54th European Regional Science Association Congress

"Regional Development and Globalisation: Best Practices"

The Tools of Metropolitan Unity in Turkey: A Holistic and Historical Elaboration

Burak Beyhan, PhD,

Mersin University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning

26th August – 29th August 2014 – Saint Petersburg, Russia

The Tools of Metropolitan Unity in Turkey: A Holistic and Historical Elaboration

Burak Beyhan, PhD, Associate Professor
Mersin University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning

Abstract: Existing studies on Turkey usually fail to conceptualize the evolution of the regulations and efforts made for the administration and planning of the metropolitan regions in the country within a historical and comparative framework incorporating all forms of legal arrangements and tools pertaining to the very concept of establishment of metropolitan unity. Within this context, the aim of this study is to shed some light on the historical evolution of the problem of metropolitan unity in Turkey within a comparative and holistic perspective. For this purpose, in this paper, firstly early practices and attempts for the expansion of the administrative and planning boundaries of growing cities in the world will be reviewed together with the earlier considerations devoted to the delimitation of metropolitan regions. After elaborating the earlier attempts and considerations made for the establishment of the metropolitan municipalities and the delimitation of metropolitan regions with particular reference to the experience of the US whose metropolitan administration and planning model was dominant in Turkey in the 1980s, the tools employed for the establishment of metropolitan unity and the problems associated with the respective tools will be historically reviewed within a comparative perspective. Elaborating the tools employed for the establishment of metropolitan unity and the problems associated with the respective tools, all the efforts made and the tools employed in Turkey to secure metropolitan unity will be sketched by revealing the interconnections between the respective tools and efforts within a historical and evolutionary perspective. After examining the evolution and articulation of the tools employed for the establishment of regional unity required for the administration and planning of metropolitan regions and conurbations in Turkey, some concluding remarks will be drawn with reference to the overall framework constructed for the evolution of the tools used for the establishment of unity in metropolitan regions. What is particularly evident from this study is that pure legislative tools are not usually capable of securing metropolitan unity due to their lack of not only a communal point of view, but also a scientific point of view in the determination of the set of criteria that can be used in order to delimit metropolitan regions or secure regional integrity for a metropolitan area.

Keywords: metropolitan unity; annexation; spatial development plans; Turkey.

1. Introduction

The number of local governments in many developed countries has steadily decreased since the 1950s owing to the reforms initiated for the restructuring of local governments, which signals the formation of larger municipalities in the respective countries. As a result of the respective reforms, the number of local government units in the UK, Belgium and the former West Germany remarkably decreased during the 1970s and 1980s (Mutlu, 1989: 21-22; Akdede and Acartürk, 2005: 8; Voets and De Rynck, 2008: 455). Overall, except for Portugal, Italy and Turkey, between 1950 and 1992 the number of municipalities in the European and other developed countries has decreased as a result of the local government restructuring and reform studies conducted in the respective countries for the consolidation of the small municipalities (Topal and Özyurt, 1999; Mutlu, 1989).

In contrast to these attempts in developed countries, the number of municipalities, districts and provinces in Turkey has increased tremendously during the last three decades. For example, the number of municipalities have increased from 1704 in 1984 to 3215 in 1999, and to 3225 in 2005 (Akdede and Acartürk, 2005: 9).[1] In a similar vein, the number of districts increased from 558 in 1984 to 793 in 1999. The most dramatic increase was experienced in the number of town municipalities. Indeed, the number of town municipalities increased from 1052 in 1984 to 2265 in 1999. As Akdede and Acartürk (2005: 9) argue, there is no doubt that this increase owes very much to the political atmosphere of the time, not the economic considerations that dictate an opposite practice. Especially, the promises given by the politicians during their election campaign were one of the factors for this dramatic increase in the number of local governments in Turkey. The fact that for a long time period the population threshold required to establish a municipality in Turkey was very low (only 2000) also facilitated the proliferation of the small municipalities particularly within the metropolitan areas and along the coastal areas of the country where the speculations for urban land is very high owing the rent expectations.

Nevertheless, with the introduction of recent laws, boundaries of the existing greater municipalities have been extended and the corporate status of the villages located inside the area defined by the laws have been abolished and annexed to the neighboring greater municipalities. The first one, the Greater Municipality Law put into practice in 2004, delineates the geographical extent of a metropolitan area in the form of concentric zones defined according to the population it currently accommodates. With the introduction of the respective law (Law no. 5216), the boundaries of İstanbul and Kocaeli Greater Municipalities have been set as the provincial boundaries in which the municipalities are located. The second one, Law no. 6360

was put into practice in 2012. With the introduction of Law no. 6360, the boundaries of 14 existing greater municipalities in Turkey have been set as the provincial boundaries in which the municipalities are located, and also 14 new greater municipalities have been established.

Parallel to these, in recent years the minimum number of population required for the designation of a settlement as municipality also increased. Nevertheless, it seems that some of the problems still continue. What is most problematic in Turkey is actually the delimitation of the metropolitan regions and municipalities in a proper and scientific way (Beyhan, 2010). Indeed, after a long period of lack of unity in the administration and planning of metropolitan regions in Turkey due to the underbounding of metropolitan areas, now we are witnessing a period of the overbounding of metropolitan areas. Whereas in other European countries it is observed that there is a significant interest on both the determination of the optimum size of the municipalities, and also the delimitation of the respective areas. In this respect, although the recent annexation regulations in Turkey have attracted the interest of both planners and political scientists, the issue is not properly elaborated within a historical and comparative perspective by taking into considerations the earlier regulations employed and the practices experienced both in Turkey and other countries in order to preserve the metropolitan unity.

Within this context, in this paper, firstly early practices and attempts for the expansion of the administrative and planning boundaries of growing cities will be reviewed together with the earlier considerations devoted to the delimitation of metropolitan regions. Subsequently, after reviewing the tools employed for the establishment of metropolitan unity and the problems associated with the respective tools, all the efforts made and the tools employed in Turkey to secure metropolitan unity will be sketched by revealing the interconnections between the respective tools and efforts within a historical and evolutionary perspective. Consequently, some concluding remarks will be drawn by re-contextualizing the evolution of the tools of metropolitan unity in Turkey with reference to the overall framework constructed for the evolution of the tools used for the establishment of regional unity required for the administration and planning of metropolitan areas.

