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Foreword

The definition of heritage is the subject of a continued debate, highly relevant and above all crucial in our search to understand and explain the current hype of valorizing a (lost) past. The heritagination process moved from private inheritance to collective claims and increasingly became institutionalized – top-down – from UNESCO policies to national or regional politics, and commercialized as a tool for economic development.

The ongoing confusion about the meaning of heritage, the search for a clear terminology and the introduction of multiple neologisms as keywords becomes obvious when scanning recent literature lists. This could be seen as a token of creative thinking about the meaning of heritage today, but is more likely an indication of a widening gap between theoretical and conceptual reflections on the one hand and empirical studies in the field of practitioners on the other. A consensus to bridge the gap between academics (in variable disciplines) requires above all an intellectual communication and a translation of theories into practical guidelines regarding heritage conservation, supported by the results of well-designed case studies. This is exactly the food for thought this book has to offer to researchers working in different cultural, economic and geographical contexts.

What then are the key issues and milestones in this interdisciplinary research field? In our understanding of current trends and research priorities, the target is to learn how geographical destinations (places, routes, regions) and tourism dynamics can ‘co-create’ heritage values, embedded in a sustainable spectrum of tourist facilities, and induce valuable tourist experiences.

The intellectual freedom to define and study heritage from various viewpoints, the drive to understand the links between past and present, and the increasingly contested myth of ‘universal values’ are the subject of a growing academic – cross-disciplinary – obsession. This process was initiated, accelerated and globalized by ‘UNESCO World Heritage’ policies in the last 40 years. New universal cultural values are created in a – rather top-down – selection process and immediately generate high expectations and a global competition. However, the mission of preservation and conservation, of valorizing a (lost) past in view of a sustainable development, remains most questionable. The current use of heritage as a tool in social, economic and political policies, regarding development in urban, rural, agricultural or natural environments, is struggling with too many assumptions on impact and support, and above all a fundamental lack of consensus on the definition and transmission of intrinsic heritage values.

The artificial and outdated distinction made between cultural and natural heritage, between tangible and intangible heritage of selected past heritage landscapes, is by all means
dissonant with the present interpretation, communication and development of heritage experience-scapes. Connecting values and images of the past in view of ‘recreating’ identities of people and their habitat and revalorizing their territorial capital implies a long and sophisticated process. Heritage-scapes are now created in various forms and functions such as townscape, rural villages or traditional agricultural landscapes, leisure landscapes (e.g. historical theme parks and events), historical trails and routes, all marked by monuments, artefacts, icons and inherited traditions, to meet the needs of a 21st century way of life in matching global and local values.

The present discussion tends to shift to the issue of sustainability of heritage values and their market potential. As demonstrated by numerous recent empirical studies, heritage is demand-driven and can be produced ‘wherever and whenever’. Obviously the process of heritagization has become extremely widespread – a movement in the hands of a range of stakeholders with divergent agendas and a variable affinity with the cultural capital of places and people.

The interesting and inspiring collection of papers in this book on conceptual reflections and empirically based experiences illustrates well the current challenges of using values of the past for a better future, but also illustrates clearly the context sensitivity (time, place, people). Heritage values are indeed ‘recreated’, demand-driven, yet not always supported by a collective view, or dislocated from their original biotope. The divergence of values and interests among the stakeholders, global and local, holds a high potential of conflict in terms of uses and users, of balancing economic benefits and costs.

There always has been an interest in heritage sites and values, World Heritage in particular. UNESCO has definitely induced a global wave of heritagization in the last decennia. The dynamics of this process are now being scanned in a multidisciplinary way. The focus in this publication is on the eventual role of and impact on tourism. When and how did this magic concept of ‘heritage’ have an impact on the travel market? The shift from descriptive travellers’ books, starting with Ibn Battuta, a Moroc explorer (Tangier 1304), to the explorative and empirical research reports today on heritage resources in relation to tourism is highly indicative. A decade ago A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy was published in an attempt to understand how the present invokes the past in the service of many and diverse contemporary needs and how such heritage functions within political, cultural and economic arenas. The (mainly Anglo-Saxon) pioneers in the previous century, such as G. Ashworth, A. Cohen, D. Lowenthal, B. Goodall, B. Graham, R. Prentice, J. Tunbridge et al., changed irreversibly the research agenda and the paradigms for future tourism research.

Today we can consult a most impressive international and multilingual bibliography on heritage and tourism projects, reflecting the complexity of the interface between the geography of heritage and tourism flows, the development of tourism heritage sites, values, successes and failures. The organizational capacities and the role of stakeholders and their networks in the development of tourism-scapes have been reported widely. However, the intellectual impact of so many conceptual and cross-cultural discussions (and publications) on the process of heritagization and the lessons on success and failure in multiple case studies about heritage and tourism experiments is dramatically low. Interdisciplinary views and research issues emerged and were published but had little or no impact on the laboratory of new research projects.

In the last decennia, more pioneers in academic research on heritage and tourism crossed the borders of their discipline, such as geography, sociology, anthropology, history and economy, and became fascinated about the complex impact of the past on our global society and world today. This new credo of many researchers, particularly in less explored areas such as heritage studies and tourism, leads to innovative views on heritage values and to a discussion on critical issues of sustainability. It also leads to ideas and guidelines for heritage management policies looking forward beyond the target of cultural tourism product development, crossing the borders of disciplines, and with the serendipity to track values of the past, capable of inspiring initiatives for the future, shaping places and peoples’ identities. Description, explanation, critique,
discussion, and debate... all this is needed to connect with empirical studies. Critical success factors in our ambition to build knowledge on the complex process of heritagization are missed opportunities to assess, communicate and discuss the results and insights of relevant empirical research in this field.

Myriam Jansen-Verbeke
Prof. em. KU Leuven (Be)
Fellow of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism (IAST)
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3 Urban Archaeology and Community Engagement: The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark in Istanbul

Alessandra Ricci1* and Ayşegül Yılmaz2
1 Koç University, Turkey; 2 Boğaziçi University, Turkey

3.1 Introduction

This chapter reflects on the complexities of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark, an ongoing urban archaeology research project in the city of Istanbul and on the work being conducted toward the progressive definition of a touristic identity for the site, one that would be beneficial for the site itself and also cater to the local community as well as outside visitors. The starting point of the discussion and, in a certain sense, its centrepiece revolves around archaeology and a currently active urban archaeological site. This chapter also considers how a single heritage element in contemporary Istanbul, notwithstanding its Byzantine dating, might offer a valuable contribution to bringing the local community together, fostering its development and encouraging outside visitors to the site to participate in the experience. The fact that the archaeological area at Küçükyalı dates to the Byzantine period and is currently identified with a monastery—hence, a place of religious and spiritual life—prompts further reflections on the local community’s perception of heritage and its response in the built environment to the nuances of the many-sided process of functional change. In present-day Istanbul, the Byzantine period is frequently associated with representations of ‘conquest’, and highly visited museums such as the Panorama 1453 History Museum engage people in a visual and cultural experience aimed at emphasizing the Ottoman conquest over the Byzantine Empire (Ünsal, 2014). Küçükyalı too might more often be perceived as a ‘conquered’ space rather than as a heritage container. These important facts orient work currently being carried out on engaging the local community in a collaborative relationship that sees reciprocity, or a mutual exchange, as one of its fundamental principles.

