

METROPOLITAN GOVERNANCE IN TURKEY WITH REGARD TO REGIONALISM APPROACHES

Tarkan OKTAY*

Abstract

City administration, which developed related to urban population rise, is one of the main aspects of public administration reforms. Reform efforts has been progressing especially on the basis of metropolitan municipality model since 2002. Reform package enforced in 2014 by depending on law numbered 6360, not only increased number of metropolitan municipalities but also extended the boundaries of authority. Metropolitan municipalities became a lever for problem solution regarding local services and local development within the scope of provinces in Turkey. Regionalism approaches have influences on design of metropolitan reform along with new public management approach. In this study, influences of metropolitan reforms in Turkey and regionalism approaches are analysed sophisticatedly.

Keywords: Metropolitan Governance, Metropolitan Reform Tradition, Public Choice Perspective, New Regionalism.

Introduction

Rise of metropolitan cities brought the question of administration for all over the world. Today, cities have been confronting multiple change and development economically, socially, politically, technologically and culturally. On the one hand, there are new cities rising, on the other hand; there are struggles for protecting and developing the level of already existing cities. Every country develops a administration model with regard to its own experience. In addition to cities at the metropolitan level, increasing problems of contexts in the process of being metropolitan has been enhancing the search of organizational model for cities in different scales. On the other hand, in addition to national level, cities became significant actor in international economic relations. Correspondingly, administration models were affected. This situation differentiated the spatial organization of public administration.

In Turkey, experience of metropolis administration goes back to the Ottoman period. In the republic period, metropolis administration gained more currency after 1970s. Migration flows from rural areas to metropolises caused a lot of problems in these cities. After 1984, metropolitan municipalities were started to established in Turkey. Metropolitan municipality model was developed through local government reform in 2004. In the later years, reform efforts continued in this area. Metropolitan municipalities are considered as a pioneer regarding economy and development of Turkey. Along with law amendment in 2012, metropolitan municipalities became responsible for whole province. This law came into force in 2014.

In reform studies regarding metropolitan municipalities in Turkey, it is possible to see not only struggles to seek solution for local government problems, but also influences of contemporary administration approaches. Sense of new public management and implementations in European Union affected local government reforms after 2002. Recently, about the issue of local development, which is main focus of public administration in Turkey as a main problem, there are significant progresses regarding provincial and region scaled policy making, organization and implementation in parallel with new regionalism understanding. New metropolitan reform package placed in between local governments and local development. In this study, development of metropolitan municipalities in Turkey, reasons of new reform and its main

* Doç.Dr. İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, tarkan.oktay@medeniyet.edu.tr

features are analysed sophisticatedly. In this regard, new metropolitan model is investigated within the scope of metropolitan reform tradition, public preference approach and new regionalism approach.

1. The Concept of Metropolitan, Administration Approaches and Models.

One of the main effects of Industrial Revolution is that it caused intense population accumulation from rural areas to urban areas. With high level of urban population and rearrangement of economic, social and spatial relations in cities, first metropolises of modern times have emerged. According to data of United Nations, whereas urban population rate was 30% in 1950s, today it reached to 53%. Urban population rate reached to 78% in developed countries and to 48% in developing countries. Rapid urbanization trend has been continuing in Asia, South America and Africa. In Europe and North America, urban population rate process horizontally (United Nations, 2015, 21-23). Countries in these regions had reached a balance by experiencing similar trends in 19th and 20th centuries.

Population generally tends towards cities and especially metropolises in the world. In 1950, there were only two cities, New York and Tokyo, in which population exceeded 10 million. In 2004, this number became 28, and it is estimated that this number will become 41 in 2030. According to data of United Nations in 2014, 11,7% of urban population has been living in cities having 10 million habitants, 7,7% of urban population has been living in cities having 5-10 million habitants, 22,3% of urban population has been living in cities having 1-5 million habitants. These data means that 41,7% of urban population has been living in cities having minimum 1 million habitants. It is estimated that this rate will reach to 45,3% in 2030. According to data of 2014, cities having more than 10 million-population are as follows: Tokyo, Delhi, Shanghai, Mexico City, Sao Paulo, Mumbai, Osaka, Pekin, New York, Cairo, Dakka, Karachi, Buenos Aires, Calcutta, Istanbul, Chongqing, Rio de Janeiro, Manila, Lagos, Los Angeles, Moskova, Guangzhou, Guangdong, Kinshasa, Paris, Shenzhen, London, Jakarta (United Nations, 2015, 79 and 86).

The concept of “Metropolis”, which comes from the words “Metro” (main, essential) and “Polis” (city), and similar concepts of “Metropolis” and “Metropolitan” are used to differentiate large-scaled cities from the others (Keene, 2004, 459-462). Today, large-scaled settlements are defined as “metropolis” or “metropolitan region”. In order to express urban and rural areas of these settlements, definitions of “metropolitan area” or “metropolitan region” are used. It is possible to define metropolitan city as the one which developed depending on city center, has one or more sub centers, contains settlements dependent to this center, has more than one local government unit, provides large-scaled local services, expands in wide surface area including rural areas integrated with settlements, and has more than 1 million-population (Oktay, 2016, 23).

Metropolitan cities, which have almost half of the urban population in the world, have been confronting many social, economic, administrative and technical problems in formation and development process. Metropolitan cities have been trying to cope with changing problems depending on development level in addition to common problems. Currently, solution seeking for problems of metropolitan areas has been continuing, which began at the end of 19th century. Metropolitan cities formed their own space in terms of administration, law, service technology and political organizations. One of the most fundamental questions is what kind of model will be employed to administrate metropolitan cities. There is no common model for administration of metropolitan cities in the world. There are different models that each country and city developed in accordance with their qualifications and social experiences. It is possible to say that generally metropolitan cities have different administration structure compare to other cities

of that country. Common feature of different models is trying to solve problems in metropolitan area by interrelating and embodying them. In this regard, we can accept “Metropolitan Governance” as an umbrella term, which contains different administration models in metropolitan cities.