2. Earlier Attempts and Considerations for the Establishment of the Metropolitan Municipalities and the Delimitation of Metropolitan Regions

During the 19th century that witnessed all the major problems leading to the institutionalization of planning as a discipline in the subsequent century, the need for the establishment of metropolitan municipalities became evident first in the US. Indeed, one of the most interesting countries for the analysis of historical development of the regulations and

practices designed for metropolitan unity is the US where the root of the respective regulations and practices can be traced back to as early as the beginning of 19th century. Accordingly, the first attempts for the establishment of metropolitan unity in terms of planning and administration of metropolitan regions in the US began in 1822 in Boston which was followed by Philadelphia in 1854, New York first in 1860s and later in 1897, and New Orleans in 1874 (Weber, 1904: 29; Olmsted, 1914: 173-174, 176-177; Geray, 1999: 95). Towards the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, the necessity for or practice of a metropolitan regional unity was also evident for other big cities all over the world such as Detroit, Chicago, Baltimore, Denver, Toronto, Berlin, London, Tokyo, Ottawa and San Francisco (Munro, 1912a: 84, 92, 102-103; Munro, 1912b: 434-448; Geray, 1999).[2]

Although both in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey there were some attempts similar to the one given above, the scope and extent of the respective attempts were not similar to the one observed in the Western context. First of all, the emergence of the municipal administration in the Ottoman Empire was too late. One of the earlier metropolitan administration models in the Ottoman Empire was introduced for İstanbul in 1869 with a regulation called *Der Saadet İdare-i Belediye Nizamnamesi* which extended the geographical extent of the municipal administration in the city to include the whole metropolitan area (Keleş, 1987: 96). In the Republican Era, again it is observed that until 1956 there was a joint administration for İstanbul Municipality and Province (Keleş, 1987: 97; Geray, 1999: 61; Yeter, 2002: 43). The respective administration, whose head was the İstanbul's governor appointed by the central government and also served as mayor of İstanbul, was established in line with the Municipal Law number 1580, dated 1930. Apart from these efforts made for İstanbul, there was no major attempt directed towards to the administration and planning problems of the greater cities in Turkey owing to the fact that until the end of the 2nd World War there was only a few big cities in the country.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the idea of administration and planning of cities within a metropolitan or regional context particularly became concrete in the study of Geddes (1915) with the introduction of the concepts of 'city-region' and 'conurbations'. By conceptualizing 'city-region' as agglomeration of interconnected urban areas, Geddes (1915: 46) points to the conurbations of cities, towns and villages overflowing and absorbing the adjacent country. While the concept of 'city-region' had been further enriched by Friedmann (1956) with reference to the concepts of planning region and functional region, it is important to notice that Friedmann (1956: 7) elaborates the concept of city-region without any reference to the earlier usage of the concept by Geddes (1915) despite the fact that they both employ the concept in order to refer to the same socio-spatial process. At the beginning of the 20th century

after observing the problems associated with the administration and planning of the city-regions, Geddes (1915: 43-44) suggests that "there should be, and that speedily and increasingly, amicable conference among all the representatives, rustic and urban, of the various cities and county-regions concerned; … [because] old Borough Councils and County Councils can no longer separately cope with what are becoming so plainly yet larger Regional and Inter-Regional tasks, like those of water supply and sanitation for choice, but obviously others also".

While Geddes (1915) was successful in revealing the need to administer and plan growing cities within a regional context, he was unable to specify a proper method for the delimitation of the boundaries of the respective region. For this purpose, Geddes (1915) proposes that population maps can be used to determine the boundaries of conurbations. Yet, he does not introduce any objective criteria for the delimitation of the respective conurbations. One of the earlier attempts for the delimitation of a metropolitan area in a scientific way was made for Cincinnati in 1930s by "the Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research which was instituted to learn the natural limits of the metropolitan district, and which included such factors as population, residence of city workers, traffic density, delivery areas, utility services, switching areas for the railways, social service districts, and property valuations" (Lowrie, 1936: 951). Although some of the factors (such as the residence of workers and delivery areas) used in the respective study signals the employment of functional regions for the delimitation of metropolitan area, it is only after the contribution of Wirth (1942) it became more apparent that functional regions can be taken as a proper basis for the delimitation of both planning regions and administrative hinterlands for the emerging and growing metropolitan areas. Parallel to Wirth (1942) and Friedmann (1956), today one can easily identify for example Rhine-Ruhr area in Germany (Knapp, 1998) and Randstad Holland (Salet, 2006) as illustrative examples of city-regions characterized by being functional regions.

3. The Tools Used for Securing Metropolitan Unity and the Problems Associated with the Respective Tools

If all the tools employed for the provision of the metropolitan cities with some sort of administrative and planning unity are historically analyzed, it is observed that a number of solutions has been devised for the establishment of metropolitan unity. One of the tools that have been widely used all over the world is the annexation of the adjacent territory to the central municipality. One of the main rationale behind the annexation practices is the fact that it is always more costly and inefficient for adjacent municipalities to sustain municipal services such as construction of a proper transportation network and technical infrastructure

by employing their own resources rather than providing the same services by combining their power (Baker, 1927; Grant, 1955: 96-97; Wiewel and Schaffer, 2001: 596).

Nevertheless, those villages and small & medium-sized municipalities located within the hinterland of a large city usually resist to their incorporation or annexation to the respective large city (Beyhan, 2000). This was particularly what had been experienced in majority of the large cities in Europe and the North America at the beginning of the 20th century (Baker, 1927; Lowrie, 1936; Wirth, 1942; Clerk et al, 1942). And today it is still one of the important problems in the administration and planning of big metropolitan regions such as Paris (Subra and Newman, 2008: 532). The failure of the administrative reform of Dutch government in the creation of "urban provinces" also seems to stem from similar problems (Salet, 2006). Particularly, in the US, many of the adjoining cities not only have resisted to their incorporation into the central city, but also have zoned against the respective city by adopting rigorous building regulations that usually excluded industrial and commercial activities (Baker, 1927: 38; Lowrie, 1936). Particularly those adjacent communities who are as old as, or even older than, the larger central city, and being capable of delivering satisfactory local government have a civic pride in their own municipalities, which leads to enormous opposition to any annexation or incorporation proposal (Baker, 1927: 39; Clerk et al., 1942: 68; Blaydon and Gilford, 1977: 1059). A similar kind of opposition in Turkey also affected the fate of the greater municipalities having a population less than 1,000,000.[3]