Whereas tourism represents one of the ‘positive’ aspects for the survival of the site, this chapter reflects on the need to adopt a new perspective that explores more fully the relationships between heritage and the urban political economy wherein forms of tourism occur. Subsequently, it raises the question of which of these forms would be most appropriate to maximize the benefit of local community development.

Engaging local communities in archaeological work beyond the use of labour is a fairly recent concept in Turkey, with archaeological site management projects increasingly involving community engagement components. A more widespread recognition of local communities as the custodians of their heritage, and an increased acknowledgement of the rights of local communities...
A. Ricci and A. Yılmaz

communities to be involved in decision-making processes that affect the future of heritage sites worldwide, has spurred efforts in Turkey as well as in other countries (Smith and Waterton, 2009). Recent research on such efforts indicates that a local community may benefit from the development of an archaeological site not only as the result of activities related to tourism, but also as the result of other activities that may be carefully designed, as part of the archaeological site management plan (SMP), with the community’s cooperation. In fact, it has been argued that archaeological sites can become engines for local and regional socio-economic development that go beyond the expectations of tourism (Orbaşlı, 2013).

In Turkey, efforts to engage communities in archaeological site management have been seen particularly within the context of UNESCO World Heritage Sites (such as at the Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük), or sites currently on the Tentative List (such as the archaeological sites of Arslantepe and Sagalassos). For other sites not displaying elements of outstanding universal value (OUV), but which might be perfect candidates to spur local socio-economic development either as cultural tourism attractions and/or through other cultural activities, community engagement in archaeological site management has been undertaken more frequently at the initiative of project leaders, when funds have been available to pursue such projects.

Tucked in the midst of a dense residential urban neighbourhood in the Anatolian part of Istanbul, the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project site, which contains ruins of a former Byzantine monastic complex comprising a well-preserved cistern, the remains of a monastic church above it and other structures, might not be a candidate for the UNESCO World Heritage List. However, the implementation of its site development, community engagement and site management planning has the potential to transform this urban archaeological site into a cultural tourism/local recreational attraction point for domestic and foreign visitors. Nevertheless, there are a number of challenges to the successful implementation of the above mentioned strategies: the more inland location of the site, far from other major tourism attractions; aggressive urban renewal processes; and varying perceptions among residents regarding the site’s cultural significance.

By focusing on the case of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, this chapter will primarily address challenges related to community engagement in an urban archaeological context, and challenges related to integrating the site within the urban cultural tourism dynamics of Istanbul. Tourism might represent an added value for the archaeological site and its conservation, while also contributing to a heritage discourse that would foreground the site’s urban ecology. Reference to the historical significance of the site will be addressed in order to reflect on the challenges posed by the interpretation of Byzantine period heritage in contemporary Istanbul. This will be followed by a discussion of sustainability concerns for the site once active project implementation is completed and site management becomes the responsibility of the ‘management mechanism’, as identified during site management planning. An important future outcome of the case of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project will be the provision of guiding mechanisms and best practices for similar future projects, as well as policy recommendations for the creation of similar urban archaeological parks in Turkey.

3.2 Archaeological Site Development and Community Engagement

Engaging local communities in conservation practices to achieve win-win (or least trade-off) situations that benefit both heritage (natural and cultural) and community well-being gained worldwide momentum with a paradigm shift in development theory that emerged in the 1990s. This shift was marked by increased environmental concerns and calls from post-development theorists for decentralized development that integrates local communities into development planning (Rapley, 2007). These post-developmentalist tendencies emerged because of criticisms of the destructive nature of mainstream development on the environment and traditional societies (Rapley, 2007). Theorists such as Wolfgang Sachs, Arturo Escobar and James Ferguson criticized the proliferation of a uniform, Western model of development around the world (Rapley, 2007). As a consequence of increased
With an increased understanding among conservationists that conservation can best be achieved by gaining local communities’ support through their involvement in decision-making processes and incorporating their traditional knowledge into conservation strategies (Furze et al., 1996; Lockwood, 2006; Berkes, 2007; Fisher et al., 2008), international development organizations such as those of the United Nations (UN), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the European Commission, as well as the international conservation community, began to emphasize the necessity to link conservation and development, calling for greater pluralism and more participatory processes in decision making. This marked the arrival of an internationally recognizable conservation ethic, and the first introduction of policies of social inclusion and community cohesion (Smith and Waterton, 2009). Conservationists increasingly started to recognize the need to implement strategies that would link cultural and natural heritage conservation with development (Pimbert and Pretty, 1995; Brechin et al., 2002; Brockington et al., 2008). Connecting conservation and development, however, has been a complex task for conservationists, governmental officials, scholars and others involved in this field, as such strategies involve balancing the interests and needs of local communities against those of various levels of government and the market economy, as well as those of other stakeholders. In addition, the context of each case is highly specific; social, cultural, economic and political settings vary significantly, making it difficult to apply blueprint strategies (Wihusen et al., 2002; Berkes, 2007).

Concerning the development of archaeological sites, the movement toward an archaeological practice involving communities started roughly around the time of the initiation of the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) in the 1980s, when archaeologists increasingly felt a professional ethical responsibility for the impacts of archaeological excavations and research practices on local social contexts (Atalay, 2007). This trend was also partly triggered by changing approaches within the field of anthropology, from an approach that sought to ‘do no harm’ to one that sought to ‘do good’ (Atalay, 2007). Since the 2000s, heritage studies and archaeology have begun to work more intensively with communities in indigenous and non-Western cultural contexts to address issues of ethics, politics, power and the marginalization of traditional knowledge (Smith and Waterton, 2009). A growing number of archaeologists are now seeing archaeology as something more than the implementation of scientific methods to collect and interpret data, and are increasingly relying on community input for their projects (Shackel and Chambers, 2004). Many archaeologists, therefore, started to use the discipline for the purpose of education, community cohesion, entertainment and economic development (Little, 2002), working directly with communities. As a result, archaeological practice has experienced a shift from something that was done for communities and the public, to something that is done with them (Smith and Waterton, 2009).

Engaging communities in archaeological site development and management requires a strengthening of their ability to participate meaningfully in the process of making conservation and management decisions for themselves and their heritage. Smith and Waterton (2009: 15) argue that it is the process by which community groups are engaged with that is important, and this should be a process that is open to – and accepting of – difference in the richest sense of the term. This orientation to difference allows for an awareness of competing definitions and understandings of the same thing, prompting useful and rewarding two-way exchanges of ideas, experiences and interpretations of heritage. It is only in this way that we can begin to acknowledge the systemic and theoretical blinkers that prevent us from engaging with community groups holistically and honestly. Indeed, it is only from such a position that we can convincingly argue that the idea of ‘community’ should be a central concern for all archaeological and heritage practice.
This requires a leap forward in terms of power, particularly in relation to scholarly privilege and control. The intention is to make heritage management processes less patronizing and paternalistic, and more open to self-examination, critical reflection and negotiation. More importantly, it means abandoning the notion that the sole role of archaeologists is to discover the truth on behalf of everyone impacted (Nicholas and Hollowell, 2007).

