



New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences



Volume 4, Issue 11, (2017) 171-184

ISSN : 2547-881

www.prosoc.eu

Selected Paper of 6th World Conference on Design and Arts (WCDA 2017), 29 June – 01 July 2017, University of Zagreb, Zagreb – Croatia

The Evaluation of 20th Century Architecture in Konya in the Context of Modern Architecture Heritage

Esra Yaldiz^{a*}, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42060 Konya, Turkey.

Dicle Aydin^b, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42060 Konya, Turkey.

Suheyla Buyuksahin Siramkaya^c, Faculty of Architecture, Selcuk University, 42130 Konya, Turkey.

Suggested Citation:

Yaldiz, E., Aydin, D. & Siramkaya, S. B. (2017). The evaluation of 20th century architecture in Konya in the context of modern architecture heritage. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 4(11), 171-184. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Ayse Cakir Ilhan, Ankara University, Turkey.

©2017 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Understanding about conservation is limited to 'monument' or 'old work of art' in the past compared with today's new concepts like 'historical and cultural heritage', 'heritage of modern architecture' and 'heritage of industry'. Turkey's 20th century modern architecture was started with the early modernism buildings constructed all over Turkey, especially in Ankara and Istanbul in the first years of the Republic. This period includes all the works of architecture that were produced until the late 1980s, carrying the traces of modern movement, rationalist, purist, transparent, reinterpreting the traditional architectural values by means of modern material and seeking of independent form. In this study, the Mevlana Axis between Alaaddin Hill and the historical city centre and the works of architecture in the modernisation period between the early 1900s and 1980s on this axis, contribute to the city identity and handled in the context of modern architectural heritage are evaluated.

Keywords: Modern architecture heritage, evaluation criteria, Konya.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Esra Yaldiz**, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42060 Konya, Turkey.

E-mail address: mimaresrayaldiz@gmail.com / Tel.: +0332 221 05 00

1. Introduction

The concept of conservation is defined in the context of the World Heritage Convention as ‘recognizing cultural heritage, defined by monuments, building groups and sites; providing the conservation of its material and when necessary all of the methods used for its promotion, restoration and development (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext>)’ and refers to a process that began and still continues before the Renaissance in the world. At the base of the preservation concept in the past is only the preservation of structures which had historical, cultural, architectural and aesthetic values, but today the concept of preservation shows a development from one monument to the periphery. Within this development process, the concept of contemporary protection aims to preserve any kind of culture that can be transferred from past to present and future. From a broad perspective, cultural heritage can be defined as a resultant accumulation of human interaction with the environment and with each other (Velthius & Spennemann, 2007). Therefore, the general scope of the conservation concept is formed of conserving and considering the natural environment and values with the man-made physical environment and cultural assets (Kuban, 2000) as a legacy (Yaldiz & Asatekin, 2016).

The definition, scope, evaluation criteria and conservation methods of cultural heritage in the world began to take shape in the 19th century and in the 20th century with the effect of modernism the fact about what will be conserved has led to debates. The discussions on the heritage of modern architecture were concentrated in the 1980s and in the 1990s public regulations and legal arrangements were started. It was determined that along with the collapse of communism in European cities and Russia, modern architecture works were vanished and damaged by neglect especially after 2. World War and those works were not documented; therefore the studies gained momentum (Sharp, 2000).

The buildings of the modern era can also be described as an architecture that is broken off the past, struggling to change and conscious of its own modernity (Colquhoun, 2002). In the direction of this point of view, the buildings that can be evaluated within the scope of modern architectural heritage are required to have the quality of a document belonged to a specific period of time for a society and represent the architectural character after the 1920s. These buildings together with their environments give the city a value of meaning and identity.