Particularly in the US, because of adjoining cities' rigorous building regulations excluding industrial and commercial activities, the suburban city has become a pleasant residential district while the larger city is forced "to provide the economic facilities for the whole area" (Baker, 1927: 39). Combined with the considerations devoted to the costs of the urban services required by the new areas, the central city is not also willing to annex the adjoining territory (Hein and Hady, 1966: 702). Indeed, in terms of the management of the physical growth of the urban areas, the lack of ample local jurisdictional authority provides builders and land developers with an opportunity to construct housing projects isolated from existing development, which eventually leads to a 'leap frog' growth creating problems in the provision of municipal services due to the increasing expenditures made by the central municipality and a decrease in tax revenues because of the move of the more affluent residents to the suburbs outside the boundaries of the city and replacement of the respective residents with poorer migrants (Bacon, 1940: 72-79, 86; Grant, 1955: 96-97; Hein and Hady, 1966: 703-704; Anonymous[4], 1970: 914; Blaydon and Gilford, 1977: 1059).

As discussed in the next section, this process of mushrooming of small municipalities within the hinterland of metropolitan areas actually exists in virtually every urban area irrespective of its size, and within a different context it is also typical of partly what has been experienced in Turkey. Overall, while the annexation of a village or small municipality to an existing large central municipality is the proper procedure for securing the administrative and planning unity in a metropolitan region, it inevitably leads to a situation in which, on the one hand, local residents usually oppose to the annexation of their territory to the central city by arguing that the incorporation of their territory as a separate municipality will be a more democratic practice, and, on the other hand, the central city does not also want to annex the territory by arguing that it could not afford for the urban services required by the new areas. What is further problematic in annexation practices, as it is exemplified in the US, was the existence of state or provincial boundaries inside a metropolitan region (Baker, 1927: 42-43; Grant, 1955).

Apart from annexation, another solution to the metropolitan unity that is required for the planning and administration of large cities is the provision of the city with some sort of extraterritorial jurisdiction (Baker, 1927: 40; Woodbury, 1928: 320; Grant, 1955: 99; Beckman and Ingraham, 1965: 98; Anonymous, 1970: 913-914). For instance, a limited planning jurisdiction expanding the plan of a city to three miles beyond its limits was available for the cities in the US outside their legal boundaries (Baker, 1927: 40; Woodbury, 1928: 320). Nevertheless, there was a stern political impediment against to the granting of extensive extraterritorial power to the central city in a metropolitan region owing to the fact that the area located outside the central city was actually governed without any political representation and it was also complicated to finance such governmental activities (Grant, 1955: 99; Anonymous, 1970: 914). Thus, extraterritorial authority can not be considered as a permanent tool for the integration of a metropolitan region.

When the pattern of fiscal behavior exhibited by the central city is further analyzed in terms of the motivation for extraterritorial zoning practices, it is observed that the respective pattern is imprinted by what Lehavi (2006: 940-941) calls as the local government parochialism that is associated not only with the exclusionary zoning patterns “keeping out low-revenue” and “high-expenditure residents”, but also pro-development land uses (such as “[z]oning an area for light or heavy industry, outlet shopping malls” and car dealerships) that may “generate environmental costs such as pollution, noise, and congestion, alongside economic costs such as reduced commercial activity at adjacent competing sites”, albeit they “may create a rich source of tax revenue and generate social benefits, such as new employment”. The problem with this

kind of zoning practice is that as “adversely influenced outsiders have no right to vote in municipal elections or do not otherwise possess political power in the deciding jurisdiction, local government officials have no incentive to refrain from engaging in "fiscal illusion" through pushing costs outside the border” (Lehavi, 2006: 942).

Another tool that has been used in order to secure metropolitan unity is the establishment of ad hoc authorities for the provision of the municipal services required within a metropolitan region. The respective authorities had been heavily employed both in the North America and Europe during the early years of the 20th century (Baker, 1927; Lowrie, 1936: 951; Grant, 1955: 100). For example, both in the US and the UK, in general, particular needs of a metropolitan region were usually met by establishing special authorities that were designed to administer one particular service through the collaboration of the existing governmental bodies mainly in the form of ad hoc organizations (Baker, 1927: 41-43; Lowrie, 1936: 951-952; Grant, 1955: 100).

It is interesting to note that among the ad hoc authorities regional planning have particularly received a great deal of attention. For example, Grant (1955) considers the regional planning as a tool that can be employed in order to solve “the state-line problem in metropolitan areas”. Beckman and Ingraham (1965: 83-85) also remarks the potential of regional planning and metropolitan planning agencies in the planning and administration of the metropolitan areas. As Grant (1955: 103) notes, regional planning can help us promote “citizen thinking and action in terms of a whole area” and develop “on the part of the citizenry of a metropolitan consciousness which transcends state and local boundary lines”. Actually, one of the earlier considerations for the employment of planning as a tool for the achievement of “a more coordinated or unified public policy for a metropolitan region” can also be observed in Wirth (1942) who suggests that metropolitan region should be taken not only as an administrative, but also, and necessarily, as a planning unit.

In terms of ad hoc authorities, the experiment being conducted in the US is particularly instructive for the fact that if one attempts to solve all the metropolitan problems in this way by forming separate ad hoc commissions for each particular urban service it could lead to a variety of overlapping commissions and consequently, as Baker (1927: 43) remarks, “the result might be worse than to remain within the political boundaries”. In other words, the basic problem in metropolitan administration and planning is actually the provision of the metropolitan region with some sort of centralized control that can only be achieved through the establishment of “a government structure extending over the whole range of the problems”, which particularly becomes evident in the administration of metropolitan regions divided by state or provincial borders (Baker, 1927: 44-45; Lowrie, 1936: 953).

These first experiments with the employment of ad hoc authorities, extraterritorial jurisdictions and annexation practices seem to have led to a conviction in the US that metropolitan regions can be best governed by employing some sort of a federated government. In fact, this ideas was already evident in the 1920s in the study of Baker (1927: 48) who remarks that although the most efficient method for the establishment of metropolitan unity could be "the consolidation of all local authorities into a single government with centralized control", a strict form of annexation was actually impossible if the adjacent communities have a strong local spirit and tradition of democracy. Baker (1927: 48) suggests that "[t]he most workable plan seems to be a combination of the two: a government for the whole area, with limited powers; and the preservation of the existing units of government for local purposes".