There are several approaches regarding how metropolitan governance will be organized. These approaches, which emerged in the process of development of metropolitan cities in Europe and North America, present a general point of view regarding design of administration models by including areas such as number of administration units in metropolitan area, their scale, their interrelations, externalities, political participation and economic progress to the analysis as a whole. It is possible to determine three main approaches in administration of metropolitan areas: metropolitan reform tradition, public choice theory and new regionalism.

Metropolitan reform tradition emerged in America after 1930. This approach, which developed in a period having Keynesian economic understanding, concentrates on planning problems and ineffectiveness of services in metropolitan areas. It admits that political and administrative fragmentation in metropolitan area underlies in those problems.

Settlements, which were existed before metropolitan period, have been growing and becoming an administrative and political unit by preserving their legal entity in the process of transformation to metropolitan city. Various units having separate legal entities, budget and investment plan cause lack of coordination, low capacity and scale problems regarding planning and service presentation in whole metropolitan area. Furthermore, important service level differences occur among units. Proponents of Metropolitan reform tradition argues that constituting one administration unit, which incorporates all functions and removing fragmented administrative and political structure in metropolitan area will solve problems in the area of planning and service. They state that single administration unit is advantageous in terms of institutional capacity, specialization, accountability, efficiency and control (Kübler and Heinelt, 2005, 9; Hamilton et al., 2004, 153; Sager, 2005, 230). Within the scope of this approach, after constituting a local government unit in charge of whole metropolitan area, other local governments are incorporated into main structure by deactivating their legal entity. Also whole service organization particularly planning, transportation and wastewater administration becomes responsibility of large scaled local government.

The second approach regarding administration of metropolitan areas based on public choice theory. Local government organization depending on single unit, which emerged after 1930s in metropolitan areas, started to change beginning from the middle of 1950s. More than one administrative units and levels were constructed in metropolitan area. Public choice approach criticizes the model depending on single administration unit in metropolitan area for not providing efficiency and productivity and different alternatives for citizens to choose regarding services. According to this approach, constituting more than one administration unit presents an alternative for citizens to settle in administration regions, which provide pleasing services. On the other hand, competition between units will increase service quality and productivity (Tiebout, 1956, p. 416-424; Ostrom et al., 1961, 838-839). Public choice approach defends decentralization of single unit based administration model, increasing number of administration units for alternatives allowing citizens to pay less taxes and to get more services, forming small administration units to filter citizen demands less, effective of ministers in smaller structures rather than bureaucracy domination in big administration structures (Sager, 2005, 232-233; Lyons and Lowery, 1989, 534).

Metropolitan reform approach and public choice approach were two main waves regarding metropolitan area till 1970s. Economic and political developments after 1970 caused to develop

a new approach in governance and organization of metropolitan area, which is called as “new regionalism”. Keynesian economy dominating after 1930 and regional politics implemented after II World War started to change after economic crisis in 1970s.

Rising global competition as a result of emergence of new economic actors in the other side of the world and especially in East Asia opposing North America and Europe, and transformation of industry to technology based, flexible and Post-Fordist mode of production in developed countries brought economic development and global competition approaches focusing on “region” instead of national development approaches. Rising of the region based on economy influenced approaches regarding metropolitan governance. Searching for the best metropolitan governance in 1980s changed the course towards how metropolitan area must be organized as a whole to gain advantage in economic development and global competition in 1990s (Oktya, 2016a, 46-47).

In new regionalism approach, local governments in metropolitan area has a key role in regional development. Local governments have advantage in terms of progressing development among each other and with public sector, and collaborating and networking to solve problems. New regionalism concentrates on the role of local governments in development and the network constructed between actors at local level rather than single administration model for metropolitan areas. Within this scope, instead of competition among administrations in metropolitan area, it defends collaboration and it aims at metropolitan governance (Hamilton et al., 2004, 154; Kübler et al., 2007, 476). New regionalism argues that governance can be constituted through not only public institutions, but also various non-public actors in metropolitan area (Kübler and Heinelt, p. 10).

New regionalism approach, which aims to prompt local resources economically, focuses on the role of metropolitan area in economic competition. In this regard, it tries to create a homogeneous environment regarding dependence relation and development between surrounding settlements and city center in metropolitan area. By this way, it is aimed to reduce negative results of fragmentation in metropolitan area (Norris, 2015, 62).

It is necessary to discuss implementation models in addition to governance approaches regarding metropolitan city governance. There are different models for metropolitan city governance in the world. Differences in historical experience of the country, political culture, development process of cities and local government model differentiate metropolitan governance models, too. Various classifications were developed regarding governance models in scientific studies. In a simple and useful classification among them, there are four metropolitan city administrations: single-stage, double-stage, optional and special purpose entities. In single-stage model, there is one administration stage in metropolitan area. In this model, there is only one local government unit in charge of whole metropolitan area. Generally, it is formed by incorporating other local governments in a central local government. Another type of single-stage model is organizing numerous local governments as single stage instead of a single administration. In double-stage model, there is a administration having authority and duties in whole metropolitan area in upper stage, and there are smaller administration units responsible within its boundaries in lower stage. Distribution of duty and authority between upper and lower stages differentiates depending on the country. In optional administration model, there is a new administration, in which more than one local government units constituting one stage in metropolitan area depend on volunteer collaboration in some services such as planning, transportation and environment. Special purpose entities, on the other hand; are administration units, which have separate legal entity in large scale service areas in metropolitan area such as transportation, water and waste water administration and energy administration. Political responsibility of technically predominated special purpose entities

belongs to the local government, which audits these entities (France et al., 1987, 16-27; Bird et al., 2008, 195-213, Tuzcuoğlu, 2003, 138-223; Slack, 2007, 14-24.).

