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ABSTRACT

RE-INTEGRATING THE FRAGMENTED CONTEXT: PRESERVATION AND
PRESENTATION OF SIDE

Güven Ulusoy, Feran Özge
M.S. in Restoration, Department of Architecture
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. A.Güliz Bilgin Altınöz

December, 2014, 251 pages

Towns can be regarded as the existing physical witnesses of the superimposition of
different periods. In their formation process, each civilization reshapes the urban form
of the towns in relation to the remains of the previous periods. However, changing
conditions and context in time cause changes in the physical form through
transformations, additions and removals. This process are resulted with losing some
components and consequently the integrity of the towns. Disintegration brings the
fragmentation and components of the town become alienated from urban context.
Therefore, the main concern of this thesis is the “fragmented” remains those lost their
unity together with their meaning in urban context. Regarding this, Side and Selimiye
village that faces the same problem is studied for this subject. Side is a town where
traditional buildings of Crete Island immigrants from Ottoman Period and
archaeological monuments, remains from Roman, Byzantine periods exist in current
context physically together. However, they do not have relation not only with each
other but also in the current context and became “fragmented”.

v
Within this scope, the main aim of this thesis is re-integrating the fragmented remains those lost their identity in the current town and providing perceptibility in this physical context.

In this regard, the study is handled in three main sections. In the first part, analysis and determinations about Side is presented. For this analysis process, the historical development of Side, the history of planning, the researches and current conditions are examined. In this scope, old maps, new-old aerial photos, new-old photos, base maps, master plans, excavations and projects are collected and studied. At the same time, written documents are benefitted with a comprehensive literature research. In the next part, the evaluations related to the analysis are produced. In the last part, a proposal for presentation and preservation principles with an integrated point of view on the basis of the conceptual framework are developed.

Keywords: fragmentation, re-integration, presentation, cultural heritage, Side ancient city
Bu kapsamda, tezin asıl amacı, mevcut kent içerisinde kimliklerini kaybeden bu parçaların yeniden bütünleşmesini ve fiziksel bağlam içerisinde algılanabilirliğini sağlamaktır.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Towns can be regarded as the physical outcomes of the superimposition of different periods. Each period in a town’s historical continual development process, re-gains its own physical unity and meaning together with its urban and architectural components, all of which are shaped by the natural, social, cultural and economic aspects of its context as well as its inhabitants. Due to changing conditions and context in time, changes occur in the physical form of the town through transformations, additions and removals. Although these are all indispensable actions occurring naturally and continuously, they can lead to some disruptions which are resulted with losing some components and consequently the integrity of the town. Hence, the town becomes a disintegrated context, where the different components from different periods exist physically together, but do not have a relation with each other as well as with the contemporary urban form and life. Disintegration brings “fragmentation” with itself.

Hernandez, Salinas and Avila (2006: 856), defines the fragmentation process as “complex, multiphysics, multiscale phenomena in Nature and Technology” ¹. “Fragmentation” is mainly defined as “disintegration”, “collapse”, and “breakdown of norms”².


Fragmentation as a word, has a wide-spread usage in many different disciplines, such as biology, economics, sociology, urban studies and computational sciences. In all these different disciplines, the “fragmentation” basically refers to the “disruption of continuity”, while in each different discipline its meaning and use alters slightly.

1.1. Problem Definition

In any of the different disciplines, “fragmentation” is considered as a problematic process, which brings different inconveniences and complexities together with it. In biology DNA fragmentation can lead to cell death; disc fragmentation in computers leads to disordered “wasted spaces” in memory which can reduce capacity and performance; in economy fragmentation causes market shakeouts; social fragmentation can bring clashes in the society.

Similarly, “fragmentation” is a serious contemporary problematic for historical rural and urban landscapes. The towns with long history, the contemporary urban context encompasses the traces and remains of different periods. However, archaeological sites sharing the same context with rural or urban settlements, suffer from various and complex conservation problems. Especially when they lose their integrity with the contemporary physical, visual, functional, social and administrative context, their annihilation process accelerates. They start to diverge from their contemporary context and become fragments. As G. Bilgin Altınöz mentions (2014: 32), in some cases, these traces and remains can become an integral part of their contemporary contexts and the “new whole”. However, in some others, they just exist physically in the contemporary context as “fragmented aliens from the past” (BİLGİN ALTINÖZ, 2014: 32).

---

3 The definition is written with the assistance of definitions http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fragmentation_%28computing%29, last accessed in January of 2015
In Turkey, development strategies are not generally conducted parallel with the conservation strategies. Therefore, generally the policies of development defined by the local and governmental authorities either totally ignore the unique and valuable features of archaeological and historical backgrounds of the towns, or they superficially try to make use of them just for the sake of economic benefit based on tourism. Whereas, today in the international platform it is widely discussed that preservation of archaeological heritage is not an action against to development, but it is a vital and very supportive component of any development scheme (MADRAN, 1994). The experiences in many European towns showed that the conflict between urban development and conservation often seems derive from poor co-ordination between town planning and conservation (Council of Europe, Cultural Heritage Committee)⁴.

