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First Symposium of the Turkish Network of Urban Morphology, Mersin, Turkey, 22–23 October 2015

Following from a Foundation Workshop in April 2014, this first Symposium of the Turkish Network of Urban Morphology (TNUM) was hosted by the Centre for Mediterranean Urban Studies at Mersin University. Attracting 56 participants from 19 universities, 35 papers were presented. The topics addressed included methods and techniques in urban morphology; planning, architecture, design and their relation to urban form; urban growth and fringe belts; the history of urban form; morphological agencies; public space; typomorphology; and space syntax.

In the first plenary session, Tolga Ünlü and Yener Baş (Mersin University) explored the transformation of the city of Mersin since the early-twentieth century. Based on a historical-geographical approach and morphogenetic method, they first revealed the urban development pattern at a macro scale through an investigation of fringe-belt formation and modification processes. Then they considered development cycles and “morphogenetic types” in a detailed exploration of the transformation of plot and building patterns. The subsequent plenary session comprised two papers on different approaches to the study of urban form. Ayşe Sema Kubat (Istanbul Technical University) discussed the use of space syntax as a method for investigating the relationship between spatial organization and social structures, focusing on open spaces in a range of Turkish cities. Cana Bilsel (Middle East Technical University) considered the contribution of urban morphological research within urban history studies. Taking an international perspective, she was mainly concerned with developing a methodological framework for urban historical studies through explorations into the shaping of urban space.

The first day concluded with a special session on different approaches and methods in the study of urban form. Spatial-analytical, configurational and historico-geographical approaches were considered, including their implementation in different contexts. A “parametric” morphological method was discussed as a tool to link morphological research with planning and urban design practices.

The second day contained sessions on ‘Morphological processes within historical city centres’; ‘History of urban form’; ‘Urban growth and fringe belts’; ‘Space syntax’; ‘Morphological agencies’; and ‘Morphological research and planning and design practice’.

This first Symposium of TNUM revealed substantial research potential for the study of urban form in different disciplines (notably planning, architecture and geography) and accommodating different approaches and methods. In the concluding session, participants discussed the structure of TNUM and possible collaborations of researchers both within TNUM and with other regional networks.

The Secretariat of TNUM will be based in the Centre for Mediterranean Urban Studies at Mersin University. The next Symposium will take place in 2017 in Istanbul organized by Istanbul Technical University. The Symposium in 2019 will be in Ankara organized by Middle East Technical University.

It has been agreed to develop a commonly accepted vocabulary of urban morphology in the Turkish language, and to give attention at an early stage to the place of urban morphology in education. Although the participants at the Symposium were mostly from the disciplines of planning and architecture, it is anticipated that at the next Symposium there will be greater representation of other disciplines, notably geography, history and archaeology.

Tolga Ünlü, Centre for Mediterranean Urban Studies, Mersin University, Yenişehir, Mersin 33343, Turkey. E-mail: tolga.unlu@gmail.com

Meeting of the Council of ISUF

The next meeting of the Council of ISUF will take place immediately preceding the Conference of ISUF to be held in Nanjing, China, 8 to 10 July 2016. Any matters that members of ISUF wish to bring to the attention of the Secretary-General of ISUF, Professor Kai Ou, should be communicated to him at the School of Architecture and Planning, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand (e-mail: kou@auckland.ac.nz) by 1 June 2016.
Sergio Umberto Barbieri, had started to share a personal interest in urban form and building type and were attending the art and architecture seminar on utopia run by the historian Kees Vollemans, who stressed the importance of subjectivity and human will in design. Vollemans introduced students to the work of Manfredo Tafuri, encouraging discussions relating to Teoria e storia dell'architettura (Tafuri, 1968) and Progetto e utopia (Tafuri, 1973). An English translation of the latter was available in 1976, and Vollemans himself translated into Dutch extracts from both books for use in lectures and seminars.