Nevertheless, what is evident from Lowrie's (1936: 950) study on Cincinnati is that this suggestion is not also workable if the necessary precautions are not taken for the delegation of the powers that are limited to activities involving the whole region from the various municipalities to the regional government. Overall, municipal federalism as a model of administration and planning of metropolitan regions seems to owe its existence to the federated government structure of the US. And it seems that, as it will be discussed in the next section in a more detail context, those experts who prepared Turkish model were also heavily inspired from this model. Indeed, Eke (1985: 52) who was invited to the commission constituted by the Secretariat of National Security Council for the administration of metropolitan areas reveals that municipal federalism was favored by both the respective commission and the ones formed after in Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East (PAITME).

4. The Evolution of the Tools and Regulations Employed for the Administration and Planning of Metropolitan Regions and Conurbations in Turkey

In Turkish literature the evolution of the administration and planning of metropolitan regions and conurbations is usually analyzed with reference to three consecutive periods mainly defined according to the legal arrangements directly introduced for the administration of the greater municipalities in Turkey. Accordingly, the first era covers the period between the late Ottoman time and the establishment of the Greater Municipality for İstanbul in 1984, and the second era begins in 1984 with the introduction of Law no. 3030 and ends in 2005 with the introduction of Law no. 5216. The third and last era that still continues starts in 2005. Unfortunately, this periodization does not consider the other efforts made for both the administration and planning of metropolitan cities in Turkey. For example, it completely

omits the regional planning studies and metropolitan planning bureaus established in the 1960s and 1970s for the planning of the metropolitan cities. It also omits the earlier regulations introduced for İstanbul, which is elaborated in the second section, the local government unions (local authority associations), and adjacent area regulation.

Parallel to the experience of other countries, the need for a metropolitan administration and planning in Turkey became evident when a multitude of small and independent urban agglomerations emerged around the big cities such as İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir particularly after the 2nd World War. Since the boundaries of the central city could not be enlarged timely, the villages and settlements adjacent to it usually granted the municipality status and threatened the metropolitan unity. In 1977, there were "34 municipalities adjacent to İstanbul and 13 to İzmir" (Tekeli and Gülöksüz, 1977: 162). Although similar kinds of problems, as noted in introduction, gave rise to a series of reforms in Europe leading to reductions in the number of local government units, in Turkey there was an opposite trend.

The urban agglomerations around the big cities were not only in the form of independent municipalities and villages, but also in the form of squatter housing. Moreover, those small municipalities mushrooming on the outskirts of metropolitan centers were characteristically different from the ones observed in the advanced capitalist countries. Accordingly, although in the respective countries the property tax revenue of the central municipality was small compared with the adjacent small municipalities owing to the fact that they accommodated more residential units, and usually upper and middle income groups (Bacon, 1940: 72-79; Wirth, 1942: 177; Grant, 1955: 96-97; Anonymous, 1970: 914; Blaydon and Gilford, 1977: 1059; Wiewel and Schaffer, 2001: 594, 597), in Turkey the areas surrounding the central city was usually inhabited by low income groups in the form of squatter housing areas (Tekeli and Gülöksüz, 1977: 161-162).

Several tools have been employed in Turkey in order to secure metropolitan unity for the growing cities particularly in the provision of municipal services. For example, parallel to the other countries, beginning from the early years of the Turkish Republic onwards one can observe the establishment of local government unions as ad hoc authorities in Turkey for the provision of urban services or technical infrastructure to larger areas comprising several settlements each of which has their own municipal or administrative bodies. Although the number of the respective unions established for the joint provision of mainly water, roads, electricity and telephone services was 34 till the enforcement of the constitution of 1961 (Köseoğlu, 2010: 86), with the introduction of the constitution of 1961 the number of local government unions increased as it was expected from the new constitution (see Kazancı (1983: 49) for a short list of the respective unions). Indeed, due to the definitional restrictions imposed on the administration of the settlements in

Turkey, the constitution of 1961 was not appropriate for the establishment of metropolitan governments covering several local government units (Eke, 1985: 52; Keleş, 1987: 98). During the period between 1960 and 1980, "only a few municipalities attempted to amalgamate in order to fulfill their tasks better" (Keleş, 1987: 98). It was particularly because of these restrictions that the first efforts made for the planning and administration of the metropolitan areas in Turkey was mainly limited to the employment of local government unions.[5]

As the respective unions were necessarily established to perform some predefined functions, they were not actually a substitute for the metropolitan administrations that can take the responsibility for the whole of the public services within a metropolitan area (Kazancı, 1983: 48; Keleş, 1987: 98). Although several draft bills were prepared for the administration of metropolitan areas in Turkey during the 1970s, after the military coup d'etat in the political life of Turkey in 1980, in contrast to the proposals of the respective bills the corporate status of the small local governments located within the hinterland of metropolitan municipalities was abolished and annexed to the neighboring greater municipalities in line with the National Security Council's decision number 34 in order to secure the metropolitan unity required to provide the people living in the metropolitan areas with the services such as electricity, water, sewerage and transportation in an efficient way and to control the respective areas properly (Keleş, 1987: 99-100; Geray, 1999: 72).

Subsequently, in December 1981 the Annexation Law no. 2561 was put into act by the National Security Council. In line with the respective law, the metropolitan areas were administratively and spatially reorganized in order to "have the fundamental metropolitan services such as energy, water for all uses, sewage, transportation and public works provided within an integrating plan efficiently and sufficiently and in such a way that the services are in harmony with one another" (Keleş, 1987: 100). According to the law no. 2561, the settlements adjacent to the municipalities having a population over 300,000 would be annexed to the respective municipalities if they are located within a radius of 3 kilometers from the fringe of the cities concerned (Yeter, 2002: 44). In terms of extraterritorial jurisdiction, as discussed in the previous section, similar kinds of criteria can also be observed in other countries.[6]

After the enforcement of the Constitution of 1982, for the first time in Turkey, the creation of special administrative arrangements required for the planning and management of large urban areas has also been allowed in line with the Article 127 of the constitution. As Keleş (1987: 102) notes, Article 127 was actually "a response to the need which has been felt for the last 25 years to have special administrations formed in metropolises". In the subsequent years, the greater municipalities came into existence in line with the laws put into force after the

Constitution of 1982. Accordingly, following the foundation of the new government in 1983, on January 1984 law no. 2972 "concerning Local Elections paved the way for the formation of a metropolitan council in any province which had more than one district within central municipal boundaries, and of district municipal councils in districts" (Keleş, 1987: 102).

