changed their old post functions into new uses such as residence, culture, administration etc. According to the review of literature mentioned above, they are the points of connection between the city and the water edge. Being a point of connection gives them the needed prerequisites for being one of the main city attraction points. Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Antwerp and Barcelona waterfront preregeneration problem was characterized with waterfront areas cut off from the city by infrastructure, not allowing the unobstructed access of visitors. The infrastructure solutions in regeneration projects, each on its own way, gave the priority to pedestrian access to the water edge instead of the vehicular domination on the waterfront. Table 3.2 Qualitative and quantitative characteristics of waterfront regeneration examples (cited and revised from Erkök (2009) *The example of Barcelona has been added from the literature review*)

		Rotterdam	Amsterdam	Antwerp	Barcelona
1.Proj	ect	Kop van Zuid	IJ-overs	't Eijlandje	Port Vell
2.Scal	e of				
transf	ormation	90 ha	490 ha	172 ha	130 ha
3.Rela	tion with				
the ma featur	ain water e	River Maas	River IJ	River Scheldt	Port Vell historical Port
Time	Start	1984	1975	1999	1989
snan	Implem.	1993		2007	-
span	End	2010	2020	2015	1992
Targeted capacity		4500 homes (15,000 people) 335.000 m ² office	$2400 \text{ homes } 400.000 \text{ m}^2 \text{ office}$	6 000 residents, total 1.3 mill m2 floor area	16 million visitors (PPS)
Program		residential, offices, education, leisure, culture, tourism	residential, leisure, culture, tourism	residential, offices, leisure, culture	Hotel, Offices, Culture, tourism, sport and leisure, institutional buildings, marina, existing residential areas and hotels
Anchors, Landmarks		Erasmus Bridge, Hotel New York	Whale, Silodam, Music building, Film museum	MAS (Museum by the Stream)	Rambla de Mar La Rambla
Added infrastructure		Erasmus Bridge, metro stop, tramline extension	Tunnel, North-South metro line, IJ-tram	tram	The construction of a drawbridge

Table 3.2 Qualitative and quantitative characteristics of waterfront regeneration examples (cited and revised from Erkök (2009). The example of Barcelona has been added from the literature review. (continue)

	Rotterdam	Amsterdam	Antwerp	Barcelona
1.Project	Kop van Zuid	IJ-overs	't Eijlandje	Port Vell
Driving force for regeneration or development	-Poor image of Rott- south -need for new, attractive residences	 re-introducing the city to river, -reutilizing old port areas, -creating attractive homes close to the city centre 	-Weak relationship of the city & Scheldt -empty port sites	- upgrading transport system, building public open space and holding 1992 Olympic Games
Plan character	Masterplan	Strategy & masterplan	Masterplan	Masterplan
Spaces of interaction with water	High quality design & lively waterfronts, terraces with panoramas of Maas and the city	Man-made islands on the IJ, quays, bridges, beaches on IJ	boardwalks, floating platforms, breakwaters and ground levels along the waterfront	-Rambla del Mar -Promenade -technical support to the marina and fishermen
Housing qualities	Mixture of high and low-income housing for a wider social mix	A mix of social, middle income & higher income housing. Good quality and high quantity housing	Luxurious housing along the quays of Willemdok; 'living by the water'.	-over 1800 flats of 533 different models (average size 140 m2), over 55 hectares of new green space -3600 new parking places, a new university
Culture initiators	Luxor theatre, museums, outdoor culture events	Westergas fabriek, NDSM yard, Music Building	MAS (Museum by the Stream) several museums	-shopping mall, aquarium, IMAX theater, Cinema -buildings of historical and architectural interest have been conserved
Diversity	residential styles by different architects working on each block	Variety of residential types and styles	Accentuating unique mix, island character & lively urban neighborhoods	-targeted for middle and upper middle class people -tourism and spectacle oriented waterfront

As mentioned in the chapters above (2.2.2 Economic dimension), the development strategy has a big role in delivering the results of regeneration processes. The regeneration projects in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Antwerp and Barcelona are plan-led projects even though the local institution context developing and implementation were different. The social dimension as one of the targets of the regeneration projects was going along with the functional transformation into mixed land use areas. An evident collaboration of different stakeholders in all four of the projects can be claimed as needed, but not the only impute for success (Table 3.3).

In order to be able to make an evaluation of the waterfronts systematically, the criteria mentioned in the above part have been used for evaluating the success of waterfront designs. Instead of using quantitative information and the characteristics of the regeneration process and the implemented projects, qualitative information have been used in order to find key principles which led to successful practice in placemaking.

Table 3.3 Logic and Institutional Context of Waterfront regeneration examples (based and adjusted on Taşan Kok (*Exploring Innovative Instruments for Socially Sustainable Waterfront Regeneration in Antwerp and Rotterdam*) in Desfor (2011) for Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Antwerp and Remesar (2004) for Barcelona - Port Vell

	Rotterdam	Amsterdam	Antwerp	Barcelona
	Kop van Zuid	IJ-overs	Het-Eilandje project	Port Vell
Development logic	-Plan-led Development (top- down from bottom-up governance approach)	-Plan-led development	-Plan-led development (fragmented governance approach)	-Plan-led development
Local Institution Context	-Bottom-up from top-down governance approach.	 -Amsterdam's Physical Planning Department -the public-private partnership - the independent public authority – Project Management Bureau 	-Complex hierarchical urban government structure and overlapping responsibilities. Semi-independent public agencies with limited power. Despite many planning activities limited and fragmented implementation.	-Mostly Public -corporation for Urban Development, co-financed by central and regional governments
Local Context of Large scale Development - Led Approach	-Shifting development power from the city to the port in the waterfront areas.	-A renewal operation based on separated interventions on different peninsulas and islands	-Problematic cooperation between the public authorities, limited private-sector initiative. Project-led development instead of an integrated approach.	-The transformation is based on small-scale interventions and infill integrated into a long-term urban and regional development strategy
Social Dimension	-Changing social strategy along with the port dominated activities.	-Complementary urban functions to the dominant residential programme, such as shops and small-scale business, are integrated in the area -Attempt at strengthening city function as a living area	Separated social and spatial tasks. Mixed land use and social-mix as instrument for integration approach.	-Attempt of strengthening the position of the city as a leading culture and tourism center

Table 3.4 Access and linkages

	Access and Linkages	
Rotterdam	Erasmus Bridge, Rotterdam (Bridge- info.org, 2012)	-The Erasmus Bridge, a metro station, and the tram line provided excellent transport connections.
Amsterdam	Borneo Sporenburg Bridge, Amsterdam (Ivar Hagendoorn, 2004)	-Different peninsulas adopted different proposals in the connection to the water, allowing to the area to have variety – from the houses over the water on the <i>Entrepot-West</i> , to the houses on the water of the <i>Borneo</i> Island, and to the public streets and squares over the water on the <i>KNSM</i> and <i>Java</i> islands.
Antwerp	Willemen Groep MAS Museum (Willemen,2011)	-Use and accessibility of the waterfront is realized by boardwalks, floating platforms, breakwaters and ground levels along the waterfront have public use.
Barcelona	La Rambla del Mar (123rf, n.d.)	 -It is well connected and situated in the heart of Barcelona. The weakest point is the connection between La Rambla and La Rambla del Mar.

Table 3.5 Activities and uses

	Activities and Uses	
Rotterdam	Wilhelmina Tower, New Luxor Theatre and	- In order to confront the lack of tourist attractions and the negative city image a mix of uses was programmed with an idea to complete the city center
_	Toren op Zuid (Dreamstime, n.d.)	
Amsterdam		-Complementary urban functions to the dominant residential programme, such as shops and small-scale business, are integrated in the area.
	Borneo Sporenburg housing (Archdaily, 2015)	
Antwerp		-Main Program of the project is offices and apartments, while the special program is marina, expected to make the site unique.
	Het-Eilandje Marina (Pinterest, n.d.)	
Barcelona	Leisure on La Rambla del Mar (Portvellbcn, n.d.)	 -A variety of different building uses and programmes is offered to the visitors -Public spaces are given a multipurpose use -In that kind of place, different activities are occurring both by visitors and inhabitants

	Comfort and Image	
Rotterdam	Kop van Zuid (Perfecthousing, 2013)	 The choice of internationally known architects and renowned developers are intended to further promote the exclusive image of Kop van Zuid. The main design principles were: insisting on high quality of design in all buildings and throughout the public realm and reusing existing landmark buildings wherever possible The change of the image was gained with high-quality mixed use.
Amsterdam	RREEF Investment , Ij-oevers (DTZ, 2015)	-Different peninsulas adopted different proposals in the connection to the water, allowing to the area to have variety – from the houses over the water on the <i>Entrepot-West</i> , to the houses on the water of the <i>Borneo</i> Island, and to the public streets and squares over the water on the <i>KNSM</i> and <i>Java</i> islands
Antwerp	Het Eilandje- from Harbour Industry to Trendy Hotspot (GoAbroad, 2014)	-Neutelings Riedijk Museum is a designed landmark that points out the whole image of the waterfront and adds up to its vertical plan
Barcelona	Port Vell (Chaterworld, 2015)	-The waterfront became a trade mark of the whole city, giving it the silhouette with different landmarks occurring on the water's edge.

Table 3.7 Sociability and livability

	Sociability and livability		
Rotterdam	Kop van Zuid (Easy Going Rotterdam (n.d.))	 -New lofts and residential dwellings are constructed as part of the project's target to improve local living conditions. -The main program consisted of offices and apartments in a wide range of price and typology with an aim to integrate social housing with luxury housing. -The public realm is memorable and highly walkable. 	
Amsterdam	NDSM, Ij-oevers (Nationale beeldbank, 2010)	 The creative core of Amsterdam acts as a pioneer to new development. When artists and theater companies were allowed to work, live and perform in brown field sites, these places got known as a cultural hot spot. The waterfront redevelopment along the IJ would helped to meet the city's challenge of housing and fulfilled the of objective that a city should attract people of all income groups 	
Antwerp	Het Eilandje (Youropi, 2007)	 People sit on terraces along the waterfront. The aim was to keep people living there in a sustainable, livable environment. 	

Table 3.7 Sociability and livability (continue)

	Sociability and livability	
Barcelona		-Rambla de Mar is first and foremost a path. This is clear from it axial form and urban context as a
		connector. Its combination of path and place is what brings interest to the bridge.-The public was given both easy access to Port Vell and a handful of good reasons to be there.
Barcelona		-The revived port gives pedestrians an excuse to continue their stroll down to the water and a reason to spend time there.
	La Rambla del Mar, leisure (Gettyimages, 2014)	-The waterfront is planned and targeted for middle and upper middle class people

To sum up all the information gathered from the literature review and systematized by using principles of evaluation given by Project for Public Spaces, the following conclusions can be withdrawn related to the waterfront regeneration projects examined:

- The mediums providing unobstructed access to the water edge are treated as functional parts of the project as well as one of the main design treated elements that became landmarks in all of the four cases (Table 3.4).

-The diversification in uses gives both the visitors and the inhabitants of the site a wide range of activities (Table 3.5).

-Each of the examples has a unique silhouette shaped by the building forms of different uses and the identity of the places painted on their facades (Table 3.6).

- As a result of all the conditions above being fulfilled, the waterfronts examined in this chapter can be described as sociable and livable places (Table 3.7).

The driving forces of the success of regeneration projects in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Antwerp and Barcelona can be considered the following ones: diversity in design, mixed-use and integration with other parts of the city.

3.4 Urban Waterfront Placemaking Principles

A successful place should fulfill people's emotional needs and even influence mood (Ferrari, 2012). In order to be able understand the role of urban design as a discipline in creating or regenerating successful waterfront designs, the place-making principles as a medium between the theory and practice should be established regarding the specific location conditions. As stated in the chapter below, not only the design, but also the management and the social moment is what makes a waterfront successful. In order to have an overall point of view which includes all of those aspects, twelve placemaking principles by Montgomery (1998) are elaborated as the ones which include all of those three aspects of a successful place (Table 3.8). The principles themselves are defined as design-related, but also give reasonable guidelines for a place to be perceived as a well-managed and socially successful one.

The Physical Conditions for Making a City		
<u>Condition1:</u> Development Intensity	 Sufficiently complex diversity must be generated in order to stimulate public contact, transactions and street life The density itself will not necessary produce urbanity: density is a necessary rather than a sufficient condition for urbanity 	
<u>Condition 2 : Mixed Use</u>	 Vital urban areas must serve more than one primary purpose, preferably more than two. The presence of the people on streets and in the spaces and buildings must be ensured across different times of the day. For mixed use to operate successfully, three further conditions must be meet: people must use the same streets and spaces, people must use at least some of the same facilities, and activity must not be concentrated into a particular time of the day. 	