The availability of the German edition of Aldo Rossi's Die architektur der stadt (Rossi, 1972) was crucial at this time in creating increasing awareness of urban morphology as an interdisciplinary field. Rossi was seen by some as having constructed a new relationship between modernity, history and architectural design and, additionally, between architecture and the form of the city. This perception was above all based on an idea of form derived from Elementi primari (Rossi, 1966). According to Rossi the Elementi primari pertained to their own inner logic despite their change of use over centuries, and they were evidence of an enduring rationality that suggested a timeless archetypal foundation of architecture in which all built artifacts are specific historical interpretations. In this way Rossi seemed to provide young Dutch architects with the possibility of bridging the gap that modernity had exposed between building and history, and therefore between history and rationality. Complementary to Rossi, Tafuri's legacy delivered an architectural criticism concerning history and context, which was missing in the Dutch debate. In fact, these positions were completely different from those of Max Risselada and others that focused on plan analysis and on a close reading of the architectural prototypes of modernism, such as the works of Russian constructivists, or of Ernst May in Frankfurt. To understand this position, it is important to remember that architectural criticism at the time was mainly ideological, based on the work of Alexander Mitscherlich (1963) and Jürgen Habermas (1969). This was applied to architecture and urbanism but was not concerned with the relationship with architectural and urban form. At this time placing stress on the importance of tracing any artifact back to a related system, or way of thinking, was the way to true understanding of the value and necessity of studying urban form.

From that moment onward there was increasing awareness in the Netherlands that to move to a rationalist position implied relating the language of architectural form to history, which conventionally has its roots in classicism. This was a standpoint very different from that of van Eyck, the Smithsons, Team X, and the legacy of the Modern Movement after the Second World War, which did not recognize any relationship to historical forms (Engel, 2013).

In 1975 the tradition of stadsanalyse officially started at the Technische Universiteit Delft with the analysis of areas designated for urban renewal, like the study of Dapperbuurt by Henk Engel and Janne Hobus (Engel and Hobus, 1978). For this work the study of Schoonhoven by Henk Visser was pivotal (Visser, 1964). It focused attention on topography, ground parcellation and site ownership as important factors in urban development and form. Various branches of teaching followed the direction in which architecture this was probably owing to difficulties with the translation. In parallel with these intellectual initiatives in the 1990s, the study of urban form was influencing planning practice in, for example, the renewal of nineteenth-century areas such as the Oude Westen next to the city centre in Rotterdam and the Dapperbuurt in Amsterdam. Additionally the approach developed at Technische Universiteit Delft, which matured through links to Italian research and design, was brought to the attention of local municipalities as a criticism of current procedures. In the practice of urban renewal various approaches were evident at that time, including the 'spot-wise' approach of filling in and the so-called 'bouwten voor de buur'. By basically denying the overall relationship of the interventions to the city form as a whole, such approaches were mainly concentrating on inhabitants' needs and interests and directed to improving housing conditions. Among the well-known architects at that time, only Aldo van Eyck, Theo Bosch and Carel Weeber tried to avoid this 'non contextual and ahistorical approach'.
He observed how people were changing their own living spaces, at the individual family scale, by indirectly claiming a role in their construction. After the Second World War the Netherlands was facing a period of unprecedented need for housing with limited financial means: this was the so-called ‘wederopbouw periode’. Habraken (1961) developed his idea of ‘De drager en de mensen’. His ideas need to be seen in the light of the housing shortage and subsequent industrial methods of construction, including high-rise building. He was attempting a compromise between unavoidable mass production principles and the perceptions of the inhabitants. He distinguished between on the one hand what should be under the control of the institutions, and the rules of technology, and on the other what could be claimed by the community and the individual. The cultural improvement of this approach was immediately evident, and its application in the study of urban fabrics became evident in Habraken’s work, especially when high-rise development was criticized and forms of low-rise development became common.

