

CITY CENTRE'S RESILIENCE, HAWLER CASTLE CAN BE A RESILIENT CITY CENTRE?

Prepared by : Ako Mustafa Rasool

There has been a tension between the old and the new also struggle over continuity and change. The historic city centers in Iraq have also been the subject of such controversy. The historic cores, which form a very small part of the cities in recent times, have been undermined in the various waves of redevelopment. There has been an underlying emphasis on physical-led regeneration and delivery of flagship projects. This dominant approach, mainly employed by the central government, has failed to solve the problems of the areas; indeed, the interventions carried out within the framework of this approach have exacerbated the existing problems. During the last decade, however, efforts to revitalize Iraq's historic cities have gained a new momentum.

Several interrelated factors contributed to the changing role or structure of the state in urban regeneration process, which provided a basis for the development of a new approach to the regeneration of historic environment in Iraq. Due to the lack of sufficient research on these approaches and the absence of comparing and assessing their results, this study aims to provide a deeper insight and develop a better understanding of these approaches to revitalize the historic urban centre. This is realized by identifying the employed approaches and addressing their deficiencies, exploring factors that shaped the approaches, examining and interpreting the features that characterize the approaches, and assessing their outcomes and impacts.

In Iraq, especially the Kurdistan Region and specifically the city of Hawler, the political and economic conditions impose the city of Hawler to be a place for destination and shelter place for people from all surrounding places and adjacent townships. Also the increasing job opportunities and lifestyle quality in the city, on the other hand, the stable political situation in Kurdistan, attract Arab families from the central and southern part of Iraq, which are not secure, unstable political and economic area, to migrate to the northern regions that characterized by

secure place , political stability and grown economic. This place Known as the Kurdistan Region and includes the city of Hawler, Dohuk and Sulaymaniyah.

Hawler is a beautiful green city and situated in flat ground, it's planned in a style like Burgess Theory (Carter, 1974), which the Hawler Castle located in the central of the city and the urban areas are made through a series of concentric cycle expanded radially from the central to outside of the suburbs. The circumstances that passed by Kurdistan Region between 1990 to 2013 were not permitted accurately the application of sustainable urban planning in term of practical side, although there are plans by foreign and local companies to development the city, and still the old plan that ratified by the Iraqi government before 1990 remained without development except a minor changes in the master plan, and also the presence of the current political power to impose theories and schemes serve his personal interests to prevent the master plan from developing scientifically and in academic way. See figure 1 and 2.



Figure 1: Hawler Castle



Figure 2: Hawler (Erbil) City

Developing a unified approach to dealing appropriately with the historic environment has always been a challenging problem in many countries. There has been a tension between the old and the new, struggles over ‘Continuity and change’ and a battle between ‘tradition and modernity’. The built environment has been subject to the polarization between, on the one hand, conservation of historic elements, and on the other hand, aggressive technology-driven modernization and development. However, as (WORTHINGTON, 1998) argued, the opportunities for revitalizing the historic environment requires both conservation and development to keep a unique sense of the historic environment whilst allowing it to flourish, adapt and grow to meet the needs of the 21 St century: “conserving and adapting the old for its cultural and historic value, whilst simultaneously demolishing those parts that reduce effective and flexible use, and building new to provide usable and adaptable space for a wider range of

functions”. (Tiesdell, 1996) put forward the view that “the fabric may be adapted to contemporary requirements through various modes of renewal: rehabilitation, conservation or by demolition and redevelopment”.

It is evident that there has been a lack of consensus over the definition of ‘values’. Historic places may have a range of values for different individuals or agencies involved in the management of historic environments. (Larkham, P.J., 1996) argues that the overwhelming motivation for change in the historic areas has been the prospect of economic gain: “there is a clash of values: land and property exploitation for capital gain versus consideration of art, aesthetic and historical appreciation”. (Feilden, 2003) classified the values under three main headings: ‘emotional’ (wonder, identity, continuity, respect and veneration, symbolic and spiritual), ‘cultural’ (documentary, historic, archaeological and age, aesthetic and architectural, townscape and ecological, technological and scientific) and ‘use values’ (functional, economic, social, educational and political). There is a need to establish a basis for balanced judgments where cultural, economic and financial values are taken into account in the context of the decision-making process concerning the planning and management of the built environment. In fact, an integrated and balanced approach is needed to combine interrelated conservation and regeneration objectives.