According to another classification, which is made by Shah within the scope of OECD, there are 6 types of metropolitan administrations. These are; a) unitary governance, b) vertically coordinated metropolitan governance, c) horizontally coordinated mandatory two tier metropolitan governance, d) horizontally coordinated mandatory two tier metropolitan governance, e) horizontally coordinated voluntary two-tier metropolitan governance, f) uncoordinated two-tier metropolitan governance g) Uncoordinated/fragmented single tier metropolitan governance (Shah, 2013, 13-19).

There are various approaches and implementation models regarding metropolitan governance so that it becomes harder to find the best model. In this regard, it can be seen that researchers do not focus on the best model, but rather they concentrate on required features of that model. The criteria developed by researchers allow to evaluate metropolitan governance model. According to the criteria presented by Slack, metropolitan governance must be evaluated in terms of sensitivity to local demands, accessibility and accountability, equity, externalities and scale economy (Slack, 2007, 9-13). Ostrom grounds on criteria of audit, efficiency, the right of political representation and local self-determination (Ostrom et al., 1961, p. 835-837). Lefèvre presents criteria of strong political legitimacy, meaningful autonomy from both 'senior governments' and basic local authorities, wide-ranging jurisdiction, and 'relevant' territorial cover, consisting, roughly speaking, of the functional urban area (Lefèvre, 1998, 10). Oktay propounds following criteria: sufficient duty and realm of authority in terms of area, depending on scale economy in institutional structure and service organization, having extensive local autonomy, highly legitimated political representation system and high capacity of governance (Oktay, 2016, 52).

2. Development of Metropolitan Municipalities in Turkey

Processes of general trend of urbanization in the world and accumulation of population in the large scaled cities are also valid for Turkey. In 1950s, urban population was 5 million, which is 25% of the country population. Urban population increased as nearly twelve times within 60 years and reached to 58 million with 77% in 2012. Migration waves tending towards Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir in first periods increased growth of these cities. According to data of 2012, cities having population over 1 million are Adana, Ankara, Antalya, Bursa, Gaziantep, Istanbul, Izmir, Kayseri, Kocaeli and Konya. These ten cities contain 42% of general population and 54% of urban population in Turkey.

First examples of metropolitan governance with distinctive municipality models in Turkey go back to Ottoman period. First metropolitan municipality examples established as Şehremaneti and district municipality in Istanbul with regulations in 1855 and 1858. This was a two-stage administration structure. In 1912, autonomy and legal entity of town halls forming low stage were terminated and single-stage structure established. Şehremaneti model was terminated with 1930 dated Municipality Law, and municipality and province administration were united in Istanbul. In 1955, centralized structure was ended, and municipal council and provincial council reopened. Single-stage municipality structure was started to be implemented (Oktay, 2015, 193).

Intense migration tending towards metropolises and especially Istanbul from rural areas and less developed urban settlements after 1950 increased population. Failure of local governments in settlement of immigrant population in cities caused unplanned settlements in the periphery of cities. In 1965, Master Plan Bureau was established by centralized administration in order to find a solution for insufficiency of municipalities in planning. Main function of this bureau was

preparing zoning plans of current and probable urban areas in Istanbul. In time, these bureau were established in other provinces having intense migration, and number of these offices reached to 10 till 1980 (Özgür, 2010, 341-342).

In 1961 Constitution, there was not any regulation regarding implementation of a particular municipality model for metropolises. This situation was limiting implementation of a administration model particular to cities. In 1970s, solution seeking for rising problems of metropolises in terms of administration remained limited with development of some models based on municipality unions. Ministry of the Interior prepared law drafts of “Metropolitan Service Unity” in 1972 and “Istanbul Metropolitan Service Unity” in 1975. “General Directorate of Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration Law Draft” prepared by Ministry of Development and Housing in 1975, “Metropolitan Service Unity Law Draft” in 1976 and “Metropolitan Unity Law Draft” prepared by Ministry of Development and Housing in 1978 are important attempts in this period. However, related drafts could not become a law through legislative power due to conditions of political competition, therefore; irregular urbanization and problems faced by cities increasingly continued (Yeter, 2002, 43).

After 1980 military coup in Turkey, legal entities of small municipalities and villages formed around district municipality in metropolises removed and engaged into main municipality through law numbered 2561 in 1981. This law was implemented in Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Adana, Bursa, Gaziantep, Konya and Eskişehir. The number of municipalities in Turkey decreased to 1.580 from 1.700. Furthermore, 150 villages were removed (Keleş, 1985, 75-76). This implementation was supporting the authority of single municipality in metropolitan area as such in old regionalism approaches. In the growing process of cities, municipalities, which emerged in especially surrounding regions and formed an uncontrolled area, were integrated to main municipality by removing their legal entities.

After attempts through municipality unity model remained inconclusive and uncoordinated planning offices and municipalities around metropolitan cities were dissolved through main municipality in 1970s, a new municipality model was introduced in 1984. This new model brought by Delegated Legislation for Metropolitan governance in March 8, 1984 was two-staged and based on vertical coordination. In upper stage, there was a municipality structure, which undertook large scaled local services in whole metropolitan area. At lower level, there were district municipalities in the city. These municipalities were carrying out small scaled local services within their borders.

These municipalities at both level had separate legal entities. Coordination function among lower level district municipality was given to upper stage metropolitan municipality. Municipal council at upper stage was forming through participation of mayor and alderman at the rate of 1/5. Council at lower level was determined in accordance with results of election based on proportional representation. Metropolitan municipality model was started to be implemented firstly in İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir. It was implemented in Adana in 1986, in Bursa, Konya and Gaziantep in 1987, in Kayseri in 1988, in Antalya, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Eskişehir, Izmit, Mersin and Samsun in 1993, in Sakarya in 2000.

