

Sinemillioglu, Mustafa Oguz

Conference Paper

Urban Competition in a regional development Project with a sustainable perspective

43rd Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Peripheries, Centres, and Spatial Development in the New Europe", 27th - 30th August 2003, Jyväskylä, Finland

Provided in Cooperation with:

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

Suggested Citation: Sinemillioglu, Mustafa Oguz (2003) : Urban Competition in a regional development Project with a sustainable perspective, 43rd Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Peripheries, Centres, and Spatial Development in the New Europe", 27th - 30th August 2003, Jyväskylä, Finland, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/116237>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Urban Competition in a regional development Project with a sustainable perspective

Assist. Prof. M.Oguz SINEMILLIOGLU (PhD)
City Planner

Dicle University
Engineering and Architecture Faculty
Department of Architecture
21280 Diyarbakir
Turkey

Abstract:

In this study, It will be compared three cities whose populations is among 500 000 and 1 Million inhabitants with their population movements, economic development, Structural urban changes and social facilities in a sustainable perspective.

Southeastern Anatolia Project (SAP) in which the cities are located is the biggest regional development project ever carried out in Turkey, And Gaziantep by far the biggest city in the project has a leading role not only in industry but also in commercial facilities. Besides all the cities are taking migrations and so the problems like infrastructure and lack of housing etc.

After analyzing the projects development and cities evolutions it will be compared cities capabilities and its effects not only to each other but also to their hinterland.

Conclusion will focus on the effects of regional Developments and its Comprehensiveness.

Key words: Regional Development, competition, population, Cities, GDP.

1. Introduction

Turkey, in a connection of two continents, tries to join EU although its economy is poor and life still is so different than other countries of EU. With a seventy million people, divided about the idea of joining EU, tries to organize its development.

One of its efforts on the way of development is a regional development plan. Regarding Turkey's planned development process, Southeastern Anatolia Project (SAP) is the most important Development Project in which there are the cities, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa and Diyarbakir.

The main focus of this study, therefore, is to analyze the cities development while competing with each other in a regional development process.

2. The Regional Development Plan: Southeastern Anatolian Project (SAP)

SAP initiated as the result of combination works done by State Hydrological Organization (DSİ) to utilize natural resources in Southeastern Anatolia in the country's economy and of projects of decreasing lack of development in the region. "The water development aspects of GAP include 13 main irrigation and energy projects, seven of which are in the lower Euphrates sub-basin and six in the Tigris sub-basin. There are 22 dams, 19 hydropower plants, and irrigation systems to irrigate 1.7 million ha of land"(GAP BKİ 1996).

GAP Region is defined as the jurisdiction of nine provinces, located in south east of Turkey, covering the land area of 73,863 km² corresponding to 9.5% of Turkey's total. The total population at the 1990 census was 5,158,013 (6,604,205 people in the 2000 census) people accounting approximately 10% with an increasing ratio since 1945. All provinces in the region are net out-migrating areas, though there is an important in-

migration percentage. The GAP region is one of the least developed regions in Turkey, and its per capita GDP is around 50% percent of Turkey (DPT 1990).

The GAP region at present faces a range of problems, which are interacting with one another. Those are; Low income level due to immature economic structure, out migration from villages to larger cities in the region and out of the region (DPT 1990). The reason listed above, are mainly problems as well as the reasons of disparities formation.

SAP, at first planned as an irrigation and production of hydropower energy, transformed to a Regional Development Project containing not only infra structure but super structure and investment to social capital. One of the main stages of the Project is Kinked Development Axis (look at Figure 1) in which there are the cities.

Figure 1: Spatial Development Structure with “Kinked Development Axis”

Source: State Planning Organization (SPO), SAP Master Plan Study, Final Master Plan Report, Executive Summary, 1990

3. The Cities

Analyzing cities, in a regional perspective, is a complicated process. A city can be described as a region by itself, though it is surely in a geographical region. In the study,

the cities will be observed and analyzed not only their features but also their effects to the region while the regional development plan's decisions are checked.

- 3.1. Gaziantep with a million inhabitants planned opening door to outside of the country and industrial center.

In SAP Master plan Study; strategies for the city of Gaziantep are as follows:

- To improve infrastructure and utilities within Gaziantep municipality in order to maintain its status as the Region's commercial and trade center,
- To take incentive measures to attract the private sector investment into new industries to diversify the industrial base

- 3.2. Sanliurfa, with its huge harran plain, planned to produce industrial raw material like cotton

In SAP Master plan Study; strategies for the city of Sanliurfa are as follows:

- To improve the urban services in Sanliurfa city and infrastructure associated with the irrigation development
- To develop the city of Sanliurfa into a regional center by much improving urban infrastructure and social services
- To expand the economic corridor by improving linkages with neighboring areas

- 3.3. Diyarbakir is not only the capital of the Upper Tigris Valley, but located in what was formerly Mesopotamia, can make claim to be one of oldest inhabited cities on earth (Hyder consulting, 2001). The City's location on the Tigris is such that it has always been a nodal point in terms of communications, both on a north to south and an east to west axis.