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention suggest that common elements of an effective site management system may include: a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders; a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback; the monitoring and assessment of the impacts of trends, changes and proposed interventions; the involvement of partners and stakeholders; the allocation of necessary resources; capacity building; and an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions (UNESCO, 2012). The various activities of archaeological site management include excavation, research, site planning, interpretation, site development and management (Orbaşlı, 2013). Local communities may play a role in, or benefit from, any of these processes in a variety of ways. McGuire (2008) offers a productive typology of archaeological relationships with indigenous groups applicable to non-traditional communities as well, classifying these under the three major approaches of education, consultation and collaboration.

The first approach, education, describes situations in which the archaeologist assumes authority over matters relating to the past, and uses that authority to inform the general public and indigenous peoples about heritage. This type of education is useful, but it can be a one-way relationship. Moreover, as McGuire (2008) notes, indigenous communities have increasingly challenged strictly archaeological versions of their history and the authoritarian stance associated with them. Indigenous communities hold diverse forms of authority and knowledge regarding their own culture, history and territory, all of which can be immensely helpful for understanding archaeological settlement patterns, named places, sacred sites and other features of the landscape (Angelbeck and Grier, 2014). In order to integrate indigenous communities’ traditional knowledge into research and interpretation processes, Atalay (2012) developed a community-based participatory research (CBPR) methodology based on Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1970), which may also be used in non-traditional contexts.

Consultation, the second approach, requires a more engaged relationship between two or more parties to address a particular issue. As McGuire (2008: 145) indicates, to consult is ‘to recognize his or her (or their) rights, authority, or power’, surrendering some authority to other parties through soliciting their involvement in or opinion on a process. Consultations, being targeted toward specific outcomes, can be short-lived, but they can also pave the way toward more in-depth engagement. When archaeologists consult local communities during various stages of the management planning process, local communities are able to voice their needs early on, which many heritage professionals regard as crucial for project success. In this way, communities also have the opportunity to negotiate and debate with stakeholders any management planning decisions that might affect their socio-economic well-being. For communities it is critical that they are able to provide input: in relation to ownership issues; on how they relate to the heritage of the site; on any emotional attachments they might have to the site; on their various past and present uses of the site; and on any existing local initiatives linked with the site (Schmidt and Merbach, 2014).

Collaboration, the third form of relationship, involves ‘the integration of goals, interests, and practices among the individuals or social groups that work together’ (McGuire, 2008: 146). Collaboration in archaeological projects means that objectives, goals and methodologies are worked out jointly among all stakeholders, specifically when community interests are at stake and/or communities may benefit socio-economically from activities related to archaeological site development. Orbaşlı (2013) argues that archaeological sites can become engines for local and regional socio-economic development as a result of strategies and activities initiated beyond tourism. At sites with tourism potential, such as World Heritage Sites, local communities have typically been engaged in a variety of tourism services activities, offering
accommodation or food, or selling arts and crafts. However, not all archaeological sites have tourism potential; some are simply not attractive enough, while others are in remote locations, and others are too fragile to expose (Orbaşlı, 2013). Furthermore, tourism activities may result in an unequal distribution of economic benefits among local social groups. Weakly managed archaeological sites, even though designated with the strictest site protection status, may still allow illegal construction of accommodation facilities to accommodate demands from increased tourism. The result may not only be detrimental to the integrity of a site, but also may lead to an unequal distribution of tourism and conservation benefits, with tourism business owners benefitting significantly more than other community groups (Yılmaz, 2012).

Orbaşlı (2013) argues that generally there is limited consideration of economic and social development directly linked to the places in which archaeological sites are located. However, active excavation, research or conservation projects, along with a management presence at the site, have the potential to generate tangible socio-economic benefits for local communities, including jobs, training, capacity building, access to funds and markets, and empowerment. The question is how these benefits can be embedded in site management practices over the long term. Ideally such practices and benefits would last long after the completion of projects, and would be integrated into long-term site management for sustainability.

Site values often differ for various stakeholders, including the community, creating conflict among key groups (Orbaşlı, 2013). Addressing all values becomes problematic but may be more easily accomplished at sites that have an active role or meaning for their communities (Orbaşlı, 2013). In many indigenous and minority contexts, heritage is necessary for sustaining local identity and a sense of place, especially for those communities threatened by transformations in the global economy (Shackel and Chambers, 2004). But in many other, particularly non-traditional (post-colonial or other), contexts, efforts to create a sense of heritage can become problematic. For example, in Turkey, a significant degree of archaeological heritage is linked to pre-Turkish and pre-Islamic eras. Therefore, communities living in the vicinity of such sites often do not identify with that heritage, regarding it as belonging to ‘others’. Despite regarding that archaeological heritage as external to their own heritage, communities nevertheless often view themselves as its guardians. Their sense of ownership is strengthened by an awareness of the value of heritage conservation and its potential for tourism (Yılmaz, 2012). Thus, while religious sensitivities can play a role in how these sites are viewed by various groups (Bartu Candan, 2007), long-term social and economic benefits generally ameliorate any animosity towards the ‘other’ heritage.

Since the early 2000s, UNESCO has increasingly encouraged nations to engage communities in the management of World Heritage Sites (Albert et al., 2012), and in World Heritage: Benefits Beyond Borders, Galla (2012) compiled a range of approaches to the conservation and sustainable development of World Heritage Sites, with a special focus on the engagement of local communities in these efforts. Individual cases show that at the community level heritage development has been stymied by several factors, but the central problem remains one of identity. In terms of site sustainability, individual cases suggest that governmental bodies need to focus on potential social and economic benefits to the local communities rather than on better legislation. Social and economic benefits can serve as an incentive for many communities to conserve their heritage properties.

In the past few years, international conservation bodies have taken the need for more inclusionary processes one step further by adopting the concept of ‘rights-based approaches’ (RBA), which were originally promoted by major international development agencies and NGOs with respect to development policies. Within the context of conserving nature, rights-based approaches were first introduced by the IUCN in 2009 as strategies in areas targeted for climate-change mitigation and forest conservation, as well as in protected areas (Greiber et al., 2009). In terms of World Heritage contexts, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) have been collaborating since 2011 as Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Convention to ensure that
rights issues at the local community level are appropriately addressed (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, 2014). One important initial outcome is the project titled ‘Building Capacity to Support Rights-based Approaches in the World Heritage Convention: Learning from Practice’, carried out in 2014 under the leadership of ICOMOS Norway. Emerging issues and preliminary lessons applicable to other cultural heritage contexts were shared at the 18th ICOMOS General Assembly, held in Florence in November 2014. They emphasize that the rights of individuals and communities are part of everyday World Heritage management and learning; that respect for the rights of local people is a critical ingredient for sustainable impacts; that mapping the issues is crucial; that the lack of clarity and systematic attention about the who, what, when and how of rights remains a major obstacle; that working with diverse rights-holders, vulnerable groups and significant rights issues is the key to change; that rights-based approaches potentially bridge the gap in linking outstanding universal value (OUV) with local values; and that it is necessary to develop national rights frameworks and secure adequate investments, as well as to ensure support initiatives and capacity building for communities and other stakeholders. These first steps indicate a commitment to integrate rights-based approaches into site management in both natural and cultural contexts, with the hope that more nations will embrace them in conservation governance.