Habraken founded the SAR group (Stichting Architecten Research) which was related to Bond Nederlandse Architecten (BNA). Architectural firms, including Van den Broek and Bakema, financed the group. However, there were tensions between Forum, the international journal in which Van den Broek and Bakema were involved, and SAR. After a failed SAR competition in Maarsseveeld, Van den Broek and Bakema had to leave SAR to avoid conflict of interests. Compared to Habraken’s attention to the production and building technology of housing, which were deeply imbued with modernity, Forum concentrated on new forms of living, and usually took a rather anti-urban, collective stance. Aldo van Eyck developed a more urban approach compared to that of other Forum members such as Herman Hertzberger and Piet Blom. This was probably caused by the severe criticism of the so-called Dutch Structuralism by Peter and Alison Smithson in 1962 (Engel, 2007; Smithson, 1991). Van Eyck was stimulated to reformulate his point of view after this criticism. Nevertheless, the tissue theories of Habraken influenced the design and planning of urban renewal areas, such as Jacobspoel in Rotterdam.

With regard to this, Barbieri made a first attempt in the international journal Lato International (Barbieri, 1978) to describe the architectural proposals of van Eyck and Theo Bosch in Zwolle and Weeber in Dordrecht. Although underlining a rational foundation based on industrial principles of repetition and modularity, resembling those still evident in the historical centre, Barbieri retrospectively considered that these examples were not entirely successful. The main problem was that from Granpré Molliérd: onward architecture in the Netherlands was intended to be either an artistic or a technical practice and Dutch architects seemed not to be able to link these two aspects.

Within this framework, searching for a new rationality rooted in environmental context rather than in universal values and aspirations, the position of the Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA) is interesting. To understand it one has to return to the Internationale Architectuur (1980), OMA was trying to continue the form and ‘metaphorical’ language of modernism. According to Lara Schrijver (2008), Koolhaas and Elia Zenghelis collaborated and criticized the ‘historicism’ approach of the Krier brothers. Especially in their project for the IJ-plein in Amsterdam in 1980, OMA was trying to continue the form and ‘metaphorical’ language of modernism. According to Gramsbergen, 2014). In an early project in the Oude Westen district, close to the historical centre of Rotterdam, he introduced for example a gallery on the second floor at the rear of the block in such a way that ground and first-floor dwellings could as far as possible have front doors on the street side. This provides a load-bearing span of about 6 m between dwellings, corresponding to the proportions of a traditional Dutch house. This access feature is at variance with the ‘modernistic’ portico stairs. It ‘imports’ a foreign solution in order to connect with former Gothic and nineteenth-century houses in a modern project, built not by individual owners but by a housing corporation. It is these kinds of forms as well as the architecture of public institutions that establish and fuel city development (Gramsbergen, 2014).

In this respect it is not only Rossi who holds a central position, but also Jean Casteix, Jean...
Jacques Depauw and Philippe Panerai. With the translation of Formes urbaines, de l’Hôti à la barre, originally published in 1977 and 7 years later translated into Dutch, not only monuments and institutions, but also trans- formations of the urban block enter Dutch discourse. Differing from the Italians, this Versailles school of urban morphology also took account of the common places of life in its studies, addressing the everyday envi- ronment of city dwellers: blocks and streets. Additionally, their studies had a broad time span, starting from the Paris of Hausmann and ending with the prototypical blocks of mod- ernism/Congrès International d’Architecture Moderne. In fact, this research group assumes the presence of an inner logic that links the history of urban forms to everyday practices. In other words, it maintains that these prac- tices are reflected in specific urban and archi- tectural models, like the building block in a particular city at a particular moment in time. In the Netherlands the design competition of the Haarlem Hofjes in 1992 reflects and reintroduces the Hof, the courtyard, as a typi- cal feature of Dutch city form. The De Nijl projects of Paddepoel, Gouda and Vreeswijk all feature the Hof as a fundamental urban ele- ment. Sometimes it was already present in the urban tissue, as in Haarlem where it is a con- stituent element; in other cases it was intro- duced anew. In Maastricht the urban plan of the Sphinx Ceramique Terrain, a masterplan by Jo Coenen, Barbieri and Geurtsen, com- missioned by the municipality in 1987-90, shows the urban block as an architectural object and urban entity that brings street, block and court into a very specific mutual relationship. In 1982 Weeber’s design for the Venserpolder in Amsterdam experiments with the perimeter block, as opposed to the ‘open composition’ as introduced in the Netherlands before and after the Second World War. These proposals basically paved the road for experi- ments in the 1990s, such as the KNSM-eiland in Amsterdam, where Kollhoff introduced the urban block as ‘GroBform’. To complete the panorama, in the field of landscape architecture it is worth mention- ing the work of Clemens Steenbergen at the Technische Universiteit Delft. Thanks to his efforts, the knowledge legacy developed by students in the field of architecture and urbanism in the 1980s is evident in the attempt to redefine the architecture of the garden and the landscape within the renewed analytical approach in landscape design. In this respect the book Architecture and landscape, co-edited in 1996 with Wouter Reh (Steenbergen and Reh, 1996), is an interesting example of projecting urban form into the dimension of the landscape. However, despite the impact of the book, Steenbergen did not succeed in establishing a critical legacy in the design of the Dutch landscape. The problem with land- scape architects is that they tend to emphasize drawing, not translating the technical aspect of land reclamation into a cultural reflec- tion of the territory (Reh, 1996). Regarding Dutch landscape, Simon Schama’s popular books also help to clarify the Dutch mental- ity (Schama, 1988). An attempt to systematize morphological approaches in the Netherlands is available in ‘Stadsmorphologie, een proeve van vormgericht onderzoek ten behoeve van stedenuwbouwhistorisch onderzoek’ (Koster, 2001).