In SAP Master plan Study; strategies for the city of Diyarbakir are as follows:

- To establish agro-processing industries on the basis of priority irrigation schemes
- To enhance the urban functions of Diyarbakir municipality

Table 1. Population of the Cities and the three Biggest Cities of Turkey			
City	Population (2000)	Population (1990)	Annual Growth Rate (%0, 1990 – 2000)
Turkey	44,109,336	33,656,275	27.04
İstanbul	9,119,315	6,779,594	29.64
Ankara	3,540,522	2,836,802	22.15
İzmir	2,750,273	2,137,721	25.19
Gaziantep	1,018,700	738,245	32.19
Sanliurfa	839,817	551,614	42.02
Diyarbakır	818,396	595,440	31.80
Resource: 1. State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara - 2002 2. http://www.die.gov.tr/nufus_sayimi/2000tablo3.xls			

Looking at the table 1., urbanization process the Cities is higher than the Turkey's average and the three biggest cities. This process brings problems in supplying urban services like improvement infrastructure projects and supplying housing although it brings a relative dynamics to the region.

Table 2. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the Cities and the three Biggest Cities of Turkey		
(At 1987 Prices in Millions of TL)		
City	1990	2000
Turkey	83,278,464	118,789,113
İstanbul	17,333,961	26,278,326
Ankara	6,579,837	9,545,749
İzmir	6,338,207	9,016,134
Gaziantep	1,504,936	1,741,987
Sanliurfa	596,677	1,250,401
Diyarbakır	1,118,803	1,196,370
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara - 2002		

Looking at table 2, the cities GDP, except Sanliurfa are almost same, though Turkey's and the biggest cities ratio are expanded. This is a contradiction to regional Development plans mentality. Actually, the increase in Sanliurfa GDP is just because of Atatürk Dam, which is one of the main parts of SAP, investments. Meanwhile Sanliurfa used this event as an engine for city development.

Table 3. Gross Domestic Product Per Capita of the Cities and the three Biggest Cities of Turkey			
		(At 1987 Prices in TL)	
City	- Rank in Turkey	1990	2000
Turkey		1,487,082	1,760,856
İstanbul	- (9/81)	2,398,603	2,645,304
Ankara	- (13/81)	2,042,436	2,397,529
İzmir	- (7/81)	2,369,207	2,680,099
Gaziantep	- (34/81)	1,330,167	1,356,619
Sanliurfa	- (57/81)	602,836	879,557
Diyarbakır	- (56/81)	1,029,661	882,901
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara – 2002			

Concerning the Human Development Index (HDI) and Sustainable Development the GDP per capita is an important point. When we analyze the Table 3, it can clearly be seen that SAP has no effects to the people of the region. Besides it can be said that there is minus effect when the cities GDP controlled, like Diyarbakır.

Table 4. Public Investment Expenditures of the Cities and the three Biggest Cities of Turkey			
		(Arranged in order of 1990-2001 Cumulative Public Expenditures) (At 2001 Prices in Millions of TL)	
City	- Rank in Turkey	1990	2000
Turkey		3,737,129,540	2,718,757,000
İstanbul	- (1/81)	430,032,171	230,168,000
Ankara	- (2/81)	343,584,155	116,131,000
İzmir	- (3/81)	216,120,041	146,770,000
Gaziantep	- (23/81)	47,644,770	26,666,000
Sanliurfa	- (5/81)	253,602,282	119,621,000
Diyarbakır	- (12/81)	94,673,329	44,739,000
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara – 2002			

Public Investment is a key element of not only cities but also countries for development, although mentality has changed a lot. From the Table 4 it can be seen that how less investment have been done to the region. On the contrary the SAP is a Regional Development for all of the Turkey.

Table 5. Consolidated Budget Incomes			
(Arranged in order of 1995-2001 Cumulative Budget Incomes		(At 2001 Prices Billions of TL)	
City	Rank in Turkey	1995	2001
Turkey		28,878,158	49,448,603
Istanbul	1/81	10,807,163	21,168,561
Ankara	2/81	3,869,986	8,294,838
İzmir	4/81	2,484,208	3,299,576
Gaziantep	18/81	167,317	236,212
Sanliurfa	39/81	46,150	88,228
Diyarbakır	30/81	76,024	103,023
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, <u>Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions</u> , Ankara - 2002			

City of Istanbul not only takes almost half of the total but also takes the highest level per capita. The cities positions are stable though the amount has increased. Since the benefits of SAP are for whole of Turkey, we prefer to neglect the increase in the Cities.