Table 3.8 The place-making principles (Montgomery, 1988)

Condition 3: Fine Crain	-The larger on urban place the greater will tend to be both
<u>Condition 5.</u> File Gram	-The larger an around place, the greater will lead to be boin the number and proportion of small businesses
	-have areater self-sufficiency
	-are able to able to provide most of the skills and equipment
	they need on-house -can warehouse and deliver for
	themselves and sell to a broad
	-do not need to be in a city
	Small firms
	-serve narrow or place-specific markets
	Employees and executives need to be in close, face -to-face
	with clients and customers
<u>Condition 4</u> : Adaptability	Successful urban areas accommodate complex patterns of
	diversity, mixture and grain. Places which continue to
	succeed despite changes in economic conditions, technology
	and culture do so because their built form is itself mixed
	and/or highly adaptable.
	The life of streets and urban areas is longer than the life of
	individual buildings, while the life of individual buildings is
	longer than the life of the original function
Condition 5: Human Scale	- Scale is a combination of the ratio of building height to
	street width, relative distance, permeability and the sense of
	intimacy of space.
	Higher buildings tend to require wider streets, and more
Condition 6 . City Plaaks and	generous allowances for natural light and ventilation.
<u>condition o</u> : City blocks and	down and more opportunities to turn corners
Permeability	City districts which have more shorter blocks tend to
	generate more street life and even more streets where back
	alleyways and courtyards are opened up to active use.
	The building line must, leaving a sufficient pavement width.
	be set up right against the street and ideally built around a
	central courtyard.
Condition 7 : Streets: Contact,	Good urban places are judged by their street life. All the
Visibility and Horizontal Grain	ingredients of city life are combined on the street: public
isibility and Horizontal Gram	contact, social life, people-watching, promenading,
	transacting, natural surveillance and culture.
	The streets should be active, they should provide diversity
	and permeability
Condition 8: Public Realm	Streets are undoubtedly the most important elements in the
	city's public realm, the network of spaces and corners where
	the public are free to go, to meet and gather, and simply to
	watch one another. The public realm in a city performs
	many functions, not only by providing meeting places but
	also in helping to define the built environment, offering
	spaces for local traditions and customs

Table 3.8 The place-making principles (Montgomery, 1988) (continue)

The Physical Conditions for Making a City		
<u>Condition 9</u> : Movement	For no matter how the public transport system is, there will always be a need to make some journeys by car. For peak rush hours in particular, much can be done to reduce trips to and from work by car: by traffic management, by investing in reliable and frequent public transport alternatives and by establishing networks of bicycle lanes	
<u>Condition 10</u> : Green space and Water Space	Public green space and water areas are important for many reasons: -recreation, providing a range of formal and informal playgrounds, fields and gardens for varying degrees of active and passive pursuits; -health, filtering the noise, light and air of the city; Setting and understanding, by framing development sites, providing views and landscape image	
<u>Condition 11</u> : Landmark, Visual Stimulation and Attention to Detail	Landmark, meeting places and smaller scale signatures have always played an important role in the life and design of cities. Public art has become important for the way it contributes to a greater sense of place by upgrading the quality of the built environment, creating meeting places and talking points, coming to represent important points of reference and for its capacity to animate public space.	
<u>Condition 12:</u> Architectural Style and Image	City building and city design are not questions of architectural style, this is to say the appearance and design of individual buildings. Rather, the essential task is to design the form of the city in such a way as to achieve city diversity, activity and urbanity. Architectural style conveys meaning, shapes identity and crates image	

Table 3.8 The place-making principles (Montgomery, 1988) (continue)

Project for Public Spaces (n.d) gives the advantage to management rather than to the design stating that 80 percent of the success of public spaces is the result of good management. By that, it refers also to providing various activities, for example, street markets, coffee shops, restaurants, giving the advantage to pedestrian traffic rather than the vehicular etc.

PRINCIPLES	Explanation
1. Make Public Goals The Primary Objective	The best solutions for waterfronts put public goals first, not short-term financial expediency. Community engagement- and, ultimately, local ownership and pride-will flow from this basic premise.
2. Create A Shared Community Vision For The Waterfront	Unlike a master plan, a vision process does not lock a project into a prescribed solution. It is a citizen-led initiative that outlines a set of goals-ideals to strive for-that set the stage for people to think boldly, make breakthroughs, and achieve new possibilities for their waterfront. Because a vision is adaptable and can be implemented gradually, starting with small experiments, it often becomes bolder as public enthusiasm for making changes builds and the transformation of the waterfront gains credibility.
3. Create Multiple Destinations: The Power of Ten	PPS has found that an effective way to structure a vision process is to set a goal of creating ten great destinations along the entire waterfront, an idea we call the "Power of Ten." This focus on destinations, rather than "open space" or parks, enables a genuine community-led process to take root. Once ten destinations have been identified, then nearby residents, businesses, community organizations and other stakeholders begin to define the uses and activities they want to see at each place. Ideally, each destination should provide ten things to do, which creates diverse, layered activity, ensuring that no single use will predominate.
4. Connect The Destinations	The next idea to keep in mind is that each of the ten destinations should be incorporated into a vision for the waterfront as a whole. The key is to achieve continuity, especially when it comes to the pedestrian experience. Creating these connections is a fascinating challenge that

Table 3.9 Principles for creating a successful waterfront (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.)
PRINCIPLES	Explanation
4. Connect The Destinations	entails mixing uses (such as housing, parks, entertainment and retail) and mixing partners (such as public institutions and local business owners).
	Creating connections also means enticing people to the waterfront on foot or bike, rather than relying exclusively on the car.
5. Optimize Public Access	It is essential that the waterfront is accessible for people's use to the greatest extent possible. Once again, the goal of continuity is of paramount importance. Waterfronts with continuous public access are much more desirable than those where the public space is interrupted. Even small stretches where the waterfront is unavailable to the public greatly diminish the experience. Access also means that people can actually interact with the water. If it is not possible to actually touch the water, people should have access to another type of water nearby–such as a fountain, spray play area or a swimming pool that floats next to the shore.
6. Ensure That New Development Fits Within The Community's Vision	When the public's vision comes first in a waterfront revitalization project, new developments can be tailored to meet the community's shared goals and expectations. Waterfronts are too valuable to simply allow developers to dictate the terms of growth and change. This is not to say that private development should be unwelcome or discouraged — on the contrary, it is necessary to the future of a healthy waterfront. But whatever is built must contribute to the goals set forth by the community, not detract from them.

Table 3.9 Principles for creating a successful waterfront (Project for Public Spaces, n.d) (continue)

PRINCIPLES	Explanation
7. Encourage 24-Hour Activity By Limiting Residential Development	Great waterfronts are not dominated by residential development because these are places that are full of people, day and night. They are the sites of festivals, markets, fireworks displays, concerts and other high-energy gatherings. A high concentration of residential development limits the diversity of waterfront use and creates constituencies invested in preventing 24-hour activity from flourishing.
8. Use Parks To Connect Destinations, Not As Destinations Unto Themselves	In a similar vein, parks should not serve as the raison d'être of the entire waterfront. Passive open space puts a damper on the inherent vibrancy of waterfronts, evident in cities such as New York, Vancouver, and Toronto that have relied too heavily on "greening" their waterfronts without mixing uses that draw people for different reasons at different times. The world's best waterfronts use parks as connective tissue, using them to link major destinations together. Helsinki, Stockholm, Sydney, and Baltimore have employed this strategy to fine effect.
9. Design and Program Buildings to Engage the Public Space	Any building on the waterfront should add to the activity of the public spaces around it. When successful, the result is an ideal combination of commercial and public uses. Towers, on the other hand, are noticeably out of place along rivers, lakes and ocean fronts. High-rises tend to be residential buildings with private activity on the ground floor. They may also create a wall that physically and psychologically cuts off the waterfront from surrounding neighborhoods.

Table 3.9 Principles for creating a successful waterfront (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.) (continue)

PRINCIPLES	Explanation
10. Support Multiple Modes Of Transportation And Limit Vehicular Access	Waterfronts are dramatically enhanced when they can be accessed by means other than private vehicles. Walking and biking are another important part of the transportation mix, and many of the best waterfronts feature pedestrian promenades and bike lanes. Unimpeded by cars or parking lots, people are more at ease, and the full breadth of waterfront activity can flourish. (Commercial deliveries to local businesses are an important exception to this rule.)
11. Integrate Seasonal Activities Into Each Destination	Rain or cold is no reason for a waterfront to sit empty. Indeed coastal and lakefront places are often known for their chilly winds and gray skies. Waterfront programming should take rainy-day and winter activities into account, and amenities should provide protection from inclement weather. Waterfronts that can thrive in year-round conditions will reap the benefits of greater economic activity and higher attendance at public facilities.
12. Make Stand-Alone, Iconic Buildings Serve Multiple Functions	An iconic structure can be a boon to the waterfront, so long as it acts as a multi-use destination. Today's icons should strive to achieve flexibility and public-spirited presence.
13. Manage, Manage, Manage	Ongoing management is essential to maintain waterfronts and sustain a diverse variety of activities and events throughout the year. Waterfronts could adopt the model of the Business Improvement Districts that have been so successful in many downtowns. Partnerships between waterfront businesses and organizations and those in the surrounding district could be forged, so that waterfront programming–such as temporary exhibits of local artists or music by local musicians–reflects the community and gives the place a unique character.

Table 3.9 Principles for creating a successful waterfront (Project for Public Spaces, n.d.) (continue)

Ferrari *et al* (2012) suggests using three scales for assessing aspects of 'place' and 'place-making' in waterfronts: the macro-, meso- and micro-scale (Table 3.10). Each of those scales refers to different levels of perceiving the waterfront. That way the placemaking principles are gathered under the scope of the scale of the regeneration impacts perception instead of being perceived under the scope of visual perception, management and design separately.

Table 3.10 Three scales for assessing aspects of 'place' and 'place-making' in waterfronts (Ferrari, 2012)

Macro Scale	-Refers to placing the waterfront in a wider regional, national		
	and international context and is often linked to different		
	approaches to 'marketing' the waterfront and locating the		
	developed area on the map.		
Meso Scale	-Refers to how the place fits into the overall area of the		
	waterfront development and, in particular, how it connects		
	the surrounding city; hence, it tends to reflect physical		
	design/planning guidance.		
Micro Scale	- Refers to the sense of place at a human scale and the		
	qualities of the physical, visual and social realm within this,		
	and, hence, includes phenomenological aspects, although this		
	also affects the meso-scales.		
	- Refers to the aspects of waterfront spaces that make areas		
	feel more 'comfortable', 'inviting', 'attractive' and		
	potentially generate a sense of place attachment. Place-		
	making at this scale is about the design of the buildings and		
	the spaces in between these, including the public realm. The		
	sense of place also depends upon other aspects, such as the		
	way in which the existing heritage remains or is reinterpreted		
	in the area, the sense of security of the waterfront, and the		
	uses and activities given to different parts in the development.		

Ferrari defines three main principles of successful waterfront regeneration: Vision and leadership; time and good design (Table 3.11). These principles cover the scope of the regeneration not only in terms of design but an overall development. Still, they are defined too wide to be applicable as principles to lead particular waterfront design processes. All the principles and facts summed up, it can be concluded that the physical conditions for making a city by Montgomery are the most suitable ones that cover the waterfront regeneration process in all scales and different fields both in general and particular terms.

Principle	Explanation	Scale
Vision and Leadership	Continuity of objectives and intentions through overall strategies and physical master planning also play a positive influence on the creation of successful places, balanced with sufficient flexibility to grasp opportunities and to adapt to changing circumstances. -Involves understanding the infrastructure connections, the function that the area may have within this wider context, identifying who these users are or will be, and creating the conditions for the creation of places which they will use and enjoy using – places to which they may grow attached in various ways.	Meso and macro scale
Time	-Residential developments require time for new residents to develop their sense of 'place attachment', and success at micro- levels cannot be assessed in the short term. However, wider meso-scale place attachment can be stimulated successfully by flagship developments that turn a non- place into a place in the minds of the citizenry in a relatively short space of time,	Micro and meso scale
Good design	-Deliberate design of the spaces between the buildings and ensuring that a sensitive and coordinated design approach reflects the wider ethos of the area and of user communities (dwellers and others). In this, available and realized design approaches and options depend upon a good understanding of the relevant socio cultural milieu and socio-economic conditions.	Micro scale

Table 3.11 Key elements of successful waterfront regeneration (Ferrari, 2012)

3.5 Chapter Summary

By examining the natural form of the water edge, the research is developed through the examination of design elements, evaluation criteria and the successful European waterfront projects. Through the analyses of those examples, it has been concluded that the driving forces of the success are: diversity in design, mixed-use and integration with other parts of the city. They are considered to be a general input for the next stage of the research, the placemaking principles for waterfront design. The Physical conditions for making a city by Montgomery (1988), Principles for creating a successful waterfront (Project for Public Spaces) and the Key elements of successful waterfront regeneration by Ferrari (2012) have been compared. The Montgomery's conditions have been chosen as the most suitable ones that are used further on in the analyses of the case study areas of Manavgat and Bar.

CHAPTER FOUR

WATERFRONT DESIGN FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE: TWO CASES FROM MONTENEGRO AND TURKEY

4.1 Background: Waterfronts in Manavgat and Bar

In order to be able to make an analysis of the development of waterfront cities in terms of urban design based on comparison of two cities (Bar, Montenegro and Manavgat, Turkey), firstly research on their main characteristics is essential. Historical background; geographical location, climate and territorial connections, environmental structures; demography and education; economy and land uses; existing green areas; culture, tradition and sport and tourism are chosen as the main criteria related to sustainability dimensions for the introductory analysis and comparison of Bar and Manavgat (App 1).

The aim of the comparison between Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro was to draw out similarities between two survey cases that would give the base for further comparison and research related to urban design, its role in waterfront redevelopment and the lessons to be withdrawn for the future development of the areas. It is important to emphasize that both of them are small scale cities; Bar is a port and Manavgat is not a port; unlike Bar, Manavgat has a designed promenade. As previously mentioned, they are not comparable with the successful examples of European port cities but the main driving forces of their success are considered to be applicable on this scale.

As it can be seen from the analysis (Table 4.1 and Table 4.2) there are some similarities between Manavgat and Bar as it follows:

a) Location

- Good geographical position in relation with other parts of the country
- Water edge; Wet land, taking precaution when constructing underground

b) Climate

-Long hot summers, short mild winters giving the opportunity for year-long tourism

c) Territorial connections

- Well connected with other parts of the country

-On the crossroad of two main corridors

-Vehicular connections, two airports in nearby cities

d) Green areas

-Lack of green areas in the city center

- The most important and biggest green area near the water edge

-The opportunity to gain a bigger percentage of green areas by different areas

redesign (streets, squares, promenades etc.)

e) Economy and land uses

-Residence, commercial uses, recreation, tourism

-Economy based mainly on tourism

f) Environmental structure

- Flat land; wetlands (high level of underground waters due to the closeness of water)

g) Culture, sport and tradition

-Lack of tradition related locations near to the city center that would support the development of that area

h) Tourism

-Different kinds of tourism with various scale facilities possible to be developed.