In the scope of this study, together with the changes in the historical process, the buildings which carry the social, cultural and economic traces of their period and rooted in the memory of the city and the citizens as they become integrated with the city life, are exemplified in the city of Konya. The location is limited with the Mevlana axis reaching to historical city centre from the Alaeddin Hill and the architectural works which were built on this axis in the modernisation period between 1930 and 1980, contributed to city identity and handled in the context of modern architecture heritage are evaluated. The selected study area provides the possibility of reading and experiencing the relations of modern architecture with local and universal architecture in the city in Konya via spaces and reveals its significance in the urban identity as the historical centre of trade.

2. The Concept of Modern Architecture Heritage

The modern word comes from the Latin word ‘Modernus’ and is defined as belonged to today, contemporary, new, independent from products of the past (Collins, 1998). Modern architecture, on the other hand, includes all architectural developments after the Middle Era and is thought to be the living architecture of the 20th century (Aslanoglu, 1988).

The architectural works of modernism - which started with the modern movement in 1920s – can be defined as building and building groups for which changing design understanding, new materials, new technologies and new production systems are used, in other words which are formed by social and technological change (Omay Polat & Can, 2008). The descriptive characteristics of the modern architecture evolving with the 20th century’s aesthetic point of view are expressed such as formal

similarities like simple facade composed of geometric shapes, transparency, solid void proportions used in facades, reflection of the plan on the facade (Otkunc, 2012), the usage of reinforced concrete, steel and glass, the appearance of cubic forms and geometric shapes, and more importantly the absence of decoration with stylistic patterns, traditional roof and ornamental details (Bozdogan, 2015). For this reason, modern architecture is defined as a movement that excludes both local and traditional ones, and producing easy, fast, identical/similar products (Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016).

The theory of conservation which conflicted with modernism and was nurtured by this conflict at the beginning of the twentieth century was skeptical about the conservation of the architectural products belonged to a recent past. Modern architecture works used anonymous and standardised building forms were not found worth to conserve, because they were manufactured with glass and steel surfaces that it is not possible to see traces of the elapsed time (Omay Polat & Can, 2008). However, since the 1970s, especially with the effect of the destruction of modern architectural works, the conservation theorists have begun to make efforts in some ways for the definition and acceptance of modern architecture as a cultural asset (Omay Polat, 2008). In this way, as a basic principle of the conservation approach, it was realised that the cultural assets in each period, had the character of the document, presented the period it was made and witnessed that period.

The thought of conservation limited by the concept of monument in the past, was expanded to cover the area around the monument with Venice Regulations in 1964 and it has reached a different dimension by discussing in international conferences with the upcoming concept of Modern Architectural Heritage towards the end of the 20th century. The concept of 'Modern Architectural Heritage' emerged at the point where the two great world wars were behind and the controversial dynamics of the modernity-postmodern revolution took over in the second half of the 20th century, which is a dynamic, innovative, seeking and destructive period for architecture just like the other arts (Jokilehto, 2003). This concept and the conservation thought it predicted strengthened in the early 1970s, when early architectural works began to disappear and in the 1980s, a more comprehensive agenda was introduced, with a focus on Europe. The debates that concentrated at the theoretical level in the 1980s reflected institutionalisation, legal regulations and practice in the 1990s. The issue of establishing an organisation in this issue started to be addressed in 1988 (Kayin, 2016). Many international organisations, especially the Council of Europe and DOCOMOMO have taken action all over the world to protect the 20th century architectural heritage. The establishment of DOCOMOMO in 1988 and the Council of Europe's recommendations on the 'conservation of the Architectural Heritage of the Twentieth Century' in 1991 were the first steps in the conservation of the Modern Architecture Heritage. The ICOMOS expert meeting in Paris in 1985 on the definition and conservation of the Modern Architectural Heritage; The founding of DOCOMOMO in 1988, Council of Europe; Seminars in Vienna in 1989 and Barcelona in 1990; Meetings of DOCOMOMO (Eindhoven 1990, Dessau 1992, Barcelona 1994); 1994, the meeting held in Art Deco, Ottawa, France and Canada; in 1995, conferences on 'Conservation of the Past' in Chicago were held (https://www.icomos.org/20th_heritage/helsinki_1995.htm). The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC20C) committee, which was established in 2005 by ICOMOS, is interested in the 20th century heritage. Madrid Document first published in 2011, second in 2014 by ICOMOS SC20C aims to guide the conservation of the architectural heritage of the twentieth century (<http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/heritage-alerts/>).

