

AN EVALUATION ON SQUATTER HOUSING AND OWNERSHIP PATTERNS IN TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS OF ISTANBUL

İsmet KILINÇASLAN, Prof. Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning
iaslan@itu.edu.tr

Gülden ERKUT, Prof. Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

Nuran Zeren GÜLERSOY, Prof. Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

Ahsen ÖZSOY, Prof. Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

İclal DİNÇER, Assoc. Prof. Dr. YTU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

Ferhan GEZİCİ, Assoc. Prof. Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

Ebru KERİMOĞLU Dr. ITU, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

ABSTRACT

Starting from the 1950s the most important problem of Turkey's cities with an increasing population and economy, and primarily of Istanbul, has been housing settlements squatting on public land built by rural migrants. The formation process of these areas, properties of the socio-economic structure and problems related to integration with the city, has been subject to several researches through different case studies. The areas that were built-up without urban infrastructure and far from technical supervision became intensely subject to regeneration, rehabilitation and renewal processes especially after the Marmara earthquake in 1999. With the authority of recent legal arrangements and using the concept of 'Urban Transformation', municipalities initialized the processes of demolishing and rebuilding such illegally developed and later legalized areas through rehabilitation development plans. However it became apparent after a short time that new planning approaches are needed for the regeneration of these areas as livable housing environments.

Recently, the emergence of a milieu has been realized in cities where planning and production processes are not easily accepted by users unless these efforts contain transparent and participatory processes. Therefore it seems that if municipalities do not integrate the residents into the project development process and if their projects focus only upon the renewal of physical structure, the end result will not be successful. This study which was funded between 1999 and 2002 by TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) is a research project conducted for two neighborhoods of Istanbul as an example to the above mentioned housing production process. The findings of this research are re-interpreted in the framework of recent developments.

As a sample of housing and settlement production processes in planned and unplanned environments, the most suitable case studies were determined as Gülsuyu, Güleusu and Esenkent neighborhoods of Maltepe district. The findings of the survey conducted on 150 residents by face-to-face interviews and a focus group study reveal the historical development of the area, and socio-economic status of residents, their perception of the problems in the area, their future expectations and the problems of the settlement area. In this study, through the

selected households who owned housing through different processes; we re-evaluate types of housing and land acquisition processes, resource transfer methods, resident's expectation of the future and their perception about environment and quality of life.

Keywords: Housing Production Process, Unplanned Urban Development, Gecekondu (squatter housing), Istanbul

INTRODUCTION

In countries with rapid urbanization and continuously high inflation rates, like Turkey, investments in land and property are always in demand as a means of socio-economic security. Since the 1950s, the housing problem of the immigrants has preserved its place in the agenda, and in time the investments in housing has become a matter of economical value rather than a means of solving the problem of shelter. The developments of the post-1950s in Istanbul, where this process was experienced most vividly, has taken place in two distinct ways; in legal/planned and illegal/unplanned developments. The Local Authorities mostly adopted a policy of keeping a blind eye to those who solved the problem of housing emerging out of a great demand due to several waves of migration through illegal squatting of land and building on it, and as a result the 'gecekondu' defined as the building of shelter upon public or privately owned land has become an important constituent in the organization of urban settlement.

This article was based on a research project ¹ funded jointly by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) and Istanbul Technical University (ITU) carried out between 1999 and 2002. The scope of the Research Project was defined as the analysis of individuals and the institutional, organizational, legal frameworks effective in the production of the housing areas emerging due to the process of migration. The socio-economical characteristics and the differing roles of the tenants and landlords in the process, and whether the value of the dwelling as shelter in the area was transformed into an exchange value, or if not, formed the main axis of the research. Issues, related to the environment and quality of life were examined through the differences in the attitudes of the tenants and the landlords in terms of accepting and embracing the area. This article resides within the boundaries of the main framework of the research project, and conveys the results from the two neighborhoods of squatter housing settlements (Gülsuyu, Gülenü), out of the three² studied in the project.

¹ The research project prepared by the authors of the article was titled "Kente Göçenlerin Farklı Yerleşme Süreçlerine Katılım Biçimlerinin Analizi" (An Analysis of the Forms of Participation of the Immigrants to Different Settlement Processes). The project accepted under the code of TUBITAK İNTAG 421 was carried out between the dates of 01.12.1999 and 31.12.2002.

² Different from the Gülsuyu and Gülenü, the Esenkent neighborhood which is not included in this article was denoted as a "Gecekondu Prevention Area" in the 1966 Gecekondu Law, to prevent the building of gecekondu and government funded housing projects were initiated in the area.

THE CHANGING POLICIES, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES IN THE SOLUTIONS TO THE ILLEGAL HOUSING AREAS IN TURKEY