The proliferation of scholarly work, projects and events with a particular focus on community engagement in conservation and heritage management – not necessarily in relation to World Heritage contexts – and successful outcomes related to community development increasingly prove that win-win situations for both communities and heritage are possible, by developing strategies in partnership with local communities. In fact, recent academic events have revealed interesting and successful heritage conservation and community development projects implemented around the globe. To mention just a few examples among the many interesting projects implemented: in Peru the Sustainable Preservation Initiative (SPI) has been working with local communities near archaeological sites to revitalize their intangible cultural heritage for transformative and sustainable economic opportunities (P. Burtenshaw, Istanbul, personal communication, 2014). In Niger the Trust for African Rock Art (TARA) has recently started to train Tuareg men to become tour guides to sites of significant rock art (T. Little, Istanbul, personal communication, 2015). And in Crete (Greece), by using a variety of tools from the fields of psychology, cognitive science and marketing while conducting ethnographic fieldwork, a team of archaeologists effectively empowered members of the local community to ‘dynamically use their heritage for the improvement of their lives and thus render it an aspect that they wish to protect, preserve and promote’ (E. Kyriakidis, unpublished results, 2015).

In Turkey, archaeological site management projects have increasingly integrated community engagement components that suit local socio-economic contexts and community needs. Various community engagement efforts were shared and discussed at a series of recent public archaeology events organized by the British Institute at Ankara (BIAA), by Boğaziçi University, and by the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul (DAI). Broad representation of archaeological excavation and site development projects currently carried out in the country have revealed that alongside well-known sites such as Çatalhöyük and Göbekli Tepe, community engagement activities are implemented in sites such as Akçalar Aktopraklık (Bursa), Asağı Pınar (Kırklareli), Asıklı Höyük (Aksaray), Aspendos (Antalya), Güvercinkayasi Höyükü (Aksaray), Kızılören (Urfa, Izmir) and Sagalassos (Aglasun, Burdur). Partnerships with local communities have involved developing methods to conserve sites, such as the application of traditional mud-brick ingredients; re-enactment efforts at ancient dwellings; reproducing ancient tools and containers; planning recreational activities and local heritage museums; establishing cooperatives and new local NGOs for site development purposes; organizing organic farmers’ markets for community members to sell produce and other local products; heritage education for schoolchildren and adults; and workshops for local women to improve their skills in the production of attractive souvenirs representing certain aspects of the site. It is clear that engaging communities in site development and management, as well
as in the creation of ‘archaeological parks/ arkeoparks’ is gaining traction among archaeologists. For example, the Aktopraklık Neolithic site near Bursa was turned into an open-air museum, named Akçalar Aktopraklık Arkeopark. Visitors are able to visit a Neolithic village, engage in recreational activities, and buy local organic food as well as arts and crafts. In the Thrace region of Turkey, with the help of local elderly workmen specializing in older construction techniques, archaeologists were able to apply construction materials and techniques in the re-enactment of prehistoric village life as it was thousands of years ago in the area. This effort resulted in the Aşağı Pınar Open-Air Museum; and a new local NGO, the Kırklareli Cultural Assets Association, was established to create a management structure that was adopted by the local community to ensure the long-term sustainability of site management and interpretive activities (Eres, 2014).

### 3.3 The Case of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark

The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project site covers a relatively modest area corresponding to some 4500 to 5000 m² and is situated amidst the dense urban residential neighbourhood of Çınar (Sycamore in English) in the district of Küçükyalı on the Anatolian part of Istanbul (see Fig. 3.1). What makes this urban archaeology project an interesting case to focus on is the project’s community engagement and site development efforts to eventually transform it into an attractive recreational and cultural tourism location for local and foreign visitors, enable local management mechanisms for sustainability over the long term, and connect it to other tourism attractions in the area. Furthermore, the site is currently identified with the remains of a monastic complex built by the former patriarch of Byzantine Constantinople Ignatios (d. AD 867); hence Küçükyalı encapsulates a meaningful trait of Byzantine period heritage (Ricci, 1998, 2012, 2014). At the same time, interpretation of Byzantine period heritage in contemporary Istanbul is potentially charged with issues of ‘otherness’ and cultural identity. The site at Küçükyalı represents a significant case study, one that might attempt at paving the way for a more sustainable approach in the interpretation of Byzantine heritage and of cultural preservation for local and foreign visitors.

![Fig. 3.1. The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark area as seen from a drone during the 2015 excavation season. Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.](image-url)
Archaeological investigations and research are providing new data for the identification of the site. The complex at Küçükýalý is currently identified as a large-sized and monumental suburban monastery built in the Middle Byzantine period. The monastery, a place of isolation, solitude and contemplation, was designed and built during the second half of the 9th century at the will of a prominent figure of the Middle Byzantine period: the patriarch Ignatios, son of the emperor Michael the First Rangabes (r. 811–813 CE), who after his father’s dethronement was evirated and exiled to the Princes’ Islands, where he became a monk. From the Princes’ Islands, Ignatios ascended to the patriarchal seat twice, and the hagiographical text composed by David Niketas Paphlago implies that he built the monastery during his second tenure as patriarch. Ignatios probably spent time at the monastery and, according to the same hagiographical text, was also buried there in a small chapel added to the south-east of the monastic church in 867 CE. We know that the church was dedicated to St Michael and that the monastery took the name of Satyros, or Anatellon (‘The Rising One’) (Ricci, 2015).

The surviving remains at the site centre around a rectangular-in-plan platform that was created in antiquity by means of massive earth removal and on a slightly southward-sloping terrain, with large, monumental and buttressed retaining walls built to support the platform (see Fig. 3.1). The earth fill and the monumental retaining walls are still visible. The lower level of the platform, completely underground in antiquity, was occupied in part by a cistern. The western and larger portion of the cistern was originally covered by four rows of parallel brick domes, for a total of 28 domes resting either on piers or columns that must have collapsed long ago (Ricci, 1998). As a result of the collapse, the cistern’s floor was filled by some 2.5–3 m of earth and debris, leaving this portion of the cistern as an open-air space that is now entirely green. Some of the cultural activities run by the Küçükýalý ArkeoPark take place in this scenic setting (Ricci, 2014). The eastern portion of the cistern, smaller in size than its western counterpart, conserves its original roofing system, dominated at the centre by a monumental brick dome resting on four massive stone and brick piers. Lateral corridors frame the dome into a square and are marked by barrel vaults and groin vaults at the corners. Once in this space visitors may also observe the feeding channel that brought water, most likely from the area of Samandıra (ancient Damatryis), a plateau where ancient water springs and water channels have been identified. The cistern is firmly impressed in the memory of generations of Küçükýalý’s inhabitants as a mysterious cave replete with tunnels and other fantastic sights. A ‘real’ inhabitant of Küçükýalý usually refers to the cistern as the magra in Turkish, or the cave (Ricci et al., 2015).