In 1984 there were only 3 cities that were eligible for the establishment of greater municipalities: İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir. Thus, the practical importance of local government unions has continued for the administration and planning of the middle sized metropolitan areas that were not allowed to be re-arranged as greater municipalities. Yet, as discussed in the previous section, these kinds of ad hoc solutions that are also widespread in other countries including the most developed ones are not capable of dealing with the problems of the metropolitan areas in the long term owing to the lack of authority possessed by the traditional administrative units such as municipalities and provinces.

Although the Constitutions of both 1961 and 1982 in Turkey made it possible to establish local government unions for the provision of metropolitan areas with the urban services required for the maintenance of daily life in the respective areas, the first proper law (Local Authority Unions Law of no. 5355) regulating the establishment of the respective unions has been put into force only in 2005, which eventually led to the establishment of the local government unions prior to 2005 by making use of other laws[7]. Nevertheless, the regulations introduced in the respective laws were not appropriate for the establishment of local government unions as incorporated bodies, albeit 137 local government unions were established till 1992 with the decisions of the cabinet (Yeter, 1992). In fact, neither the activities performed by the local government unions has been at the desired level (Karaer and Öktem, 1988: 57; Eke, 1985: 60) nor the authority and administrative functions possessed by the respective unions has been adequate in meeting the current needs that can only be addressed by a proper metropolitan administration (Kazancı, 1983: 48-49; Dilek, 1998: 95). Köseoğlu (2010: 87) argues that Law of no. 5355 is also not successful in the establishment of the local government unions capable of solving the problems of the regions concerned due to the uncertainties about the status of unions in the constitution and the lack of enforcement for the financial regulations introduced in the law. Further, in contrast to the previous regulations, the law allows for the establishment of local government unions only for a single purpose or service (Genç and Özgür, 2008: 220).

Nevertheless, as the Greater Municipality Law and Law no. 6360 could not solve the problems associated with administration and planning of the middle sized cities or urban conurbations, other regulations that can be employed for the administration and planning of the respective areas are still important tools for the achievement of socio-spatial unity required for

the planning and administration of the urban conurbations. In addition to the local government unions, adjacent area regulation has also been actively employed in Turkey for both planning and administration of the middle sized and fast growing cities. The first proper reference to the adjacent area regulation as an active tool of establishment of administrative and planning unity for the middle sized cities can be found in Genç and Özgür (2008), albeit some earlier considerations can also be seen in Geray (1999).

Overall, the tools that have been employed for the provision of conurbations omitted in the Greater Municipality Law with some sort of administrative and planning unity can be listed as following; (1) the annexation of adjoining municipalities and villages to the central municipality in line with the Law no. 5393, (2) the establishment of local government unions, (3) the declaration of the adjacent areas for the growing municipalities, (4) the preparation of upper scale spatial plans for the regions covering conurbations, and (5) inter-governmental protocols and collaborations as ad hoc organizations (Geray, 1999; Genç and Özgür, 2008: 200-201).

The employment of upper scale plans as a tool in the establishment of metropolitan unity in Turkey can actually be traced back to the first regional planning practices and Spatial Development Plans (Çevre Düzeni Planı – ÇDP) that emerged and evolved during the 1960s and 1970s. Beginning from 1960s onwards, the central government began to be involved in the planning process of the areas comprising several settlements and sometimes provinces. The first of these kinds of plans was Eastern Marmara Preliminary Regional Plan (*Doğu Marmara Bölgesi Ön Planı*) prepared by Marmara Regional Planning Organization of the Ministry of Development and Housing in the early 1960s for the metropolitan region dominated by İstanbul (Geray, 1999: 63; Tekel, 2002: 48). In the subsequent years, the Ministry of Development and Housing established a Metropolitan Planning Bureau (MPB) in İstanbul in 1966, and in the subsequent years the second and third offices were opened in 1968 and 1969, respectively, in İzmir and Ankara in order to prepare the master plans of these regions (Türkoglu, 1992: 18-19; Arkon and Gülerman 1995: 15; Altaban, 2002: 33; Ecemiş Kılıç, 2009: 1286). The respective bureaus worked in coordination with the Metropolitan Planning Office of the Ministry of Development and Housing in the production of master plans for metropolitan regions (Keleş, 1987: 98; Tekel, 2002).[8]

Metropolitan Planning Office was one of the four offices established under the Directorate of Planning and Construction of the Ministry of Development and Housing for the identification of existing and prospective metropolitan centers, the specification of the principles and methods that would be employed in the preparation of the master plans for the respective centers, the preparation of the respective master plans and the investment programs

required for the implementation of the master plans together with the studies aiming at the solution of transportation problems in metropolitan regions (Tekel, 2002: 48).[9] MPBs were always reluctant to prepare and approve a static plan; instead they favored a planning approach which is dynamic and comprehensive. In spite of these efforts, Bureaus were unable to direct some of the developments in the metropolitan areas due to the existence of many independent small municipalities and villages inside the metropolitan regions (Tekel, 2002: 50). For Geray (1999: 95), this is the principle reason behind the failure of planning attempts in metropolitan regions. As Geray (1997: 307) insistently emphasizes, a planning exercise for a metropolitan region can not be successful unless a proper administrative unity is also achieved for the respective region.