Various theoretical researches on the phenomenon of *gecekondu* (squatter housing) as an individual solution to the shelter requirements of the population migrating from the rural areas into the cities, and the problems it poses has been carried out (Abrams 1966, Alpar and Yener 1991, Adam 1979, Acar 1981, Aslan 1989, Aslan 1998, Atalık et al., 1986, Dursun and Sağlamer 1996, Eke 1981, Erder 1996, Ergun 1990, Erkut 1991, Ersoy 1985, Görgülü 1998, Gülersoy Zeren et al., 1999, Gürel et al., 1996, Hard 1966, Heper, 1977, Karpat 1976, Kartal 1981, Kongar 1973, Özsoy 1983, Özsoy et al., 2001, Şenyapılı 1981, Şenyapılı 1985, Şenyapılı 1998, Tekeli 1971, Tekeli et al., 1976, Tekeli 1992, Tekeli 1994) and since the 1940s various legal, managerial and practical precautions were employed against it. The policies implemented from the 1940s through to the 1960s were in the line of municipalities providing land bought at a cheap rate or for no price at all from the treasury and various public institutions. This was distributed to those in need to be paid in long terms and low interest rates, disallowing the building of new squatter housing and legalizing the ones built previously. With the first amnesty law ³ that was enacted in 1949 all squatter housing that was built prior to that date were legalized. This law was followed by the amnesties of 1953 ⁴ and 1963⁵. Under the protection of the amnesties the numbers of the squatter houses in Istanbul grew rapidly and the squatter houses which were counted to be 5000 in 1949 became 8239 in 1950, 61,400 in 1959 and reached 120,000 in 1963. It was established that in the year 1963, 35% of the population of Istanbul were people living in *gecekondu* areas (Tekeli, 1994). The 'Gecekondu Law' with the number 775, enacted in 1966 was prepared with a different outlook from the previous amnesty laws. In the law where the term '*gecekondu*' was used for the first time, the existing squatter houses were granted a pardon and also *gecekondu* areas were classified under areas of abolishment, rehabilitation and prevention; opting for the possibility of betterment in the rehabilitation areas. Even though there has been evident increase in the quality of the *gecekondu* areas after the law numbered 775, prevention of the building of new squatter housing could not be achieved with it. Due to the rapid increase of the population in the *gecekondu* areas developing in close proximity to the industrial areas on the eastern and western sides of the metropolitan area new municipalities were formed between 1970 and 1975, bringing infrastructure services to these areas. In the post 1970 period the building of squatter housing has become a business and the land where *gecekondus* could be built as well as houses already built on these lands were marketed to the homeless migrant families by an organized group of land merchants operating in these areas.

³ 5431 numbered "Law on the Abolishment of Unauthorised Buildings"

⁴ 6198 numbered "Law on Construction Encouragement and Unauthorised Buildings"

⁵ 327 numbered "Law on the Addition of a Temporary Article to the Building Code number 6785"

In 1976 a new amnesty law ⁶ was enacted, preventing the demolition of *gecekondu*s built on public land between 1966 and 1976. Parallel to these developments towards the end of the 1970s and in the 1980s the process of squatter housing and the physical appearance of the *gecekondu* areas have changed, and new multi storey squatter houses resembling apartment buildings emerged. With another amnesty ⁷ enacted in 1983, all *gecekondu*s built before June 1981 was legalized. And with a law ⁸ enacted the next year, the owners of *gecekondu*s were given the right to build up to 4 storeys high buildings on their plots and a new concept of rehabilitation development plan was introduced. This new implementation has altered the characteristics of the *gecekondu* areas greatly and the old *gecekondu* quarters have transformed into areas of apartment buildings. In 1986 the span of the law ⁹ was expanded to grant a pardon to all *gecekondu*s built before 1985.

THE LOCATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OF THE RESEARCH AREA

The Gülsuyu and Gülen su neighborhoods selected as the research area are located in the district of Maltepe, 30 km to the east of the centre of the Istanbul Metropolitan area (Figure 1). Due to being a concentration area for industry and being close to national and international highway routes, the area has developed as a residential area for a vast number of workers and/or low income groups. Gülsuyu which is 75 meters above the sea level is a settlement on the slope reaching 160 meters in height towards the north. The southern slopes offer views of the Marmara Sea and the Prince's Islands (Figure 2). Due to its topographical characteristics, potential for receiving the sun and offering views, it is an attractive spot for settlement. The first *gecekondu* on Gülsuyu, which entirely belonged to the treasury, was built in 1959 and it soon became a favorite spot of the workers in industry as a 'neighborhood with good water and views'. The development of Gülen su, an area mostly owned privately, located to the north of Gülsuyu on the slopes reaching 320 meters above the sea level, started between the years 1975 and 1980. Not separated by a natural border, the two neighborhoods function together. With the enactment of the amnesty laws ¹⁰ in 1989 a 'rehabilitation development plan' was prepared spanning over the Gülsuyu and Gülen su areas, legalizing the *gecekondu*s, offering them the right to title deeds and to build up to four storeys. The population of the area which has undergone rapid urbanization and had its infrastructure established since then, had reached 35.000 in the year 2002, when the research was carried out (Table 1).

⁶ 1990 numbered "Law on Amendments to the Gecekondu Law number 775"

⁷ 2805 numbered "Law on Procedures to be Implemented on Constructions Contradicting Building and Gecekondu Regulations"

⁸ 2981 numbered "Law on Procedures to be Implemented on Constructions Contradicting Building and Gecekondu Regulations" and 6785 numbered "Law on Amendments to an Article of the Building Code"

⁹ 3290 numbered "Law on Amendments to certain Articles of the Law number 2981 and the Addition of Certain Articles to the Mentioned Law"

¹⁰ 2981 numbered "Law on Procedures to be Implemented on Constructions Contradicting Building and Gecekondu Regulations"

Table 1. The Population and the Number of Households in the Settlements, 2002

	AREA	POPULATION	HOUSEHOLD	PERSON per HOUSEHOLD
GÜLSUYU	92 ha	18.500	4.058	4.56
GÜLENSU	98 ha	14.698	3.550	4.14
TOTAL	190 ha	33.198	7.608	4.32



Figure 1. Location of the Research Area



Figure 2. The View from Gülsuyu

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The issues dealt with in the research necessitated the use of different research techniques, and data gathered from section and process analyses were used together. In the months of May, June and July in 2000, the whole area was explored and documented with photographs. At the end of this thorough examination data sets including 1. Land Use; 2. Building Construction Methods; 3. Number of Storeys; 4. Building State; 5. Buildings Covered and not Covered with Roofs; 6. State of Exterior Plaster; 7. Street and Infrastructure Facilities, were formed. Between the same dates also an enquiry based on a survey at 100 households in the Gülsuyu and Gülsu neighborhoods was carried out. The first set of the survey included data related to the dwelling; the character of the building, the date it was built, whether it had an extension or not, about the processes of building the housing unit and its acquisition, as well as facilities and their availability. In the second set data related to the population was gathered. And the third set which was the spatial database included characteristics of the environment, land use, existing density and characteristics of the facilities. The aim of the survey was to define the socio-economical status of the dwellers, their perception of the problems in the neighborhood and their future expectations, and to picture the problems related to the livability of the area and to the diminishing quality in the environment. On March 23rd, 2001 a 'Focus Group Interview' was realized with 9 participants. Three of these participants were chief (*muhtar*) of the neighborhoods, the other three participants were long-term residents in the area, one of whom was a worker and a member of the Maltepe District Municipal Council, another one a retired worker and the ex-president of the Association for the Improvement of Gülsuyu and the last one a retired industry worker. The last three participants to the meeting were professionals employed at the Maltepe Municipality in charge of the building works, who were familiar with the history of the developments in the area. A vast array of data was collected from the group interview and analyses carried out through the surveys. This raw data was edited into four separate sets; Characteristics of the Physical Environment, Demographical and Socio-Economical Characteristics, Processes of Land and Housing Acquisition, Dweller and Immediate Environment Relations.