A newly completed walkway through the northern area of the platform provides views of the ancient extension of the complex to the north of the platform. This is a reminder of the fact that the complex extended well beyond the platform, particularly on its northern, western and southern sides. On the northern side, remains of building foundations have been excavated in part. The walkway is pleasantly framed within the ancient remains, and three monumental, historic mastic trees form a small recreational space for local inhabitants and visitors. Remains of the ancient access ramp leading up to the platform from the north were excavated during the 2010 season. The ramp leans against the platform’s walls, which on this side may have been marked by a long arcade, or arcaded portico.

Once on the platform, it is possible to observe the remains of a church above the uncollapsed eastern portion of the cistern (see Fig. 3.1). Though preserved only to a maximum height of 1.2 m from the floor level, the church is currently being excavated and reveals walls built of solid brick and mortar. There also appears to be a physical correlation between the cistern and the church, thus supporting a hypothesis that the two architectural features were built concurrently. The church preserves faint traces of its narthex, excavated during the 2014 season. This discovery determined the length of the building at c.21 m, while its north–south axis extends over c.18 m. (Ricci, 2015). The ecclesiastical building presents three apses, with a central dome resting on four massive piers forming an octagonal central space. The likelihood is particularly strong that the church at Küçükýalý is a large-sized representative of the so-called cross-domed buildings with side
compartments, a tripartite sanctuary and a compact square plan that matured during the iconoclastic period and continued through the 9th century. Architectural details and the decoration of the building point to a dating in the second half of the 9th century. Archaeology confirmed the use of the site through the first decades of the 14th century, with minor architectural interventions after the 9th century (Ricci, 2015). At the south-eastern side of the church, archaeological investigations brought to light the remains of a funerary chapel, which was likely to have been added not long after completion of the church. Its location appears to match the description provided by the hagiographical text of the Vita Ignatii, which mentions the location of patriarch’s Ignatios burial (Ricci, 2012, 2015).

Findings indicate that the area of the monastic complex was settled until around the first decades of the 14th century when the Ottoman troops took possession of the Byzantine capital’s Asian hinterland. The excavations have thus far revealed no subsequent Ottoman period occupation or traces of violent destruction during the same period. The site was abandoned and faced neglect for many centuries until in the second half of the 20th century when steady encroachment of urban development towards the hinterlands of the Anatolian side of Istanbul prompted archaeologists and conservation officials to protect the site.

In 1971, the site received official strict 1st grade archaeological site protection status, prohibiting any form of intervention on the site, except for scientific purposes. Despite strict protection status, the site continued to experience neglect and erosion until in the late 1990s when Ricci conducted a preliminary assessment survey of the site, the first one since 1959 (Ricci, 1998). In 2005, the Regional Protection Board complying with international regulations added a buffer zone around the strictly protected 1st grade archaeological site, designating it with 3rd grade archaeological site status. The buffer zone includes a row of residential apartment buildings and a mosque (Çinar Camii) immediately surrounding the ruins of the monastic complex. Any intervention, restoration, demolition and new construction within the buffer zone requires official permission of the Regional Protection Board.

The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project titled ‘A Sustainable Urban Archaeology Experience: The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark’ was carried out between September 2014 and August 2015, with a grant obtained from the Istanbul Development Agency (ISTKA). The major goal of the project was to develop the site to increase its tourism and recreational potential and to establish a suitable management structure for its sustainability in the long term. More specifically, the scope of the project involved the following tasks: continuation of archaeological excavations inside the 1st grade protection area (Ricci, 2015); the preparation of a site management plan (SMP) for the site with 1st and 3rd grade protection designation (Gülersoy et al., 2015); the formulation and implementation of a site plan for tourism and recreational purposes that included a visitor/excavation centre and walking trails; a public outreach and community engagement component that included the organization of social, cultural and educational activities; and the development of strategies that would connect the site to other cultural tourism attractions in other locations in the city. Activities related to all of these components started almost simultaneously and, as mentioned earlier, the focus here will be on the community engagement component of the project and challenges related to ensuring the future sustainability of the site, and to its future tourism potential.

The purpose of engaging the local community (in this case the residents of the neighbourhood) was to learn about their level of knowledge about the site, their perceptions regarding the history of the site, their sense of ownership of the site, issues they might have related to ownership of property, and their expectations from the site and the project. The overall goal was to improve mutual trust concerning the development of the site, and seek ways to work with the community for the site’s long-term sustainability. Survey questionnaires, as well as informal interviews, were conducted in the neighbourhood of primarily middle-income households.

The survey revealed positive perceptions about the site, its history, and community engagement and site development activities within the scope of the project. Many community members expressed the need to be better
informed about the site and the state of excavations. Many wanted to see the site as a place offering various educational and cultural activities on a regular basis, not just within the scope of a project. They regarded the open space within the cistern as a suitable space for gatherings such as concerts, movie screenings and performing arts, and after-school activities for school children and youth. In the absence of sufficient green space around the neighbourhood, many valued the site with its trees and green areas, and asked for recreational possibilities such as walking trails.

While attitudes of the majority of residents were positive and encouraging, relations with a group of residents whose properties (apartments) were within the buffer zone (with 3rd grade archaeological site status) were not always smooth. Their perceived concern was related to any potential loss of property earnings as a result of 3rd grade protection designation, in the event of the renewal of their apartment buildings. Istanbul’s many older historic and residential neighbourhoods currently experience a particularly aggressive period of urban regeneration and urban renewal, exacerbated by Law No. 5366 (Law on Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalizing of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties), and Law No. 6303 (Law on the Transformation of Areas Under Disaster Risk), which makes it possible that any urban area is declared as an area in risk of being affected by a disaster, and taken out of the scope of conservation legislation. The negative impacts of these laws on the conservation of historic districts of Istanbul are monitored and criticized by major civil platforms, scholars and activists (Dinçer, 2011, 2013; Kıvılcım Çorakbaş et al., 2014). In fact, a new ‘movement’ or civil platform called ‘Istanbul Belongs to All of Us’ (Istanbul Hepimizin) was formed, led by a large group of scholars, experts and interested citizens, calling for more inclusive strategies in decision-making processes, transparency and accountability. Many older residential neighbourhoods are declared a disaster area under the law, because of the risk of a major future earthquake in and around Istanbul. Often these areas are demolished and replaced by luxurious residences, leading to gentrification.