DOCOMOMO established in 1988 with the aim of conserving the modern heritage used the definition of 'the products containing modern design principles depending on function, technique and spatial conditions instead of ornamentation and decoration' while determining the scope of this heritage (Omay Polat & Can, 2008; Sharp, 2000).

Modern architectural works need to carry a number of values in order to be able to acquire the character of a cultural asset that needs to be conserved. However when modern architectural works are questioned in the context of conservation criteria, there are a number of changes and differences in the criteria. While one of the most important concepts in the conservation criteria that had been

valid until the 20th century is the agedness value of the building; newness/new material/new technology value emerged in the building/buildings to be evaluated within the scope of modern architectural heritage. Modern architectural works do not carry the agedness value. In addition to this, the values of the works considered as the heritage of modern architecture such as original material, construction technique, plan features are regarded as the originality of the design idea (Omay Polat, 2008). One of the basic reasons for the differences in evaluation criteria is that there is the large number and variety of building typologies in quantity from the previous periods. In addition to new building materials and construction techniques; the document value of the building, the memory value it carries for the community, identity value it creates for the city can also be the criteria for the building to be evaluated as modern architectural heritage.

In 1993, DOCOMOMO defined the evaluation criteria to be used in documenting the international heritage of modern architecture (Table 1). DOCOMOMO determined the building’s technological, aesthetical, art, social values and the characteristics to be canonic – reference as a value and expressed its contribution to modernism, its place in national and international architecture, recognisability of its designer, importance of its design in the scope of originality, art, aesthetic and environment, usage of new technology – material – detail in the work and the creation of new building typology, life style, socio-economical strategies via work as evaluation criteria to be used in the documentation of heritage (www.docomomo.com). On the other hand ICOMOS uses the parameters like design, function, usage, form, pattern relationships and historicalness (www.international.icomos.org; Kayin, 2016) as evaluation criteria by using the philosophy which generates the work as base.

Table 1. The evaluation criteria to use in the documentation of international modern architecture heritage

Basic criteria	Subsidiary values
<p>Technological merit Usage of new material/new Technologies</p>	<p>Canonic merit Its contribution to modernism in its period/a work of a famous architect</p>
<p>Social merit Reflection of the changing communal and social characteristics of 20th century</p>	<p>Referential value Its relationship with its environment and referential quality in its environment Forming an example with its spatial/structural characteristics</p>
<p>Artistic and aesthetic merit Reflection of the characteristics such as composition/proportion/scale/material/construction system with aesthetical properties</p>	<p>Integrity Original design/architectural integrity</p>

(Constituted by making use of Omay Polat, 2008 and DOCOMOMO 1993) (<http://docomomo-us.org/explore-modern/explore-the-register/how-to-evaluate-modern>)

The modern architectural heritage concept, which is included in the legal regulations and professional practice related to conservation in Turkey, as it is in the whole world, is defined as, ‘the buildings, building groups and settlements, which have been produced since the beginning of the 20th century in Turkey, that exemplify both international and national tendencies and/or innovative techniques and technologies’ in the Architectural Heritage Conservation Legislation of the ICOMOS Turkey Committee in 2013 ([http://www.icomos.org.tr /Dosyalar/ICOMOSTR_0623153001387886624.pdf](http://www.icomos.org.tr/Dosyalar/ICOMOSTR_0623153001387886624.pdf)). Also in the same legislation it is emphasised that other than the originality the building, building group or building part should have one or a few of the values such as historical value, documental value, integrity, aesthetic art value, technological value, rareness oneness value, group value, usage value and folkloric value to gain the quality of culture asset needed to be

conserved. When the scope of the modern architectural heritage in our country is taken into consideration in terms of buildings, it is seen that houses, public buildings, bank buildings, business inns and hotels are important places.