All these actions for development, disregarding heritage conservation, end up with leaving the traces and remains of the past as fragments disintegrated from their historical and contemporary context. Side, the case of this study, is many of such towns in Anatolia.

Side, is a multi-layered town that has many valuable buildings and remains from different periods representing its far and near past. When the planning decisions of local authorities, those of conservation councils and the legislative framework for the conservation of archaeological heritage are examined, the reason of the problems those Side struggle today can be seen easily. The process that started with the opening of The International Planning and Tourism Competition that was organized by the Ministry of Tourism in 1968 became the turning point for Side ancient town. While tourism was a strategy to contribute the economic development of Side in 1970’s virginally, today poorly-managed tourism threaten its integrity and significant characteristics because of overuse of the town.

⁴ Further information can be reached from the journal of “Council of Europe, Urban Archaeology in today’s towns,, MPC (91) 3, Strasbourg, 30 January 1991”
In this regard, fragmented heritage that lost their unity both in their historical and contemporary urban context is the substantial conservation problem of Side.

While the archaeological heritage, historical buildings and modern architecture were in harmony with their open spaces, green areas and each other in the middle of the 20th century, today archaeological remains are seen as individual fragmented scenes those separated from their physical and historical context (Figure 1. 1). For this reason, Side ancient town and historic town center together is analyzed in this thesis. It is obvious that, multifaceted conservation problems of cultural heritage can be read in this scope.

![Figure 1. 1: Bird’s-eye view of the peninsula in 1950’s (right), 2010 (left)](from the Arkitekt, 03/1973, 343, P:125-128 and Side Municipality)
1.2. Aim and Scope of the Study

Being considered as a problem by all different disciplinary fields, thereupon, it becomes essential to study for solutions for eliminating the fragmentation and regaining the integrity. The “defragmentation” action can be given as an example of such efforts in computing. “Defragmentation” in computing is defined as a process for reducing the amount of fragmentation by organizing the components of “mass storage” in a continuous process. Hence, through the process of defragmentation, gaps and disorders in computer’s memory are tried to be re-filled by the small fragments through their re-organization. In this respect, A. Savaş (2014:50), explains defragmentation in computational sciences as an “infill” operation to remove gaps in the memory system. In this respect, she suggests that “fragmentation” and “defragmentation” as a relevant analogy in architecture and urban planning (SAVAŞ, 2014: 50).

Consequently, this analogy can be used also for the historic rural and urban contexts where the traces of past periods exist in the form of disintegrated and disordered pieces as “fragments”. Hence, conservation of the fragments of the past periods within the contemporary urban or rural context is a complex issue. These fragments are fragile and irreplaceable witnesses of past civilizations, cultures, periods and life styles. They need actions that can re-integrate them with each other and with their contemporary context.

“I seek to insist on the understanding and use of historical and archaeological evidence as a tool for the future and as a means of coming to grips with the physical presence of the past as a source of inspiration and understanding. The physical presence of the past is certainly only one of the elements to be understood and used in the

6 The information is taken from the article of Ayşen Savaş which is published in “Studio-log” Architectural Design Studios Arch 401-402, DOHA Exploring Artistic Landscapes, Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture
creation of the new, but it is ignored, misunderstood or perverted at our peril.

(BIDDLE, 1980: 9)

Martin Biddle points out that, the evidences of the past in a contemporary town is, actually, an important tool that should be considered for the design of its future. He defines those fragments of the past as a source of inspiration and understanding, which have a potential to contribute to the contemporary and future urban form. On the contrary, in most cases, they are ignored, misunderstood or misused instead, turning out to be problem (BIDDLE, 1980: 9).

So the protection of the archaeological heritage should constitute an integral component of policies relating to land use, development, and planning as well as of cultural, environmental and educational policies (ICOMOS, 1990). In fact, the fragments of the past in contemporary urban and rural contexts should be treated very cautiously, in order not to lose their identities and values. Besides, they need creative approaches and actions while trying to find ways for re-integrating these fragmented contexts.

Thereupon, the aim of this thesis is to discuss the principles and possible actions for the re-integration of the fragments of the past those lost their integrity in the current town, based on the case of Side. Those necessitates primarily, to have a comprehensive understanding of the historical development of the town; to reveal the existing traces and remains of different periods within that historical development process; understand each fragment in relation to its contemporary context; to assess the values, problems and potentials of the fragmented urban form as a whole as well as each fragment within this urban whole. Based on all these analysis and assessments, the thesis aims at defining the principles and proposals for presentation and conservation.

7 Further information can be reached from the ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (1990)
of the fragments of the past and for re-integrating the existing fragments with the contemporary context of Side.

However, it should not be forgotten that each site is a different case, having its own identity and significance related with its own history as well as past and present context. Besides, each town has different problems and potentials regarding the fragmentation problem. Therefore, this study does not try to find a generic solution for disintegration and fragmentation of past periods in contemporary rural and urban contexts. Instead, it focuses on the specific case of Side, tries to understand that specific case in detail; hence, understanding the historical development process of Side in detail; revealing the traces of the past periods in the contemporary urban context; defining the values, problems and potentials of the fragmented context of Side as a whole, as well as of each remain as a fragment from its ancient past; and discussing solutions for re-integrating the fragments in Side constitute the main objectives of the study. For the specific case of Side, this study reveals that the context is highly fragmented due to various interventions taking place since especially 1970s onwards. Hence today, for the case of Side, it is impossible to have a re-integration based on its ancient past. Instead, the question is how to re-integrate these fragments with the contemporary context.