FINDINGS

Characteristics of the Physical Environment

Gülsuyu

Gülsuyu, one of the 19 neighborhoods of Maltepe district is located to the north of the E5 transportation axis which used to be the Ankara-Istanbul link in the past and is presently a part of the inner city traffic of the eastern side of the city. With an area spreading over 92 hectares and a population of 16,463 (in the year 2000) Gülsuyu has a gross density of 180 persons per hectare. In terms of land use, residential buildings have a weighty 84% amongst the total number of buildings. The second biggest percentage of the trade function in the buildings only reaches a mere 8%. Buildings serving the function of small scale production and storage amount to 7%. The existence of a single building

dedicated to education in contrast to the five buildings serving administrative functions and four religious facilities is worth noting (Figure 3).

Even though the establishment of the neighborhood goes back before the 1970s and the approved rehabilitation development plan of 1989 allows building up to four storeys, the percentage of four storey buildings is as low as 8%. In contrast, the percentage of single storey houses is 45% and apart from the main route axes the single storey squatter housing character reigns. The fact that 84% of the buildings have plastered exteriors and that 76% of them are covered with roofs is a sign that the demand for building more storeys is not high.

When the decisions of the rehabilitation development plan which was in effect since 1989 and the present day land use is compared, it becomes apparent that only one of the four proposed educational areas and none of the green area facilities has been realized. All roads in the Gülsuyu are covered with asphalt and open to two-way traffic and only half of these roads have a median. All roads have lighting fixtures; however only the roads with a median have trash cans, and street furniture such as telephone booths and seats exist only at bus stops.



Figure 3. The View from the Center of Gülsuyu

Gülensu

Gülensu was developed on the slopes of a hill reaching 320 meters above sea level, located further from the Gülsuyu settlement. The settlement which borders on to the forests in the north has a surface area spreading over 98 hectares and with a population of 14,698 it is an area of residential function alone (93%). According to data collected in 2002 the quarter with a gross density of 150 persons per hectare has two administrative buildings, one religious facility and one educational facility (Figure 4). The percentage of 4 storey buildings is 2%. In contrast, 77% of the building stock is made up of single storey buildings and 14% of it is two storey buildings. The fact that 85% of the buildings have

plastered exteriors and that 75% of them are covered with roofs is a sign that the tendency of making extensions by adding new storeys is not common and that the characteristics of the first period *gecekond* quarters still persist. Although the rehabilitation development plan was enacted in 1989 it is apparent that demands for building new stock and regeneration in the area are low, and that none of the green area facilities proposed in the plan were realized. The percentage of asphalt covered roads in the quarter is 67% and only 10% of these have a median. The remaining roads are dirt roads, yet they all have lighting fixtures.



Figure 4. The General View of Gülensu

Demographical and Socio-Economical Characteristics

As it was explained in the research method the concentrations of groups 'building their own squatter houses', 'buying a flat from a built multi-storey squatter house' and 'tenants' is considered an important data in terms of showing if the area is open to becoming a housing market. As a result of the household surveys conducted in the neighborhoods, four groups in terms of the acquisition of housing emerged, and the data was evaluated on the basis of these groups.

These groups are defined as:

1st Group: Living in the Single Storey Self-built Squatter House - Not yet Under the Influence of the Housing Market - Preserving the Traditional Definition of *Gecekond*

2nd Group: Owner of a Squatter House with More than One Storey- At the Initial Stages of the Process of Becoming Part of the Housing Market

3rd Group: Purchaser of a '*Gecekond*' - 'The Buyer' in the 'Housing Market'

4th Group: Tenant in a '*Gecekond*' - 'The Potential Buyer' in the 'Housing Market'

Gülsuyu

In this context, interviews conducted with 46 households at Gülsuyu demonstrated a concentration of 8 households in the 1st Group; 12 households in the 2nd Group; 9 households in the 3rd Group; 17 households in the 4th Group (Table 2).

1st Group: The household population in this group is 4 and nuclear family formation is dominant (75%). A majority of the household heads have been working 'self-employed' for an average of 20 years. 70% of the other members of the household who are in employment are single children between the ages of 26 and 44. All of the household heads are over the age of 45 and this group is dominated by older families. The place of birth of the household heads is at all cases outside Istanbul, and mostly in the Eastern Anatolia and Black Sea region. The arrival of the households to Gülsuyu is concentrated between the years of 1975 and 1979. There is no household in this group to arrive later than 1990.

2nd Group: The household population size in this group is 4.1 and the nuclear family formation is more dominant than the 1st Group (92%). Amongst the ones who are in employment the percentage of the household heads is 47%, the remaining 53% is made up of children over the age of 15. Although the structure is similar to the 1st Group, the age of the children in employment in this group is much lower. The origins of the households that are consisting of relatively younger families when compared to the 1st Group are dominantly from the Eastern Anatolia Region (50%) and they have arrived at Gülsuyu between the years 1975 and 1979 like those in the 1st Group. These findings illustrate that there are no great socio-economical differences between the first and second group.