Those laws do not yet affect the Küçükıalyah ArkeoPark area. However, some of its buildings are considered old and perishable and are facing urban renewal pressures, which forces residents to contemplate the renewal of their apartment buildings. Residents with properties in the buffer zone with 3rd grade protection status expressed concern about a perceived loss in earnings either in terms of square metres from the rebuilding of their apartment buildings, or in terms of financial gains from the sale of their apartments. Often, the underlying reason was a lack of adequate financial means to incur any additional costs for renewal of properties. Discussions with officials and verifications with official documents and maps revealed that concerns were unjustified. Nevertheless, at times residents expressed suspicion, even animosity, regarding the purpose of excavation and site development activities, seeking support from local and even national governmental officials. These negative perceptions were exacerbated by the fact that some residents regarded Byzantine heritage as belonging to a pre-Turkish or pre-Islam era, or as representing a ‘conquered past’, and was therefore not considered as ‘their’ heritage. With support from the local mayor and other key partners such as the director of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums and the Regional Protection Board, the project team sought ways to effectively communicate the goals of the project and that such concerns were unjustified (see Fig. 3.2). The project team therefore regarded it as crucial to communicate project objectives and potential impacts in a more effective way using a variety of media, tools and activities. The most effective form of communication, exchange of ideas and dialogue was open-air community meetings organized within the premises of the archaeological area. During these meetings pamphlets containing detailed and up-to-date information were distributed. The head of the SMP team, the director of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums and one of the vice mayors of the Maltepe local municipality, together with the local administrator (muhtar) and the archaeological excavation’s scientific coordinator and members of the Küçükıalyah ArkeoPark Project, interacted with the local inhabitants using a transparent information approach one, rarely applied in the city of Istanbul.

Within the scope of the project, a number of social, cultural and educational activities were targeted to specific groups: schoolchildren,
women and youth, with special emphasis on local residents. Some of the target groups had been identified during 2010 when the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark was elected a project of the Istanbul European Capital of Culture (ECoC) (Eroğlu, 2010). Although the general experience of Istanbul as an ECoC hosting city to promote European integration, improve its image and mobilize communities received a mixed reception, the ArkeoPark benefitted from the experience (Göktürk et al., 2010; Ooi et al., 2014). In 2010 a main objective of the ECoC experience at Küçükyalı was to begin identification of a development strategy for the site that would balance archaeology, ecology and local partnership. During the 2010/11 school year and in collaboration with local elementary schools, the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark developed an initial programme of hands-on archaeological exploration and heritage awareness (Ricci, 2012, 2014). In addition, the ArkeoPark maintained an open-door policy during the excavation season – unprecedented in the city of Istanbul – along with free daily guided tours of the site and cultural events; activities continued during the winter with a literacy programme for local elderly women run in collaboration with a national NGO, the Mother Child Education Foundation (AÇEV), and held in the project’s office. All of these activities contributed to establish that community participation represented a vital aspect of the project’s development strategy.

The main limitations of the ECoC at Küçükyalı concerned the sustainability of the project beyond the funding period. In fact, the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark remained archaeologically inactive from 2010 through to the summer of 2014. The absence of archaeological activities at the site for such a prolonged period resulted in a general feeling of disenfranchisement in the local community.

The ISTKA project’s intention was to address these sustainability issues by introducing the creation of a SMP for Küçükyalı as one of its...
main actions. Work on the SMP considered earlier research and experiences at Küçükyalı while also closely monitoring the social, cultural and educational activities. In the initial stages of the project, the project team reviewed experiences gathered in 2010 through community engagement. With the support of the local government and through the creation of a social media platform, which had not been used in 2010, the ArkeoPark team began a programme of daily visits to the archaeological site followed by more in-depth conversations with the public at the project’s office. This initial effort at public outreach aimed to bring the archaeology and ecology of the site back to the centre of discussions with the community. After a cleaning season for the archaeological area, reduction of illegal car parking on the protected area, and construction of a fence equipped with doors regulated by a newly introduced security system, a range of public activities were initiated at the site.

Cultural activities involved the screening of a documentary about the nearby Princes’ Islands and their history and culture; artisanal markets designed primarily for local women to sell arts, crafts and food; and a toy exchange activity for children. These events and guided tours offered for interested visitors turned out to be good opportunities for the project team to deliver more detailed information about the history of the site and project activities. Many residents showed curiosity about the history of the site and its function, expressing enthusiasm regarding site development activities. Long-time residents shared childhood memories related to the site, particularly its ruins of the ancient cistern, which was at one time a favourite space to play, before site access was restricted for protection. Based on these initial experiences, during the later stages of the project the project team organized a third social and cultural event, which this time involved two musical youth groups as well as Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Kids Club activities (guided tours offered by local schoolchildren) and the opportunity for local women to sell food. This activity, also supported by the local government, turned out to be a success since it brought together various community groups, as well as visitors from other parts of the city who had the chance to learn more about the site while enjoying live music in the enclosed historical setting of the cistern (see Figs 3.3 and 3.4).

Fig. 3.3. A public event at the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark. Members of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Kids’ Club wear their club shirts and enjoy a concert in the cistern’s open area after having guided visitors through the site (9 May 2015). Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.
An additional activity addressed to local women was the sponsorship of adult literacy courses. These courses had proved to be a success in 2010. The project team, partnered again with the AÇEV, was experienced in providing these kinds of services for disadvantaged groups. During the writing of this chapter, a first group of women completed the course with success, expressing deep gratitude to the organizers, and a new course is planned for the autumn of 2015. Participants were also guided through the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark, learning about the various former functions of the ruins and the cultural significance of the site. A special relationship was cultivated with this group of women, who later participated in social and cultural events. With modest funding, the women were able to organize an event to sell traditional food items at reduced costs for visitors; they designed the signage, arranged the display tables and made a financial profit. This proved to be a successful event, one that drew the attention and support of visitors and suggests the possibility of future sustainability for cultural activities at the site.

Another community engagement strategy was a heritage education programme for local schoolchildren. Heritage education and awareness-raising activities addressed toward local communities – schoolchildren in particular but also toward the general public – have been a major tool of public archaeology strategies. Heritage education undoubtedly helps communities to understand the past of different societies and ethnic groups, and can help promote a more democratic society, prevent neglect of heritage sites and possibly stop plundering, looting and destruction (Apaydın, 2014). In order to develop a suitable education programme, the project team worked with experts of relevant backgrounds, including archaeologists from the public sector with experience in heritage education for children, art historians, cultural policy experts, representatives of several cultural heritage NGOs, and local schoolteachers with an interest. Through a series of meetings and brief workshops, experts also discussed the contents of the cultural heritage and archaeology programme.

The cultural heritage education programme developed for the project addressed students from ages 8 to 12. The first step involved visiting neighbouring schools to conduct surveys among students in order to understand their experiences with heritage and archaeology. This information was used to tailor the content and approach of the education programme to be as engaging and relevant as possible. The programme included activities such as guided tours of the site, workshops on archaeological methods, and interactive sessions to encourage critical thinking about the historical and cultural context of the ruins.

Fig. 3.4. Mr Ali Kılıç, mayor of the local Maltepe Municipality, one of Istanbul’s sub-provincial municipalities, welcomes visitors to the site and to the open-air concert in the cistern’s area during a public event (9 May 2015). Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.
level of awareness regarding cultural heritage and archaeology. As a next step, students visited the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project site to learn firsthand about archaeological activities carried out there and about the importance of heritage conservation. These visits involved an in-house presentation about the cultural significance of the site, followed by a guided tour and the students’ participation in hands-on activities. At the end of the visits, a second survey measured the impact of the heritage education programme on the students’ level of awareness about the significance of cultural heritage conservation. Valuable feedback was also received from teachers of classes visiting the site, who reported a significant increase in their students’ interest in archaeology and excavations. One class even prepared explanatory labels for archaeological tools to be displayed during public events.

