The impact of urban planning on the sustainable development of archaeological sites

studying the role of culture in the urban planning of Nasiriyah city and the archaeological site of Ur

Kamil Y Hussain¹ and Sophia R Ali Al-timimy²

¹Technical Institute of Shatrah, Southern Technical University, Thi-qar, Iraq; shathras1@yahoo.com; Tel.: +964-7801418418
²Central of Urban and Regional Planning for Post Graduate Studies, Baghdad University, Baghdad, Iraq; sophia.razzaq@stu.edu.iq; Tel.: +964-7802803065

Abstract. Cities have been at the center of initiatives to integrate culture into sustainable planning since the beginning of the new millennium. The culture, which is an invaluable tool, has been ignored in the three-pillar sustainability model. In recent years, the role of culture in sustainability or sustainable development has emerged and contexts and the rise of the “four pillars” model of sustainability in a number of countries. Paper seeks to integrate the concept of culture in the models of planning in general and urban planning in particular, which emerge as effective ways to move towards a society that embodies the values of its citizens and takes into account the cultural heritage of the region through the analysis of the urban planning project of the city of Nasiriyah as a city of culture and the impact of this planning on the site of the archaeological city of Ur in terms of sustainability and development. The main conclusion is the follow this type of planning knowledge and practice as being the most appropriate and effective for the planning process under the type of local authorities and democratic practices, i.e. dealing with the planning problem as a unique and special case to use it.

1. Introduction

Since prehistoric times, planning has been known as a process and humanitarian endeavor. It is the crucible in which the state-community relationship is developed and from which the most cohesive manifestation of the desires of a society will emerge[1]. With the end of the era of rational scientific planning, which dominated during the decades from the 1950's to 1970's on the planning process[2], the field was opened to the emergence of a set of theoretical trends, some of these theories emerged as a reaction to the failures and setbacks suffered by planning because of the tyranny of modernist thinking and technocratic planning, and after the failure of modern comprehensive planning methodology to achieve those goals.

One of these trends is the communicative planning, which is very popular these days among those involved in urban planning issues. It is even the undisputed prevailing trend on the arena, this trend focuses on participation in decision-making, by means of questionnaire forms, opinion polls and dialogues between stakeholders and authorities with authorities and planners. The paper attempts to focus on this trend because it is a trend to some extent in the experience of of Nasiriyah, which we will address later. It is clear from the foregoing that the fundamental question of planning theory has always been centered on how to ensure the quality of urban life and improve the level and achieve the of society well-being.
2. **Sustainable development and well-being**

When the Brundtland Report popularized the idea of sustainable development in 1987, it was praised by many as a better alternative to the current growth-oriented models of development. Conceived as the creation that meets today’s needs without compromising future generations’ needs[3], sustainable development was attractive because of its boldness in addressing the nexus between the cultural, environmental and economic aspects of sustainability[4]. Unlike previous debates that concentrated on whether growth and environment are mutually contradictory[5].

Wellbeing has become one of the basic concepts used to describe the state of a society that actually aspires to it, or at least the public authorities are trying to plan in their development plans to achieve this goal. There is no doubt that the fulfillment of material needs and wants contributes greatly to the well-being of the community, but the sense of meaning and purpose is the one mentality that is most closely associated with life satisfaction and the well-being of society[6]. The process of arriving at collective meanings is fundamental to a community’s wellbeing and may well be the government’s most important role. Wellbeing in the society is founded on a common sense of purpose[7].

3. **Culture as process and way of life**

The word culture is one of the most complex and contested words in the English language. Culture is one of those omnibus words that incorporates many different uses used by many different people for many different purposes. It therefore defies precise definition[8]. "When sustainability embodies a desire that future generations inherit a world at least as bountiful as the one we inhabit. Nevertheless, as shown above, how to get there will always be the topic of constant discussion. This discussion is about values; it is a cultural debate".

Culture as an aspect of sustainable development is gradually being taken into consideration by academics and policymakers. Doubleday, Mackenzie and Dalby[2004] argued that discussions of sustainability must include dynamic understandings of the particular complexities of culture as well as of the place in which it occurs[9]. Thinking of culture as an important aspect of sustainable development was expressed at both global and local levels in the writings on sustainable development[10]. The incremental consideration of cultural elements (cultural heritage) as a sideline in the context of sustainable development[11]. In many cases, cultural considerations are considered under the umbrella of social sustainability.

4. **New sustainability paradigm (relationship between culture and sustainability)**

In the last years of the twentieth century, environmental concerns continued to be the cornerstone of sustainable development. As the concept matures, however, increasing emphasis is being placed on interconnections between the natural environment and development's social and economic dimensions, leading to the sustainability paradigm of three pillars. Over the past few decades, proposals for new approaches to planning have burgeoned, with initial initiatives to separate culture from social[12].