Actually, to a large extent MPBs became successful in the coordination of the interactions between different organizations in terms of actualization of some projects until the end of 1970s. Yet, they lost the support of both the Ministry and municipalities at the beginning of the 1980s when the Ministry of Development and Housing began to engage in international projects for the planning of metropolitan regions in Turkey. The active engagement and responsibilities of the Ministry in the respective international projects supported by World Bank and OECD hindered the studies conducted by MPBs (Tekel, 2002: 50). The conflict between the bureaus and politicians were also instrumental in the decreasing importance assigned to MPBs. Overall, the period between 1965 and 1984 can be defined as the golden years of metropolitan planning in Turkey in terms of planning of the big cities within their regional integrity created by the daily mutual relations between a metropolitan center and the settlements surrounding it. Despite their imposition by the central government as it is emphasized by Tekeli and Gülöksüz (1977: 172), Tekel (2002: 52) notes that the metropolitan regions were actually delimited by MPBs in a more successful and scientifically proper way compared with the recent laws pertaining to the establishment of the greater municipalities in Turkey. A large part of the areas included within the metropolitan regions by MPBs was later left outside the greater municipalities established during the 1980s.

Together with the first adjacent area practices these early regional planning experiences had paved the way for a specific type of upper scale spatial plan in Turkey. This plan called as Spatial Development Plan (SDP) owes its existence to the studies conducted by MPBs and particularly for adjacent area practices. Indeed, it is observed that for a certain period of time the earlier forms of the respective plans were called as Adjacent Area Plans (*Mücavir Saha Planı*). In the early years the applications made by the municipalities for the adjacent areas were evaluated by employing a spatial planning perspective that involved the production of a map showing the growth direction and

boundaries of the adjacent areas of the respective municipality by taking into account the all findings, justifications, objectives and requests of the municipalities (Tekinbaş, 2001: 57-58).

There are lots of these kinds of adjacent area approvals made by the Ministry between the second half of the 1960s and the early 1970s. With the introduction of the Law no. 1605 in 1972 an additional article was appended to the 26th article of the law no. 6785. The term metropolitan planning was first introduced in the respective article which was very similar to the 9th article of 3194. According to the 26th and 29th articles of the law no. 6785, the Ministry could prepare development (*imar*) and settlement plans for the metropolitan areas covering more than one municipality (such as coastal areas) without taking into account the decisions of the municipalities and other administrative units actually responsible for the respective areas. These plans were generally prepared for the fast growing cities or groups of settlements usually located along the coastal zones within their regional integrity and generally inside the adjacent areas that were also simultaneously approved by the Ministry. Majority of these plans was prepared during the 1970s and 1980s (TAU, 2000; Tekinbaş, 2001: 57-59). As a form of spatial planning, the respective plans are considered to be imperative over the lower scale spatial plans that should obey the decisions taken in them.[10]

Particularly with the introduction of the Municipal Income Law no. 2464 in 1981, adjacent areas became remarkable sources of income for the municipalities in terms of expansion of their geographical base for tax revenues (Meriç, 1980: 3; Tekinbaş, 1992: 10-11; Beyhan, 2000). According to the respective law all the municipal taxes and majority of the levies charged by the municipalities can be collected within both municipal boundaries and adjacent areas. While Meriç (1980: 3) anticipates that respective law would lead to a situation in which municipalities rush to extend their adjacent areas, and the villagers or people residing in the adjacent areas resist to this, the transformation of the adjacent area practice into a tool of struggle between villages and town municipalities could not be prevented. In terms of gerrymandering and the will to increase the revenues of municipalities this problem was also widespread in other advanced capitalist countries (Hein and Hady, 1966: 699; Anonymous, 1970: 916; Briffault, 1996: 1128, 1134; Cameron, 2004; Edwards, 2008: 121-123).

5. Concluding Remarks

Existing studies on Turkey usually fail to conceptualize the evolution of the regulations and efforts made for the administration and planning of the metropolitan regions in the country within a historical and comparative framework incorporating all forms of legal arrangements and tools pertaining to the very concept of establishment of metropolitan unity. In an attempt to

prevent these pitfalls, in this paper all the legal arrangements and tools that can be employed to maintain metropolitan unity through enlargements of the boundaries of local-regional governments and other means are historically reviewed within a comparative perspective.

Although the delineation of a metropolitan region is scientifically well defined in terms of establishment of regional unity required for a given territory, the tools employed in order to secure metropolitan unity for the administration and planning of urban conurbations in the delivery of services required in the respective areas are not usually capable of addressing the issue in a proper way. A number of problems are associated with the tools employed and efforts made for the establishment of metropolitan regions. While the easiest way to solve the problems associated with the government of the metropolitan areas seems to be the creation of ad hoc authorities (such as the local government unions employed in Turkey), they don't provide us with permanent solutions to the problem.

One can prefer to find a permanent solution to the problem by employing annexation regulations and practices. Nevertheless, the respective tool is also associated with some problems. In the case of annexation, main problem stems from the fact that a number of small and even sometimes medium sized cities may co-exist within a metropolitan area surrounding the large central city. Although the respective cities are economically depending upon the large city, they are politically independent and resist against the annexation of their territory to the central city. From the very beginning both in Turkey and other countries it is observed that main problem hindering the formation of the metropolitan unity has been this struggle between the town municipalities and the greater municipalities.

The struggle between the central city and the adjoining small municipalities actually reveals the famous trade-off between a more democratic and efficient system of administration. The respective trade-off has been one of the important themes in both planning and political science as a dilemma over many years. Local decision making has always been thought to be more democratic and more responsive to the local needs. Indeed, as "they have a smaller polity" and associated with a feeling of community, local governments encourage democratic practices better than the larger jurisdictions do. That's why it is observed that there is a tendency in many countries to delegate power over local affairs to locally elected bodies because of the capability of local and regional governments to meet communally eccentric needs and to calm tensions stemming from lifestyle choices.

Although for an efficient provision of municipal services formation of greater municipalities is a desirable end and in this respect one can easily argue to give the administrative agency more power to realize the respective end, this does not readily mean

that municipalities should be given unilateral power to annex unincorporated contiguous territory. In Turkey, the problem is much more complicated by the law makers because of the delimitation of metropolitan regions in the form of concentric zones defined according to the population they currently accommodate (the Law no. 5216) or the delimitation of metropolitan regions with the provincial boundaries (the Law no. 6360). Instead, metropolitan regions should be delimited by taking into account the interconnections between parts in a region. Overall, law makers are far from an active collaboration with regional and political scientists in the establishment of metropolitan unity. Future studies on the problem of metropolitan unity may reveal the proper methods of delimitation of the metropolitan regions.

Notes

[1] Here it is important to note that after the military coup d'etat in the political life of Turkey in 1980, as a result of the the National Security Council's decision number 34 "the number of municipalities in Turkey went down from 1700 in 1980 to 1580 in 1981" (Keleş, 1987: 100).