	CONSTRAINTS			
	Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro		
Location	Good geographical position in relation w	vith other parts of the country		
Climate	Long hot summers, short mild winters			
		One of the most sunny places in South Europe (270 days /year)		
Demography	42 048 in total	193 738 in total		
and education	 - education organized on all levels except universities 	- education organized on all levels		
Territorial connections	Well connected with other parts of the co corridors, two airports	ountry; On the crossroad of two main		
	-Railway connection with the capital city -Water connection with ports in the Mediterranean			
Green areas	The most important and biggest green area near the water edge			
	Lack of green areas in the city center Lack of green areas in the city center and in general			
Economy and land uses	and uses Economy based on tourism; Residence, commercial uses, recreation			
	Possibility of constructing a port	Port activities		
	High rate of commercial use in the city center leads to crowds and problems in traffic			
Environmental structure	Slightly sloped flat land Flat land			
	wet lands	wet lands		
Culture, sport and tradition	-Zindan Kalesi, Manavgat waterfalls	The old town of Bar, Olive oil in Mirovica, King Nicola's Castle		
Tourism	Resorts	Hotels		
	- Majority of the accommodation capacities is settled far from the center			

Table 4.1 Constraints of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro

Table 4.2 Possibilities of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro

	POSSIB	ILITIES	
	Manavgat	Bar	
Location	Water edge		
	Wet land, taking precaution when const	ructing underground	
Climate	Giving the opportunity for year-long tourism		
Territorial connections	Infrastructure in the favor of the development of survey areas, firstly tourism		
	The closeness of the highway may bring problems in the future development of the settlement	The future spread of the port may increase the density of the city structure and change the city image in an unpredictable way	
Green areas	The opportunity to gain a bigger percentage of green areas by different areas' redesign (streets, squares, promenades etc.)		
Economy and land uses	High potential for development of touris	sm and agriculture	
Environmental structure	- The natural characteristics give the opportunity for ports and marinas to be built	- Existing port with a potential of growing	
Demography and education	Growing population Dense structure of the city Absence of higher education(university)	-High percentage of population over the year of 60	
Culture, sport and tradition	Lack of tradition related locations near to the city center that would support the development of that area		
Tourism	Different kinds of tourism with various scale facilities possible to be developed		

4.2 Analysis of Case Study Areas According to Montgomery's Conditions

As previously mentioned (Chapter 3.4), Montgomery's principles are stated as the most appropriate ones to evaluate the waterfronts in general and waterfronts of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro as the case studies of this thesis. The individual characteristics such as mentality, culture and social differences are taken into account but are considered not to have a significant effect on the survey. According to those differences, the aim of the parallel analysis is not the comparison of the case studies but a systematical view of design elements and characteristics in both cases regarding the difference in having a designed or not-designed water edge-promenade (Manavgat has a designed promenade while the promenade of Bar is not designed).

The online survey has been done from July 1st, 2015 until July 15th, 2015 both in Manavgat and Bar. The online survey respondents are the full-time and part-time working members of the Municipalities of Manavgat and Bar that are between twenty and thirty years old. The aim of the survey was to get professional people's view of the case study areas that would support the conclusions from the unobtrusive observation part of the research. Results of the online survey have been presented in two ways. The first one is the tabulated, numerical and graphic representation of the multiple choice and interval scale questions. The second is the graphic representation of the open-ended questions related to the weaknesses and strengths of the waterfront areas, the activities etc.

The subjects of the surveys are similar in terms of gender and working status (Table 3.4). As shown in Table 4.3, in both cases the majority are female (Manavgat 64.5 %, Bar 65.5%) and full-time workers (Manavgat 83.8 %, Bar 78.5%).

Table 4.3 Surveys' respondent profile

		Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro	
Age		20-30		20-30	
Gender	Female		64.9%		65.5%
	Male		35.1%		34.5%
Working	Full-time		83.8%		78.5%
status	Part-time		16.2%		21.5%

According to the results of the survey, the majority of the subjects in Manavgat (52.1%) visits the waterfront area once a week and less, while majority of subjects in Bar (58.6%) visits the waterfront are once to two times a week (Table 4.4). As stated before, the water edge is designed in Manavgat, but not in Bar. That leads us to a conclusion that design does not necessarily bring the social aspect of attachment to the water.

Table 4.4 Visits to the waterfront area (results from the online survey)

How often do you visit the waterfront area?				
	Manavgat, Turkey Bar, Mo			negro
Each day		10.8%		24.1%
Once in two days		5.4%		6.9%
Once a week (%)		38%		41.4%
Two times a week		21.6%		17.2%
Less than once a week		24.1%		10.4%

The subjects' perception of the waterfront area in the case studies of Manavgat and Bar has been questioned in the survey. Areas chosen by the subjects in majority include the area up to the first densely used street in both cases (Table 4.5). In case of Manavgat, the preference of the area which includes only the designed promenade (Figure 3a) is still higher than the area that includes the wider area up to Atatürk Street (Figure 5b). In case of Bar, there is a similar percentage between the picture that includes only the non-designed promenade and the area until the highway (Figure 3b, Figure 5b).

In order to further question the role of design in attraction of the waterfront, the waterfront cases are going to be analyzed on basis of Montgomery's twelve principles supported by the quantitative information and graphic explanations from the previously mentioned online survey.

Choose the n	umber of the picture which represents You	view of the waterfront area.	
	Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro	
Figure 3			
Figure 4			
Figure 5			
Percentage of responses	48.6 % 18.9% 32.4 %	62.1 % 17.2% 20.7 %	

Table 4.5 Waterfront areas' depth perception (results from the online survey)

4.2.1 Access and Linkages

The aim of this chapter is to analyze the visual and physical access and linkages in the waterfront area of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro. The following conditions by Montgomery are used as tools for measuring them: Condition 7 (Streets: Contact, Visibility and Horizontal Grain) and <u>Condition 9 (Movement)</u>.

4.2.1.1 Movement

As shown in Table 4.6, the waterfronts are mainly accessed by walking or by car with a slight increase in choosing to walk in weekdays rather than go by car in both Manavgat and Bar. Amongst the survey subjects in Bar and Manavgat, public transport is not the way of transport that is preferred. That can be the reason to a partial problem in traffic and parking problems in both case studies that will be discussed further on.

In which way do you come to the waterfront area in weekdays?				
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro	
By car		58.4%		62.1%
Walking		40.5%		31 %
Publ. transport		0%		3.4%
I don't come		0%		3.4%
In which way do you come to the waterfront area in weekends?				
	Manavgat,	Turkey	Bar, Monte	enegro
By car		51.4%		62.1%
Walking		45.9%		34.5%
Publ. transport		0%		3.4%
I don't come		2.7%		0%

Table 4.6 Way of transportation (results from the online survey)

There is not a clear difference between positive and negative answers on traffic and parking problems in both of cases (Table 4.7). In Bar 62.2% of the answers were positive while the negative rate of answers in Manavgat was 58.6%. That can lead to a conclusion that there is a complex situation in both cases where the answer depends on the route the visitor takes on his/her way to the waterfront. The conclusion that can be withdrawn with certainty is that a completely functional traffic grid does not exist in both of cases. According to the onsite survey, there is lack of parking places in peak hours and peak seasons in both Manavgat and Bar.

Do traffic and parking pose problems on your way to the waterfront or in the area?				
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Monte	negro
Yes		62.2%		41.4%
No		38.7%		58.6%

Table 4.7 Traffic and parking (results from the online survey)

The closeness of the water edge itself is not a sufficient reason to attract people to those areas except the waterfront promenades in both cases. As shown in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9, both pedestrian and vehicular access to the waterfront are estimated as high in both Manavgat and Bar. The pedestrian and vehicular access are on a similar level in Bar, while the vehicular access in Manavgat is prior to pedestrian access.

Table 4.8 Pedestrian access (results from the online survey)

Can you approach easily to the waterfront by walking?							
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro				
Yes		73%		89.7%			
No		27%		10.3%			

Table 4.9 Vehicular access (results from the online survey)

Can you approach easily to the waterfront by vehicle?							
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro				
Yes		94.6%		82.8%			
No		5.4%		17.2%			

In summary, the main movement routes are vehicular routes with the aim to pass by service routes in order to reach the waterfront area in both Manavgat and Bar (except the waterfront promenades), rather than pedestrian ways. The fact to be emphasized is the underuse of public transport in both cases that would solve the traffic problems in some parts of both case areas.

4.2.1.2 Streets: Contact, Visibility and Horizontal Grain

As stated in the analyses of the Movement as a condition, street life is the generator of the activity on areas adjacent to the waterfront edge. In order to define the main movement routes instead of leaving them only assigned, the relation between the routes with the main attendance areas based on the surveys is analyzed further on the maps on visits of different areas and main routes.

In the case of Manavgat, it is obvious that the most visited area are the waterfront promenades from both sides of the river (Figure 4.1). However, the distribution of the visits is not the same on both sides. When the characteristics and design of the riversides are compared, it can be said that the side with more activities, newer buildings and a higher-level-of-standard inhabitants is preferred more than the other one. The attendancevisits rate of the rest of the area does not fall gradually as one goes further from the water edge, which means that the attendance is not only related to the distance-from-the-water-edge factor. The factors that caused this situation will be considered in the further analysis of other conditions. In the case of Bar, the situation is similar. The waterfront promenade is the most visited area. As in Manavgat, the use of other areas is related to higher commercial and recreation activity. In the same way, the area attendance does not fall gradually, which means the distance from the waterfront is not the measure for waterfront use in both designed and non-designed areas (Figure 4.2).





Figure 4.1 Movement and area attendance maps, Manavgat (based on the asnwers in online survey and unobtrusive observation)



Figure 4.2 Movement and area attendance maps, Bar (based on the asnwers in online survey and unobtrusive observation)

As much as the street life to be considered, the success of placemaking on the water edge is the one of the main topics in these kind of studies. The sections of the designed promenade in Manavgat, Turkey and the undesigned promenade in Bar, Montenegro are shown on Figure 4.3. Even though both of them are the most visited parts of the waterfront area, the distribution of visits through the year is not the same, especially in summer and winter. The section of the promenade in Manavgat can be described as a designed longitudinal park with lack of destinations. The leveling in the pathways gives emphasis on consideration of the comfort for special groups of visitors (eg. disabled persons) that will be considered later on. When compared to the waterfront edge's section of Manavgat, the one in Bar shows a difference in activities summed in summer though. While the lower promenade in Manavgat gives a direct contact of the visitor with water, the barrier that divides the beach and the promenade makes it only a distant visual contact.



Figure 4.3 Waterfront promenade sections in Manavgat and Bar

An overall view of the street life in both cases is considered through the graphical analysis of sample streets as the main movement routes and service streets. Atatürk street in Manavgat, Turkey (Figure 4.4) and Vladimir Rolović Street in Bar, Montenegro (Figure 4.4) are chosen as sample streets. The streets chosen are the inner street examples in both Manavgat and Bar. As evident in the pictures for both cases, both streets can be characterized as the ones offering an underdeveloped sense of

street life, but instead functioning as rather a pass-by longitudinal element in the city center's traffic grid. Even though pedestrian ways are provided in both cases, the placement of elements on the pavement make their use either restricted of decreased in some parts (Figure 4.4). The building facades with their uses of floor plans do not support the street life of case streets.



Figure 4.4 Atatürk Street, Manavgat and Vladimir Rolović Street, Bar

Other examples chosen as sample service streets are given on Figure 4.5. The streets chosen are the inner street examples in both Manavgat and Bar.In the case of Manavgat, pedestrian circulation is not provided and the street is vehicular traffic oriented. The surrounding does not support the street life and activity that is considered to be an issue of lack of security and eyes-on the street.



Figure 4.5 Service street cases in Manavgat and Bar

4.2.2 Uses and Activities

According to Wrenn's (1983) definition of three groups of land uses related to water dependency (water-dependent, water-related and water-independent uses) analysis of case study areas in those terms has been done (Figure 4.6). As presented graphically, there are no water-dependent uses in Manavgat, the promenade is the only water-related use while the rest of the city center with its mixed-use character (residential and commercial uses) is defined as a water-independent area. That can also be conluded from the unobtrusive observation as the design of the waterfront area is limited on the promenade and does not have any relation with the inner parts of the city center. The port is the only and main water-dependent area in Bar, Montenegro. Still, its existence does not disturb the other uses and activities on its waterfront. In the same way as in Manavgat, the promenade is the water-related use in Bar while the rest of the city center area is mixed-use that is considered as a waterfront-independent use.



Figure 4.6 Water-dependency related classification of uses in Manavgat and Bar

The activities in any form and place make up the attraction points for the visitors of the waterfront area. There is a major problem of lack of activities in both case studies as stated in the online surveys giving a large percentage of negative responds (Manavgat 86,5%, Bar 62.1%) concerning the number of activities to be done (Table 4.11).

Are there enough outdoor activities to attract you to spend time there?							
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro				
Yes		13.5%		37.9%			
No		86.5%		62.1%			

 Table 4.11 Satisfaction from outdoor activities (based on the asnwers in online survey)

The list of the activities for both case areas is short. The main activities listed for both Manavgat and Bar are walking, having a coffee, sport and riding a bicycle (Figure 4.7). It appears that it is not enough for both of them to be attraction points on a higher level. That can also be the reason of the low waterfront visits rate mentioned above for both of the cases (two times a week and less for Bar; once a week and less for Manavgat).



Figure 4.7 Activities in the waterfront area (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Designed or not, each place should be comfortable for different types of visitors. Elder people, mothers with babies in strollers and disabled people are those groups that special attention should be paid. Directly related to the design of the case area, the comfort is usually provided by ramps on otherwise inaccessible places. In the case of Manavgat, the waterfront area is described as generally inaccessible for such kind of visitors, even though designed. The non-designed waterfront area of Bar is still considered to be accessible in that way (Table 4.10). This is due to the existing topographical characteristics of the site where the flat land and water edge section mostly has no big differences in leveling (Figure 4.21).



Table 4.10 Waterfront area convenience for special groups of visitors (based on the asnwers in online survey)

4.2.2.1 Development Intensity and Fine Grain

The development intensity is considered to be tightly connected to the activities and uses in case studies (Montgomery, 1997). As seen from both the bulding pattern and the aereal pictures, the development intensity differs in cases of Bar and Manavgat as well as in the case of the river banks of Manavgat (Figure 4.8).

The development intensity in terms of total built area in Manavgat is on a high level on the river bank with longitudinal pattern of buildings while the one on the opposite river bank with the spot pattern (detached buildings) has a lower development intensity. The ground floor density ratio according to the Master Plan of Manavgat reaches even the maximum (1.00) (Figure 4.8).



Figure 4.8 Block patterns and areal pictures of Manavgat and Bar

The ground floor density ratio of the city center of Bar, as manifest even visually, is on a lower level in comparison to the development intensity of Manavgat. Though, the building pattern and form in Manavgat can be characterized as over-standardized for both banks of the river, that is not the case in Bar. High density and plot coverage in Manavgat is not supported with the correct amount of open space, while lower density and plot coverage in Bar are not supported with a correct number and diversity of activities.

The right development intensity is directly connected with the fine grain condition (Montgomery, 1977), that produces most of the street life and activity. In both cases of Manavgat and Bar, small-sized shops are spread mostly along the main movement routes.