In Hawkes monograph which inspired its title by Yencken and Wilkinson book (Resetting the Compass, 2000), who support those asserting that there should be four pillars of sustainability. He argued that the new governance paradigms and views of what constitutes a healthy and sustainable society would be more effective if cultural vitality were to be included as one of the basic requirements[13]. There are many attempts to concentrate specifically on culture or 'cultural sustainability' as distinct from social sustainability e.g.[14].

Operationally, this new paradigm is being advanced through a wide range of grassroots, varied, and experimental initiatives, rooted in a pervasive and heightened concern for grassroots public participation. Arguing that the ingredients needed to fully elaborate and impose it are all in play. When sustainability became the dominant paradigm for both local planning and political contexts, questions about cultural heritage's relative neglect grew in sustainability discourse and agreements. This frustration gave rise to grassroots thinking that promoted the creation of a sustainability paradigm of four pillars. The four pillars of sustainability are:

- **Cultural** vitality wellbeing, creativity, diversity and innovation
- **Social** equity justice, engagement, cohesion, well-being
- **Environmental** responsibility ecological balance
Sustainability's four-pillar model represents a paradigm shift in method for both sustainability methodology and public and planning sectors. Appearing from the above, the new frameworks are deprived of the means of understanding, let alone implementing, the changes they promote without a foundation that expressly includes culture. After we have established the importance of the role of culture in sustainable development, we will address what needs to be done in the following paragraphs and suggest concrete methods through which culture can influence the planning process itself.

**5. Culture at the heart of urban planning**

Urban planning and, in particular, urban design contribute significantly to development guidance[15]. "It is recognised that the expression of social purpose and aspiration is at the heart of the planning process." Once culture is used to represent social development and the dissemination of values and meaning, the connection between culture and planning becomes clearer[16].

The values of a community are the cornerstone on which everything else is founded. Such values and the manner in which they are articulated are the culture of a society. Without consistent channels for the presentation of community values, the way a society defines itself cannot be fully democratic. Culture, as noted, refers not only to society's values, but to the way they create and express these values. In reality, we cannot know what a society’s values are, except by observing their manifestation. To planners, the most difficult challenge may be not so much to define the values of a community, but to create the conditions under which that community can express those values itself autonomously, expressing its opinion and speech at all stages of the planning process. When we recognize culture to mean the meaning and representation of what it means to be human, it becomes apparent why the fundamental basis of all public policy is a cultural perspective. That is, a commitment to the values and aspirations of those who will be affected by the plan must be the first step in a planning process.

It is self-evident that it is necessary for people to make sense of their lives and to behave on the basis of that sense. This process and its results appear as a system of value – a culture. The social dimensions of this activity constitute the culture of a society. One of the biggest issues facing any society is the state's role in defining the principles that guide both government and, more importantly, the values of society as a whole.
6. Urban planning and conservation of World Heritage sites

When archaeology and archaeological research is seen as an intellectual luxury, it would be to treat the entire cultural heritage of humanity as irrelevant and unnecessary to the quality of our lives; while in reality it is integral. Thus, material culture is not merely a product of society, but an integral part of society. It follows that the material and archaeological remains of the past are more than evidence of the disappeared entities, part of which is still with us nowadays[17]. It is an integral part of the history and identity of nations[18]. It could be said that these objects constitute a part of our present world and have been found at a time when skills were developed to make sense of them[19].

The misconception that monuments will always be with us, since they have endured for centuries, has had-and continues to have-tragic and irreversible consequences[20]. The remains we see today of past activities (what archaeologists study) is a nonrenewable resource, and once it is destroyed, it is gone forever. Many recent studies have warned of changing urban environments and their degradation over time and place, In addition, there is a need to change modern practices and learn from the lessons of the past and the need to adapt to new the environments[21];[22];[23], and it's also indicate that such academic and intellectual separation is foolhardy. Archaeology, anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology need to work together and collaborate more on addressing current concerns about urban development. Lots of researches implemented around the world demonstrate that preservation of cultural heritage enhances environmental, social, cultural and economic sustainability. Cultural heritage can contribute towards well-being and quality of life of communities, can help to mitigate the impacts of cultural globalization and can become an incentive for sustainable economic development.

7. Sustainability of cultural heritage

Cultural heritage is not just of value to the individuals who own it or live in historic properties, it can also have a value to well-being and quality of life of communities, can help mitigate the impacts of cultural globalization and can become an incentive for sustainable development[24]. Cultural heritage has become increasingly significant over the past decade in the public policy discourse at the local and international level. The stronghold for such a change in perception can be found in international umbrella conventions, charters and recommendations from organizations such as the Council of Europe[1], UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM and others[25].