[2] As these attempts were mostly directed towards the enlargement of the municipal boundaries, they can not be taken as a direct step for the formation of first metropolitan models. For example, the establishment of a greater municipality system in Toronto actually dates back to 1953 (Eke, 1985: 51).

[3] In the earlier drafts of the Greater Municipality Law (Law no. 5216), for the greater municipalities having a population less than 1,000,000 the boundaries were proposed to be delimited by drawing a circle around the existing governorship building with a radius of 25 km. As Tarsus, one of the oldest cities in Çukurova region, is located within the respective radius drawn around the governorship building of Mersin Greater Municipality, those politicians who are the fellowmen of the respective city lobbied against the respective law and, at last, succeeded to decrease the radius defined for the metropolitan cities covering Mersin to 20 km.

[4] This study was conducted by the Law Journal with the help of Professor David Trubek of the Yale Law School.

[5] In this respect, the imprints of the definitional restrictions imposed by the constitution of 1961 can also be observed in the draft bills that were prepared during the 1970s to reshape the form and method of local administration in order to increase the effectiveness of management of metropolitan regions (Eke, 1985: 52; Geray, 1999: 71-72; Yeter, 2002: 43-44). Accordingly, the metropolitan administration was named as "metropolitan service unions" in the respective bills in line with the article 116 of the constitution of 1961 (see for example "Metropolitan Hizmet Birliği" draft bill prepared by the Ministry of Interior Affairs in 1972, "Büyük Şehir Birliği" draft bill prepared by the Ministry of Public Works and Resettlement in 1975, and "Büyük Kent Birliği" draft bill prepared jointly by the Ministry of Interior Affairs, and the Ministry of Public Works and Resettlement in 1980). The respective unions would be charged with not only the planning of the metropolitan regions covering the municipalities and villages but also provision of the respective regions with the technical infrastructures required to sustain daily life (Yeter, 2002: 44).

[6] Only eight cities (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana, Bursa, Gaziantep, Konya and Eskisehir) could benefit from this rearrangement as they have a population of 300,000 and above (Keleş, 1987: 100).

[7] Such as the Village Law no. 442, Municipal Law no. 1580, Province Administration Law no. 5442, Province Special Administration Law no. 3360 (Dilek, 1998: 94-95; Çevikbaş, 2001: 87; Köseoğlu, 2010: 87).

[8] As Tekeli and Gülöksüz (1977) note, the transfer of the authority to make zoning and construction plans to the central government without getting the approval of municipalities is completely problematic. Yet, respective plans were a reflection of the efforts made for the spatial control of the areas adjacent to the growing cities. Even Tekinbaş (2001) argues that the earlier Spatial Development Plans that has been prepared at a geographical scale of 1/25,000 served to solve the problems associated with areas located within the overlapping hinterlands of growing municipalities.

[9] Following İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, the Ministry of Development and Housing established MPBs also in Bursa, Samsun, Erzurum, Çukurova (Adana and Mersin) and Elazığ (Tekel, 2002: 49; Beyhan, 2009: 123).

[10] What is particularly interesting is the fact that neither local governments nor central government institutions questioned the hierarchical position of the respective plans in spite of the fact that there was no clause for such kind of a hierarchy of (upper scale) spatial plans at that time (Tekinbaş, 2001: 58-59). What is much more interesting is the fact that after the introduction of the Law no. 3194 in 1984, the Ministry had authorized the local governments for the implementation of the respective upper scale spatial plans for a period of 4 years in spite of the fact that there was no article in Law no. 3194 for the delegation of the authority of making upper scale plans to the municipalities. As there was actually no article in the Law no. 3194 for the preparation of upper scale spatial plans, the Ministry re-authorized itself for the respective plans.

References

Akdede, S.H., and Acartürk. E. (2005) "Türkiye'de ilçe ve Belediyelerin Optimizasyonu." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 14(3): 5-17.

Altaban, Ö. (2002) "Ankara Metropoliten Alan Planlama Deneyimi: 1970-1984 (Nazım Plan Bürosunun Kuruluşu, Örgüt Yapısı, Planlama Yaklaşımı ve Sorunlar)." *Planlama* 4: 32-45.

Anonymous (1970) "The Constitutionality of Local Zoning." *The Yale Law Journal* 79(5): 896-925.

Arkon, C. and Gülerman. A.R. (1995) "İzmir Büyükşehir Bütünündeki Nazım Plan Çalışmaları Üzerine Bir inceleme." *Planlama* 12: 14-20.

Bacon, E.N. (1940) "A Diagnosis and Suggested Treatment of an Urban Community's Land Problem." *The Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics* 16(1): 72-88.

Baker, N.F. (1927) "The Problem of the Metropolitan Area or Region." *The University Journal of Business* 5(1): 35-52.

Beckman, N. and Ingraham. P.L. (1965) "The States and Urban Areas." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 30(1): 76-102.

Beyhan, B. (2000) "Bir Planlama ve Çevre Yönetimi Aracı Olarak Mücavir Alan Uygulaması Üzerine." In *9. Ulusal Bölge Bilimi / Bölge Planlama Kongresi Bildirler Kitabı*, 60-71. Trabzon: KTÜ Basımevi.

Beyhan, B. (2009) "Üst Ölçek Planların İzlenmesi ve Degerlendirilmesi Üzerine: Kentsel ve Bölgesel Gözlemevlerinin Gerekliliği." In *3. Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Yönetişim Sempozyumu: 'Planlamadan Uygulamaya' - Bildiri Kitabı*, 133-203. Ankara: Matsa Basımevi.

Beyhan, B. (2010) "Kamu Yönetimi ve Bölgesel Planlamada Düzgüsel Bölgelerin Açmazları ve İşlevsel Bölgelerin Tanımlanmasında İzlenebilecek Yöntemler Üzerine." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 19(4): 1-29.

Blaydon, C.C. and Gilford. S.R. (1977) "Financing the Cities: An Issue Agenda." *Duke Law Journal* 1976: 1057-1117.

Briffault, R. (1996) "The Local Government Boundary Problem in Metropolitan Areas." *Stanford Law Review* 48(5): 1115-1171.