3rd Group: Different from the first and second group, the household size of this group is 4.7. While the percentage of the household heads amongst all in employment is 57%, the group differs from the previous two in that 7% of those in employment are the spouses of the household heads and the remaining 36% are children over the age of 19. Another point of difference from the first two groups, is the existence of those employed in the service sector, like teachers and doctors as well as craftsmen in this group, apart from the 50% of the household heads who are shop owners and self-employed. The fact that there are household heads whose place of birth is Istanbul is another important difference with the other two groups. Amongst the 78% of the ones born outside Istanbul, an even distribution of the Eastern Anatolia, Central Anatolia and Black Sea regions is visible. The dates of the household heads' arrival at Gülsuyu also differs from the previous groups in that 75% of the arrivals are concentrated between the years of 1985 and 1994 and the remaining 25% is after 1995. This distribution resembles the structure seen in the 4th Group. In light of this data it is possible to state that the structure of 'renting a squatter house' starting from the 1980s has transformed into 'buying a squatter house' after around 1985.

4th Group: The size of household in this group is 3.4. In the group dominated by the nuclear family structure (94%), the average number of children is 1.5. The urban family typology visible in this group is different from the other groups. 61% of all in employment are household heads, their spouses make up for 17% and

the remaining 22% are children over the age of 19; thus differing vastly from all other groups and raising the activity ratio to 40%. Another difference from the 'house owner' groups is that 57% of the household heads are salary earning workers. The fact that 59% of the household heads are between the ages of 26 and 44 proves that the 'tenant families' in the 4th Group are a lot younger than the 'house owner' groups. Amongst the household heads whose place of birth is 88% outside Istanbul, those from the Black Sea Region (40%) have the highest percentage. The 71% of the dates of arrival of the households to Gülsuyu are concentrated between the years 1990 and 1999 and there are no households that have arrived before 1980 in the group. This data illustrates that 'renting a squatter house' in Gülsuyu area started in the 1980s and spread after 1990s.

Table 2. GÜLSUYU: Demographical and Socio-Economical Characteristics of Households (2002)

In Households where the Surveys were held	GÜLSUYU GECEKONDUS (SQUATTER HOUSES)				TOTAL	
	First Group	Second Group	Third Group	Fourth Group	46	
Number of Households	8	12	9	17	46	
Population	32	49	43	57	181	
Average Household Size	4.0	4.1	4.7	3.4	3.9	
Family Type	Single	-	-	1	1	
	Young Married	-	1	-	4	5
	Old Married	1	-	-	1	2
	1 Child	2	2	1	3	8
	2 Children	1	4	4	5	14
	3 Children	2	3	1	1	7
	4 Children	-	1	-	-	1
	5+	-	-	-	1	1
	With Parents	-	-	1	-	1
	With Bride and Groom	2	1	2	1	6
Total in Employment	10	15	14	23	62	
Activity Ratio	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.40	0.34	
Dependency Ratio	2.20	2.27	2.07	1.48	1.92	

Gülensu

In Gülensu a total of 49 interviews were conducted and a concentration of 18 households in the 1st Group; 10 households in the 2nd Group; 9 households in the 3rd Group; 12 households in the 4th Group was encountered (Table 3).

1st Group: The fact that the number of households in this category in Gülensu is twice the amount in Gülsuyu demonstrates a basic difference between the two settlements; that Gülensu is less under the influence of the housing market. The household size in this group is 4.1 and with 30% extended families in this group have the highest ratio amongst all groups both at Gülensu and Gülsuyu. The majority of those in employment are married children (56%) between the ages of 26 and 44, living together with their parents. As 73% of the household heads are over the age of 45, this group much like the 1st Group of Gülsuyu consists of older families. The birth place of the household heads is predominantly outside Istanbul (83%); mainly from the Eastern Anatolia and Black Sea regions. The

dates of arrival of the households to Güleusu are concentrated between the years 1970 and 1979 (72%).

2nd Group: The household size in this group is 4, 2 and nuclear family formation is dominant (90%). The ratio of household heads amongst all in employment is 41%. The remaining 59% are children over the age of 15. There are no household head spouses in employment in this group either. The origins of the relatively younger households in comparison to the 1st Group are the Eastern Anatolia (50%), Black Sea (20%) and Central Anatolia (20%) regions. The dates of arrival of the households, different from the 1st Group, stretch into the next period and concentrate between 1975-1979 (40%) and 1980-1984 (40%).

3rd Group: The household size in this group is 4.3. The ratio of household heads amongst all in employment is 70% and they are mostly employed in the trade and service sector as middle range employees. 10% of those in employment are the spouses of the household heads and 20% are children. This is a structure different from the 'house owner' groups and the ratios are more reminiscent of the 'tenant families'. The activity ratio in this group is 26% and it is the lowest ratio by far. It seems possible to explain this due to the relatively younger children in these households who are continuing in education further than the other groups. The fact that 89% of the household heads are between the ages of 26 and 44, shows that this group has younger families than the previous two. The 33% Istanbul born household heads has the highest ratio amongst all groups. At households with birth places outside Istanbul, the Black Sea (30%) and Eastern Anatolia (22%) are dominant as in other groups. The dates of arrival of the households slide a period further than the 1st and 2nd Groups and concentrate in the years between 1980-1984 (30%) and 1990-1994 (44%). With the help of this data it is possible to state that in the Güleusu area the structure of 'renting a squatter house' starts in the 1980s and the process of 'buying own squatter house' spreads after 1990s.

4th Group: The household size in this group is 3.3. In the group dominated by the nuclear family structure the average number of children is 1.5. These ratios which differ from the house owner groups in Güleusu and yet show similarities with the tenants in Gülsuyu signify the distinct urban family typology apparent in this group when compared to all the rest. The percentage of the household heads amongst all in employment is 67% and the ratio of those in organized and stable employment is higher than the 'house owner' groups (42%). 17% of those in employment are the spouses of the household heads and 17% are children over the age of 19, raising the activity ratio in the households to 46%. This structure is similar to the 'tenant' groups (61%) at Gülsuyu. This could be explained due to the high ratios of household head spouses in employment and smaller household sizes in both 'tenant' groups. The household heads are younger than those in Gülsuyu tenant groups and 83% of them are between the ages of 26 and 44. This data demonstrates that the 'tenant families' are younger families and that the 'house owner' families are from an older generation. The places of birth of the household heads are predominantly outside Istanbul (84%). 83% of the households have arrived at Güleusu between 1990 and 1999. This shows that the pattern of 'renting a squatter house' in Güleusu area has spread after the 1990s.