The aforementioned recommendations, conventions and charters point out that heritage protection refers to the entire community; the principle of sustainable use of heritage– creating dynamic plans/strategies of cultural heritage management should ensure sustainable patterns of the use of space as well as a broader economic justification for investing in heritage; the principle of the holistic approach to cultural heritage–this means working to strengthen cross-sectoral connections and cooperation among public authorities, non-governmental organizations, local communities, and the private sector through various development policies.

8. Cultural heritage as a cultural capital

Economists traditionally distinguish between three forms of capital: physical capital, human capital and natural capital. Throsy proposes a fourth type of capital, cultural capital which defined as an asset embodying cultural value[26]. As a distinctly different category from the other three. Formulation of this proposition stems from the common observation that many cultural phenomena such as heritage / archaeological buildings and works of art do indeed have all the characteristics.

Cultural capital is the most recent form of capital in the literature of economics. Although cultural capital is a relatively new concept in economics, there has been a fast growing interest into the topic in recent years[27];[28];[29];[30];[31]. By definition, cultural capital is the only form of capital that can give rise to both economic and cultural value simultaneously[31].

---

1 Council of Europe Framework Convention2005. This convention pointed out the importance of heritage as a factor of sustainable economic development, as well as the necessity of respecting its specific character and integrity when using it and creating development policies.
Within the sustainability field, culture has often been discussed in terms of cultural capital. We inherit this stock of tangible and intangible cultural capital from past generations and pass it onto future generations. This view is prominent in discussions of built heritage within the context of sustainable development planning. Although the value of cultural capital may not always be measurable in terms of money, both tangible and intangible cultural assets are considered as capital that has value. This cultural capital, as Throsby argued, is situated within cultural ecosystems[that] underpin the operations of the real economy[32]. As for the creative economy which brings together culture, economy, science and education, the development potentials of cultural heritage hold a place of particular importance within it, It ensures the continuity of heritage as well as the identification and promotion of individual and collective identities, respect for other cultures and diversity of cultural expressions[33].

9. Urban sprawl and danger to archaeological sites

Many countries are characterized by the existence of a civilizational heritage, representing the product of the civilizations that have left them. The preservation of the cultural heritage has become a historical human responsibility. Its protection and preservation is no longer solely of local concern, but has become a humanitarian message in which peoples cooperate and perform their experiences under the supervision of specialized international organizations or regional bodies.

It is a historical human responsibility that contributes to the preservation of the past for future generations. Cultural heritage, especially its tangible heritage (cities, archaeological and heritage buildings), is exposed to many different dangers. The most prominent of these risks related to the subject of our paper are the urban expansion and the encroachment of cities towards these sites. Many archaeological sites in various parts of the world have vanished due to the encroachment of cities and the expansion of residential areas as a result of the desire for material wealth and the priority of individual interests.

10. New trends in urban planning

Over the past centuries, there have been three coherent and competing philosophical approaches: rational, empirical, and pragmatic. The influence of these philosophical currents has shown contemporary trends that rise above the normative aspect of planning. The most important of these trends is the communicative direction influenced by Habermas philosophy. It is concerned with the formation of consensus and agreement through negotiation and dialogue between the various conflicting parties in the planning process.

Attention to communication and communication has begun as a means to enable non-governmental groups and organizations to operate outside the state. This is what prompted John Forster, and others to argue that communication is the most important element of active planning and practice. Interacting with different parties, communicating ideas, shaping opinions, formulating arguments, discussing differences and then reaching consensus and consensus are the basis of the planners' work [34]. The communicative experience rises and is based on an interactive relationship that connects individuals and achieves a kind of social sharing and cooperation.

The purpose of understanding between the parties to the dialogue is mutual agreement between the issues, mutual understanding and convergence of views through debate and presentation, resulting in convergence of views and positive interaction between the interlocutors. “Understanding is a process of mutual persuasion coordinating the actions of multiple parties involved, and it means communicating for an acceptable agreement”[35]. According to the communicative theory, the role of the plan is merely to communicate, to listen to people's issues, and to help them to form a consensus among different viewpoints. Here the planner relinquishes the leadership role to become a provider of information and a sense of convergence and convergence in different perspectives.