Figure 4.9 Fine Grain

In both of cases the horizontal commercial lines in Manavgat and Bar are based on units (restaurants' street, shops' street, cafes' promenade) with same or similar use that effects the street life of the case areas. The previously mentioned Atatürk Street in Manavgat and Vladimir Rolović Street in Bar are characteristic examples of the case areas each (Figure 4.9).

4.2.2.2 Mixed Use and Adaptability

Mixed use diversity in Manavgat and Bar can be described as the primary uses diversity defined by Jacobs (1961). It consists of commercial ground floors and residential upper floors (Figure 4.10). That is why the city diversity is not achieved as there are no services and enterprises that would generate street life on a higher level. This is directly connected with the fine grain diversity, both horizontally and vertically as mentioned in the previous part (Chapter 4.2.2.1).



Figure 4.10 Mixed-use examples in Manavgat and Bar

In terms of adaptability, there are some prerequisites specific to the case areas that should be fulfilled in order to be able to gain high adaptability of public and private spaces. When it comes to Manavgat, the first limit to adaptation of buildings and areas to any alternative use are the property legislation and small-scaled private properties that inhibit any kind of big-scale redevelopment projects. Lack of public spaces and available areas for them makes it firstly difficult to develop them and then to make design that would be scored as adaptable.

In the case of Bar, as seen from previous examples and the further analysis of green areas, it has a potential for a high developed adaptability of public spaces. Though, the non-designed areas of the promenade and other open spaces in the city center put the adaptability topic into back-plan considerations. When it comes to the adaptability of building uses, it usually varies on different uses (offices, small health enterprises, tour-agencies etc.) that are fit in into the apartment grids of residential areas.

4.2.2.3 Green Space and Water

The maps on Figure 4.11 show the distribution of green spaces in Manavgat and Bar. As previously mentioned in the background analyses of case areas, Manavgat has an obvious lack of green areas. The existing ones consist on the green edge and small designed parks on the water edge, passive green area in the undeveloped part of the city center and the private green front gardens in the spot-pattern area.

The green spaces in the case area of Bar take a high percentage in the low-density building pattern. Though, the passive green areas and semi-public green areas take advantage on the active green areas that consist on the park near King Nicola's castle, an non-designed park with a children playground next to the Cultural center and football and tennis pitches next to the sea promenade.



Figure 4.11 Green areas distribution in Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro

4.2.3 Comfort and Image

The aim of this chapter is to analyze the physical characteristics of the case areas in order to be able to understand the existing image of waterfront areas. The following conditions by Montgomery are used as tools for measuring them:

-Condition 6: City Blocks and Permeability
-<u>Condition 11</u>: Architectural Style and Image
-and <u>Condition 12</u>: Landmark, Visual Stimulation and Attention to Detail

4.2.3.1 City Blocks-Permeability

In order to quantify the permeability and get information about the suitability of the city-block formations in waterfronts of case areas, online surveys are held to question if people can easily find their way to the shore from each part of the city center.

The city block patterns of Manavgat and Bar display different characteristics in terms of build area density, distribution of block types and building forms (Figure 4.12). The longitudinal building pattern placed parallel with the water edge in Manavgat gives less approach opportunities than the spot pattern (detached houses). The block pattern differences in the case area of Manavgat are the form-givers of districts. The block pattern of Bar enriched with different buildings forms digresses from a strict building grid in terms of placement and orientation. Some similarities may be found between building forms, but still not as strong as in the case area of Manavgat where small differences in a district are noticeable.



Figure 4.12 Block pattern and building form in Manavgat and Bar

Both Manavgat and Bar case areas are estimated as permeable, but not in a percentage that could be signed with high permeability (Table 4.12). Given this, the results reveal that the permeability of the case areas depends on the characteristics of the block pattern and size in different parts of case areas.



Table 4.12 Permeability (based on the asnwers in online survey)

4.2.3.2 Architectural Style and Image

In scale of an individual building, the analysis is based on characteristics of the architectural style. The aim of this analysis is not to make any detail analysis of the architectural elements, but to emphasize the difference in the building styles through time for each case separately and its effect on the overall image of the case areas in Manavgat (Figure 4.13) and Bar (Figure 4.15).

Unlike the traditional houses, the majority of the built structure in Manavgat gives an impression of monocultural 'international' architecture (Figure 4.30 b), c) and d)). It cannot be classified under any style characteristics that would determine the identity of case areas. The closeness of the water edge is neither on the vertical, nor in the horizontal plan of the buildings.



Figure 4.13 a)Traditional houses in Manavgat,Turkey and b), c), d) Actual design and architectural style of Manavgat

In order to bring a traditional touch to the water edge, one part of the buildings on the promenade have been reconstructed. They have some elements of the tradition, which are not typical traditional elements from Manavgat though (Figure 4.14).



Figure 4.14 Interpretation of tradition in Manavgat

The preservation of the image and identity in architectural and urban design style in Bar was also not a priority in the years of port construction. The old city of Pristan, so called "Second Bar"(Figure 4.15 a, b), as mentioned in background analysis with individual housing has been whipped off in order to build high-rise residential blocks as an answer to the growing population caused by the port construction (Figure 4.15 c). The architectural style of those kind of buildings has a highly expressed socialism note. However, some of the buildings as the Home of Culture"Vladimir Popović Španac", the public library and Reading center "IvoVučković", Art Gallery "Velimir A. Leković" and the Heritage Museum of Bar placed in the King Nikola's Castle have a characteristic identity-oriented design.



Figure 4.15 a) Pristan before the destruction in 1976. (Montenegrina,2006) ;b)Pristan square in 1970s, the image before the destruction in order to build new high-rise residential buildings(Montenegrina, 2006; c) The actual architectural style in Bar d) King Nicola's castle e) Home of Culture "Vladimir Popović Španac"
4.2.3.3 Landmark, Visual Stimulation and Attention to Detail

Landmarks as attraction points are considered to be the main activity generators of each public space. In order to designate the landmarks in case areas of Manavgat and Bar, the subjects have been asked to name the landmarks. According to the responses, the city center of Manavgat was mostly assigned as an area with no landmark, while the most important landmark in Bar is the King Nicola's castle (Figure 4.16). The other assignment in both cases is concerned with the uses of mentioned areas. Even though designed, the promenade in Manavgat was not depicted as any landmark in more than 30% of answers. The same counts for the non-designed promenade in Bar. When analyzed in general, it can be stated that gathering and activity points are seen as landmarks instead of the buildings individually.



Figure 4.16 Landmarks in Manavgat and Bar (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Public art is a topic that has mainly been developed in the design of the promenade in Manavgat. It is consist of artistic elements like statues, different kinds of floor and wall arrangements, water elements etc. Unlike Manavgat, Bar has a few elements of public art that mainly include elements like drinking fountains and the newly installed Zero kilometer statue (Figure 4.17).



Figure 4.17 Public art in Manavgat and Bar

4.2.4 Livability and Sociability

A diversity of age groups, mixture of visitors and inhabitants, income groups etc. are prerequisite to generate different interactions between people and support the livability and sociability of case areas. The age groups distribution in both Manavgat and Bar is similar. All age groups are present and the families make the biggest percentage of the visitors (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13 Age group distribution (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Which of the groups below do You think visit the waterfront area?				
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro	
Children	21.6%		24.1%	
Adults	40.5%		34.5%	
Elder	13.5%		20.7%	
Families	59.5%		72.4%	
Others	8.1%		10.3%	

As presented in Table 4.14, the majority consists of the medium-income visitors or inhabitants in both case areas. This can be also proven by the annual reports of the National Tourist Organization and predicted by the profile of the activities and uses the area offers.

Table 4.14 Income groups (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Which of the income groups visit the waterfront more?					
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro		
High-income	32.4%		31%		
Medium-	81.8%		93.1%		
income					
Low-income	8.1%		13.8%		

The profile of the visitors has major differences in summer and during the rest of the year in both case areas. The majority of the visitors in Manavgat and Bar in summer is a mixture of inhabitants and visitors while the majority in the rest of the year are the inhabitants of the waterfront area (Table 4.15).

Table 4.15 Visits in summer and during the rest of the year (based on the asnwers in online survey)

In Your opinion, Who visits the waterfront in summer?					
		Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro		
Inhabitants	40.5%		6.9%		
Tourists	16.2%		24.1%		
Inhabitants	43.2%		79.3%		
and tourists					
In Your opinion, Who visits the waterfront during the rest of the year?					
			or the year.		
		Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro		
Inhabitants	89.2%	Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro 86.2%		
Inhabitants Tourists	89.2%	Manavgat, Turkey	Bar, Montenegro 86.2% 0%		

4.2.4.1 Human Scale and Public Realm

Human Scale and Public Realm are Montgomery's conditions that can be partially analyzed in all of the conditions mentioned in previous chapters. They are related to smaller-scale analysis then the previous conditions. In both of cases of Bar and Manavgat different types of the human-building relation can be found, but cannot be assigned as characteristic examples of the case areas in general (Figure 4.18).

The Public realm condition is tightly related to the street life and contacts (Chapter 4.2.1.2). The designed promenade in Manavgat is the area that is on a satisfying level when it comes to the topic of treatment with urban furniture. The adjacent city area either lacks those kinds of elements or has some examples of their inappropriate placement (Figure 4.19). The same situation can be noticed in Bar except that even the promenade lacks any public realm treatment.





Figure 4.18 Human Scale



Figure 4.19 Public realm

4.2.5 General Perception of the Case Areas

In order to get an overall perception of the case areas in Manavgat and Bar, the subjects participating in the surveys are asked to evaluate the potential of the waterfront during summer and the rest of the year. Both of the case areas give medium development potential. It is obvious in both cases that the potential of the waterfronts is estimated as higher than in the rest of the year (Table 4.17).

On scale from 1 to	o 5, how we	ould you evaluate the develo	opment por	tential of actual waterfront in		
terms of its use in summer?						
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro			
1 (low. grade)	0%		3.4%			
2	2.7%		10.3%			
3	40.5%		44.8%			
4	45.9%		34.5%			
5 (highest	10.8%		6.9%			
grade)						
On scale from 1 to	On scale from 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of its use					
in the rest of the y	in the rest of the year?					
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro			
1 (low. grade)	2.7%		3.4%			
2	24.3%		37.9%			
3	56.8%		41.4%			
4	13.5%		13.8%			
5 (highest	2.7%		6.9%			
grade)						

Table 4.16 Waterfront potential (based on the asnwers in online survey)

When the potential of the actual waterfronts in terms of design is estimated, the medium figure is valid for both Manavgat and Bar even though there are differences between areas in terms of design (Manavgat has a designed and Bar an non-designed promenade) (Table 4.18).

On scale from 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of design?					
	Manavgat, Turkey		Bar, Montenegro		
1 (low. grade)	5.4%		0%		
2	13.5%		6.9%		
3	48.6%		58.6%		
4	29.7%		31%		
5 (highest	2.7%		3.4%		
grade)					

Table 4.17 Design potential of case areas (based on the asnwers in online survey)

The waterfronts characteristics as revealed by subjects are presented in Figure 4.20 and Figure 4.21 with emhasis on their response rate. According to the fact that the differences in the case areas' characteristics, identity etc, a clear comparison cannot be made on basis of the answers. The emphasis has been on the commercial character of Manavgat waterfront area and recreational character of Bar waterfront area (Figure 4.20).

Lack of activities; lack of design; lack of seating; lack of parking places; crowd in summer are the common weaknesses of case areas determined by the respondents (Figure 4.21). Security and lack of parks are the weaknesses specified in the case of Manavgat, while unregulated beaches and lack of playgrounds are weaknesses specified in the case of Bar (Figure 4.21). Clean, water edge, promenade and cafes are common strengths in both Manavgat and Bar (Figure 4.22). When asked whether they would spend more time in the waterfront area if the design was improved, the responses were mainly positive in case of Manavgat, while there is not a precise distinction in case of Bar (Table 4.18).



Figure 4.20 "How would you describe the actual waterfront characteristics?" according to the surveys' subjects (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Table 4.18 Design preferences (based on the asnwers in online survey)

Is the design of the waterfront right now good enough to attract you to spend your free time there?						
	Manavgat,	Turkey	Bar, Montenegro			
Yes		27%		51.7%		
No		73%		48.3%		
If the design of the waterfront area was improved, would you spend more time there?						
	Manavgat,	Turkey	Bar, Monte	enegro		
Yes		83.8%		48.3%		
Maybe		16.2%		44.8%		
No		0%		6.9%		



Figure 4.21 Weaknesses of case areas (based on the asnwers in online survey)



Figure 4.22Strengths of case areas (based on the asnwers in online survey

4.3 Chapter Summary

The case area of Manavgat with designed promenade has been estimated as not good enough in terms of design to attract visitors while the evaluation of case area in Bar with an non-designed promenade does not have any clear negative or positive response. Both of the waterfronts are mainly visited by medium-income groups, mainly families. Lack of activities has been recognized as main weakness of both case areas. It leads to the conclusion that placemaking principles are required if all the dimensions of a successful waterfront are to be accomplished.



CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSION

Some main conclusive points related to waterfront placemaking can be withdrawn from all the analysis and discussions of previous chapters:

-Defined operations in infrastructure and public spaces, varied scale and character of investment programmes and coherent financial and organizational modes for the realization of particular tasks can transform the waterfront design to a communityused and community-led area.

-Mixed-use type of land use is widely accepted both in general and in specific sites like waterfronts as a solution for compact design with various activities that mixed-use facilities offer.

-If properly programmed, waterfronts can provide economic benefits in terms of new jobs, rise in land values, economic investment in degraded areas, attraction of tourists etc.

-New waterfront redevelopment projects should be used as a guide for developing countries in which way design, environmental, social and economic issues can be effectively accomplished, but not as a ready formula or prescription due to case areas' site characteristics.

-Waterfront areas can notably be not only areas that can bring economic benefits from tourism and other uses, but also represent the identity of the city and its culture through its image.

-Activity is what turns waterfronts from a bare edge to an attraction point. Even though designed, many waterfront regions have been left abandoned because of lack of activities. The design itself does not guarantee long-term livability and use if not properly planned in terms of welcoming different age groups, income groups, variety of activities and adaptable design and functions. What is usable and attractive now may not be in a distant time point. For the waterfront activities to be successful, a company or group of companies, individuals and other stakeholders have to persuade in creation of an adaptable environment, in step with technology and market requirements, facilities and public places.