Witnessing the enthusiasm among children for such activities, the project team created the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Kids Club to host various cultural heritage activities, and to serve as a meeting place for children interested in cultural heritage and archaeology. A graphic designer was hired to design a logo inspired by a small porcupine that was found at the site during excavations, and that became popular among children visiting the site. Members of the Kids Club started to meet on a regular basis in the project office for various group activities, even composing a song and writing a poem about the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark. Site visits were particularly interesting for students during excavation seasons. They expressed enormous excitement when given the opportunity to come close to excavated ancient fragments, and when they were shown different archaeological tools.

The second phase of the educational programme involved an archaeological excavation simulation. The location of the simulation area on the archaeological complex’s platform, not far from the ongoing excavation, proved to be significant. Young students, their trainers and their teachers found themselves in the physical space of ‘real archaeology’. Three large wooden boxes were built and filled with sand in which a variety of everyday objects were buried (see Fig. 3.5). A small display of modern and ancient objects was also set up inside a large container placed at the edge of the archaeological area, which, during the excavation season, serves as a conservation laboratory for movable
finds (see Fig. 3.6). There, project archaeologists taught students how to distinguish between modern and historical findings, and how to recognize mediums such as marble, brick, roof tiles, ceramics, glass mosaic, ancient mortar and metals. At the excavation simulation, student groups were broken down into archaeological teams and taught how to identify archaeological layers, and how to work like practising archaeologists. Students performed the tasks of workmen, sifter operators, washers, photographers and data recorders; had the chance to conduct an excavation with real tools in sand pools designed for the education programme; and learned to record their findings (see Fig. 3.7).

Benefits of the proximity to the actual archaeological excavation were further enhanced during the 2015 summer season when children joining the educational programme had the opportunity to spend time observing archaeologists at work and interacting with them. Apart from the students’ excitement at working like professional archaeologists, the project team also observed that they particularly enjoyed being out in a natural green space marked by heritage. Their interest and curiosity in wildflowers and the small animals that inhabit the site was a clear indication of the need for more green space in a vast metropolitan city like Istanbul. The continuous on-site educational activities for children proved to be catalysts for attention from adults as well, and encouraged children to share with their parents the excitement and knowledge they acquired. As a result, many parents who spent their childhood in the neighbourhood shared with others childhood memories of the archaeological area (‘mağara’ in Turkish or, ‘cave’) to bring back metropolitan legends about the Byzantine period water reservoir, a cavernous and dark space.

Experience gathered over the course of a full year of educational programmes merged in

![Fig. 3.6. Young students examine a tools-and-finds display inside a temporary dig house in the archaeological area. The display contains archaeological tools, samples of the field archaeologists' toolboxes, a modest selection of ancient finds and a variety of modern objects. The display helps students to become familiar with objects and finds before they start with the archaeological simulation exercise. In the dig house, students are also able to learn about archaeological layers by examining a transparent box set up for this purpose. Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.](image)

![Fig. 3.7. Archaeological simulation exercise with primary school children. Excavated material is taken to the recording table where a team of designated students records it. At the end of the exercise, all team members interpret the finds and the area they excavated. Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.](image)
the production of a cultural heritage booklet whose production was completed in the 2015 excavation season (Ricci et al., 2015). Its central themes are cultural and natural heritage, accompanied by sections on Istanbul’s historical timeline and the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark. When visiting the ArkeoPark, students are encouraged to reflect on the meaning of water in ancient and modern societies, with special reference to the mağara. When exploring the site, they are asked to record memories and stories about it. The booklet uses an interactive and hands-on approach complemented by a wealth of illustrations. The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark team will distribute it for free to schools that have participated in the educational project and will use it in the 2015/16 school year.

Middle-school classes produced clay artefacts based on what they learned at the site, while older students created posters promoting the archaeological park and its activities. The project team rewarded students with certificates for attending the educational programme. Witnessing the enthusiasm among a large number of children and adult residents for a variety of cultural and educational activities, and their interest in learning more about the site and how to protect it, the project team’s hope is that these and future community outreach and engagement activities will create synergy for future collective site management.

3.4 Challenges Related to Visitation and Tourism

Alongside community engagement and heritage education activities, the implementation of the site development project – involving landscape design and construction of a visitor centre/community space physically linked to a dig house and the ArkeoPark administrative building – was initiated with two main purposes. The first goal is to transform the site into an attractive recreational/cultural tourism location. The second aims at ensuring sustainability for the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark in terms of financial costs and continuous public accessibility. At the time of writing this chapter, two lightweight, dual-purpose and reversible structures were close to completion.

In addition, to integrate the ArkeoPark within newly developing forms of cultural tourism routes in Istanbul – particularly those oriented to the Princes’ Islands, because of the historical connection – the Küçükyalı project became part of an EU-funded scheme (‘LIMEN: Cultural Ports from the Aegean to the Black Sea’) whose goal was to enhance the cultural tourism potential of city ports along the Aegean and Black Sea. A new bike route was planned for the neighbourhood that would connect the site to a major bike route along the coast. For enhanced visibility, improved signage to the park at nearby public transportation stations and traffic intersections was planned (Ricci and Altan, 2016).

The Küçükyalı archaeological site, once the Byzantine monastery of Satyros, bears a historical connection to the Princes’ Islands of Istanbul. Ignatios not only built the monastery of Satyros but also directed that monasteries be built on the Princes’ Islands. Today, the islands display a significant amount of Byzantine archaeological heritage not well known to the majority of visitors. The project team therefore worked with Turkey’s Culture Routes Society, partnering with the European Institute of Cultural Routes and the World Trails Network, to establish alternative urban and urban-hinterland cultural routes that include Byzantine heritage for Istanbul. Two expert meetings were held, where Istanbul’s generally neglected Byzantine heritage and possible routes were discussed. Three alternative cultural routes were proposed for the following parts of the city: an urban route zigzagging along the Byzantine period Land Walls of Istanbul, a UNESCO World Heritage Site; a route on the Anatolian side focusing on the Byzantine archaeological site at Küçükyalı and extending along the bike route to the Princes’ Islands via a sea connection from Bostancı; and an urban-hinterlands route on the European side focusing on the Anastasian Wall (http://www.shca.ed.ac.uk/projects/longwalls/AnastasianWall.htm) and the aqueducts at Çatalca. The work is currently in progress, and the bike trail for the Küçükyalı route is currently being built.

The location of the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark, at some distance from the city’s major tourist attractions and routes, poses a challenge for integration with more popular areas. However,
with the eventual creation of alternative cultural routes for the city, the goal is not only to enhance the cultural tourism potential of the city’s Byzantine and non-Byzantine heritage, but also to redistribute visitation, which is currently concentrated on the Historic Peninsula. The city’s Anatolian side Kadıköy-Kartal metro line, with the Küçükyalı station located within a short walking distance from the ArkeoPark, together with the relatively new Marmaray metro line connecting the city’s European and Asian parts, will enhance the ease of visits from the Historic Peninsula and the European side of the city (see Fig. 3.8). Toward this end, a newly awarded ISTKA grant to the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark (September 2015–September 2016) will aim at devising creative methods of communication to better link the ArkeoPark to the city’s tourist routes. It will also be crucial to work with the local community with regard to management of the site, particularly to ensure that it is an attractive site for recreation and tourism in the neighbourhood through the organization of various social, cultural and educational activities, as well as the creation of small businesses serving visitors.