11. Participation in Decision Making: The Experience of Nasiriyah
The concept of popular participation in contemporary planning was first introduced in the British City Planning Law of 1947, which provides for discussion and consultation, taking the opinion of the stakeholders about the subject of the plan, as a guarantee for the success of the planning process. In the last quarter of the last century, the concept began to spread and adopted as an important means for the success of the planning process at all stages as an important means to achieve economic growth, social justice. This is due to the fact that there is a strong conviction among planners, politicians, and executives that the efforts of the government alone cannot achieve the goals effectively, efficiently, and sustainably without the participation and effort of those involved. This means Bottom up procedure.

What is based on all modern trends, is the principle of planning for others, or legitimate interference in the affairs of others and decision-making, it is thus a central mechanism for decision-making[36]. The difference between them, lies in planning techniques only and hence urban planning is a state-controlled activity.

11.1. Criticism and discussion
The criticisms of this trend are: A relentless attempt to reach a consensus may mean that it is imperialist culture, It seeks to abolish local specificities and dissolve minority cultures in order to settle it with what it calls the agreed culture, Or consensus culture. It will only be the culture of the majority, the culture of the dominant and the opinion of the power. In this way, it is of a conservative nature that rejects others who are inconsistent with the mainstream and not in harmony with the prevailing culture. In practice, the field survey revealed that it is the opinion of the strongest that dominates during the implementation of the plans.

In this sense came criticism Flyvbjerg and Richardson) for this trend in planning that hinders the understanding of the role of power in the formulation of plans[37]. Therefore, they call for the need to focus on what is already happening on the ground it is not possible to think of the theory of communication in isolation from power Flyvbjerg refers “Democracy of speech, negotiation and dialogue based on rationality is not sufficient to solve problems unless supported by the force of the power”[38]. It also adds that Plan is the Reason, or rational means, that needs the power of the authority to come into effect. Thus the power is the mechanism that implements the scheme (logic) and its embodiment on Reality. Hence, the essence of the planning process is not limited to the development of plans and implementation of the involvement of those concerned, but must upgrade popular participation to a genuine partnership in the planning process with the need to empower vulnerable parties until you run in the conflict to snatch their interests without favor from any party even if this is imbued with good intentions.

12. Urban planning of Nasiriyah (city of culture) and site of Ur
The city of Nasiriyah is the center of the province of Dhi Qar, located on the Euphrates River in the southeast of Iraq, was built in 1870. Nasiriyah was famous for the existence of the ruins of Ur, the capital of the Sumerians. It is also known among other cities of Iraq as a city of culture, art and poetry. Current master plan for Nasiriyah was prepared by the British company (Garsdinal Design) in 2011, describes what the city should look like in 2040.

12.1. Alternatives and participation in decision-making
Four basic planning alternatives or ‘options’ have been developed and discussed for the purpose of formally evaluating them[39].

12.1.1. First alternative (peripheral growth): This alternative proposes that the urban expansion will be on the western, northern and eastern regions of the existing urban area boundaries. (Fig 2).
This alternative proposes that the air base adjacent to the site of the archaeological city of Ur be a regional civil airport with associated work as an area focused on national and international trade, and call it a free trade zone. To support this project shows the urban transport line (tram) extending from the city to the airport and the city Ur, while keeping the area empty of any expansion towards the southwest (the city of Ur). The expansion does not exceed the current railway line.

**12.1.2. Alternative 2 (Eastern Expansion):**
The expansion to the potential secondary development areas to the east will exceed Route 7, which extends north from the Euphrates River.

As in the first alternative, a free trade zone is proposed in the air base on the assumption that it will be converted for use as a civil airport. It is connected to the public transport system with the city, in addition to linking it with road to direct traffic to it west of Basra road. While keeping the area empty of any expansion towards the south (the ancient city of Ur), the expansion does not exceed the current railway line.

**12.1.3. Third alternative (linear expansion):**
In this alternative, the expansion will be traditionally linear along the current Kut-Baghdad road, and a new parallel road will be developed to form the new eastern border of the city.
This alternative proposes to transform the air base adjacent to the archaeological site of Ur into a regional civil airport and link it to the public transport system (tram or light rail), with the outskirts of the old city, and the industrial zone focused on free trade, while keeping the area empty of any expansion towards Expansion does not exceed the railway line.

12.1.4. Fourth alternative (Southern expansion):
This alternative includes expansion towards the airbase and the site of the archaeological city of Ur and represents the most challenging alternative to implement because such expansion causes problems because the area is used for military purposes and destroyed warehouse equipment and oil refinery.

The planners hope that the conversion of the air base to a civilian airport to service the province of Dhi-Qar, and with regard to the military base there are many buildings that can be rehabilitated for residential uses, and ammunition stores are a major obstacle as shown by satellite imagery detection, this alternative includes expansion towards It is very close to its borders and overlaps with the oil refinery area.