-The attractiveness of a waterfront depends as much from a fetching design as much as from the management and market requirements, land use and property division. The breaking moment when the water edge does not play the role in the visitors' eye anymore is the one when the water's edge is led to risk of being only an edge instead of being an attraction point.

-The sustainability and economy factor should be in balance. If left entirely to the private sector, it may develop with an accent of profit much more than environment, sustainability and livability of the waterfront. In other words, the economy factor would have priority over the other sustainability factors. As a result, the visitor profile would change. The facilities and uses would be the designed attraction powers. Otherwise, they would visit any other place that would give them the same service with no relation to the site or waterfront edge.

-Not only the design, but also the management and the social moment are elements that make a waterfront successful. In order to have an overall point of view which includes all of those aspects, twelve placemaking principles by Montgomery (1998) are elaborated as the ones which include all of those three aspects of a successful place.

All the facts summed up above provide a general conclusion of the role of urban design as a discipline regarding with the design of waterfronts. The role of urban design in waterfront redevelopment involves waterfront placemaking, which includes principles respecting the spatial, economic, social and cultural qualities of the given site, the water edge, in order to transform it from edge to an attraction point. In other words, the role and task of urban design is not only the bare design of elements on the water edge. Rather, it should be the driving force gathering all the disciplines and balancing all the sustainability factors as inputs for placemaking principles of a site-characteristic design.

REFERENCES

- Abu Dhabi Urban Planning Council (2009). Al Bateen design guideline. RetrievedJanuary10,2016,fromhttp://www.upc.gov.ae/template/upc/pdf/AlBateenDesignGuidelinesA.pdf
- Akköse, A. C. (2007). The analysis of Istinye shipyard area within the context of redevelopment of urban waterfront areas. Master Thesis, Istanbul Technical University, İstanbul.
- Al Ansari, F. (2009). Public open space on the transforming urban waterfronts of Bahrain – The Case of Manama City. PhD Thesis, Newcastle University, Newcastle.
- Archdaily, (2015). Borneo Sporenburg housing. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.archdaily.com/586834/architecture-doesn-t-need-rebuilding-it-needsmore-thoughtful-critics
- Ashworth, G. J. & Tunbridge, J. E. (2011). *The tourist-historic city. Restrspect and prospect of menaging the heritage city.* London:Routledge.
- Asker, I. (2015). *Features of Manavgat and the traffic problems of the city and the solutions*. MSc Thesis, Bahçeşehir University, Istanbul.
- Bentley, I., Alcock, A., Murrain, P., McGlynn, S. & Smith, G. (1985). Responsive environments: A manual for designers. London: Architectural Press.
- Breen, A. & Rigby, D. (1994). Waterfronts: Cities reclaim their edge. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Bridge-info.org, (2012). *Erasmus bridge*. Rotterdam Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.bridgeinfo.net/bridge/index.php?ID=4

- Cadell, C., Nicholas Falk, N., & King, F. (2008). Regeneration in European cities. Making connections. Retrieved February 10, 2016, from https://www.jrf.org.uk/file/37373/download?token=7ScqQfC0
- Carmona, M., Heath, T., & Tiesdell, S. (2003). *Public places-urban spaces. Three dimensions of urban design*. Oxford: Architectural Press.
- Chaterworld, (2015). *Port vell*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from http://www.charterworld.com/news/tag/port-vell
- City of Portland Planning Office (2002). *Master plan for redevelopment of the Eastern Waterfront*. Retrieved March 23, 2015, from http://digitalcommons.portlandlibrary.com/citydocs_documents/5
- Comission of the European communities (1990). European commission green paper on the urban environment. Retrieved January 19, 2016, from http://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51990DC0218&qid=1432 048192317&from=EN
- Craig-Smith, S. J. & Fagence, M. (1995) Recreation and tourism as a catalyst for urban waterfront redevelopment. New York: Praeger.
- Desfor, G. & Laidley, J. (2011) Introduction: Fixity and flow of urban waterfront change, in Desfor, G., J. Laidley, J., Stevens, Q., & Schubert, D. Transforming urban waterfronts: fixity and flow. New York and London: Routledge.
- Detailed urban plan of Topolica 1-city center of Bar, Montenegro (2009). Retrieved February 10, 2016, from http://195.66.163.195/Portal/KorisnickiDeo/Lokalni%20planski%20dokumenti/D etaljni%20urbanisticki%20planovi/default.html
- Dong, L. (2004). *Waterfront development: A case study of Dalian*. Master Thesis, University of Waterloo, Canada.

- Dreamstime, (n.d.). *Wilhelmina Tower, New Luxor Theatre and Toren op Zuid.* Retrieved October 17, 2015 from https://www.dreamstime.com/royalty-freestock-photos-skyline-rotterdam-netherlands-new-meuse-river-wilhelmina-tower-lnew-luxor-theatre-m-toren-op-zuid-r-also-known-image35079618
- DTZ, (2015). *RREEF Investment*, *Ij-oevers*. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from https://www.dtz.nl/nl/over-dtz-zadelhoff/nieuws-en-agenda/overzicht-transactieberichten/2015/q2-2015/transactieberichten-uit-het-tweede-kwartaal-van-2015/rreef-investment-gmbh-koopt-huys-azi%C3%AB-aan-ij-oevers-in-amsterdam
- Dreiseitl, H. & Grau, D. (2005). *New waterscapes: Planning, building and designing with water*. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Dündar, Ş., Karataş, N., Erdin, H. E., & Lorens, P. (Eds), (2014). New faces of harbour cities. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Easy Going Rotterdam (n.d.). *Kop van Zuid*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from http://www.easygoingrotterdam.nl/hotel-new-york/
- Edwards, B. (1992). *London Docklands: Urban design in an age of deregulation*. Oxford: Butterworth Architecture.
- Erkök, F. (2009). *Waterfronts: potentials for improving the quality of urban life*. Master Thesis, Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul.
- Falk, N. (1993). Organizing for Success: British experience in waterfront development, in Bruttomesso, R. Waterfronts. A new Frontier for Cities on Water. Venice:Centro Internazionale Citta d'acqua.

- Fang, C. (2011). Waterfront landscapes. Hong Kong: Design Media Publishing Limited. Retrieved May 15, 2016, from https://www.scribd.com/document/259559737/Chole-Fang-Waterfront-Landscapes
- Feldman, M. (1999). Urban regeneration in Eastern Europe: Waterfront revitalization and local governance in Tallinn, Estonia. Phd Thesis, Syracuse University, New York.
- Follow the flamias, (2013). *Waterfront in Hamburg*. Retrieved August 14, 2016 from http://followtheflammias.com/hamburgs-miniatur-wunderland/
- General urban plan of Bar, Montenegro (2007). Retrieved February 10,2015 from http://195.66.163.195/Portal/KorisnickiDeo/Lokalni%20planski%20dokumenti/G eneralni%20urbanisticki%20plan%20Bara/default.html
- Gettyimages, (2014) . *La Rambla del Mar, leisure*. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.gettyimages.com/detail/news-photo/locals-and-tourists-relax-at-the-rambla-del-mar-in-news-photo/523906440
- Giovinazzi, O. & Moretti, M. (2010). Port Cities and urban waterfront: transformations and opportunities. *TeMALab Journal*, Vol 3 - SP - March 2010 Retrieved February 02, 2015 from http://www.camerablu.unina.it/index.php/tema/article/view/urn%3Anbn%3Ait%3 Aunina-3515/125
- GoAbroad.com, (2014). *Het Eilandje- from harbour industry to trendy hotspot*. Retrieved October 17, 2016 from http://www.goabroad.com/articles/studyabroad/from-harbor-industry-to-trendy-hotspot-the-new-best-area-of-antwerp-heteilandje

- Golubovic Matić, D. (2006). Influence of socio-economic factors in the development of the Bar's urban region, 42 nd ISoCaRP Conress Retreived March 14, 2016 from http://www.isocarp.net/data/case_studies/808.pdf
- Gospodini, A. A. (2002). European cities in competition and the 'uses' of urban design. *Journal of Urban Design* 7(1):59-73. Retrieved on December 10, 2015 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248992148_European_Cities_in_Competition_and_the_New_%27_Uses_%27_of_Urban_Design
- Gravagnuolo, G., & Mariarosaria Angrisano, M. (2013). Assessment of urban attractiveness of port cities in southern Italy—A Case Study of Torre Annunziata. *Sustainability*, 5(9), 3906-3925.
- Haber 3, (2011). Zindan castle, Manavgat. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.haber3.com/zindan-kalesi-aydinlatilacak-941047h.htm
- Haber zamani, (2016). *The Municipality building of Manavgat*. Retrieved April 13, 2016, from http://www.haberzamani.com.tr/haber/manavgat-belediyesi-konserli-acilisi-iptal-etti
- Halk egitim, (n.d.). Public education center, Manavgat. Retrieved December 17, 2015, from http://cdn.hemhalkegitim.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Antalyamanavgat-hem-halk-egitim-merkezi-kurs-binasi-2.jpg
- Hough, M. (1984). *City form and natural process: Towards a new urban vernacular*.London: Routledge.
- Hoyle, B. S., & Pinder, D. (1992). European port cities in transition. , Australia: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoyle, B. S. (1997). Review of *The new waterfront: A worldwide urban success* story, by A. Breen and D. Rigby. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 5 (4), 304-306.

- Hoyle, B. S. (1988). Development dynamics at the port-city interface. In *revitafising the waterfront: International dimensions of dockland redevelopment*, edited by B. S. Hoyle, D. A. Pinder, & M. S. Husain, 5-19. London and New York: Belhaven Press.
- Hoyle, B. (2000). Global and local change on the port-city waterfront'. *The Geographical Review*, 90, no. 3, 395-417,.
- Hoyle, B. (2001). Lamu: Waterfront revitalization in an East African port-city. *Cities*, 18, 5, 297-313.
- Ivar Hagendoorn, (2004). Borneo Sporenburg Bridge, Amsterdam. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.ivarhagendoorn.com/photos/series/borneosporenburg-2
- Iznumi, (2009). *Barcelona waterfront*. Retrieved August 14,2016, from https://inzumi.com/en/travel/point-of interest/d_id/Barcelona/c_id/Sightseeing/p_id/Port-de-Barcelona
- Jenks, M., Burton, E. & Williams, K. (1996). *The compact city. A sustainable urban form?* London: E & FN Spon.
- Jones, A. (1998). 'Issues in Waterfront Regeneration: More Sobering Thoughts, A UK Perspective', *Planning Practice & Research*, 13, 4, 433-442.
- Josef W. & Konvitz, J.W. (1978). *Cities and the sea: Port city planning in early modern Europe*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Karvinen M. (1997). Kaupungin ranta kulttuurisena rajana T. Haarni, M. Karvinen,
 H. Koskela, S. Tani (Eds.), Tila, paikka ja maisema. Tutkimusretkiä uuteen maantieteeseen, Vastapaino, Tampere, Finland, 143–162.

- Land use and building decree issued in Helsinki (1999). enacted under the Land Use and Building Act (132/1999) issued on February 5, 1999, Retrieved March 24, 2016 from http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990895.pdf
- Luigi Fusco Girard, L. F., Karima, K., & Nijkamp, P. (2014). Waterfront areas as hotspots of sustainable and creative development of cities. *Sustainability*, 6, 4580-4586.
- Llewelyn-Davies (2000). *Urban design compendium*. London: English Partnerships/Housing Corporation.
- Lorens, P. (2014). Urban waterfront regeneration: Origins of the issue in Dündar, Ş.,
 Karataş, N., Erdin, H. E., & Lorens, P. (Eds), (2014). New Faces of Harbour Cities. Newcastle: Camridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lorens, P. (2014). Comparative analysis of contemporary regeneration of waterfronts in port cities in Dündar, Ş., Karataş,N., Erdin, H. E., & Lorens,P. (Eds), (2014). New faces of harbour cities. Newcastle: Camridge Scholars Publishing.

Lynch, K. (1960). The image of the city. Cambridge: Technology Press.

Lynch, K. (1981). A theory of good city form. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Manavguide, (n.d.). *Manavgat river*. Retrieved December 17, 2015, from http://manavguide.com/Images/Thumbs/News/3150-manavgat-genel-910x0.jpeg
- Marshall, R. (2001). Contemporary urban space-making at the water's edge, in R.Marshall, (ed.) Waterfronts in post-industrial cities. London: Spon Press, 3-14.