Fig. 3.8. A proposed cultural route map that connects the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark to historically related areas of the city, in particular the Princes’ Islands where tourists may visit the Princes’ Islands Museum on the Büyükada island, or the Halki Monastery on the Heybeliada island. The map also shows a newly designed and approved bike trail that links the site to an already existing coastal bike trail. Source: Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project, 2015.
3.5 Challenges Related to Site Management and Future Sustainability

Site management plans are strategic documents that also aim to integrate sites into their surroundings based on principles of sustainability. To establish an effective management ‘mechanism’ and to propose strategies that would make sustainable management of the site possible over the long term, the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project team collaborated with a team of urban planners who were instrumental in the site management planning processes for the Historic Peninsula of Istanbul, a UNESCO World Heritage Site threatened by aggressive urban renewal, regeneration (see Fig. 3.9).

In Turkey, the preparation and implementation of SMPs for archaeological sites became mandatory with the Legislation for Site Management launched in 2005. The legislation introduced SMPs as essential tools for managing protection, conservation and visitor needs (Orbaşlı, 2013). Since then excavation teams, primarily those at UNESCO World Heritage Sites, but also those at sites included in the World Heritage Tentative List, have been working intensely to prepare SMPs, often in partnership with local universities and NGOs. In that regard, as a smaller-scale urban archaeological park with ongoing excavations, the Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Project can be considered a unique archaeological site management case in Turkey.

The Legislation for Site Management requires site management planning and implementation to be done in coordination with local governments and civil society organizations. A site manager is appointed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MOCT). Site boundaries are determined by all key stakeholders. With the coordination of the site manager, a team of heritage professionals and consultants prepare a draft plan. Stakeholders and the local community are consulted during at least two public meetings organized before and during the management

---

**Fig. 3.9.** Approved boundaries of the site management plan (SMP). The SMP does include 1st and 3rd grade protection areas. Source: The Küçükyalı ArkeoPark Site Management Plan prepared in partnership with Europa Nostra Turkey and Koç University.
planning process. The site manager appoints a site management advisory board, a board of coordination and supervision, and an auditory unit. Once the board of coordination and supervision accepts and launches a plan, local governments, municipalities and key partners are responsible for the implementation of management policies.

In the case of the Küçükçay ArkeoPark Project, key stakeholders included the MOCT, Istanbul Archaeological Museums, the Regional Protection Board, the local sub-provincial municipality (Maltepe), Koç University, Europa Nostra Turkey, the local governmental representative (muhtar) and the local community. The SMP’s boundaries were approved by the MOCT to include areas designated with 1st and the surrounding 3rd grade archaeological site status. While writing this chapter, the site manager (in the figure of the director of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums) had just been appointed, and a comprehensive draft plan had been completed (Gülersoy et al., 2015). Preliminary public meetings with some stakeholders and the local community took place as the 2015 summer excavation season progressed. These meetings proved to be a good mechanism for dialogue and sparked further interest in the work conducted on site. Eventually, more systematic and comprehensive meetings will take place in order to include stakeholders in decision making concerning management policies. Throughout the project, the project team encountered a number of dedicated residents deeply concerned about the protection and proper management of the site, and willing to volunteer their time and effort to help develop it. These volunteers were regarded as instrumental in facilitating communication with the local community, particularly in relation to decision making on management strategies and policies that could potentially improve its socio-economic well-being.

### 3.6 Conclusions

Experience at the Küçükçay ArkeoPark, although a work in progress, points to the following issues related to archaeological site development and community engagement in an urban context. First, in order to develop efficient ways to work and partner with the community, it is crucial to conduct socio-cultural fieldwork at the beginning of any project and while the work progresses, to learn about community members’ level of knowledge about the site, their perceptions about and attitudes toward the heritage of the site, their needs and expectations from the site, and any property ownership issues that need to be resolved.

Second, the project has shown the importance of community outreach, and effective communication of project activities as well as potential positive and negative impacts on residents’ lives. At the Küçükçay ArkeoPark, one group of residents lived immediately outside the 1st grade protection boundary of the site, resulting in a more ‘intimate’ relationship to site activities but at the same time placing the properties of these residents within the buffer zone, with 3rd grade protection status. With current urban renewal pressures underway in many parts of Istanbul, including at Küçükçay, these residents were concerned about potential financial or property losses as a result of the protection designation. Such conflicts of interest became even more complicated to resolve because some residents regarded Byzantine heritage as belonging to ‘others’. It was therefore important for the project team to use a variety of media, tools and opportunities (particularly public meetings), as well as to seek support from key partners (such as the local municipality and Istanbul Archaeological Museums) and neighbourhood volunteers knowledgeable about project goals, to communicate clearly that such concerns were unjustified.

The third issue relates to tourism, visitation and site management. A main challenge was how to integrate a site with cultural tourism potential but relatively remote from other tourism attractions or routes to these areas. A bike trail was planned connecting the site to a major coastal bike route as part of an EU cultural tourism development project. In addition, connecting the site to its historically related sites on the Princes’ Islands was considered. This idea first materialized as part of a spin-off project that resulted from meetings to establish alternative cultural routes within Istanbul that would encompass Byzantine and non-Byzantine heritage. Despite such efforts, visitation to the site from other parts of the city will likely remain low. The Küçükçay ArkeoPark Project team regards low
visitor numbers to this relatively modestly sized protected area as an important consideration in defining a sustainable and long-lasting strategy for the archaeology and ecology of the site. The project’s significant challenge will therefore be to develop a site management structure that can be supported over the long term, one whereby the local community and local institutions will take an active role in both protecting and maintaining the site as an attractive cultural and recreational location it can be proud of. If residents regard their archaeological heritage as a source of pride, and as an asset that enhances their quality of life, then with initial guidance and empowerment by the project team, site manager and key partners, the site may become an attraction not only in the neighbourhood, but perhaps even in a larger area. To succeed in this effort, working with a group of dedicated volunteers was regarded as a potentially effective strategy. Initial discussions included establishing a local cultural heritage association that would partner with key stakeholders, particularly the local municipality. Depending on the needs and expectations of residents, various mechanisms that create different opportunities for the participation and empowerment of residents could be developed.

Some examples were shared in this chapter, but in an urban context with mixed educational, cultural, socio-political and ethnic backgrounds, these initiatives need to be carefully planned.

Undoubtedly, among the most significant outcomes so far is the positive synergy, knowledge exchange, problem-solving efforts, networking and creation of partnerships among various public, civil society and private sector groups that projects like the Küçükyalı Arkeo-Park initiate. It is hoped that this synergy and the experiences that all partners, including the local community, gain from such experiments will provide guidance for similar projects, with the ultimate aim of effective and sustainable cultural heritage conservation and local socio-economic development.
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