3. Evaluation of Konya and 20th Century Architecture in the Context of Modern Architecture Heritage

20th century, as for many countries in the world, happened to be the century of changes and transformations for Turkey in social, economic and political areas (Hasol, 2017). In Turkey the only architectural understanding of that time period was not modernism, a process including national, historical identity seeking (Otkunc, 2012) was lived. For this reason, different concepts such as '20th century architecture', 'modern architecture', 'Republican period architecture' and 'Early Republican architecture' based on style or time interval were exposed. A new search for Turkish Architecture has come to the agenda with the nationalism tendencies developed parallel to the developments in the world in late 19th century. A period -named First National Architecture Movement- inspired by Seljuk, Ottoman and Islamic Architecture especially in the official buildings was experienced between 1910 and 1930. Then the 1930s were the years of development and rapid modernisation for the young Republic of Turkey, and the progressive movement that has become increasingly widespread in the field of architecture in Europe and the United States has also affected Turkish Architecture. In the direction of contemporary understanding, the first phase of modern architecture in the country was seen between 1930 and 1940. Between the years 1940-1950, the Second National Architecture Movement intervened and the process was interrupted. The effects of modern architecture, which has become widespread in the western world, have begun to be seen rapidly in Turkish Architecture with the opening of Turkish architecture to the outside in the 1950s (Hasol, 2017).

Konya is one of the cities where modernisation effects and modern architectural works are seen in Anatolia during the modernisation process of Turkey. After 1960s, modern architecture works started to be seen with a new structuring process in Konya. In this period, many houses, public buildings, business inns, commercial buildings which can be defined as 20th century modern architecture were built by architects such as Sevki Vanli, Sehabettin Uzlu, Nihat Demirdag, A. Tunaoglu, Ozhan Sokmen, Coskun-Filiz Erkal and Cenap Ozkasikci. Residences like Yesil Meram Site, Kibrit Apartment, Hayat Apartment, Emniyet Apartment; public buildings like Central Bank, Meram District Governorate, State Theater, DSI Regional Directorate Building, Old Court House, Vakif Business Inn, Alaaddin Officer's Club, Alaaddin Wedding Hall, City Club; commercial buildings like Mevlana Bazaar, Fatih Bazaar, Ergun Business Inn, Storey Bazaar, Sahin (Antik Hotel) were the examples of modern architecture in the 20th century which carry modernisation influences in Konya (Alagoz, Semerci & Aydin, 2015). While some of these structures are protected by being registered, some are destroyed or about to be destroyed; the others may still survive despite some interventions (Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016). In the study, 20th century modern architectural works on the axis reaching from Alaaddin Hill to Mevlana in the city centre of Konya were examined. Mevlana Research Institute (Country Public Library), Fatih Bazaar, Central Bank, Sahin Hotel, Karatay District Governorate are the buildings evaluated within the framework of the 20th century modern architecture heritage with the values they carry.

3.1. Field study

The history of the axis that connects Alaeddin Hill -which is effective in the formation of the city of Konya- to Mevlana Museum is based on the 13th century. At the end of the 1800s, it was defined as a 'street' and today it has become a 'place' where the processes of architectural practices are watched and staged (Figures 1 and 2). Many buildings built on different periods are located together on the axis. While the Alaeddin Hill took its name from the Alaeddin Mosque located there and built in Seljuk period, also the Iplikci Mosque built in the same century and Serafettin Mosque built in Ottoman period are located on this axis. Sanayi Mektebi and Government Hall are architectural works built in the late 1800s and influential in the formation of the identity of the street. The Axis was shaped by the

Republican period buildings built between 1920 and 1970. In the 20th century, works of early Republican period such as Ziraat Bank, PTT building, Yapi Kredi Bank, which were built between 1910 and 1930, can be given as examples of the works of the first national architectural period which is important in terms of architectural practice.