Cameron, R. (2004) "Local government reorganization in South Africa." In *Redrawing local government boundaries: an international study of politics, procedures and decisions*, edited by J. Meligrana, 206-227. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Çevikbaş, R. (2001) "Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetim Birlikleri ve Sulama Birliği Örneği." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 10(3): 86-113.

Clerk, G., Taylor, E.G.R., Harris, G.M., Strauss, H., Cadbury, G.W. and Stamp, D. (1942) "Discussion on the Geographical Aspects of Regional Planning." *The Geographical Journal* 99(2): 61-80.

Dilek, M. (1998) "Yerel Yönetim Birlikleri, Müteahhitlik Hizmetleri Yapabilirler mi?." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 7(2): 94-98.

Edwards, M.M. (2008) "Understanding the Complexities of Annexation." *Journal of Planning Literature* 23(2): 119-135.

Ecemiş Kılıç, S. (2009) "Proposals for Regional Administrative Structure and Planning in Turkey." *European Planning Studies* 17(9): 1283-1301.

Eke, A.E. (1985) "Anakent Yönetimi ve Yönetimlerarası İlişkiler: Batı Deneyimi ve Türkiye." *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 18(4): 41-62.

Friedmann, J.R.P. (1956) "The Concept of a Planning Region." *Land Economics* 32(1): 1-13.

Geddes, P. (1915) *Cities in Evolution: An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Genç, F.N. and Özgür. H. (2008) "Orta Ölçekli Kentsel Alanların Yönetimi: Kuşadası-Söke ve Aydın Merkez İlçe Örnekleri." *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute) 5(9): 195-225.

Geray, C. (1997) "Bölgesel Gelişme için Planlama ve Örgütlenme." *SBF Dergisi* 52 (1-4): 299-313.

Geray, C. (1999) "İstanbul İçin Yönetim Biçimi." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi* 8 (4):60-99.

Grant, D.R. (1955) "The Government of Interstate Metropolitan Areas." *The Western Political Quarterly* 8(1): 90-107.

Hein, C.J. and Hady. T.F. (1966) "Administrative Control of Municipal Incorporation: The Search for Criteria." *The Western Political Quarterly* 19(4): 697-704.

Karaer, T. and Öktem. M.K. (1988) "Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesinin Yönetsel Boyutu Üzerine." *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 21(2): 37-61.

Kazancı, M. (1983) "Yerel Yönetimler Üzerine Birkaç Not." *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 16(4): 36-51.

Keleş, R. 1987. "The Metropolitan Administration in Turkey." *Turkish Public Administration Annual (1985-1986)* 12: 91-110.

Knapp, W. (1998) "The Rhine – Ruhr area in transformation: Towards a European metropolitan region?" *European Planning Studies* 6(4): 379-393.

Köseoğlu, M. (2010) "Yerel Yönetim Birliklerinin Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri." *Türk İdare Dergisi* 468: 85-102.

Lehavi, A. (2006) "Intergovernmental Liability Rules." *Virginia Law Review* 92(5): 929-989.

Lowrie, S.G. (1936) "Metropolitan Government in Cincinnati." *The American Political Science Review* 30(5): 950-955.

Meriç, O. (1980) "Mücavir Saha Kavramının Anlam ve Kapsamında Meydana Gelen Değişme ve Bunun Olumsuz Etkileri." *İller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 411: 1-4.

Munro, W.B. (1912a) "Current Municipal Affairs." *The American Political Science Review* 6(1): 84-104.

Munro, W.B. (1912b) "Current Municipal Affairs." *The American Political Science Review* 6(3): 434-448.

Mutlu, S. (1989) "Kamu Yönetiminde Mekansal Örgütlenmenin Esasları ve Türkiye için Bazı Öneriler." *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 22(4): 21-46.

Olmsted, F.L. (1914) "The Town-Planning Movement in America." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Housing and Town Planning)* 51: 172-181.

Salet, W. (2006) "Rescaling territorial governance in the Randstad Holland: The responsiveness of spatial and institutional strategies to changing socio-economic interactions." *European Planning Studies* 14(7): 959-978.

Subra, P. and Newman. P. (2008) "Governing Paris – Planning and Political Conflict in Île-de-France." *European Planning Studies* 16(4): 521-535.

Teknik Araştırma ve Uygulama Genel Müdürlüğü (2000) *Türkiye Planlama Envanteri Atlası* (Planning Inventory Atlas of Turkey), unpublished atlas.

Tekel, A. (2002) "Metropoliten Planlamanın Önemi ve Gerekliliği Üzerine." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 11(1): 42-55.

Tekeli, İ. and Gülöksüz. Y. (1977) "Problems of Turkish Municipalities in the 1970s." *Turkish Public Administration Annual* 4(1): 157-187.

Tekinbaş, B. (1992) "Mücavir Alanlar." *Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı ile Belediyeler* 15: 10-12.

Tekinbaş, B. (2001) "Çevre Düzeni Planı Nereden Nereye..." *Planlama* 2: 57-60.

Topal, A.K. and Özyurt. H. (1999) "Avrupa Ülkelerinde Belediyelerin Konsolidasyonu Eğilimleri ve İstanbul için Optimal Bir Plan Önerisi." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 8 (4): 30-59.

Türkoğlu, H. (1992) "Metropoliten Değişim Sürecinde Planlama: İstanbul Örneği." *Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı ile Belediyeler Dergisi* 16: 16-20.

Voets, J. and De Rynck. F. (2008) "Contextualising City-regional Issues, Strategies and their Use: the Flemish Story." *Local Government Studies* 34(4): 453-470.

Weber, A.F. (1904) "The Significance of Recent City Growth: The Era of Small Industrial Centres." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 23(2): 29-42.

Wiewel, W. and Schaffer. K. (2001) "Learning to Think as a Region: Connecting Suburban Sprawl and City Poverty." *European Planning Studies* 9(5): 593-611.

Wirth, L. (1942) "The Metropolitan Region as a Planning Unit." In *American Planning and Civic Annual*, edited by H. James, 174-184. Washington, D.C.: Mount Pleasant Press, J. Horace McFarland Company, Harrisburg.

Yeter, E. (1992) "Yerel Yönetimler Üzerine Düşünceler." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 1(4): 13-21.

Yeter, E. (2002) "Metropolitan Alan Yönetiminde Yeni Arayışlar: İstanbul." *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler* 11(2): 41-50.