Table 3. GÜLENSU: Demographical and Socio-Economical Characteristics of Households (2002)

In Households where the Surveys were held	GÜLENSU GECEKONDUS (SQUATTER HOUSES)				TOTAL	
	First Group	Second Group	Third Group	Fourth Group	49	
Number of Households	18	10	9	12	49	
Population	74	42	39	39	194	
Average Household Size	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.3	3.9	
Family Type	Single	1	-	-	3	4
	Young Married	-	-	-	1	1
	Old Married	3	1	-	-	4
	1 Child	1	2	1	3	7
	2 Children	4	2	3	1	10
	3 Children	1	2	1	3	7
	4 Children	2	2	-	-	4
	With Parents	3	-	1	-	4
With Bride and Groom	3	1	3	1	8	
Total in Employment	25	17	10	18	70	
Activity Ratio	0.34	0.40	0.26	0.46	0.36	
Dependency Ratio	1.96	1.47	2.90	1.16	1.77	

Processes of Land and Housing Acquisition

Gülsuyu

43% of the 46 examples interviewed in Gülsuyu belong to the 1st and 2nd groups. While 40% of these still continue living in their single storey *gecekondus*, the remaining 60% have added a new storey to their buildings and offered it to the housing market. The data collected from these two groups are being evaluated together as there was no difference amongst these groups in terms of the processes of land and housing acquisition.

1st and 2nd Groups: The dates of the households arriving at Gülsuyu and their ways of building their *gecekondus* share similar characteristics. They have built their house mostly with the help of a master builder (35%), from their families (20%) and relatives (20%). Apart from the 25% who have stated that they have bought the land from the previous settlers, a majority of 55% have replied by saying 'did not buy', 'squatted' or 'it is a *gecekondu*'. 'The suitable prices' (30%) and 'the existence of relatives' (30%), were among the dominant reasons for choosing that area. They mentioned that the house was designed by themselves (45%), the size of it was decided by them (75%) and that they have not consulted anyone before constructing the house (65%). The distance of the building from the neighboring plots and the street was also decided by them (90%). 55% have kept the house in the way it was built, 45% made an additional storey. 33% have let the additional storey and 56% have their daughter/son residing there. The number of storeys allowed by law in the area is generally not known (65%) in the households.

3rd Group: The group 'purchasing the squatter house' has a small ratio of 19%. The households in this group have generally (75%) moved into Gülsuyu after 1990. They have mostly bought the *gecekondu* from a previous settler (78%)

and all of them have made the payment in cash. They mention the 'suitable prices' (78%) as the reason for buying their *gecekond* in Gülsuyu.

4th Group: The 17 households that have been 'tenants in a squatter house' have all been residing in Gülsuyu for the past ten years. 35% of them have moved in between the years 1990-1994 and 3% after 1995. The 'suitable rents' were the primary reason (53%) behind their choice of location. None of them owns a piece of land in Gülsuyu and most of them do not consider buying.

Gülensu

57% of the 49 examples interviewed in Gülensu belong to the 1st and 2nd groups. While 64% of these still continue living in their single storey *gecekond*s, the remaining 36% have added a new storey to their buildings and offered it to the housing market.

1st and 2nd Groups: 75% of the households in these groups have built their own houses and 25% had it built for them. They have built their house mostly with the help of their families (36%) and relatives (10%). Apart from the 14% who have stated that they have bought the land from the previous settlers, a majority of 75% have replied by saying 'did not buy', 'squatted' or 'it is a *gecekond*'. Answers such as 'from the previous owner' or 'from a relative' make up for a small share like 18%. The reasons for choosing that location are the same as in Gülsuyu. They have mentioned that the house was designed by themselves (68%), the size of it was decided by them (96%) and that they have not consulted anyone before constructing the house (71%). The distance of the building from the neighboring plots and the street was also decided by them (100%). 56% have kept the house in the way it was built, 28% made an additional storey. The number of storeys allowed by law in that area is not known (85%) in the households. When the way the additional storeys are used was examined it is seen that 40% have let the additional storey, 40% have their children residing there and 20% have the additional storey remaining empty, and there is no incidence of selling the empty storey.

3rd Group: The group 'purchasing the squatter house' has a small ratio of 18%. An inspection of the group shows that 33% have bought the squatter house while 76% own a flat in a multi storey squatter house. The households in this group, much like the ones in Gülsuyu, have moved to Gülensu after 1990 (44%). They have mostly bought the *gecekond* from a previous settler (56%) and mostly with cash payment. They mention the 'suitable prices' (78%) as the reason for buying their *gecekond* in this area.

4th Group: The 12 households that have been 'tenants in a squatter house' have all been residing in Gülensu for the past ten years. A small amount of the households like 17% have rented a single storey *gecekond* while the remaining 83% live in a flat rented in a multi storey squatter house. 42% of them have moved in between the years 1990-1994 and 44% after 1995. The 'suitable rents' were the primary reason (92%) behind their choice of location. None of them owns a piece of land and just like in Gülsuyu most of the tenants in Gülensu don't consider buying.

Dwellers Relations with the Immediate Environment

In the analysis of dwellers and immediate environment relations, the issues of 'embracing the quarter', 'taking part in improving the quality of the environment in the quarter' and 'willingness to belong' in all four groups were evaluated comparatively.