- Morena, M. (2011). Morphological, technological and functional characteristics of infrastructures as a vital sector for the competitiveness of a country system.
 Milano: Maggioli Editore.
- Montgomery, J. (1998). Making a city: urbanity, vitality and urban design . Journal of Urban Design, Vol3. No 1. Retrieved March 24, 2016, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13574809808724418
- Montenegro charter, (2014). *Bar city center and the port*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from http://www.montenegrocharter.com/en/destination/marinas.html
- Moretti, M. (2008). *Cities on water and waterfront regeneration: a strategic challenge for the future*. Grundtvig, II meeting *Rivers of change-river//cities* Warsaw, Poland, July 24th -27th 2008. Retrieved May 10, 2015, from http://www.river-cities.nazwa.pl/www/download/m.moretti_warsaw2008.pdf
- Moughtin, C. (2003). Urban Design: Street & square, (3rd edition). Oxford: Architectural Press.
- Nationale beeldbank, (2010). *NDSM*, *Ij-oevers*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from https://www.nationalebeeldbank.nl/shop/products/486644ij_kantine_aan_de_noorder_ij_oevers
- Oxford English Dictionary (2004). *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved December 10, 2015, from http://www.oed.com
- Panoramio, (2009). *King Nicola's Castle with the park*. December 17, 2015, from http://static.panoramio.com/photos/large/98200016.jpg

- Papatheochari, D., (2011). *Examination of best practices for waterfront regeneration*. *Littoral 2010*, Article No. 02003. Retrieved September 20, 2015, from http://coastnetlittoral2010.edpsciences.org/index.php?option=com_article&access =st
- Perfecthousing, (2013). *Kop van Zuid*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from https://www.perfecthousing.com/expat-information/rotterdam/area-guide
- Pinder, D. A., Hoyle, B. S. & Husain, M.S. (1988). Retreat, redundancy and revitalization: forces, trends and a research agenda. in Revitalizing the waterfront: international dimensions of dockland redevelopment, edited by Hoyle, B. S. & Pinder, D. A. and Husain, M. S. 247-260. London and New York: Belhaven Press.
- Pinterest, (n.d.). *Het-Eilandje Marina*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from http://www.goabroad.com/articles/study-abroad/from-harbor-industry-to-trendy-hotspot-the-new-best-area-of-antwerp-het-eilandje
- Portvellbcn, (n.d.). *Leisure on La Rambla del Mar*. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.portvellbcn.com/en/live_port_vell/points_of_interest/detrambla_de_mar_i14413
- Project for public spaces (n.d.). *Eleven principles for creating great community places*. Retrieved August 10, 2015 from http://www.pps.org/reference/11steps/
- Project for public spaces (n.d.). *What makes a successful place?* Retrieved August 10, 2015 from http://www.pps.org/reference/grplacefeat/
- Remesar, A. (2002). Waterfronts and public art: a problem of language. in Remesar,
 A. (ed.), The arts in urban development Waterfronts of art II (pp. 3-26).
 Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.
- Remesar, A., & Costa, P.C., (2004). Multifunctional land use in the renewal of harbour areas: patterns of physical distribution of the urban functions. Retrieved

on September, 2015, from http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Waterfront/article/viewFile/216970/289614

- Report on the current state of planned areas of Bar, Montenegro (2014). RetrievedMay5,2016,fromwww.gov.me/ResourceManager/FileDownload.aspx?rId=208739&rType=2
- Roberts, P. (2000). The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration. *Urban regeneration*, Sage, London. Retrieved March 10, 2016 from https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/urban-regeneration/book210562
- Sairinen R. (2004). Assessing social impacts of urban land-use plans: from theory to practice. Boreal Environmental Research, 9 (6), 509–517.
- Sairinen, R., & Kumpulainen, S. (2005). Assessing social impacts in urban waterfront regeneration, *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 26 (2006), 120-135.
- Sert, J.L. (1942). Can our cities survive? Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Smyth, H, & Garcia Ferrari, M.S. (2012). Waterfront regeneration experiences in *city-building*. New York: Routledge.
- Strategy of the regional development of Montenegro in the period 2014-2020 (2014). Retrieved February 10, 2016 from http://www.gov.me/ResourceManager/FileDownload.aspx?rId=172087&rType=2
- Timur, U.P. (2013). Urban waterfront regenerations in Özyavuz, M. (2013). Environmental sciences "Advances in landscape architecture". Retrieved February 15, 2015 from http://www.intechopen.com/books/advances-inlandscape-architecture

- Tinsley, H.E.A., & Johnson, T.L. (1984). A preliminary taxonomy of leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16, 42-48.
- Turkish State Meteorological Service official site (n.d.). *The Climatic Conditions of Manavgat*. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from http://www.mgm.gov.tr
- *Turkish Statistical Institute official site*. Retrieved March 16, 2016 from http://www.mgm.gov.tr/iklim/iklim-siniflandirmalari.aspx?m=MANAVGAT
- Wang, C. (2008). Waterfront regeneration, MSc Thesis, City and Regional Planning Cardiff University, Cardiff
- Waterfront Alliance (n.d.). *Waterfront edge design guideline (WEDG)*. Retrieved February 10, 2016 from http://waterfrontalliance.org/what-we-do/waterfront-edge-design-guidelines/
- Willemen, (2011). *Willemen groep MAS museum*. Retrieved October 17, 2015, from http://www.willemen.be/en/project/museum-aan-de-stroom-mas-antwerp
- Wrenn, D. M., Casazza, J. A., & Smart, J. E., (1983). Urban waterfront development.Washington: Urban Land Institute.
- Yılız, M. (2012). Tourism development analysis of its space as a secondary house; Manavgat example. MSc Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Youropi, (2007). *Het Eilandje*. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.youropi.com/nl/antwerpen/locations/het-eilandje-1091#review_form
- 123rf, (n.d). La Rambla del Mar. Retrieved October 17, 2015 from http://www.123rf.com/photo_11263554_stock-photo.html

APPENDICES

APENDIX 1: Background analyses of Manavgat, Turkey and Bar, Montenegro

1. The Historical Background

<u>Bar</u>

It cannot be said with certainty when the city of Bar was founded. The archeological remainings testify that the life on this area started even in prehistory (neolith and bronze period). A lot of different cultures and nations gravitated through this period starting from the domestic Illyrians continuing up to Romans and Ottoman Empire. The name of the city as a reconstructed roman castle Antipargai was mentioned for the first time in 6th century by Procopius, Antobareos in 10th century, as d'Antibaris in 11th century and Bar in the 13th century in a biography written by Stefan Prvovjenčani (Golubović, 2006).

The Ottomans occupied the city in 1751 and stayed there until 1878. When the fortress was conquered again by Montenegrins, it could not be resettled again because of war destruction. The first urban core called the Pier (New Bar) was formed in 20th century under the Volujica Mountain. The pier was the first Montenegrin port. A mini-airport and hotels were constructed at that time. The first urban plan proposed by Italian engineer Gegli while it was under the governance of Austro-Hungarians (Figure 1.1). After a short period under their governance, it became a part of the Kingdom of Serbians, Croatians and Slovenians in 1918 and went through the Second World War under the same conditions (Golubović, 2006).



Figure 1.1 The first urban plan proposed by Italian engineer Gegli (Golubović, 2006)

The pier was destructed in 1976. as an unique case of its kind on these lands. The whole city was whipped away in order to widen the port area (Figure 1.2). The inhabitants were moved to Topolica where only the King Nicola's castle existed until the urbanization period. In 1990s, Bar was one of the crucial ports of Yugoslavia (Golubović, 2006).



Figure 1.2 Detailed urban development plan "The first phase of the economic zone Bar" (Golubović, 2006)

<u>Manavgat</u>

According to the information given in the Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013), the certain date of the Manavgat's foundation is not known. Though, the ancient cities of Side and Selge inside the limits of the districts are estimated to origin from the 6th century B.C. Current Manavgat is situated in the east part of the antic Pamfilya. There are some assumptions that the current city center takes it roots for 150-200 years. Until the recent years, on the location of the current district center on both sides of Manavgat River, the exchange of human and goods has been stated in some documents.

As stated in the previously mentioned report, at the time of the announcement of the Republic in 1923, Antalya was made a province and Manavgat was attached to the province in1924. Due to the research on the historical spread of the settlement, it becomes evident that the area of the Republican Square and the location of the current center were the first settled region. During the spread of the settlement around the Manavgat River, the connection between the two banks of the river was not created. The west part of the river was the first settled area and the transportation between the two sides of the river was provided by boats. After the construction of the first bridge in 1950, the first crucial breaking point in the history of the settlement, the city continued its spread in an organic way along both sides of the river (Figure 1.3). In years between 1970 and 1985, the previously used agricultural areas were transformed into residential areas. The second crucial point in urban development occurred in 1985 when the first investments in tourism were made. Along the south coast, high capacity tourism facilities were built and put into use. At first seen as an area left in the second plan, Manavgat was later integrated into the touristic offer of the region. Due to the immigrations as a result of tourism development, the population of Manavgat was multiplied more than three times. The spread of the city in current limits was a reflection of those processes. In the years between 1985 and 2000, the development on the scale of the neighborhoods was negligible. The most important change was the transformation of vineyards into residential areas. The development of Manavgat in the post-2000s has been subject to decline when compared to the previous periods. In the same way, the spread of the

neighborhoods is continued on the outskirts of the current ones and along the highway. Based on the on-site surveys, 1600 new buildings were identified from 2003 to 2011. Because of the absence of stages in the zoning plan, illegal buildings took place in areas disconnected from the residential tissue, posing problems of infrastructure and service.



Figure 1.3 Manavgat in 1960s, postcard (Asker, 2015)

The most important cultural heritage in the borders of the urban tissue are Zindan Castle and the remainings of old fortress in Eski Hisar (Figure 1.4). Both of them have been named as archeological sites of first and third degree. Efforts are made and clearly stated in the Report for the Developmental Plan of Manavgat to preserve the small part of the remaining of the ancient castle.



Figure 1.4 Zindan Castle, Manavgat (Haber 3, 2011)

2. Geographical Location, Climate and Territorial Connections

<u>Bar</u>

The Municipality of Bar is situated in the South part of Montenegro, between the Mediterranean Sea and Skadar Lake (Figure 2.1). The Municipality of Bar, which is the largest port and industrial center of South Mediterranean, occupies an area of 598 kilometers square (Strategy of the regional development of Montenegro in the period 2014-2020).

As stated on the official site of the Municipality of Bar, Montenegro, the city has a climate of 270 sunny days per year which makes it one of the sunniest places in South Europe. The average annual temperature is 16 degrees Celsius, in July 23 degrees Celsius, and in January 1 degree Celsius. The summers in Bar are long and hot, the winters are mild and rainy with an average of 38 rainy days. Regarding the facts given above, Bar is a very attractive place not only in summer, but also in winter.



Figure 2.1 The location of Bar in Montenegro

The territorial connections of the city are /elaborated in The Strategy of the regional development of Montenegro in the period 2014-2020. The Municipality is connected by highways with Budva, Cetinje, Boka Kotorska and Croatia on the North-West; Podgorica, the North of Montenegro and Serbia on the North; with Ulcinj and Albania on the South-east. By the railway on the Beograd-Bar line it is connected with Podgorica and Serbia (Figure 2.2). After the Sozina tunnel being constructed, the distance between the Capital of Podgorica and Bar is decreased to 54 km. There are two airports within the circle of 70 km- Podgorica and Tivat. By the water ways, Bar is connected with middle and East Mediterranean over the Otrant Door, and farer to all the ports of all continents. Compared to the other ports on the east side of the Mediterranean. According to The Detailed Urban Plan of the first economic zone of Bar, an extra 350 ha, is reserved for later development of the activities directly or indirectly related to the main function of the port (The Strategy of the regional development of Montenegro in the period 2014-2020).



Figure 2.2 Territorial connections of Bar

Bar is situated on two main corridors in Montenegro- the Adriatic highway and the east corridor Bar- Podgorica- Kolašin- Mojkovac- Bijelo Polje-Serbia. This gives a big advantage on the future development of the city in general and in all fields of activities in specific. To add up, the railway and two airports in the distance of 70 km raise the international access to the city.

Manavgat

Manavgat is a municipality on the Mediterranean region and the second largest district in Antalya with an area of 2,283 km². The district is spread parallel to the coast and bordered with the Toros Mountain (Figure 2.3).



Figure 2.3 The location of Manavgat in Turkey scale and in Antalya

According to the analysis of The Turkish State Metrological Service, Manavgat has a typical Mediterranean climate with hot summers, rainy and warm winters. Considering the annual average situation in the region, the dominant winds from the north direction, the summer winds from the southeast direction are the dominant ones.

According to the information given in The Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013), there are 10 municipalities in the Manavgat district. Except for Oymapinar Municipality, all of them are situated on the coast and spread in the west-east direction along the highway. The municipality of Manavgat is surrounded with Side in the west, Hatipler Village in the northwest, Manavgat River in the north, Çeltikçi ve Aşağı Işıklar Villages in the northeast and sandy sites on the east.

As mentioned on the official site of The Municipality of Manavgat, the Manavgat district is situated in the east part of the Antalya region surrounded by the Mediterranean sea. One part of the district is coastal, while the other takes place on Toros Mountain. The coastal part of the district is spread 5 km from Serik district on a 30km long area until the Alara River. The district is surrounded by Serik district on the west, Isparta on the north, Ibradi and Akseki on the east and Alanya on the southeast.

As stated in The Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat from 2013, Manavgat district center has an advantage of being on the crossroad of two important corridors- Alanya-Antalya coastal road and the Akseki-Seydişehir-Konya highway. The distance of the Manavgat district center to Antalya Province center is 78 km, Ankara 486 km and Istanbul 802 km. The nearest airport to the district center is 78km far, in Antalya district center. Besides it, there is also the Gazipaşa airport situated 104 km from Manavgat. The Antalya airport, which is one of the most important airports of the region and Turkey in general, has a huge significance in supplying the tourism centers of the region.

3. Demography and Education

<u>Bar</u>

According to a survey held in 2011 by the Municipality of Bar, the population living on the territory of the Municipality of Bar is 42.048. The urban territory of the municipality is settled with 44,3% of the total population. The main problem in the demographical structure of the municipality is the inconvenient age structure: according to the survey (2011), 18,7 % of the population is over the age of 60. When compared with the number from 2003 the increase in this structure is evident (17,6%). The education in the Municipality is organized on all levels, kindergartens, the elementary, high school and university education.

Manavgat

According to the Turkish Statistical Institute, the total population of the Manavgat District is 193,738 48% (94,661) of which live in the districts center, while 52% (99,077) live in the surrounding villages according to the census in 2011. Manavgat is the first in the Antalya Province by the annual increase in population. The education is organized on all levels except universities.

4. Environmental Structures

<u>Bar</u>

The environmental structure of Bar is analyzed in The Development plan of Bar for the period between 2014 and 2020. The sea is the most important natural feature, which has a crucial effect not only on the climatic, bio-geographical, hydrological and other natural factors, but also on the commercial, touristic and infrastructural development of the city of Bar (Figure 4.1). The total length of the sea shore on the territory of the municipality is 46 km. The depth of the sea is the biggest measured in the South-Mediterranean valley, which gives the opportunity for the ports and marinas to be built. The total length of the beaches within boundaries of the Municipality of Bar is 9 km with an area of 21,3 ha. Stated in a research of the Center for Eco-toxicological researches in Montenegro, the Municipality of Bar has a

relatively healthy and preserved natural environment (The Strategy of the regional development of Montenegro in the period 2014-2020).



Figure 4.1 Bar city center and the port (Montenegro charter, 2014)

<u>Manavgat</u>

The environmental structure of Manavgat is analyzed in the Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013). As stated above, the coastal settlements have a great potential in terms of tourism. Due to that factor, they can be described as developed areas. Examination of the general environmental structure of Manavgat reveals that the district center is built on the high of 2-8 m over the sea level on a flat and slightly sloped land. The coast of Manavgat district is 55 km long. The most important natural watercourse in the area is Manavgat River (Figure 4.2). The depth of the river canyon in the district region varies from 2 to 7 meters. Another precious environmental value in the district is Titreyen Göl. The lake covers an area of approximately 3000 m^2 , formed as a lagoon with great touristic potential.