Conclusion
Both aspirations and opportunities have played a part in the growth of interest in urban morphology and building typology in the Netherlands. In the case of the former, the theoretical legacy of the Italian intellectual criticism of modernity was important, nota- bly in Tafuri’s Progetto e stopia. As far as the latter is concerned, the influence of Dutch culture has been important: its pragmatism, once deprived of any ideological premise, heavily affected the transformation of the city during the ‘post-industrial’ phase. Especially relevant was the deep concern about planning practice as it existed in the 1960s and 1970s. That practice led to the production of an excess of cheap social housing in cities while, paradoxically, the number of elderly in the major cities was decreasing. In addition, housing for higher income residents was in short supply, which meant that municipali- ties failed to receive sufficient tax income to maintain existing levels of urban amenity. These circumstances demanded a clear policy. The new brief entailed more expen- sive housing at higher density near to city centres and ‘densification’ of existing tissue, to counteract the previous phase of dispersal of people and opportunities. Density stud- ies, income calculations and the creation of consensus were all needed. The political pro- gramme changed and the architect’s task was to reformulate the design brief and produce comprehensive and consistent proposals. The new approach required new instruments. A great number of ‘density’ studies were pro- duced. Dutch architects became renowned for combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Many important studies on this subject have been published (see, for exam- ple, Bergerhauser Pont and Haupt, 2010). In fact this combined approach was still evident during the decades that followed, lasting until the recent economic-financial crisis. These practical considerations have recently been added to by discussions within ISUF. Many researchers within ISUF prefer analytical methods of investigation while in the Netherlands design practice remains the main priority. In addition, the influence of the Italian legacy remains significant. Looking back, it is evident that Rossi played a leading role, and the position and influence of Muratori, which was known before ISUF came into being, should not be underesti- mated. However, while the Muratorian per- spective was that the ‘design solution’ would follow from analysis of existing urban form, emphasizing that this would provide the key to development and change, in the Dutch per- ception of urban form and building type, influ- enced by Rossi’s work, analysis and design act as different categories. More precisely, analysis determines the field and framework in which the Dutch architect formulates the brief. Whereas Muratori considers the city as a continuum, Rossi understands it as a frag- ile composition and an unstable battlefield of varying competing initiatives, and therefore as a political artifact.
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The study of urban form in the Netherlands

The Twenty-Third International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF 2016), hosted by the School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Nanjing University, will take place in Nanjing, China, from 8 to 10 July 2016. The theme of the conference is "Urban morphology and the resilient city". Topics to be covered include:

- Urban morphological theory
- Urban morphology and urban design/planning
- Urban form, society and technology
- The fringe-belt concept
- Urban morphology, sustainability, and climate change
- Transformation and resilience in urban development
- Urban form in the global era
- East and West: similarities and contrasts

Post-conference excursions include short excursions in Nanjing (the Confucius Temple, Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Mausoleum, and the Presidential Palace) and a two-day excursion to the historical city of Suzhou.