Conservation versus restoration:

“Restoration means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed. It is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture”

(John Ruskin, ‘The Lamp of Memory’ chap. 6, in the Seven Lamps of Architecture, London, 1849)

In the mid-nineteenth century, two basic, and ideologically contrasting tendencies developed, which were associated with particular influential individuals. These were restoration a la mode, associated with Viollet-le-

Duc (1814-1879) and the anti-restoration movement, associated with Ruskin (1819-1900) and Morris (1834-1896) (Ashworth, 1999). The basic idea of mimetic or ‘a la mode’ restoration is that the architect can and should complete the building to leave it in its original state. Every building and their elements should be restored in its own style, returning their purity, which implied the possibility of removing the additions of other epochs and filling in the last parts with pieces copied from the same building or others of the same period (Ashworth, 1999); (Jokilehto, 1999a). The new restoration movement, which was based on scientific methods and development of knowledge, dominated the scene from the second half of the nineteenth century. However, the conception of stylistic restoration raised issues of ‘authentic restoration’ and ‘style selectivity’, which faced increasing criticism that led to an ‘anti-restoration movement’ and ‘modern conservation’. The anti-restoration movement criticized the previous style for the destruction of the historical authenticity of the buildings and struggled for their protection, conservation and maintenance (Jokilehto, 1999a). While initially leading a movement based on criticism, conservation gradually became accepted as the modern approach to the care of historic buildings and works of art. The modern conservation movement, headed by Ruskin and Morris, emphasized daily maintenance in the preservation of heritage as well as the concept of minimal intervention in restoration. Clear principles of intervention were evolved, which are key concepts in the present day management by many official heritage management institutions. The new approach addressed a number of issues on authenticity and originality in the evaluation of historic buildings: “Stress is placed on the sanctity of authentic historic fabric and the custodianship of buildings for future generations” (Pendlebury, 2002).

At a time when Europe was dominated by the stylistic unity in restoration, the modern conservation movement was not well understood. However, as a result of the efforts of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings founded by Morris in the UK², the attempts of Camillo Boito (1836-1914) and G. Giovannoni (1837-1947) in Italy and Alois Riegl (1857-1905) in Austria, the conservation movement spread to other countries (Ashworth and Howard 1999; Jokilehto, 1999b; Pickard, 1996). Although the new approach evolved around individual buildings and

monuments, it initiated the consideration of some different problems in conserving the character of historic areas (Pendlebury, 1999).

From building preservation to urban conservation:

“The Concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event;...’ A monument is inseparable from history to which it bears witness and from the setting in which it occurs)

(Article I and 7, the ICOMOS Venice Charter, 1964)

Moving into the twentieth century, a major shift of emphasis occurred in the conservation of historic buildings movement. Interest has expanded to encompass a widening range of elements in the historic environment, moving out from individual buildings and specific sites to their interrelated contexts. This second wave of preservation, or more accurately, conservation policies was mainly a reaction against the trend in post-Second World War planning towards comprehensive clearance and redevelopment which provoked strong feelings towards the past (Larkham, 1996; Pendlebury, 1999; Saunders, 1996; Tiesdell, Oc et al. 1996). The massive destruction of historic cities gave rise to community awareness of the values of lost or severely damaged familiar neighbourhoods. While major efforts were devoted to restoring notable monuments, this consciousness gradually led to organised efforts to protect historic city centres and entire territories, respecting their traditional diversity, people and activities (Jokilehto, 1999; Manley and Guise, 1998). Earlier conservation policies have therefore progressed from a simple and restrictive concern with preservation of individual buildings and specific sites to an increased concern for revitalisation and enhancement of historic urban areas.

Conservation as a component of urban regeneration and economic development:

“Conservation is not backward looking. It offers sustainable solutions to the social and economic problems afflicting our towns and cities. It stands

in the vanguard of social and economic policy, capable of reversing decay by injecting new life into a familiar area”

(Conservation-led regeneration: The work of English Heritage, 1998, p 1)

Over the past three decades conservation activity has broadened from being characterised as an act of preservation towards being characterised as part of a broader vehicle for urban regeneration and economic development (Delafons, 1997; Pearce, 1994; Pendlebury,

2002; Strange and Whitney, 2003). The term ‘conservation’, which was officially defined as ‘preservation and enhancement, has been redefined to reflect a wider view. This wider view addresses the need to manage change sensitively within the historic environment to ensure “the retention of this finite resource in a way which does not compromise its integrity, while guaranteeing its economic well being” (Manley and Guise. 1998). Conservation has been encouraged to develop its regenerative potential, particularly through the more economically productive use of historic buildings, it represents the reorientation of conservation towards more economically focused regeneration objectives.

Thinking about the ways in which historic assets can be used and adapted for economic uses is clearly evident in contemporary conservation thinking and practice. Although the link between the historic environment and the economy is not new (“tourism is the obvious example where there is long and acknowledged linkage between the two” [Pendlebury, 2000, p 45]), the economic role and function of conservation became more important and clearly defined in this period.

This is a new concept in the conservation/preservation debates that has emerged since the early 1980s. Within the scope of this concept, the term ‘heritage’ is used to describe a new trend in the management approaches to the historic environment. As Ashworth and Tunbridge (1994, p 24) stated, ‘heritage’ is the concept that provides “the link between the preservation of the past for its intrinsic value, and as a resource for modern community or commercial activity: “Heritage is the contemporary usage of a past and is consciously shaped from history, its survivals and memories, in response to current needs for it” (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1999, p 105).