Metropolitan municipality system, which was established in 1984, did not change significantly until 2004. Through the Metropolitan Municipality Law numbered 5216, which was accepted in this year, current model was tried to be developed by maintaining its main structure. Number of meetings of municipal council increased and realm of their duty and authority was extended. Tutorship of governor over municipalities decreased considerably. Structure of councilor was changed. Furthermore, jurisdiction of metropolitan municipality was extended till provincial borders in Istanbul and Kocaeli as pilot scheme.

In other provinces, in which metropolitan municipality model was implemented, coverage zone was extended through circle regulation named as “Compasses” regulation. Accordingly, boundaries of circle with 20 km radius in metropolises having population till one million, with 30 km radius in metropolises having population from one million to two million, with 50 km radius in metropolises having population more than two million were accepted as boundary of metropolis on condition that governor’s office will be taken as center and will be placed within the boundary of province. Main justification for extending boundaries of metropolitan municipalities was providing zoning control and planning unity by containing nearby settlements and possible extension areas to the metropolitan boundaries.

Extension of metropolitan municipality boundaries with the law enforced in 2004 made some district municipalities and town municipalities incorporate in the metropolitan area. Town municipalities had established in settlements which are not in the status of district but having population more than 2000. In order to decrease segmented structure, town municipalities in the metropolitan area were removed in 2008 with law numbered 5747. Therefore, a simpler and more united structure, which has metropolitan municipality at upper stage and district municipality at lower level, started to be implemented.

3. Metropolitan Reform in Turkey: Transition from City Administration to Field Administration

For the metropolitan municipality model started to be implemented in 1984, 2012 was a year of turning point. Reform steps in 2004 and 2005 was towards developing authority and duties, service capacities and boundaries of municipalities. In 2012, a comprehensive reform was activated. Justification of reform package through law numbered 6360 states that a “economy”, “efficiency” and “effectiveness” administration through new public management approach and transition to “citizen oriented”, “accountable”, “participation” and “transparency” local government models were aimed. One of the main areas regulated by reform is small scaled local governments. Reform was justified by arguing that existence of various small scaled local governments cause incoordination in planning and presentation of local services, inefficiency in public resource usage, zoning planning without holism, not utilizing from scale economy and failures in services like transportation and environmental protection. It is argued that this reform aims municipality structures organizing in optimal service scale, having large institutional scale and strong capacities, and using advanced technology (Grand National Assembly of Turkey, Commission Report, 2004).

Reform package enforced in 2012 includes significant changes regarding metropolitan municipalities and general local government system in Turkey. In previous regulation, boundaries of metropolitan municipalities contained only the city, which is in center of province. With new regulation, boundaries of metropolitan municipalities contained whole province. In previous regulation, the criteria of being a metropolitan municipality was having 750 thousand-population for center of province, and having 3 district municipalities in center. With new regulation, 750 thousand total population of whole province found adequate rather than province center. In addition to current 16 metropolitan municipalities, metropolitan municipality was constructed in 14 more provinces which meet the condition of having 750 thousand-population. Boundaries of district in lower stage are made contained by district territorial boundary.

Table 1. Metropolitan Municipalities after Reform in Turkey

Metropolitan Municipalities Before Reform	Population	New Metropolitan Municipalities	Population
İstanbul	14.657.434	Şanlıurfa	1.892.320
Ankara	5.270.575	Hatay	1.533.507
İzmir	4.168.415	Manisa	1.380.366
Bursa	2.842.547	Balıkesir	1.186.688
Antalya	2.288.456	Kahramanmaraş	1.096.610
Adana	2.183.167	Van	1.096.397
Konya	2.130.544	Aydın	1.053.506
Gaziantep	1.931.836	Denizli	993.442
Kocaeli	1.780.055	Tekirdağ	937.910
Mersin	1.745.221	Muğla	908.877
Diyarbakır	1.654.196	Mardin	796.591
Kayseri	1.341.056	Malatya	772.904
Samsun	1.279.884	Trabzon	768.417
Sakarya	953.181	Ordu	728.949
Eskişehir	826.716		
Erzurum	762.321		

Resource: It is prepared by using the database of Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) in Local Elections Result.

One of the most important regulation of reform is about provincial special administrations. In previous model, local services regarding urban and rural are in provincial scale was carried out by provincial special administrations. In new model, provincial special administrations were removed in 30 provinces which became metropolis. Therefore, metropolitan municipalities became responsible from whole area in the province including urban and rural area. Metropolitan municipality and district municipalities transitioned to field administration including urban and rural area from administration of urban settlements. Majority of functions of provincial special administration transferred to municipalities. In other 51 provinces without metropolitan municipality, provincial special administrations carried on.

Provincial special administrations are subjected to central administration although they are in status of local government since mayor is executive organ in the system in Turkey. Mayor, who engaged in central administration hierarchically, may lead provincial special administration regarding investments and decisions. Central administration was carrying out many investments based on conditional transfer for services like education, health, social services, public work, over provincial special administration (Oktay, 2010, 92). After removal of provincial special administration in provinces becoming metropolis, departments of investment monitoring and coordination were established within governorship instead. Functions undertaken by provincial special administration on behalf of central administration are taken by field service of central administration in the new period. Legal entity was given to department of monitoring and coordination on September 1, 2016. This aims to fill the gap regarding investments and services due to removal of provincial special administration. Since new institution bounded to central administration hierarchically, it also placed out of control of local politics.