Figure 1. Air photograph of Alaaddin-Mevlana axis in 1955 (<https://kentrehberi.konya.bel.tr/#/rehber/>)



Figure 2. Satellite image of Alaaddin Mevlana axis in 2016 (<http://www.satdrops.com/@37.87158,32.498467,17z,2t>)

The modern architecture works on this street handled in the scope of this study are the products of period in which Turkey effectively lived the economical, social, cultural and political changes, and they have rational, simple and functional qualities as architectural style. There were no buildings higher than 2 floors on the street until 1950s. Hayat Apartment – defined as the first apartment building in Konya, is the first modern building on the axis in the 1930s. Tekel building was placed on the street in 1935. The Old Municipal Building built in 1923 was demolished in 1961 and the new municipal building was built in 1963 in the same place. The Central Bank, Sahin Hotel, Sumerbank, Fatih Bazaar and Mevlana Research Institute, which were built afterwards, have similarities about rational and simple qualities of modern architecture (Figures 3–6).



Figure 3. Old municipality building demolished in 1961 and Alaaddin Mevlana axis (Koyunoglu Museum Archive)



Figure 4. Alaadin Mevlana axis in 1970s (Koyunoglu Museum Archive)



Figure 5. Alaadin Mevlana axis in 1990s (Koyunoglu Museum Archive)



Figure 6. Alaadin Mevlana axis in 2013

In the first years the axis, which has an image in harmony with the buildings around it through the form, size and facade layouts of the buildings in a way to form an ordered urban square, has begun to lose its original character in the 1970s. The arrangements independent from each other and the irregularities in new constructions have greatly influenced the original character of the area.

3.1.1. Central Bank

The project of the Central Bank Konya Branch Building, which is located on Mevlana Street in island no 2677 and parcel no 56, was obtained by conducting the National Architectural Project Competition in 1969. The Erkal Architecture Office won the competition. The designers of the project are Coskun and Filiz Erkal. The project was prepared in 1970 and the construction of the Central Bank was started in 1971. It is a typical modern architecture building with its mass that reflects the period of modern architecture through surface and plan characteristics within the surrounding historical fabric (Figures 7 and 8). It is one of the most beautiful examples of brutalism in Konya. A modular understanding dominates both the plan scheme and the facade layout. Travertine coatings on the facade are used together with brut concrete. Both solid void effect and solar control are provided by drawing the facade back on ground floor. The effect of the closed mass is rather high as it is required by the

function of the bank building. The horizontal effect of the mass was increased by using the terrace roof and the mass surface relation was strengthened (Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016).



Figure 7. Konya Central Bank (<https://www.panoramio.com/photo/95123814#>)



Figure 8. Konya Central Bank entrance facade

Values of the Central Bank in the context of 20th century modern architecture heritage

- *Technological value* due to the use of new construction materials and the travertine coating on the facade,
- *Social value* due to reflection of the changing communal and social characteristics of the 20th century,
- *Integrity value* with original design understanding and architectural integrity,
- *Aesthetic value* because of its mass and facade arrangement, composition / proportion / scale / material / structural system reflects aesthetic characteristics,
- *Canonic value* as it was produced as the result of the National Project Competition by a famous architect,
- *Document value* in the name of documenting the 20th century Konya modern architecture,
- *Identity value* as it gives the identity to Konya city with many other buildings.

3.1.2. Fatih Bazaar

Fatih Bazaar located on Mevlana Street, in island no 3115, parcel no 118 was designed in 1966 by Sevki Vanli. The mass, surface and plan organisation of the bazaar was designed rationally and the building is among the modern architecture products in Konya with its building materials and terrace roof. It has a plain and simple plan scheme. It is one of the most beautiful examples of the splinter of the prism in 1960s. The mass formed by the intersection of the rectangular prisms has become transparent in the areas required for the plan layout. The seeking for vertical effect on the facade is provided by the vertical windows opened on the surface. The building seems to be both higher and monumental with the vertical strips formed on the facade.

The vertical effect in the mass and the surface ensures that the ground floor and upper floors are perceived differently from each other. This perception has been reinforced by the use of terrace roof (Figures 9 and 10; Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016).