Figure 4.2 Manavgat River (Manavguide, n.d.)

5. Economy and Land Uses

Bar

The General Urban Plan of Bar (GUP) regulates the urbanism in Bar as an official document adopted by the City's Parliament. The area covered by GUP is defined as a construction zone. Anyway, the current situation in construction activities bring up some negative circumstances stated in The Report on the current state of planned areas (2014) by the municipality. Some problems effecting the urban design and design in general of the city center are as follows:

-dominant construction without respecting the framework of the plans and the building permits,

- Construction over the limits of the city core is not followed by the construction of needed infrastructure or its reconstruction which poses problems in wider area,

- Works on making the Detailed Urban Plans for different parts of the city, as the ones on scale lower than GUP take more time than supposed and are not followed by an urban design guide.

The general state of economic development Bar is that it is the largest and the most developed municipality on the Montenegrin coast. The process of the economic development of Bar has begun in early 20th century when a pier was been constructed on the current location of Port Bar. An intensive investment activity in constructing the port buildings took place in the 1960s. Besides the Port of Bar, the largest investments were the Adriatic highway and the Beograd-Bar railway in 1970s. The dynamic development of port, infrastructure, small-scale manufacturing capacities, tourism, trade, agriculture etc. has affected the socio-economic development in general (Golubović, 2006).

As stated in the Strategy for the Regional Development of Montenegro for the period between 2014 and 2020, infrastructure, tourism and agriculture became the main development sectors with the majority of working population in the south region of the country and the city of Bar as its part. This phase of the development meant a need of structural compatibility- the encouragement of industrial
development-manufacturing sector and a faster development of the service sector (tourism, trade, construction, catering etc.). That kind of developmental politics caused the concentration of port, manufacturing and service capacities and population on the waterfront area of the city that led to massive structures and spatial disproportion in the territorial organization of the city.

Manavgat

Manavgat with its organic form stretches along the west-east direction on a slightly sloped land. The most important landmark of the city is the Manavgat municipality building. The commercial activity in this area is high especially in Antalya Street and İbrahim Sözen Street. The aesthetic natural and built form-giver of the city is the Manavgat River with its banks. Except for the natural character, the cultural heritage and the architectural characteristics are not on a level to affect the image of the city in aesthetic terms. According to the development of the built environment in last 25 years which went through serious changes, it is impossible to see any examples of urban and rural traditional residential architecture (Asker, 2015).

The variations in the building typology in neighborhoods near the city center show similarities as stated in The Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013). The density decreases from the city center towards the surrounding neighborhoods. Some even display a transition from urban to rural character. The current microform of Manavgat is conditioned by its natural as well as legal borders. Another element that affected its macroform is the implementation of the zoning plans. The low emigration towards the outer parts of the city caused an accelerated increase of population density in the inner parts. Due to the fast increase in population, the trade facilities increased and developed in a short period of time. This led the city center to become a dense and crowded waterfront city.

According to the information and on-site surveys held by the municipality presented in The Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (personal communication, Municipality of Manavgat, September 15, 2013), there are 23.318 residential units in Manavgat. When the general plan of the city is observed, it can be

seen that the city center and surrounding areas have characteristics of a dense structure. Both the building and the population density decrease along the line from the city center to the surrounding of the city. New residential areas display different characteristics from the existing urban pattern under the influence of urban development practices. The use of larger building heights, the size of the parcel and building density differ from one neighborhood to another. Regarding the building quality in the center, there can be seen a lot of buildings that are old and of low quality in the city center.

As mentioned previously, the commercial sector in the town is mainly based on tourism. The city's economy is based on the tourism sector, which provides the most important value-added businesses in the region. The majority of non-residential activity is located in the central business district of Manavgat (Yıldız, 2012).

Local offices and buildings of official institutions are scattered in various areas in the city center of Manavgat, along the major arteries of the city. In the region where the trade organizations in the city are settled, the official facilities increase the density and congestion in the city center. The District Governorate building and Municipality building have recently been located in the Governmental Square (Figure 5.1). Multiple corporate activities such as Directorate of Population, Directorate of Administration, Medical center, Telekom Administration, District Directorate of National Education are also located at the Governmental Square and its surroundings. Some administrative facilities are scattered around the center of the city and its various regions, many of them on main arteries such as Ibrahim Sözen Street and Antalya Boulevard.



Figure 5.1 The Municipality building of Manavgat (Haber zamani, 2016)

As stated in The Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013), DLH General Directorate dated 28.07.2005 Manavgat (Antalya), there is a possibility of constructing the port on the point where the river meets the sea, on the western and eastern breakwater of the river into the sea. The location of the breakwaters outside the existing maps became an obstacle that inhibited future development and researches of that idea.

6. Existing Green Areas

Bar

The Castle Park in the center of the town is the most important and the biggest green area. On the side facing the water edge, the park is bordered by an alley of palm trees, oleanders, agaves and tamaris. It covers the area around the Big castle, Small castle and the ex-survey center for the southern cultures of plants (Figure 6.1). The park is protected as a cultural heritage in the category of horticulture. Yet, it has not been maintained properly as observed during the on-site research.



Figure 6.1 King Nicola's Castle with the park (Panoramio,n.d.)

Findings of the on-site research reveals that the park continues on the green area of the Home of Revolution and along an alley of palm trees and other species until the little forest around the ex-hotel "Agava", the central building of the Port of Bar and the "Sidro" hotel. The sports complex on "Madzarica" with the "Princess" resort and a petrol station is covered with greenery and the efforts have been done to build a visual protective green belt around the sports complex. There is need for constructing more green areas both in the central area and the town as a whole (Figure 6.2).



Figure 6.2 The seaside promenade, Bar

As emphasized in The Development plan of Bar for the period between 2011 and 2020, rapid urbanization and construction of residential and administrative buildings in the central city core led to the reduction of the total green area in the city. Parks and other green areas are not maintained properly, especially in the summer period. Only the King's park, some greenery on the promenade and the park near the port are protected from devastation.

<u>Manavgat</u>

Despite the lack of green areas in the city to catch up with the standards, it appears to be better than those in settlements of similar size. The forest areas in the settlement are often used for recreational purposes. The ones found in the city, near the Manavgat River are classified in The Report of the Development plan of Manavgat (personal communication, Municipality of Manavgat, September 15, 2013) as the passive green space in the city. A large portion of pine tree vegetation reflects the characteristics green areas in the city and constitutes the most important visual value in the city (Figure 6.3).



6.3 Manavgat promenade

7. Culture, Tradition and Sports

Bar

Rich cultural-historical heritage of Bar originates from various periods and civilizations. The old town of Bar, unlike the other maritime towns and cities, was settled within a distance of 4 km away from the waterfront. There were many reasons for placing it on that location; first of all, the underground waters and the configuration of the terrain. The oldest triangle part of the town was circumscribed by remains of ancient walls. The main form-givers of the town were the citadel built on the north, the relatively regular grid of streets and the Square of Saint George that is predicted to be built on the place of former forum. In the period when it was occupied by the Ottoman Empire, the town was supplied with water by an aqueduct which was the first of its kind in Montenegro. In the same period, the facilities of the city were also widened with a Turkish bath and a clock tower. Many of the churches in the town have been conserved, still in ruins. The old olive in Mirovica is the statue of nature which made Bar internationally recognizable (Figure 7.1). It is supposed to be over 200 years old that makes it the one of the oldest olive trees in the Mediterranean (Golubović, 2006).



Figure 7.1 The Olive tree, Bar

The Municipality of Bar is rich in festivals and manifestations presented on the official site of the municipality, especially in summer. The festivals like "The chronicle of Bar", " The Days of Olive", " International TV Festival", " The days and wine and fish", "Swimming marathon", " Summer with the stars", "The days of chestnuts" can be named among many, which are popularly visited both by tourists and the inhabitants.

As emphasized in The Report of the Development plan, the main culture bearer in the Municipality of Bar is the Cultural center of Bar as a complex institution consisting of the Home of Culture "Vladimir Popović Španac" (Figure 7.2). The public library and Reading center "Ivo Vučković", Art Gallery "Velimir A. Leković" and The Heritage Museum of Bar placed in the King Nikola's Castle. The biggest attention is drawn by the King Nicola's castle built in 19th century. The museum placed in the summer residence of the king has a concept of a complex type institution with archeological, historical, artistic and ethnological sections.



Figure 7.2 The cultural center of Bar

Sports hall Topolica is the main sports factor in the town (Figure 7.3). It includes basketball, volleyball handball etc. pitches on an area of 1 290 square meters with an capacity of 2 625 seats. It is also equipped with the supporting facilities and a press center. The aim of the sports center is creating a new urban ambient. The sports function is dominant, but not the only one. It is also used for various cultural gatherings and manifestations.



Figure 7.3 Sports Hall Topolica, Bar

<u>Manavgat</u>

The city's social and cultural facilities are estimated to be insufficient in the Report of the Development Plan of Manavgat (2013). Among the social and cultural facilities in the settlement area take place a public library, an adult education center and various associations. The Public Library and Public Education Center are located in the city center in Aşağı Hisar neighborhood (Figure 7.4).



Figure 7.4 Public Education Center, Manavgat (Halk egitim, n.d.)

Many of the social-cultural facilities are within the boundaries of the planned area in Manavgat. Findings of the on-site research reveal that there is an obvious lack of social-cultural facilities in Manavgat. The structure the settlement and its specifications are considered to meet the needs of the population in terms of social and cultural facilities.

Social and cultural facilities as nursing home, rehabilitation centers, wedding halls, shelters, community centers and public facilities like libraries, museums, cinemas, theaters, exhibition and conference halls, youth centers, art galleries, public education centers, centers for people with disabilities and technical training centers etc. are the facilities that lack in Manavgat.

8. Tourism

<u>Bar</u>

According to the statistics of the Statistics office of Montenegro, the city of Bar is visited by 157.685 tourists in 9 months in 2013, which shows an evident increase of 4,89 % compared to that of 2012. The structure of the tourists consists both of the Montenegrin and foreign visitors, making up 96% of the total number of tourists. The accommodation capacities in Bar represent 15,5% of the total accommodation

capacity of Montenegro according to a survey made by the mentioned office in August 2011.

The waterfront of Bar has potential for various kinds of tourism described in The Report of the Development plan. Few of them are developed or at the beginning of being a focal point of future development. The swimming tourism is the main reason of receiving middle-standard domestic and foreign tourists the most. Except for the stationary guests, the majority of tourists come as one-day-tour visitors from Podgorica and north of Montenegro coming by car or train, usually on weekends. Those kinds of visits usually do not reach the city center, but the nearest outskirt beaches of the city. The main resource of this kind of tourism is the seaside, precisely the beaches whose capacity and characteristics of the maritime offer is dependent.

The recreation tourism is still not adequately developed in Bar. There are many clubs for water and land sports, but they are not properly integrated in the touristic offer of the city for many reasons. One of the main reasons is the insufficiency of pitches and building with sport functions which leads to the inability to make Bar a destination for that kind of tourism. The manifestation of tourism is a very important part of the summer and winter concept of tourism, still they are usually settled out and far from the city center.

Transit tourism is related to the touristic movements in the summer and conditioned by the benefits for nautical tourism and the function of the port, railway and bus transportation with their routes from Bar to Budva, Kotor and Ulcinj. The public areas are not adjusted enough for both pedestrians and vehicular access, as there are not enough parking places, technical services, info points, signalization, adequate layout of catering and trade facilities. Some other kinds of tourism are also present in Bar, but not developed due to the inefficient and inappropriate facilities and economic situation.

Nautical tourism has a raising interest in Bar as the natural and situational characteristics of the city allow it. The waterfront is appropriate for locating marinas

and other nautical facilities since the area is naturally protected from wind and changing levels of the sea. The current marina is located near the port and covers an area of 15 ha with all the accompanying facilities. The increase of living standard and the interest of foreign investors demands raising the capacity of 400 commercial bindings. Congress tourism has been an important kind of tourism in an earlier period, but has lost its significance due to the fact that the current hotel capacities cannot fulfill the high demands of that kind of clientele. Cultural tourism in Bar is mainly based on the historical and cultural values of the Old town of Bar.

<u>Manavgat</u>

The eastern region of Antalya with residential tourism is a very important brand with international recognition. As mentioned previously, the city holds a natural and environmental tourism potential. Manavgat's tourism, which constitutes the basis for the city's economy, provides a significant value in the domestic economy.

According to data from MATAB (*Manavgat Çevre Koruma Turizm Altyapı Tesisleri Yapma ve İşletme Birlikleri Başkanlığı*- The Manavgat Presidency of Associations of Environmental protection, Tourism, Infrastructure construction and management) in 2011, tourism center facilities located city in the south of Sorgun-Titreyengöl offer accommodation for 19 836 beds. In this region, there are 27 units and the average unit size is 735 bed / unit.

As mentioned in The Report of the Development plan of Manavgat (2013), lodging houses and a small hotel business in the city are not developed. Tourism facilities in the region are mainly high standard facilities spread over a wide area. Apart from these facilities, there are also some small hotels which serve more as city hotels. In total, 19.13% of the total number of employees works in tourism, which shows its importance for the city.

APPENDIX 2: Survey on Waterfront perception, Manavgat, Turkey

Manavgat merkez kıyı alanı

* Required

1. Cinsiyetiniz *

Mark only one oval.

OKadın

OErkek

2. Yaş *

Age

Çalışma durumu *
 Working status. *Mark only one oval.*

^OÇalişiyorum

OÇalışmıyorum

4. Manavgat merkez kıyı alanına hafta içi nasıl geliyorsunuz ?

In which way do you come to the waterfront area Mark only one oval.

OArabayla

OYuruyerek

OHiç gelmiyorum

5. Manavgat merkez kıyı alanına hafta sonu nasıl geliyorsunuz ?

In which way do you come to the waterfront area Mark only one oval.

OArabayla

OYuruyerek

OHiç gelmiyorum

6.Ne kadar sıklıkla kıyı alanını ziyaret ediyorsunuz? *
How often do you visit the waterfront area? *Mark only one oval*.
OHer gün
OBir kez iki gün içinde

OHaftada bir kez

OHaftada iki kez

Oother:

7. Sizce kıyı alanındaki en önemli binaları hangileridir ? Listeleyiniz. * Name the most important buildings near the waterfront.

8. Lütfen kıyı alanındakı en sık yaptığınız aktiviteleri listeleyiniz. * Name the activities that you usually do in the waterfront area.