One of the important features of reform package enforced with law numbered 6360 is regulations regarding small scaled local governments. Through scale reform regulation in local governments, municipalities in Turkey having less then 2.000 population were removed. Furthermore, all town municipalities were removed in provinces having the statue of

metropolitan municipality. Within this scope, legal entity of 1.553 municipalities were removed. Another important change is about rural settlements. All villages were removed in provinces having the statue of metropolitan municipality and they transformed to quarter administration without legal entity. Names of 16 thousand villages became the names of quarters within this scope. In order to prevent difficulties and reactions regarding this transformation to quarter from village in terms of financial responsibilities and city law, some conveniences were implemented such as payment sale and real estate tax immunity in this transition period. Reform package of 2012 regarding metropolitan municipalities was started to be implemented as from March, 2014, when first local government elections occurred.

Through removal of provincial special administration and villages, it was transitioned to a model based two-level vertical coordination composed of metropolitan municipality and district municipality. Metropolitan municipality had the authority of planning and servicing in whole area with coordination and collaboration; without limitation of any other administration.

Table 2. Numbers of Local Governments in Turkey Before and After Reform

Type	2014 (Situation Before 6360)	2014 (Situation After 6360)	Rate of Change (%)
Provincial Special Administration	81	51	-37,0
Village	34.283	18.143	-47,1
Municipality	2.950	1.397	-52,6
Metropolitan municipality	16	30	87,5
Metropolitan district municipality	143	519	262,9
Provincial municipality	65	51	-21,5
District municipality	749	400	-46,6
Town Municipality	1.977	397	-79,9

Resource: 2014 Annual Report, General Directorate of Local Administrations, 2015, 13.

Income structure of local governments in Turkey re-regulated with law numbered 6360. Before reform, 6,5% of general budget tax income were given to local governments. This share was distributed at the rate of 2,85% to municipalities out of metropolitan municipalities, 2,5% to metropolitan district municipalities and 1,15% to provincial special administrations. Distribution rates re-regulated through new regulation in parallel with establishing 14 new metropolitan municipalities and removing 30 provincial special administrations. In accordance with new regulation, local government share of 6,5% distributed to municipalities out of metropolitan municipality at the rate of 1,5%, to metropolitan district municipalities at the rate of 4,5% and to provincial special administrations at the rate of 0,5%. Share of metropolitan municipalities from general budget tax incomes within boundaries of metropolitan municipalities increased to 6% from 5%. Despite significant changes within the scope of reform, there was not executed any enhancement in total income of metropolitan municipalities. Rather, it can be seen that total share was changed for new municipality model.

In Turkey, number of metropolitan municipalities reached to 30 after reform. This reform does not only mean extending metropolitan municipality model to new provinces. With reform package, metropolitan municipality model significantly changed in addition to changes in local government system. By removing four different local government units composed of provincial municipality, provincial special administration, district municipality and village, which were not coordinated, two-staged model started to be implemented based on coordination.

In this way, metropolitan municipalities became a local government unit at provincial scale also. The main reason of authorizing metropolitan municipalities in provincial scale is constructing a holistic local government structure based on coordination. Giving municipalities

a leading role is utilizing flexibility, convenience in connecting local actors and relatively high institutional capacity of municipalities. In Turkey, regional scale was used as a base in development strategies with reforms in public administration after 2002. Ninth Development Plan including the period 2007-2013 accepts providing regional development as one of the main politics in development. Main issues in development plan within the scope of new regionalism are developing institutional capacities at regional level, providing collaboration between economic actors, determining and actualizing strategies to advantage in economic competition, providing coordination between public institutions at local level and developing economic potential (Ninth Development Plan, 2006, 91-94). Provincial special administrations developed through regulations in 2005 could not take an active role in local development. Main reasons of this situation are that could not enhance income structure of provincial special administrations, being mayor as an executive organ, negative effect of high administrative tutelage and institution culture close to central administration (Oktay, 2010, 151-152; Ömürgönülşen and Sadioğlu, 11). In Turkey, development agencies were established in 2008 with influence of European Union process, new public management approach, governance and new regionalism approach (Kayasü and Yaşar, 2006, 210). However, dependence to central administration, deficiency of qualified staff, insufficiency of financial resources and insufficient institutional power in terms of activating local potential limited their role in development (Taş, 2007, 139-152). Metropolitan municipalities became the main actor of local government at provincial level as much as local services with model change in 2014.

Although reform contains metropolitan municipalities, metropolitan city qualification of provinces that new model implemented is weak. Population in center of province is under 500 thousand in 12 provinces in which new metropolitan municipality was established. While urban population average of provinces which have the status of metropolitan municipality is 83% before reform, average of new metropolitan provinces is 59%. This situation indicated that metropolitan municipality model was used in order to remove deficits in local services due to population increase and increase development level at provincial level.

The part, which brings significant changes in local government system in metropolitan municipality reform package, is the regulation including removal of municipalities whose population is under 2000. One of the main problems in local governments in Turkey was small municipalities. Population of majority of these municipalities became under 2000 because of migration (Gündüzöz, 2011, 99). Small scaled municipalities had faced with serious problems regarding income level, financial dependence on central government, technical staff employment, service capacity, debt level, current expenditure level, attendance of citizens and utilizing scale economy (Canpolat, 2016, 94). With metropolitan reform, small scaled municipalities were removed and transformed to quartet or village. Main approach of reform was increasing efficiency and sufficiency in services by transitioning to a large scaled model from small scaled local government structure.

Removal of provincial special administration, small scaled municipality and villages within the scope of metropolitan reform has been discussing in terms of local autonomy and centralization. Transition of authority and duties of provincial special administration, which is controlled by mayor connected to central administration, to the metropolitan municipality can be evaluated as localization. Constructing a new field service by giving legal entity to department of investment monitoring and coordination within governorship will increase centralization. On the other hand, transferring majority of authority and duties regarding local services at provincial scale from local governments at lower level to metropolitan municipality revealed more central municipality structure at provincial level. It can be said that removal of small scaled local governments brought a less convenient model in terms of local politics and

representation. While new model has advantages in terms of increase in efficiency and sufficiency of local services and holistic planning, it has disadvantages in terms of local democracy and sensitivity towards demands of citizens. Large bureaucratic structures filters demand of citizens more compare to smaller structures. On the other hand, professionalized strong bureaucratic structure can limit control of local politics upon municipality.