Table 6. Total Bank Deposits			
(Arranged in order of 2000 Bank Deposits Per Capita		(At 2001 Prices)	
City	Rank in Turkey	2000 (Total, Billions of TL)	2000 (Per Capita, Millions of TL)
Turkey		102,028,746	1,503.9
Istanbul	2/81	45,710,888	4,555.8
Ankara	1/81	21,194,900	5,288.3
Izmir	3/81	6,037,600	1,782.1
Gaziantep	47/81	552,504	427.0
Sanliurfa	74/81	149,529	104.1
Diyarbakır	69/81	227,790	167.0
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, <u>Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions</u> , Ankara – 2002			

Table 7. Total Bank Credits (Arranged in order of 2000 Bank Credits Per Capita (At 2001 Prices))			
City	Rank in Turkey	2000 (Total, Billions of TL)	2000 (Per Capita, Millions of TL)
Turkey		47,890,374	705,9
Istanbul	3/81	20,529,869	2,046.1
Ankara	2/81	8,511,968	2,123.8
Izmir	6/81	2,893,942	854.2
Gaziantep	13/81	442,842	342.3
Sanliurfa	71/81	118,385	82.4
Diyarbakir	70/81	122,327	89.7
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara – 2002			

Table 8. Health Indicators 2000 (Arranged in Order of Population Per Doctor)					
City- Rank in Turkey	Population Per Doctor	Population Per Specialist	Population Per Dentist	Population Per Pharmacist	Population Per Nurse
Turkey	788	1,634	4,516	2,885	978
Istanbul- 3/81	487	789	2,098	1,833	1,124
Ankara – 1/81	317	600	1,655	1,566	537
Izmir – 2/81	443	958	2,200	1,662	674
Gaziantep – 48/81	1,338	2,862	8,862	3,171	1,940
Sanliurfa – 74/81	2,325	6,908	28,176	5,169	2,360
Diyarbakir – 55/81	1,426	4,345	28,421	4,907	1,049
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions, Ankara - 2002					

It is clearly seen that Sanliurfa and Diyarbakir are the poorest cities among the cities shown in the Table 8. Besides, situation of Sanliurfa may describe worse when it looked the SAP applications.

Table 9. Number of Motor Vehicles and Private Cars (2000) (Per 10,000 Population)			
City	Rank in Turkey	Number of Private Cars	Number of Motor Vehicles
Turkey		652	1,056
Istanbul	16/81	998	1,280
Ankara	1/81	1,614	2,033
Izmir	8/81	981	1,519
Gaziantep	28/81	452	1,029
Sanliurfa	58/81	207	484
Diyarbakir	73/81	123	242
Resource: State Planning Organization of Turkey, <u>Various Indicators Related to Provinces and Regions</u> , Ankara - 2002			

Another indicator, that is Number of Motor Vehicles and Private Car, is shown in Table 9. An important indicator of modern era can be said that having a private car. When it is looked at the Table 9, the cities, Gaziantep, Sanliurfa, Diyarbakir, are under the average of the Turkey, besides Diyarbakir is approximately one fourth of Turkey's average.

4. Conclusions

- There is no regional concept among the cities.
- Cities try to develop by traditional industrialization way, so that There is no sustainability concept either in SAP region or among cities,
- The Regional Development Plan, SAP, has no overall control and management on cities development.
- The idea of the cities, to be the leader of the region, does not contain a long-term urbanization process but sentimental compatriotism.
- Every city demands every infra structure, that is discouraging regional development, as it is a free region and /or country.
- Regional disparity is continuing, although there is a regional development plan.
- Gaziantep seems to develop by its way, the idea of sustainability still far a way,

- Sanliurfa, whose is a getting lot of investments for SAP applications, still did not find out the way of development.
- Diyarbakir is getting worse and no clues of development but chaos.

5. Resources

- 5.1.** GAP İdaresi Başkanlığı, “GAP Tanıtımı İçin Hazırlanan Brifing Raporu”
Ankara, 1996,
- 5.2.** DPT (1990), VI. Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı Öncesinde Gelişmeler, 1984-1988,
Ankara,
- 5.3.** The Future of Diyarbakir, The Overall City Plan, Scoping Report, Hyder
Consulting, 2001,
- 5.4.** State Planning Organization (SPO), SAP Master Plan Study, Final Master Plan
Report, Executive Summary, 1990,
- 5.5.** Sinemillioğlu, M.O., “The Dilemma Between Regional Development And
Regional Disparities: The Case Of GAP (Southeastern Anatolia Project),
Unpublished PhD Thesis in Technical University of Istanbul