9. Sizce aşağıdaki gruplardan kıyı alanını ziyaret eden hangileridir?

Which of the groups below do You think visit the waterfront area ? *Check all that apply*.

○Çocuklar

OYetişkinler

OYaşlılar

OAileler

Oother:

10. Sizce yaz aylarında, kıyı alanı kimler tarafından ziyaret edilir ? Who do You think visits the waterfront in summer ? *Check all that apply*.

^OKıyı bölgesinde oturanlar

OTuristler

^OKıyı bölgesinde oturanlar ve turistler

11. Sizce yaz dışında yılın geri kalanında, kıyı alanı kimler tarafından ziyaret edilir? Who do You think visits the waterfront in the rest of the year ? *Check all that apply*.

^OKıyı bölgesinde oturanlar

OTuristler

OKıyı bölgesinde oturanlar ve turistler

12. Sizce hangi gelir grubu kıyıda daha çok zaman harcıyor?

Which of the below income groups spend more time on the waterfront? *Check all that apply*.

^OGelir seviyesi yüksek olanlar

OGelir seviyesi orta olanlar

^OGelir seviyesi düşük olanlar

13. Kıyı alanına yüruyerek kolayca ulaşabilir misiniz?

Can you approach easily to the waterfront by walking? Mark only one oval.

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

14. Kıyı alanına arabayla kolayca ulaşabilir misiniz ?

Can you approach easily to the waterfront by vehicle? Mark only one oval.

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

15. Kıyı alanına giderken yolda herhangi bir otopark ve trafik sorunu yaşıyor musunuz?

Do parking and traffic pose problems on your way to the waterfront or in the area? *Mark only one oval.*

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

16. Sizce kıyı alanın bügünkü düzenlemesi tüm ziyaretçi grupları için yeterince rahat mı (erişebilirlik ve kolay hareket edebilirlik anlamında)?*

İs the actual design of the waterfront comfortable enough for these groups of visitors ? *Mark only one oval per row.*

	Evet	Hayır
Yaşlılar		
Tekerlikli sandaliye çocuklu		
anneler		
Özürlüler		

17. Şehir merkezinin her yerinden kolayca kıyı alanına yolunuzu bulabilir misiniz (yollar sizi yönlendiriyor mu) ?

Can you find your way to the shore easily from each part of the city center (are the routes clearly marked) ? *Mark only one oval*.

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

18. Kıyı alanında zaman geçirmek için alanında sunulan aktiviteler (açık hava aktiviteleri) yeterli mi ?

Are there enough outdoor activities on the waterfront to attract you to spend time there? *Mark only one oval.*

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

19. Eğer varsa, kıyıda en çok kullandığınız açık hava aktivitelerin isimleri yazınız. *

Name the the recreational areas you use the most on the waterfront, if any

20. Sizce kıyı alanının tasarimı boş zamanınızı değerlendirmek için yeterince uygun mu ?

Is the design of the waterfront right now good enough to attract you to spend your free time there? *Mark only one oval*.

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

21. Kıyı alanında bügün mevcut bulunan düzenlemeyi/tasarımı nasıl

değerlendiriyorsunuz?

How would you describe the actual waterfront ?Check all that apply.

Ticari	Çekici	Dişleyici
Tarihi	Çirkin	Keyıflı (hoş olan)
Eğlence alanı	İlginc	Keyıfsız (hoş olmayan)
Çalışma alanı	Sıkıcı	Other:
Konut alanı	İçerici	

22. Tasarım açısından değerlendirdiğinizde, kıyı alanı düzenlemesine 1 ile 5 kaç not verirsiniz ?

On scale from 1 to 5, how would You evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of design. *Mark only one oval*.

1 2 3 4 5

0 0 0 0 0

en düşük not en yüksek not

23. Kıyı alanının tasarımı geliştirilirse, orada daha fazla vakit geçirmek ister miydiniz?

If the design of the waterfront area was improved, would you spend more time there? *Mark only one oval.*

OEvet

OBelki

O_{Hayır}

24. Kıyı alanının yaz aylarındaki kullanımı açısından değerlendirdiğinizde, kıyı alanına potansiyel olarak kaç not verirsiniz ?

On scale from 1 to 5, how would You evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of its use in summer? *Mark only one oval*.

En düşük not En yüksek not

25. Kıyı alanının yılın geri kalanında kullanımı açısından değerlendirdiğinizde, kıyı alanına potansiyel olarak kaç not verirsiniz ?

On scale from 1 to 5, how would You evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of use in the rest of the year? *Mark only one oval*.

En düşük not En yüksek not

26. Sizce kıyı mahallerinde oturanlar, kıyı alanlarındaki sosyal aktivitelere katılıyorlar mı ?

Are inhabitants included in creation of the social life on the waterfront ? *Mark only one oval.*

OEvet

O_{Hayır}

27. Kıyı alanıınn üç güçlü yönünü yazınız. *

Name three opportunities of the waterfront

28. Kıyı alanının üç zayıf yönünü yazınız. *

Name three weaknesses of the waterfront

29. Lütfen aşağıda verilen Resim 1' e bakarak kıyı alandaki bölgelerin içinde genellikle zaman geçirdiginiz sayılarını seçiniz.

Choose the numbers of the areas marked on Picture 1 You usually spend your time in when on the waterfront.

Check all that apply.

01	O ₁₀	O ₁₉
02	O ₁₁	O ₂₀
03	O ₁₂	O ₂₁
04	013	022
05	O ₁₄	023
06	O ₁₅	024
07	016	025
08	O ₁₇	026
09	O ₁₈	027

Other:

Resim 1. Division in districts



30. Lütfen aşağıda verilen Resim 2' e bakarak kıyıya kadar rotanızı oluşturan caddelerin numaraları veya isimleri yazınız. *

Choose the numbers of the streets on Picture 2 which create your route to the waterfront

Resim 2. Routes to the waterfront



31. Sizce " kıyı alanı " dediğinizde, aşağıdaki resimlerden hangisi kıyı alanı olarak kasdettiğiniz bölgeyi en yakın tarif eder ? Tek seçenek yapınız. *

Choose the number of the picture where You think the marked area is the nearest to Your

view of waterfront area

Mark only one oval.

OResim 3

O_{Resim} 4

OResim 5

Resim 3. Waterfront area 1



Resim 4. Waterfront area 2



Resim 5. Waterfront area 3



APPENDIX 3: Survey on Waterfront perception, Bar, Montenegro

* Required

Bar, Crna Gora- priobalno podrucje grada

1. Rod *

Mark only one oval.

OŽensko

O_{Muško}

2. Starosna dob *

Age

3. Status zaposlenosti *

Working status. Mark only one oval.

O_{Zaposlen/a}

ONezaposlen/a

4. Na koji način dolazite do priobalnog područja u centru grada vikendom ? *

In which way do you come to the waterfront area in weekends? Mark only one oval.

OAutomobilom

OPješice

OGradskim prevozom

ONe dolazim

5. Na koji način dolazite do priobalnog podrucja u centru grada tokom sedmice ? * In which way do you come to the waterfront area during the week ? *Mark only one oval*.

OAutomobilom

OPješice

OGradskim prevozom

O_{Ne} dolazim

Koji su po vama najznačajniji objekti u priobalnom području gradskog centra? Nabrojite. *

Name the most important buildings near the waterfront

7. Nabrojite aktivnosti kojima se najčešće bavite u priobalnom području gradskog centra Bara. *

Name the activities that you usually do in the waterfront area.

8. Koliko često posjećujete priobalno područje grada? * How often do you visit the waterfront area? *Mark only one oval*.

OSvaki dan

O Jednom u dva dana

O Jednom sedmično

ODva puta sedmično

Oother:

9. Koja od ispod navedenih grupacija najčešće posjećuje priobalno područje centra Bara? *

Which of the groups below do You think visit the waterfront area ? *Check all that apply*.

ODjeca

Odrasli

OStariji

OPorodice

Oother:

10. Ko, po Vašem mišljenu, posjećuje priobalno područje Bara u toku ljetnjih mjeseci?*

Who do You think visits the waterfront in summer ? Check all that apply.

OStanovnici priobalnog regiona

O_{Turisti}

OStanovnici priobalnog regiona i turisti

11. Koji po vama sloj društva provodi najviše vremena u priobalnom dijelu centra Bara? *

Which of the below income groups spend more time on the waterfront? *Check all that apply.*

ODruštvo sa visokim standardom (prihodima)

^ODruštvo sa srednjim standardom (prihodima)

ODruštvo sa niskim standardom (prihodima)

12. Ko, po Vašem mišljenu, posjećuje priobalno područje Bara u ostatku godine? *Who do You think visits the waterfront in the rest of the year ?*Check all that apply.*

OStanovnici priobalnog regiona

OTuristi

OStanovnici priobalnog regiona i turisti

13. Da li je omogućen nesmetan prilaz pješice do priobalnog područja?*

Can you approach easily to the waterfront by walking ?Mark only one oval.

ODa

 O_{Ne}

14. Da li parking i saobraćaj stvaraju probleme na putu ka priobalnom području? * Do parking and traffic pose problems on your way to the waterfront or in the area *Mark only one oval.* O_{Da} O_{Ne}

15. Da li je trenutno uređenje u priobalnom području dovoljno pristupačno i lako za kretanje za sve grupe posjetiliaca ? *

İs the actual design of the waterfront comfortable enough for these groups of visitors? *Mark only one oval per row*.

Grupe posjetilaca	Da	Ne
Stariji		
Majke sa djecom u kolicima		
Osobe sa invaliditetom		

16. Da li je omogućen nesmetan prilaz automobilom do priobalnog područja ? * Can you approach easily to the waterfront by vehicle? *Mark only one oval*.

ODa

ONe

17. Da li je moguće lagano naći put od bilo kojeg mjesta u centru grada do obale (jesu li putanje dovoljno jasne) ? *

Can you find your way to the shore easily from each part of the city center (are the routes clearly marked)? *Mark only one oval*.

O_{Da}

ONe

18.Da li postoji dovoljno ponuđenih aktivnosti na otvorenom u priobalnom dijelu koje bi vas privukle da tu provodite vrijeme ? *

Are there enough outdoor activities on the waterfront to attract you to spend time there? *Mark only one oval.*

ODa

ONe

19. Ako postoje, nabrojite aktivnosti kojima se najčešće bavite u priobalnom području.*

Name the recreational areas you use the most on the waterfront, if any.

20. Da li mislite da je trenutno uređenje priobalnog područja dovoljno dobro da bi Vas privuklo da u njemu provodite svoje slobodno vrijeme? *

Is the design of the waterfront right now good enough to attract you to spend your free time there? *Mark only one oval*.

ODa

ONe

21. Kako opisujete postojece uređenje u priobalnom području? Nabrojati opise ako nedostaju u polju "other". *

How would you describe the actual waterfront Check all that apply.

OKomercijalni	^O Zona stanovanja	O Privlačno
OIstorijski	OAtraktivno	ONeprivlačno
ORekreaciona zona	ONeatraktivno	OPrijatno
(mjesto za zabavu)	OZanimljivo	ONeprijatno
^O Radna zona	ONezanimljivo	Oother:

22. Na skali od 1 do 5, kako procjenjujete potencijal trenutnog uređenja priobalnog područja centra Bara ? *

17) On scale from 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of design. *Mark only one oval*.

$1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5$

najniža ocjena najveća ocjena

1

23. Da li bi ste provodili više vremena u priobalnom području centra Bara kada bi bio preuređen? *

If the design of the waterfront area was improved, would you spend more time there? *Mark only one oval.*

Da

Možda

Ne

24. Na skali od 1 do 5, kako ocjenjujete potencijal trenutnog uređenja priobalne oblasti centra grada u smislu njegove upotrebe u tokiu ljetnjih mjeseci ? *

On scale from 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of its use in summer? *Mark only one oval*.

1 2 3 4 5

0 0 0 0 0

Najniža ocjena Najviša ocjena

25. Da li su, po Vašem mišljenju, stanovnici priobalnog područja uključeni u kreiranju

socijalnog života (društvenim aktivnostima) u tom području? *

Are inhabitants included in creation of the social life on the waterfront? *Mark only one oval.*

O Da

O Ne

26. Na skali od 1 do 5, kako ocjenjujete potencijal trenutnog uređenja priobalne oblasti centra grada u smislu njegove upotrebe u toku godine ne uključujući ljeto ? * On scale from 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the potential of actual waterfront in terms of use in the rest of the year? *Mark only one oval.*

1 2 3 4 5

0 0 0 0 0

Najniža ocjena Najveća ocjena

27. Nabrojite tri vrline priobalnog područja centra grada Bara . *

Name three opportunities of the waterfront

28. Nabrojite tri mane (slabe tačke) priobalnog područja centra grada Bara. *

Name three weaknesses of the waterfront

29. Izaberite brojeve regiona označenih na Slici 1 u kojima obično provodite vrijeme.

Choose the numbers of the areas marked on Picture 1 You usually spend your time in when

on the waterfront

*

Check all that apply.

01	09	017
02	010	018
03	O ₁₁	019
04	012	020
05	O ₁₃	021
06	014	022
07	015	O Other
08	016	

Slika 1. Distrikti



30. Nabrojite nazive ulica označenih na Slici 2 koji čine vašu putanju ka obali. *

Choose the numbers of the areas marked on Picture 1 You usually spend your time in when on the waterfront. *Check all that apply*.

01	O ₁₀	019
02	011	O ₂₀
03	012	O ₂₁
04	013	022
05	O ₁₄	023
06	015	024
07	O ₁₆	OUl. Mila Boskovica
08	017	OUI. Vladimira
09	O ₁₈	Rolovica II

OUI. Vladimira

Rolovica

OUI. Jovana

Stojanovica

OBulevar 24.

Novembra

OUL. Jovana

Tomasevica

OUI. Branka Calovica

O_{Novi} Bulevar

OUl. Marsala Tita

OOther:

Slika 2. Putanja do obale



31. Izaberite Sliku na koja, po Vašem mišljenju, najviše odgovara vašoj predstavi priobalnog područja centra grada Bara *

Choose the number of the picture where you think the marked area is the nearest to your view of waterfront area. *Mark only one oval*.

OSlika 3

OSlika 4

OSlika 5

Slika 3. Priobalna regija 1



Slika 4. Priobalna regija 2



Slika 5. Priobalna regija 3