4. Regionalism Approaches and Metropolitan Municipality Administration in Turkey

Since the beginning of 1800s, in Turkey, main resource in solving problems faced in public administration and designing reform steps had been approaches and implementation models in Europe. After 1960s, implementation models in North America became another important resource in addition to Europe. The level of this interaction and influence of public administration on sub fields were not in same intensity in every period. Not only qualification of Turkey's relations with outside world and intensity of reform efforts, but also preferences of political governments influenced the level of this interaction. After transition to planned period in 1960s in Republic Period, utilizing from experiences of Europe and North America in public administration started to increase. After 1980s, development of liberal economy and politics, and steps of expansion to outside world increased this interaction. More influence compare to previous two periods occurred after 2002. Significant difference of last period from others is allowing implementation of administration approaches and model interaction through reforms.

Urban problems caused by population tended to mobile from rural or towns to the metropolises, and settled in uncontrolled way started to enter agenda of public administration more after 1965. At that time, there was not any separate model specific to metropolises. Metropolises were managing according to same municipality model with any other provinces. There was one municipality in charge of urban area in center of province. The first significant step about metropolitan cities was planning offices constructed within hierarchical structure of central administration and detailed above rather than change in local government model. In addition to this, in second development plan in 1968, it was suggested for metropolitan cities to have a different administration (Second Five-Year Development Plan, 1967, 268).

Actual attempts of changing governance model in metropolitan cities came to agenda in 1970s as mentioned above. Common point of these models was constructing a second stage formed as union of municipality upon lower stage composed of district in metropolitan city administration. It is aimed to authorize this stage in services containing whole metropolitan area exceeding boundaries of district above.

These models were foreseeing a administration structure, which has segmented structure at lower level and union of municipality at upper stage as in public choice approach, rather than one municipality without segmentation in metropolitan reform approach. By means of union of municipalities it was aimed to provide coordination in services and to utilize from advantages of scale economy. Through union of municipality, upper stage would have vertical coordination with lower stage. None of these models passed the level of law draft and found an opportunity to be implemented. In 1970s, metropolitan cities were continued to be administered by one municipality like any other provinces.

Administration after military coup in 1980 removed new municipalities at the boundaries of metropolises and included them to the boundaries of metropolitan municipality. This implementation was supporting authority of one single municipality in metropolitan area as such in metropolitan reform approach. Legal entities of municipalities causing an uncontrolled area in surrounding area were terminated in growing process of cities and these municipalities included to main municipality.

Model, in which metropolises are administered by one staged single municipality, was changed in 1984 in Turkey. Administration structure in metropolitan cities became segmented in parallel with liberal and competitive economy and politics of that period. In two stage model, there was one municipality at upper stage and segmented various municipalities at lower stage in metropolitan cities. Transition to two staged model means leaving one staged single municipality in metropolitan reform approach. In time, two staged model expanded its legitimacy and became main model in city administration in Turkey.

Metropolitan municipality model enforced in 1984 have a balanced distribution of duty and authority between upper and lower stage. Lower stage was structured as neither very powerful nor very weak. While lower stage had legal entity, administrative and financial autonomy, local services at district level became responsibility of district municipality. Municipality at upper stage was in charge of services which include more than one district. Vertical coordination between district municipalities and metropolitan municipality, which is provided through council at upper stage, allows district to balance metropolitan municipality.

A new trend initiated through reform implemented in local government field in 2004. This trend was expansion of boundaries of metropolitan municipality. Through metropolitan municipality law dated 2004, boundaries of metropolitan municipality moved beyond city boundaries and became equal to provincial borders in İstanbul and Kocaeli. For other metropolitan municipalities, on the other hand, boundaries expanded by determining circles with 20 km, 30 km and 50 km radius depending on population rate. We can see influences of new regionalism approach more on reforms after 2004. With new regulations, metropolitan municipality started to become prominent as a administration unity having strong institutional capacity at provincial scale. New functions of metropolitan municipalities had characteristic supporting local development at provincial level. Within the scope of principles brought with reform, metropolitan municipalities had more roles in providing coordination between economic actors in province and activating economic potential.

Expansion of boundaries in metropolitan area in 2004 had increased the number of lower staged municipalities within boundaries of metropolitan municipality. While metropolitan model based on a segmented structure, in new situation, increasing segmented structure and small scaled municipalities caused disunity of planning and zoning, coordination deficiency in services and auditing deficit. Small scaled municipalities were insufficient in fulfilling the local service demand in terms of institutional capacity. For this reason, in 2008, a law regulation was made in order to decrease segmentation; and town municipalities were removed in settlements, which are not district. This step decreased segmentation in lower stages of metropolitan municipalities. Nevertheless, two staged model, which has segmented lower stage, continued. In Turkey, although public choice approach and new regionalism determines major axis in metropolitan governance, it can be also seen that there were attempts to decrease segmentation in conformity with arguments of metropolitan reform approach.

Reform package regarding metropolitan municipalities in Turkey, which actualized in 2012 and started to be implemented in 2014, has an understanding using metropolitan governance approaches compositely. In reform justification, need for strong municipality structures to eliminate small scaled municipalities and segmented administration structure was emphasized; and efficiency, sufficiency and effectiveness were presented as main objective. On the other hand, a frame was formed, which is citizen oriented, governance based and participatory.