Gülsuyu

The initial inquisition on this subject was made to identify the perception of different groups about the lack of certain facilities in Gülsuyu. The primary facility the lack of which was felt the most in Gülsuyu is 'a cinema and theatre' (28%), in second place is 'a cultural centre' (24%) and with 12% each in third place are 'a playground for children', 'a shopping place' and 'a school', and finally 'running water' (5%). There is no big difference amongst the groups in terms of prioritizing the needs. It is apparent that the demands are not related to infrastructure but that they are concerned about the lack of social facilities.

Next was about the perception of 'participation' in different groups. From the replies it is understood that there was no incident participated and embraced by the quarter as yet. In case there was a common activity in the quarter, answers such as 'would participate in cleaning the streets' and 'would take part in sawing trees and flowers' come to the fore. When this data is examined with the differences amongst the groups in mind it becomes visible that the house owners and those living in single storey *gecekondu*s are more willing to take part in shared activities; the answer 'would not care to take part' mostly belongs to the group of 'tenants'.

Subsequently, the tendency of 'belonging' was examined in different groups. The replies to 'your favorite place in the quarter' tend to be concentrated in the answer 'home'. The answer indicates both the fact that public places are not embraced by the dwellers and that these places are not that superior in quality. The answer of the 'tenants' group; 'no favorite place' indicates their unwillingness in terms of belonging to and embracing the area. The answer 'I don't like anywhere here' is also a common one. The fact that the question 'Which part of your quarter has changed the most?' was left unanswered in various cases is a sign of the inadequate awareness about the immediate environment.

Finally, the groups were asked about their ideas on 'continuing to live in Gülsuyu in the coming years' and their willingness to live in the quarter was examined. The answer 'I would like to continue living here' is 67% in the 1st and 2nd groups, while much lower in the 'purchaser' (33%) and 'tenant' groups (35%).

Gülensu

In all the groups in Gülensu the facility, the lack of which is felt the most, is 'a playground for children' (26%). In joint second place are 'a cinema and theatre' (13%) and 'a school' (12%), and in third place are 'running water' and 'a cultural centre' (10%). In the facilities stated to be lacking in second place there are certain differences amongst the groups. While the 1st and 2nd groups mention the lack of cultural facilities with their demands for a cinema and theatre, the

'tenants' with their demands for running water point to the fact that the necessary infrastructure was not yet finished for this group.

It is worth noting that when asked about whether they would participate in a shared activity in the quarter, the answer 'would not participate in any' is in second place right after 'would participate in all activities' which takes the first place. The fact that all of the 'tenants' state that they would not participate in any activity, and that the 'house owner' groups state that they would participate in all, is a clear sign of the difference of the two groups in terms of embracing the quarter.

Subsequently, the accumulation of the answer 'home' to the question about 'their favorite place in the quarter' proves that the dwellers of Gülsuyu just like the people of Gülsuyu have a low ratio of embracing and utilizing public places. The high ratio of this in 'purchaser' and 'tenant' groups is worth mentioning. Not answering the question 'your least favorite place in the quarter' and the reply of the 'tenant' groups to the same question 'everywhere' are statements that add to the findings. The fact that the question 'Which part of your quarter has changed the most?' was left unanswered in most cases is another sign of the inadequate awareness about the immediate environment. The high rates of this especially in the tenant and purchaser groups is also due to the fact that they have only witnessed the last ten years of the development process of Gülsuyu. The reason behind the common answer 'everywhere has changed a lot' that the group living in 'self-built *gecekondu*' have mostly stated is due to the fact that they are the principle actors in the development process of Gülsuyu who know how the area looked like in the past. The answers '*gecekondu* have become apartment buildings' and 'houses have become higher' indicate that the vertical development is more apparent than the horizontal one.

While the majority of the 1st and 2nd groups who have been living in Gülsuyu for 25-30 years have answered that they 'would like to continue living there' when asked about 'where they would like to live in the coming years', the ratio of the tenants who would like to continue living there is only 25%. The tenants' answer 'somewhere else in Istanbul', as well as 'anywhere at all' is a clear sign of the weak connection that they have with Gülsuyu.

CONCLUSION

In the process of *gecekondu* construction which has started as early as 1950s in Turkey, a new phase has emerged with the 1980s a phase of legalization and acceptance as a phenomenon that is part of the urban space. 2000s marks yet another phase in this process. These areas that have developed with the amnesty laws of the 1980s, without urban facilities and technical supervision, especially after the Marmara Earthquake of 1999 have become the focal point of "urban transformation". With the help of arrangements made in The Law on Local Authorities and the cooperation with the Housing Development Administration, municipalities have started demolishing these areas, which were legalized by rehabilitation development plans, and started constructing new buildings in these areas based on a standardized model. However, the resistance of the residents and the criticisms coming from the non-governmental institutions, professional chambers and universities has shown that urban

transformation cannot be achieved with the implementation of a single model repeatedly utilized under various different circumstances. It is apparent that every area has circumstances specific to that place and that the local authorities should produce alternative solutions to improve, rehabilitate or renew the socio-economical and physical conditions of that place, by appropriating their urban transformation model to the problems and characteristics of that area.

Apart from the framework set out at the beginning, this article also offers the foundation for developing an original urban transformation model, by analyzing the physical and socio-economical characteristics of an area that has developed as a squatter housing settlement. Following are the characteristics that could lay the foundation for such a model.

The physical characteristics of the area: The research area has the characteristics of a dormitory town housing a population of 35,000. But it is apparent that not even the minimum infrastructure that is necessary for a housing area is finalized. Although the rehabilitation development plan allows the construction of up to 4 storeys, most of the buildings in the area have remained either single storey or two storeys high. This demonstrates that the housing market is not dominating the area. The manifestation of such a structure could be defined through Maltepe being 30 kilometers away from the city centre, the steep slopes in the topography, the distance of the quarters to the transportation axis E5, the 190 hectares of land open to settlement and the inadequate infrastructure and facilities.