Models of development Process:

It is commonly acknowledged that awareness of the development process helps decision-makers, planners and other professionals involved gain a deeper understanding of both the context in which they operate and the forces acting upon the process by which their policies, proposals and projects originate and are implemented (Carmona et al., 2003; Guy and Ilenneberry, 2000; Madanipour, 1996). In order to find a clear understanding of the interaction between contexts and forces that affect decisions and outcomes, therefore, it is necessary to see urban regeneration as part of a broader context of urban development process. Urban development is a process that “involves a large number of agencies and is deeply rooted in the general constitution of the social and economic processes” (Madanipour, 1996, p 130). Guy and Ilenneberry (2002, p 5) argue that ‘urban development is a complex process which entails the orchestration of finance, materials, labour and expertise by many actors within a wider, social, economic and political environment’. To facilitate understanding of development process, several models have been devised. This section reviews these models of the development process in order to understand the different aspects of this complex process. Such a review has the advantage not only of bringing together from diffuse sources the principal approaches adopted in investigating the way in which the development process operates, but also of permitting discussion of key components and attributes of that process. Awareness of mechanism and components of the development process can be the best way for understanding the urban changes and interventions in this context.

In a series of articles, Healey (1991, 1992, and Healey and Barrett, 1990) identified and introduced the models of development process embracing equilibrium models, ‘Event sequence models’, ‘Agency models’, ‘Structure models’, and later an ‘structure-agency institutionalism’, which was considered as the subset of two main approaches: Actors-

institution and Political-economy. Gore and Nicholson (1991, p 706) also identified four main types of approach to modelling the development process including: ‘Sequential or descriptive approaches’, ‘Behavioural or decision-making approaches’, ‘Production-based approaches’, and

Structure of provision'. Some of the approaches introduced by Gore and Nicholson are almost in common with the models identified by [lealey. Ball (1998). after his extensive work n this field, similarly suggested an institutional model. which was approached from mainstream economics, power, structure-agency and structures of provision methodologies. In the following sub-sections, live broad perspectives of the development process are briefly reviewed, which have been derived from a substantial body of work conducted by Gore and Nicholson, Hcalcy and Ball,

The Local Challenge for Improves :

It is clear that local authority that has the power with the policy-makers and practitioners should consider in designing regeneration policies and developing programs arid efforts dealing with the problems of historic environments. The primary implications of the study are summarized in five elements including:

- a. There is no balance between local and central development.
- b. Missing innovative local partnerships, multi-agency regeneration partnership.
- c. Weakness of local authorities' (locally-based regeneration).
- d. Lack of Adopting and developing an integrated approach' (conservation-led regeneration).
- e. Local people are not Involving to the urban development (community-based regeneration).

To provide a deeper insight and develop a better understanding of approaches to the revitalization of historic urban centers in Hawler City. First, to promote an understanding and awareness of city centre regeneration, it is necessary to look at the processes that shaped or framed this trend, while at the same time, it is important to look at the outcomes and their impacts. However, first it requires an investigation at national level to identify the major approaches that provides a basis for an

in-depth investigation on cases representing major approaches for this study. Therefore, to achieve this aim it will be necessary to:

- a.** Identify the employed approaches.
- b.** Explore factors that shaped the approaches.
- c.** Examine and interpret the features that characterize the approaches.
- d.** Assess their outcomes and impacts.

The obvious questions leads the policy makers to a more clearly focused discussion of the type of information needed:

- a.** What are the approaches to the regeneration of city centers in Iraq?
- b.** What are the characteristics of these approaches?
- c.** How were these approaches shaped and what factors served to shape them?
- d.** What are their outcomes and impacts in practice?
- e.** Why these approaches are mainly considered problematic and deficient? Is there any alternative model or approach capable of addressing these problems?

The way for finding best choice to finding solutions in Hawler City Center, the first largest cities in Kurdistan Region. The case of Hawler City Center exemplifies a physical-led, redevelopment oriented approach employed by the central government. However, Hawler Castle represents an integrated and more sensitive, conservation-led approach adopted by the local authorities, because right now facing renovation process under the Hawler municipality's supervision and UNESCO. The city center will be comparisons between another cities, that will be choose later during the study period and after supervisor's decision.

7. REFERENCES

- Ashworth, G. &. (1999). *European Heritage, Planning and Management*. Exeter: Intellect Books.
- Carter, H. (1974). *The Study of Urban Geography*. New York: Grane, Russak and Company.
- Feilden, B. (2003). *Conservation of historic building*. Oxford: Architectural.
- Jokilehto, J. (1999a). A Century of Heritage Conservation. *Architectural Conservation* , 14-33.
- Larkham, P.J. (1996). *Concervation and the city*. London: Routledge.
- Pendlebury, J. (2002). Conservation and Regeneration: Complementary or Conflicting Processes? The Case of Grainger Town, Newcastle upon Tyne. *Planning Practice and Research* , 17, 145-158.
- Tiesdell, S. O. (1996). Revitalizing historic urban quarter. *Architectural Press* , 18.
- WORTHINGTON, J. (1998). Postscript: concervation through development. In J. W. Warren, *New building in historic setting* (p. 177). Oxford, Boston: Architectural Press.