Nanjing was one of the earliest established cities in China. It first became a capital in 229 CE, and it has continued to be a prominent place in Chinese history and culture. It is recognized as one of the Four Great Ancient Capitals of China. As the capital of the Ming Empire, Nanjing was the largest city in the world from 1358 to 1425. Legacies from that period include the longest city wall in the world, 21 km of which still exist. In 1912, Nanjing was selected as the capital of the Republic of China and became the national centre for modernization. It remains a national centre of education, research, transport networks and tourism as well as the second-largest commercial centre in the East China region after Shanghai.

More information is available on the conference website (http://urbanform.cn).
ISUF 2017: City and territory in the global era

The Twenty-Fourth International Seminar on Urban Form (ISUF 2017) will take place in Valencia, Spain, from 4 to 8 July 2017. The theme of the conference is ‘City and territory in the global era’. The organizers and the Council of ISUF invite participation in the Conference by interested academics and professionals. Topics on which proposals are particularly welcome include:

- Stages in territorial configuration
- Urban form and social use of space
- Reading and re-generating the informal city
- Efficient use of resources in sustainable cities
- City transformations
- Big data
- Tools of analysis in urban morphology
- Urban green space

Proposals for papers should take the form of abstracts of papers. They should be prepared in the following format: title of paper, author(s) name, affiliation, address, e-mail address, telephone number, keywords and 250-word abstract. They should be e-mailed to isuf2017valencia@gmail.com. Authors should consult the ‘Notes for the guidance of contributors to Urban Morphology’, available on the ISUF website (www.urbanform.org) or in recent copies of the journal, before preparing their papers. Selected papers may be published after the conference.

The official conference language is English. There will be a New Researchers’ Forum in which researchers new to the field are invited to take part. New researchers should indicate when they submit their abstracts whether they would like to be included in the New Researchers’ Forum. There will be a number of excursions to places in the city and the region.

Enquiries and suggestions concerning the conference should be forwarded to isuf2017valencia@gmail.com

Journal of Space Syntax

Volume 6, Number 1 of the Journal of Space Syntax, published online on 26 October 2015, contains the following articles:

S. Westin, ‘To know is to know one’s geometry’ – Reflections on the problem of inference in space syntax from the viewpoint of a human geographer

D. Seamon, ‘Understanding place holistically: cities, synergistic relatedness, and space syntax’

F. Weissenborn, ‘After structure: expression in built form’

L. S. Liebst, ‘Phenomenology of the movement economy: a multilevel analysis’

H. Stöger, ‘Roman neighbourhoods by the numbers: a space syntax view on ancient city quarters and their social life’

N. Charalambous and I. Geddese, ‘Making spatial sense of historical social data’


L. Lim, T. Ying, A. Vialard, C. Feng and J. Peporini, ‘Urban morphology and syntactic structure: a discussion of the relationship of block size to street integration in some settlements in the Province’

M. D. Major, ‘The invention of a new scale: the figurative form.

The focus of attention in this paper is the ‘substratum permanent structures’ that influenced the transformation of Rome. Owing to its dual life cycle and unusual complexity, Rome is an exceptional city. The New Rome topography by Nolli (1748) (Figure 1) is the first measured urban map of the modern era. It documents the form of Rome in the middle of the eighteenth century when, after a period of building stagnation, the city entered a new phase of growth. The areas built within the Aurelian walls (which were still intact 1500 years after their construction) are located mainly in the area formed by the meander of the River Tiber facing the Vatican citadel. The remaining area within the ancient city walls in the eighteenth century was mostly pasture, having been employed for centuries as a source of building materials. Painters, academics and architects have left countless testimonies to this landscape, especially in figurative form.
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