Demographical and socio-economical characteristics: For the purpose of the research it is important to know if the four groups defined according to the criteria of settlement have differences in terms of socio-economical characteristics. The main hypothesis is that the *gecekondu* owners will differ from the tenants and purchasers. There were no apparent differences observed between the *gecekondu* residents (1st Group) and *gecekondu* owners who are edging into the housing market (2nd Group). The households who are living in their single storey *gecekondu* and the households who have built an additional storey on top of their *gecekondu*s display similar demographical and socio-economical characteristics. Both groups consist of older families over the age of 45 living in the area for 30-35 years. In both quarters the 3rd Group who have 'purchased a *gecekondu*' and the 4th Group who are 'tenants in a *gecekondu*' consist of households younger and with a better socio-economical status than the 1st and 2nd groups. Again in both quarters, households with origins other than Istanbul and especially in the Eastern Anatolia and Black Sea regions are in majority; yet in households purchasing or being a tenant at a *gecekondu* those whose place of birth is Istanbul is increasing in number.

Processes of land and housing acquisition: In an analysis of the processes of land and housing acquisition in GÜlsuyu and GÜlensu; it is evident that the households defined as 1st and 2nd groups have arrived at and built their own *gecekondu*s in the area in 1970s, and that the *gecekondu* has transformed its initial shelter value and taken on an exchange value with the coming of 1980s. The fact that in both quarters 'purchasing of *gecekondu*s' has started in the 1980s while the phenomena of 'tenancy' has begun in the 1990s has surfaced as an important result of the research.

The analyses carried out demonstrate that the exchange of *gecekondus* is realized through traditional methods, through relatives and acquaintances; that there are no actors such as real estate agents and that the very small size housing market is governed without the middlemen. The way they state that they have not made any payment to anyone when acquiring the land; their answers such as 'this is a *gecekondu*', 'did not buy it', 'squatted it' proves that the institution referred to as '*gecekondu* lords' has not been effective in this area.

The implementation of the Building Amnesty Law of 1985, the allocation of the invaded land belonging to the treasury to those claiming a right to ownership, in exchange of a certain payment has been realized in the area same as in other squatter housing settlements. These allocations legalized with a 'Title Deed Allocation Document' were exchanged for an official title deed when the payments were completed. In the interviews it was stated that the owners of *gecekondus* who did not have enough money or who 'did not want to put money into this process used to transfer their house or land to someone else by signing a document they called 'confidence voucher' (*hatır senedi*). Therefore it is apparent that properties with a title deed allocation document were considered much more valuable and that the property transfers continued as part of the informal economic system.

From the point of actors involved in the building process of the *gecekondu*, the situation changes according to the number of storeys. That is to say, while the construction of single storey *gecekondus* are realized by the members of the family, in two storey, and particularly three storey buildings the ratio of realization through building masters and developers approaches 50%. These proportions indicate that while the actors in *gecekondus* built for 'shelter' are limited to the immediate family circles, the transition to the commercial purposes of the housing market forces the addition of first the construction master and then the developer to these actors.

The fact that it is the *gecekondu* owner 'himself' who decides on the size of the house, the number of storeys and the building approach distances up to 96%, and the statements of the 71% that they 'did not consult anyone' while constructing the house are evidence strengthening the finding that the actor directing the *gecekondu* development was the *gecekondu* owner 'himself'.

Dwellers relation with the immediate environment: The surveys conducted have shown that because the ones in the 1st and 2nd groups were people directly involved in the construction of the space, they embraced the environment much more than the other groups. It is also apparent that although not as high as the other two groups the 3rd Group also has a higher ratio of wanting to be involved with improving the quality of environment of the quarter and 'willingness to belong'. This group has a stronger connection with the quarter in comparison to the group of 'tenants'. As the reason behind the choice of location for the tenants is the 'suitable rent rates' they do not wish to continue living here in the long run. The additional facts that the quality of the environment in these areas are poor, that the tenants are not willing to be involved in the improvement of the area, and that they have only moved there due to economical reasons point to the fact that their tendency to move away from the area is high.

It is clear that the Gülsuyu and Güleusu quarters exemplifying the *gecekondu* process starting in 1970s are not different from one another in terms of development processes and their socio-economical structures; it is also apparent that Güleusu has developed in connection to Gülsuyu. In these research areas that constitute an example to traditional *gecekondu* settlements, although the *gecekondus* have gained an exchange value from the 1980s onwards on top of the shelter value that they initially had, it is seldom that the right to build up to four storey high buildings allowed by the authorities in these areas is exploited. With the lack of facilities and the limited infrastructure in these quarters the present situation could be evaluated as an opportunity for the creation of a healthier structure in the future.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, C., (1966), Squatter Settlements: The Planning and the Opportunity, Office of International Affairs Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
- Acar, E., (1981), İşçi Konutu Olarak Gecekondu, [Gecekondu as Housing of the Worker], The First City Planning Congress of Turkey, Ankara.
- Adam, M., (1979), "Gecekondu Sorununa Bir Bakış", [A Glimpse on the Issue of Gecekondu], Mimarlık, 1979/3, pp. 30-34.
- Alpar, İ.; Yener, S., (1991), Gecekondu Araştırması, [Gecekondu Research] DPT, Ankara.
- Aslan, R., (1989), "Gecekondulaşmanın Evrimi", [The Evolution of Gecekondus], Mimarlık, Number: 1989/6, pp.34-37.
- Aslan, R., (1998), "İmar Dışı Yapılaşmalara Sosyo-Politik Bir Yaklaşım", Göç, Kent ve Gecekondu, Kentte Mekanın Dönüşümü Sorunu ve Yaklaşımlar Üzerine Yazılar, ["A Socio-Political Approach to Illegal Housing", Migration, City and Gecekondu, Essays on the Approaches and Issues of Spatial Transformation in the City], Y.D.Yüksel, Z. Kerem (Eds.), Birsen Yayınevi, İstanbul, pp. 9-20.
- Atalık, G., M. Ünügür, Bölen, F., Aksoylu, Y., A. Özsoy, Köksüz, B., Dener, A., (Ed.), (1986), Field Studies in Squatter Settlements of Istanbul /Istanbul Gecekondu Yerleşmelerinde Alan Araştırmaları, United Nations International Year of Shelter for the Homeless / Birleşmiş Milletler Dünya Konut Yılı, Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul.
- Dursun, P., Sağlamer, G., (1996), Informal Housing Areas: From Single Story shelters to Multi story Apartment Blocks", XXIV.IAHS World Housing Congress, METU, Ankara, 27-30 May 1996, Ankara.
- Eke, F., (1981), "Düşük Gelirli Grubun Kente Uyum Aracı Olarak Gecekondu", [Gecekondu as the Tool for the Cohesion of Low-Income Group to the City], The First City Planning Congress of Turkey, Ankara.
- Erder, S., (1996), İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye, [A City Emerged in Istanbul: Ümraniye], İletişim Publications, İstanbul.