Figure 9. Fatih Bazaar in 1990s (Karatay Municipality Archive)



Figure 10. Fatih Bazaar facade in 2016

Values of the Fatih Bazaar in the context of 20th century modern architecture heritage

- *Document value* in the name of documenting the 20th century Konya modern architecture,
- *Canonic value* because of its contribution to modern architecture in its period and its project designed by a famous architect – Sevki Vanli,
- *Integrity value* with original design understanding and architectural integrity,
- *Technological value* due to the use of new construction techniques and materials such as concrete,
- *Social value* due to reflection of the changing communal and social characteristics of the 20th century,
- *Aesthetic value* because of its vertical facade components, composition / proportion / scale / material / structural system,
- *Identity value* as it gives the identity to Konya city with many other buildings.

3.1.3.Sahin Hotel

The building is located on Mevlana Street, in island no 3115 and parcel no 106. It was designed by architect A. Tunaoglu as a hotel and commercial area between 1958 and 1959. The facade character of Sahin (Antik) Hotel shows that 3 rectangular prisms are passed into each other. It has a plan scheme with narrow facade and there are deep surfaces with shadows on the main facade. The balconies were drawn back from the surface and used to create horizontality on the facade. The modularly planned mass was drawn back so balanced and proportioned surfaces were created. The function of the building is reflected both on the facade and on the plan. Transparent surfaces in the form of simple and clear rectangular prisms have been created for the purpose of commercial usage.

The building carries the traces of 20th century modern architecture with its simple and clear geometry, plan scheme with narrow facade, mass effect on the surfaces, reflection of the function on the facade, shaded deep facade, solid void proportions and terrace roofs (Figures 11 and 12; Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016).



Figure 11. Sahin Hotel in 1970s (Karatay Municipality Archive)



Figure 12. Sahin Hotel and its surrounding in 2016

Values of the Sahin Hotel in the context of 20th century modern architecture heritage

- Document value in the name of documenting the 20th century Konya modern architecture,
- Technological value due to the use of concrete carcass system reflecting its period,
- Social value and memory value because it is one of the first hotel buildings in Konya, used as a space for movie shooting and it is an important building for the memory of the city,
- Aesthetic value because of its scale and proportion, voids created with balconies and the reflection of the prism in modern architecture with its plan scheme and facade characteristics,
- Identity value as it gives the identity to Konya city with many other buildings.

3.1.4. Karatay district office

The building is located on Mevlana Street in the historical city centre. The building was designed by the Municipality of Konya in 1958 as the Directorate of Special Administration and Nafia and later it was used as Karatay District Governorate. The building, which was renovated in 2016 after the district governorate moved to the new building, is now being used as the Karatay Registry Office since.

The building was designed with clear geometric shapes and simple lines in accordance with the modern architectural sense of the time. The building, which consists of basement, ground floor, first floor, second floor and third floor, has a rectangular plan scheme. Volumes were created mainly by aligning the units around the middle corridor. When the facade features are considered, it is a building carrying the traces of the architectural character of its period. The building is formed of balanced gaps and voids. Each facade has its own rhythm. Unlike other floors, the entrance floor is designed to be in

the rear and more transparent. The windows that open to the front facade and the side facade are repetitive, small and vertical stripes. The vertical stripes on the facade make the building look both higher and monumental. The rear facade is designed in a standardised way; no vertical stripes were placed as it is less visible from the outside (Figures 13 and 14).



Figure 13. The view of the District Governate from Mevlana Street (date is unknown)

<http://www.konyahaber.com/eski-konya-fotografлари-201g.htm>



Figure 14. The recent view of the building used as Karatay Registry Office after the renovation

Values of the Karatay District Governate in the context of 20th century modern architecture heritage

- Document value in the name of documenting the 20th century Konya modern architecture,
- Integrity value with original design understanding and architectural integrity,
- Technological value due to the use of new construction techniques and materials such as concrete,
- Aesthetic value because of its vertical voids on the facade, composition / proportion / scale / material / structural system,
- Identity value as it gives the identity to Konya city with many other buildings,
- Witness of the changing period of Mevlana axis and the city.