On one side, reform package includes provisions regarding forming a central and powerful metropolitan administration unit by asserting arguments of metropolitan reform approach about negative effects of segmented administration structure. On the other side, it takes into

consideration the arguments of public choice approach about advantages of segmented structure. In this regard, municipalities at lower stage are not removed completely considering negativities due to single and powerful municipality, but segmented structure are lessened. Metropolitan municipality are placed as main administration unit at provincial scale within the scope of new regionalism approach, which influenced new regulations in reform more.

In new model, removal of special provincial administration strengthened the condition of metropolitan municipality. Since special provincial administrations and development agencies could not have provided sufficient efficiency, organization and collaboration for regional and local development objectives adjusted in Ninth Development Plan within the scope of new regionalism approach, metropolitan municipalities became prominent through their powerful capacity at local level. New roles of metropolitan municipality are planning province with its urban and rural area as a whole, developing infrastructure, using outmaneuvering strategies in competition, activating economic potential and providing collaboration between economic and administrative actors in province, in addition to provide classical municipality services at provincial level.

Conclusion and Evaluation

Metropolitan municipality model increased its legitimacy by developing since 1984 as a result of its advantages and it was accepted in local government system in Turkey. This model, which was started to be implemented after problems of metropolitan cities that faced in 1960s and 1970s and increased in time, brought enhancement in various fields. Allowing planning with a holistic approach, facilitating coordination in large scaled local services, constituting a relatively high institutional capacity and allowing utilization from advantages of scale economy are prominent advantages of metropolitan municipality model.

In Turkey, the last phase of reform process about metropolitan cities initiating in 2000s is the model regulated in 2002 and started to be implemented after local elections in 2014. The trend started with expansion of authority and duty boundaries of metropolitan municipality in 2004, was completed by containing whole province. Metropolitan municipality and district municipalities at second level transitioned to field administration including urban and rural area from city administration.

Reform package started to be implemented in 2014 objectives to overcome problems of local governments and local services in province by using metropolitan municipality as a lever. In this regard, it has sub regulations supporting main objective such as lessening small municipalities and removing special provincial administrations and villages in provinces in which metropolitan municipality model was implemented. After reform, municipality became main actor in local services and in development of province as a whole. On the other hand, it can be said that new regionalism approach was accepted as major axis, which was started to be adopted with EU process of Turkey in especially 2000 and was internalized more through establishment of development agencies in 2008. Focus on development of Turkey shifted to local governments rather than central administration. Metropolitan municipalities became main actor within the scope of new regionalism. Although major axis is new regionalism, the other sides of the reform package are lessening segmented structure and small municipalities in accordance with arguments of metropolitan reform approach. The model in Turkey uses advantages of segmented municipality model and large scaled municipality structure together. With this qualification, it keeps some features of old regionalism approach and new regionalism approach together.

The main reason of seeing influences of three approaches, which occurred in time in Europe and North America as from 1930s, at the same time in reform package actualized in 2014 in

Turkey in metropolitan governance is development process of country. Designs about metropolitan governance differentiate in parallel with economic, political and social developments. Turkey is a country, in which the level of urbanization started to increase after 1950s and urbanization rate is still high in 2000s. Expansion of urban population and settlement has not reached to balance level yet. This situation also brings constant change of urban population and physical spaces of cities. There are cities having accumulation of population and the other ones having decreasing population. It is known that Europe and North America experienced similar process in earlier periods. A similar condition with implementing administration approaches, which belong different periods, together in public administration in Turkey can be also seen in metropolitan reform package. Designers of reform effort for both solving accumulated problems and taking contemporary approaches into consideration. This balance differentiates depending on reform areas in public administration. We can evaluate keeping regulations including scale reform, lessening segmented administration structure in metropolitan area and giving metropolitan municipality to role of main development actor in whole province through model constructing powerful metropolitan municipality at the same time in metropolitan reform package in this frame.

Removing numerous municipality and village and turning them to quartet with new reform package includes a risk in terms of democratic participation. Larger scaled local governments rather than small local governments have advantages in terms of efficiency and scale economy. On the other hand, they have disadvantages in terms of democratic aspects. Main future problems of new municipalities established after metropolitan reform are institutional capacity deficit and democratic participation mechanisms. When new model is implementing, there must be a balance between efficiency and democratic requirements.

Positive reflections of large scaled metropolitan municipality structure in province will be seen in planning and local development. Metropolitan municipality model provides important opportunities such as flexibility, fast action, coordination of economic actors and implementation unity in terms of development of province as a whole. In global economic competition, it is possible to see a shift from national level to sub level. Structures at regional level have been becoming main element in environment of local development and global competition. Metropolitan municipalities have more potentials in connecting with global economic actors, orienting investment to its province and providing important incentive opportunities in this regard. On the other hand, attracting global investments and developing local development; and public interest must be run together. Otherwise, metropolitan municipalities would overtake a function facilitating and carrying investments of global or national economic actors, which may have orientations against public interest.

References

- 2561 sayılı Büyük Şehirlerin Yakın Çevresindeki Yerleşim Yerlerinin Anabelediyelere Bağlanmaları Hakkında Kanun. *Resmi Gazete*, 17538, 08/12/1981.
- 2972 Sayılı Mahalli İdareler İle Mahalle Muhtarlıkları ve İhtiyar Heyetleri Seçimi Hakkında Kanun. *Resmi Gazete*, 22068, 01/10/1994.
- 5216 Sayılı Büyükşehir Belediye Kanunu. *Resmi Gazete*, 25531, 23/07/2004.
- 5747 Sayılı Büyükşehir Belediyesi Sınırları İçerisinde İlçe Kurulması ve Bazı Kanunlarda Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun. *Resmi Gazete*, 26824, 22/03/2008.
- 6360 Sayılı On Dört İlde Büyükşehir Belediyesi ve Yirmi Yedi İlçe Kurulması ile Bazı Kanun ve Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamelerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun. *Resmi Gazete*, 28489, 12/11/2012.
- Bird, R. and Slack, E. (2008). "Fiscal Aspects of Metropolitan Governance", Rojas, E., Roura, J. R. C., and Güell, J. M. F. (ed.), *Governing the Metropolis: Principles and Cases*. Inter-American Development Bank, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies. 193-259.
- Canpolat, H. (2016). Türk Yerel Yönetim Sisteminde Ölçek Reformları ve 5747 Sayılı Kanunla İlgili Yargı Kararlarının Değerlendirilmesi. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 467, 93-95.

- Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı. (2006).* Kalkınma Bakanlığı. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkınma%20Planlar/Attachments/1/plan9.pdf>.
- France, G., Feldman, L. D., Horgan, D., Ünlü, H. and Yıldırım, S. (1987). *Metropolitan Yönetim Dünya'da ve Türkiye'de*. İstanbul: Marmara ve Boğazları Belediyeler Birliği Yayını.
- Gündüzöz, İ. (2011). *Küçük Belediyeler Sorunu*. Ankara: Türkiye Belediyeler Birliği Yayını.
- Hamilton, D. K., Miller, D. Y. and Paytas, J. (2004,). Exploring The Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of The Governing of Metropolitan Regions, *Urban Affairs Review*, 40 (2), 147-182.
- İkinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı 1968-1972. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkınma%20Planlar/Attachments/8/plan2.pdf>.
- Kayasü, S. And Yaşar, S. (2006). Avrupa Birliği'ne Üyelik Sürecinde Kalkınma Politikaları: Yasal ve Kurumsal Dönüşümler. *Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Yönetişim Sempozyumu Bildirileri Kitabı*, Ankara, 199-213.
- Keene, D. (2004). Metropolitan Comparisons: London as a City-State. *Historical Research*, 76, 459-480.
- Keleş, R. (1985). Türkiye'de Anakent Yönetimi. *Amme İdare Dergisi*, 18 (2), 69-82.
- Kübler, D. and Heinelt, H. (2005). Metropolitan Governance Capacity, Democracy and the Dynamics of Place. *Metropolitan Governance: Capacity, Democracy and the Dynamics of Place*. Heinelt H. and Kübler D. (ed.), New York: Routledge, 8-28.
- Kübler, D. and Schwab, B. (2007). New Regionalism in Five Swiss Metropolitan Areas: An Assessment of Inclusiveness, Deliberation and Democratic Accountability. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46, 473-502.
- Lefèvre, C. (1998). Metropolitan Government and Governance in Western Countries: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22 (1), 9-25.
- Lyons, W. E. and Lowery, D. (1989). Governmental Fragmentation Versus Consolidation: Five Public-Choice Myths About How to Creating Informed, Involved, and Happy Citizens. *Public Administration Review*, 49 (6), 533-543.
- Norris, D. F. (2015). *Metropolitan Governance in America*, London: Routledge.
- Oktay, T. (2010). *Yerel Yönetim Reformu Sonrasında İl Özel İdareleri*, Hayat Yayınları.
- Oktay, T. (2015). Tanzimat'tan 21. Yüzyılda İstanbul'un Yönetimi, Yılmaz, Ç. (ed.), *Antik Çağ'dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: Siyaset ve Yönetim* 2, 3, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş., 134-217.
- Oktay, T. (2016). Metropolitan Kent Yönetimi Yaklaşımları ve Uygulama Modelleri, *Strategic Public Management Journal (SPMJ)*, 4, 37-55
- Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C. M. and Warren, R. (1961). The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry. *The American Political Science Review*, 55 (4), 831-842.
- Ömürgönülşen, U. and Sadioğlu, U. (2009). Türkiye'de Yakın Dönemde Yapılan Yerel Yönetim Reform Çalışmalarının İl Özel İdarelerine Yansımaları. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 18 (1), 1-22.
- Özgür, H. (2010). Metropolitan Alanların Deneyimi: Büyükşehir Belediyesi Modelinin Uygunluğu. Parlak B. (ed.), *Yerel Yönetimler, Yerel siyaset ve Kentsel Politikalar, IV. Kamu Yönetimi Sempozyum Bildirileri Kitabı*, 341-342.
- Population Division: World Urbanization Prospects. (2015).* United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2014 Revision, New York, Retrieved from <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>, (12.09.2016).
- Sager, F. (2005). Metropolitan Institutions and Policy Coordination: The Integration of Land Use and Transport Policies in Swiss Urban Areas. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 18 (2), 227-256.
- Shah, A. (2012). Grant Financing of Metropolitan Areas: A Review of Principles and Worldwide Practices. *Policy Research Working Paper 6002*, The World Bank.
- Slack, E., "Managing the Coordination of Service Delivery in Metropolitan Cities: The Role of Metropolitan Governance", **Policy Research Working Paper 4317**, The World Bank, 2007.
- Taş, H. C. (2007). Bölgesel Kalkınma Ajanslarına Yönelik Eleştiriler ve Son Gelişmeler, *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 456, 137-163.
- TBMM, Büyükşehir Belediyeleri Kanunu Tasarısı ile İçişleri, Avrupa Birliği Uyum ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları (1/768). 03/03/2004*, Retrieved from <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem22/yil01/ss619m.htm>.
- Tiebout, C. M. (1956), Pure Theory of Local Expenditures. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 64 (5), 416-424.
- Tuzcuoğlu, F. (2003). *Metropolitan Yönetim*, Sakarya Kitabevi.
- TÜİK Genel Nüfus Sayımı Sonuçları 1950-2012. Retrieved from <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=tr>.
- Yeter, E. (2002). Metropolitan Alan Yönetiminde Yeni Arayışlar: İstanbul. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi*, 11 (2), 41-50.