- Ergun, N., (1990), Gecekondu İslah Bölgelerinin Yeniden Yapılanmasında Kullanılabilecek Bir Yöntem Önerisi, [A Proposed Methodology for Restructuring of the Gecekondu Areas] (Doctoral Thesis), ITU Institute of Science and Technology, İstanbul.
- Erkut, G., (1991), "Kentleşme Sürecinin Sosyolojik Boyutu", [Sociological Dimension of Being Urbanized] H. Suher (ed. by), Kentleşme ve Kentleşme Politikaları, TÜSES Publications, İstanbul.
- Ersoy, M., (1985) Göç ve Kentsel Bütünleşme [Migration and Urban Integration], Türkiye Geliştirme Araştırmaları Vakfı, Pub. No.2, A.Ü.S.B.F. and Basın Yayın Yüksek Okulu Printing House, Ankara.
- Görgülü, Z., (1998), "Gecekondu'nun Yasal ve Niteliksel Dönüşümü ya da Hisseli Bölüntülü Alanlar", [Legal and Qualitative Transformation of Gecekondu], Göç, Kent ve Gecekondu, Kentte Mekanın Dönüşümü Sorunu ve Yaklaşımlar Üzerine Yazılar, [Migration, City and Gecekondu, Essays on the Approaches and Issues of Spatial Transformation in the City], Y.D.Yüksel, Z. Kerem (ed. by), Birsen Publications, İstanbul, pp.21-43.
- Gülersoy-Zeren, N., Özsoy, A., Erkut G., Eyüboğlu E., Yiğiter R., (1999), "İstanbul'da Gecekondu Alanlarının Mekansal Yayılımı ve Armutlu Örneği", [Spatial Development of Gecekondu Areas in İstanbul and the Case of Armutlu], Prof.Dr. Gündüz Atalık'a Armağan, ITU Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning, İstanbul, pp.53-86.
- Gürel, S. et.al, (1996), Dar Gelirli Kesime Altyapısı Hazır Arsa Sunumu, [Land Provision with Infrastructure to the Low Income Group], Housing Research Series, Housing Development Administration of Turkey (TOKİ), Ankara.
- Hard, W.C., (1969), Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Bölgesi, [Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Area], İstanbul Chamber of Commerce, İstanbul
- Heper, M. (1977), Gecekondu Policy in Turkey, An Evaluation With a Case Study of Rumelihisarüstü Squatter Area in İstanbul, Boğaziçi University Publications.
- Karpat, K., (1976), the Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kartal, K., (1981), "Kırdan Kente Göçenlerin Yarattıkları Kaynak Akımları ve Gecekondu", [Resource Flows by Migrants from Rural to Urban Areas and Gecekondu], The First City Planning Congress of Turkey, Ankara.
- Kongar, E., (1973), "Altındağ Gecekondu Bölgesi", [Altındağ Gecekondu Area], Amme İdaresi Magazine, Volume: 6, No: 3.
- Özsoy, A., (1983), Gecekondu Biçimlenme Süreci ve Etkenlerinin Analizi, [The Analysis of Formation Process and Factors of Gecekondu] (Doctoral Thesis), İTÜ Faculty of Architecture, İstanbul.

- Özsoy, A., Gülersoy, N. Z., Erkut, G., Yiğiter, R., Eyüboğlu, E., (2001) (ed. by Turgut, H., Kellet, P.), "Social, Cultural and Spatial Complexity of a Squatter Settlement in Istanbul: Armutlu District", Cultural and Spatial Diversity in the Urban Environment, IAPS-CSBE Network, Yem Publications, Istanbul, pp. 121-132.
- Şenyapılı T., (1998), "Cumhuriyetin 75. Yılı, Gecekonduyunun 50.Yılı", [75th Year of Republic, 50th Year of Gecekondu], 75 Yılda Değişen Kent ve Mimarlık, Tarih Vakfı, İstanbul, pp. 301-316.
- Şenyapılı, T., (1981), Gecekondu: "Çevre" İşçilerin Mekanı, [Gecekondu: The Space of Workers], METU Faculty of Architecture, Ankara.
- Şenyapılı, T., (1985), Ankara Kentinde Gecekondu Gelişimi, [Development of Gecekondu in the city of Ankara] 1923-1960, Batıkent, Housing Production Cooperative Union, Ankara.
- Tekeli, İ., (1992) "Development of Urban Administration and Planning in the Formation of Istanbul Metropolitan Area", Development of Istanbul Metropolitan Area and Low Cost Housing, İ.Tekeli, T.Şenyapılı, A.Türel, M.Güvenç, E.Acar (ed.), Turkish Social Science Association, İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality, IULA-EMME, pp. 1-111.
- Tekeli, İ., (1971), Bağımlı Kentleşme, Kırdan Kente Dönüşüm Süreci, [Dependent Urbanization, Transformation Process from Rural to Urban], Chamber of Architects, Ankara.
- Tekeli, İ., Gülöksüz, Y., Okyay, T. (1976), Gecekondu, Dolmuşlu, İşportalı Şehir, [The City with Gecekondu, Dolmuş and Street Vendors], Cem Publications, İstanbul.