3.1.5. Mevlana Research Institute

The building, which is located on the Museum Area in island no 155 and parcel no 49, was designed by the architect Ozhan Sokmen between 1970 and 1973 as Mevlana Research Institute. The building which served later as the Provincial Public Library is one of the typical 20th century modern architectural works, with its simple materials and color selection, mass made of plain geometry, small windows appropriate for its function and the use of a terrace roof.

But in 2012 the building was demolished. The front facade of the building expresses that the building was composed of rectangular prisms that pass through each other. The building formed of clear geometric masses in plan scheme is an expression of 20th century modern architecture culture in Konya with its use of a terrace roof for horizontality on the facades, vertical strip windows on the upper floors and the transparent surfaces the lower floors for the relationship between the inner and outer spaces (Figures 15 and 16; Yaldiz & Sayar, 2016).



Figure 15–16. Mevlana Research Institute

Values of the Mevlana Research Institute in the context of 20th century modern architecture heritage

- Integrity value with original design understanding and architectural integrity,
- Technological value due to the use of new construction techniques and materials such as concrete and the plan scheme giving opportunities to great interior openings,
- Aesthetic value because of its solid void proportions on the facade, horizontal mass effect, composition / proportion / scale / material / structural system,
- Document value in the name of documenting the 20th century Konya modern architecture,

4. Conclusion

Modern architectural products reflect the cultural values, lifestyles, social and economic levels of the period in which they were built. These buildings, which are obliged to provide cultural continuity with the traces they carry and which are described as the heritage of modern architecture; contribute to the formation of the character and identity of the city they are located in because they carry traces of a certain period. For this reason, these buildings determined as modern architectural heritage should be evaluated within the scope of conservation.

Cities constitute the memory of the city and the feeling of belonging to the city, with the identities of the buildings/environments that are the witnesses of the changes they have experienced in the historical process. The products of the modern architectural heritage of the 20th century should also be conserved and kept alive because they constitute a part of city's memory.

Modern architectural products reflect the cultural values, lifestyles, social and economic levels of the period in which they were built. These buildings, which are obliged to provide cultural continuity with the traces they carry and which are described as the heritage of modern architecture; contribute to the formation of the character and identity of the city they are located in because they carry traces of a certain period. For this reason, these buildings determined as modern architectural heritage should be evaluated within the scope of conservation.

Cities constitute the memory of the city and the feeling of belonging to the city, with the identities of the buildings/environments that are the witnesses of the changes they have experienced in the historical process. The products of the modern architectural heritage of the 20th century should also be conserved and kept alive because they constitute a part of city's memory.

The modern architectural heritage in the city of Konya has developed within the approach of the Republican administration, which is trying to position its existence as a modernisation project as it is in the whole country, to 'break away from tradition, to create a unique identity by using tradition, to adapt international modern orientations'. The Central Bank and the Fatih Bazaar which are handled in the urban centre in the scope of the study should be evaluated within the scope of 20th century Modern Architecture Heritage due to its canonic, technological, social, integrity, aesthetic, document and identity values. Sahin (Antik) Hotel, in addition to document, technological, identity and aesthetic values, carries social value and memory value. For this reason, it should be regarded as a part of 20th century Modern Architecture Heritage. The Karatay District Governorate faced many changes on its facade. However, because the building carries the document, integrity, technological, aesthetic and identity values, it should be considered within the context of the 20th century Modern Architecture Heritage. Mevlana Research Institute was destroyed in 2012 despite many values of 20th century modern architecture, such as integrity, aesthetics, document and identity value.

Acknowledgements

This paper is supported by Necmettin Erbakan University Coordinatorship of Scientific Research Projects with 172518001-319 project number.