Within the framework of the stated goal of Nasiriyah City to be a city of culture and the pursuit of the integration of culture within sustainable communities and to create a more balanced set of ideas and knowledge, and from the principle of participation in the evaluation of alternatives has been adopted evaluation forms for alternatives and distributed to specific categories (members of the provincial council, a number of representatives of trade unions and organizations In light of this, the first alternative was chosen, which corresponded to the selection of the designing company for the project chosen by it based on evaluation criteria developed for this purpose.
Extensive discussions were held on the advantages of the proposed alternatives. A broad consensus was reached on the first alternative (ocean growth) as the best proposal with the recommendation to add a strip of land towards the south after the railway to be used for light industries, warehouses and businesses as in the fourth alternative. Archaeological sites (the city of Ur) and the air base if converted to a civilian airport. This decision came after consulting professionals and archaeologists.

**Figure 6. Approved alternative**

### 12.2. Criticism and discussion

It is evident from the discussion of the plans that have been reviewed and the reference to the minutes and pictures of the meetings and the discussions that were held that they were very few and focused on the discussion and evaluation of alternatives only. All the alternatives discussed did not explicitly deal with the archaeological site.

It is evident from the discussion of the proposals reviewed and the reference to the minutes and pictures of the meetings and the discussions held, it is clear that they were very few and centered only on the debate and analysis of alternatives. All the alternatives mentioned did not explicitly tackle the archaeological site, in terms of its development and sustainability, and focused on the air base adjacent to it completely, where it was proposed to convert to a civilian airport, a proposal previously imposed by the provincial council.

The new plan chosen and accepted did not address the region adjacent to the ancient city of Ur, or decide land uses in it. Planners would only link the region with a light rail or road without emphasizing this important axis as a potential axis of growth or cultural development towards the archaeological site of Ur and the new airport. As outlined in the objectives of the plane, the area was kept empty of any use or future development plan.

At present, thinking about culture in a sustainable development context is emergent, overly focused on the concrete, tends to over-preserve (heritage) conservation and not address (future) resilience and transition, and generally lacks a process approach that links history, current, and future holistically, and links culture with other domains. Planning practitioners focus on the shape of the plane while development practitioners have placed emphasis on natural resources, neglecting the fact that humans that oversee the resources are the key agents, and their actions ultimately shape the future.

The transition to cities and communities that are more holistically sustainable, inclusive and resilient is a fundamental social challenge that requires multiple perspectives and ideas, seeing what is really there and not just what the experts tell us, or is based on the results of the survey that has been circulated to a very small class of stakeholders.

Hence the need to listen to the views of everyone who lives and works there attentively and respectfully. Whether one carefully considers culture as a fourth pillar of sustainability or as an overarching structure and values the views of anyone living and working there. Whether we are aimed at embracing culture as a fourth sustainability pillar or as a comprehensive framework.
13. Conclusions
1- The main conclusion of the paper is that a complete cultural framework for government, working in parallel with social, environmental and economic structures, is necessary to achieve appropriate urban planning that aspires to a sustainable society. The paper proposes to follow this type of planning knowledge and practice as being the most appropriate and effective for the planning process in light of the type of local authorities and democratic practices, in other words to deal with the planning problem as a unique and special case. It has its own special circumstances that require wisdom in dealing with it.

2- Our previous reviews of research literature, policy and planning reports have shown that the three-pillar paradigm of sustainable development is insufficient to tackle the problems of the world and does not incorporate a key component of the cultural aspects of society where culture is neglected or, at best, diminishes its importance.

3- The experience of Nasiriyah is one of the leading attempts at local level, as it raised the issue of culture as one of the development goals for planning, an inspiring initiative whether or not most of those goals have been achieved. Culture's position and location is still unclear and therefore needs to be worked out in group dialogs and planning processes.

14. Recommendations and proposals
1- A systematic approach to sustainability is required where the cultural dimension is embedded in a holistic conceptualization of sustainable development that can be rooted in policy and planning processes together with others-social, economic, environmental.

2- A 'whole of society' approach would need to be taken to be practical and effective, as the actions of an individual cannot be intelligently measured without taking into account the entire environment on which they affect.

3- Cultural impact evaluation must be implemented throughout the urban planning process as a required activity.

4- Government and practitioners in development and planning should pay attention to the culture of society, and look at people's culture, values and knowledge and use them as tools for change, rather than resorting to Western concepts that often fail to communicate with people.

5- Adopting a multidisciplinary approach through the combination of aerial and satellite imagery offers a continuously updated profile of urban development processes, allowing the effect on archeological sites to be predicted.
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