References

- Alagoz, M., Semerci, F. & Aydın, D. (2015). Anadolu'da Modernizmin Yerel Acilimleri Konya'da Uc Yapi. *Journal of Academic Studies of Turkish-Islamic Civilization*, 2015(19), 109–124.
- Aslanoglu, I. (1988). Modernizmin Tanimi, Sinirlari, Erken Yirminci Yuzyil Mimarliginda Farkli Tavirlar. *Odtu Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, 8(1), 59–66.
- Bozdogan, S. (2015). Architecture and the late ottoman historical imaginary: reconfiguring the architectural past in a modernizing empire. *Journal of Art Historiography*, 13(1).
- Collins, P. (1998). *Changingideals in modern architecture, 1750-1950*. London, UK: McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP, McGill-Queens University Press.
- Colquhoun, A. (2002). *Modern architecture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hasol, D. (2017). *20. Yuzyil Turkiye Mimarligi*. Istanbul, Turkey: YEM Publish.
- <http://docomomo-us.org/explore-modern/explore-the-register/how-to-evaluate-modern>
- <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext>
- http://www.icomos.org.tr/Dosyalar/ICOMOSTR_0623153001387886624.pdf
- <http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/heritage-alerts/>
- <http://www.konyahaber.com/eski-konya-fotograflari-201g.htm>
- <http://www.konyakutuphanesi.gov.tr/yazdir?49CBDFE0E9066C2D2E4F27814AB2E429>
- <http://www.satdrops.com/@37.87158,32.498467,17z,2t>
- <https://kentrehberi.konya.bel.tr/#/rehber/>
- https://www.icomos.org/20th_heritage/helsinki_1995.htm
- <https://www.panoramio.com/photo/95123814#>
- Jokilehto, J. (2003). Continuity and change in recent heritage. In R. van Oers & S. Haraguchi (Eds.), *Identification and documentation of modern heritage* (pp. 101–110). UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Yaldiz, E., Aydin, D. & Siramkaya, S.B. (2017). The evaluation of 20th century architecture in Konya in the context of modern architecture heritage. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 4(11), 171-184. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Kayin, E. (2016, April). Modern Mimarlık Mirasi Baglaminda Izmir Kenti ve Izmir Ticaret Odasi Yapi Kompleksi. *Ege Mimarlık*, 28–33.

Kuban, D. (2000). *Tarihi Cevre Korumanin Mimarlık Boyutu: Kuram Ve Uygulama*. Istanbul, Turkey: YEM Publish.

Omay Polat, E. E. (2008), *Turkiye'nin Modern Mimarlık Mirasinin Korunmasi: Kuram Ve Yontem Baglaminda Bir Degerlendirme* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Yildiz Technical University, IAS, Istanbul, Turkey.

Omay Polat, E. E., & Can, C. (2008). Modern Mimarlık Mirasi Kavrami: Tanim ve Kapsam. *Megaron YTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*,(2), 177-186.

Otkunc, A. (2012). Modernist Bir İlk Yapit: Mimar Maruf Onalin'in Dr. Fahrettin Evi. *Tasarım+ Kuram Dergisi [Design+ Theorie, Revue Scientifique Nationale]*, 8(13), 82–92.

Sharp, D. (2000). Registeringthe diaspora of modern architecture. In D. Sharp & C. Cooke (Eds.), *The modern movement in architecture: selections from the DOCOMOMO registers*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: 010 Publishers.

Velthuis, K. & Spennemann, D. (2007). The future of defunct religious buildings: Dutch approaches to their adaptive re-use. *Cultural Trends*, 16(1), 43–66.

www.docomomo.com

www.international.icomos.org

Yaldiz, E. & Asatekin, N. G. (2016). Anitsal Yapilarin Kullanim Surecinde Degerlendirilmesine Yonelik Bir Model Onerisi. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, 33(2), 161–182.

Yaldiz, E. & Sayar, G. (2016). Modernizmin Mimariye Yansimasi ve 20. Yuzyil Konya Modern Mimarligi. *Online Journal of Art and Design*, 4(4), 63–89.