1.3. Methodology

In order to define re-integration, presentation and preservation principles, it is essential that the urban form of all periods, the traces, remains from them, should be analyzed and understood thoroughly. Only based on such a comprehensive understanding and assessment of the past together with its traces in the contemporary context. These traces and remains can be used as a fund of experience for the future (BIDDLE, 1980). In order to make further decisions for integration, it is important to reveal the disintegrations and their reasons systematically with all components of the site. At this point, it is also important to discuss the concepts of “fragmentation” and “integration”.
The methodology and the structure of the thesis is shaped accordingly. Focusing on this purpose, the thesis is structured in four main sections. In the first part, related concepts such as “fragmentation”, “disintegration”, “fragments” are discussed in the introduction section. In the next part, Side that is selected for the case study is considered in detail for a better understanding of the place with all aspects. Because, in order to develop interpretation and presentation principles the significance of a site, its multi-faceted historical, political, spiritual and artistic contexts should be explored. It should consider all aspects of the site’s cultural, social and environmental significance and values (ICOMOS, 2007)\(^8\). In this regard, main features of Side, history of Side, planning history of Side, the observations of travelers and decisions of conservation council are researched precisely. In the next part, the evaluations will be produced related to the analysis about the site. Finally, a proposal that comprises the presentation and preservation principles those aim to integrate the remains in their current context.

At the beginning of the studies for the thesis, comprehensive literature research was done in order to gain sufficient written documents. These sources can be listed as some subjects;

- International documents related to the discussions of archaeological heritage and examples from all over the world
  - Journals, articles, books etc...
  - International charters, declarations, recommendations
  - Projects
- National Documents
  - Laws, regulations, decisions
  - Decisions of Conservation Council related to Side Ancient Town
- Thesis related
- Other written documents related to the content of the study

\(^8\) Further information can be reached The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, Proposed Final Draft, 10 April 2007
The sources were scanned to find related information about both the main scope of the thesis and Side ancient town. In addition to that, many visual documents like base maps, maps, old and new master plans, old photos, projects and drawings were gathered. In order to gain these sources, libraries, scientific people, Side Municipality, Antalya Regional Conservation Council of Cultural Assets, General Command of Mapping, International Institutions and web-sites on the Internet were visited.

After all, for the next step of the thesis, field surveys were realized to get the sufficient information about the site. During these surveys, detailed studies about the archaeological remains, historical buildings and the whole site were done. In order to get systematic information about the fragmented archaeological remains and surroundings, survey sheets were prepared and implemented at the sites. The sheets were not applied for the traditional buildings on the site. By the photos taken and some markers on the base map, the buildings were documented. In addition to that, detailed information at the site scale was gathered in the field surveys those realized three times in a year and lasted one to seven days. During the field surveys, interviews were done with the inhabitants and professionals.

The stages of gathering information for the case study can be summarized as written below;

- **Pre-Survey:** In this step, all information sources related to the sites such as; base maps, maps, aerial photos, old aerial photos and other visual documents were collected so as to use in field survey. Base maps, old maps, conservation master plans were taken from Side Municipality, old and new aerial photos were reached in General Command of Mapping and the others were provided from Side Excavation archive. In addition, survey sheets were prepared for archaeological monuments and surroundings in order to understand their conditions and gather data systematically.

- **Survey:** This step is based on field surveys which is planned to gather all information at the site. Revision of base maps, determining the vehicle or pedestrian traffic scheme and density, three dimensional relationships of buildings and streets by
street sections, collecting data about the traditional buildings such as number of storeys, current functions, relationship with the open spaces were some of the analyses produced at town scale. The survey sheets prepared before were applied to all archaeological monuments and their surroundings in order to understand physical accessibility, visibility, integration with the environment and functional relation. At some points sketches were drawn to reveal the perspectives and vista points of archaeological properties. Furthermore, all cultural properties, new constructions, street perspectives, vista points and open spaces were documented by the way of taking photos. In order to gather all this information three field surveys were planned; in May, 2013 three days long, in August 2013 ten days long and February 2014 two days long trips were arranged.

-Presentation of Analyses: Presentation of the data gathered in the previous stages composed of the final part of this analyses. In order to visualize the data systematically for a better understanding of the places, computer tools such as Adobe Photoshop, Adobe Illustrator and AutoCAD were used.
CHAPTER 2

UNDERSTANDING THE FRAGMENTED CONTEXT: THE CASE OF SIDE

“It is now generally accepted that, the purpose of this type of research (urban archaeology) must be to achieve a comprehensive understanding of an urban environment by means of horizontal and vertical cross-sectional analyses and thematic studies presenting the full history of the Civitas, including its relations with its hinterland.”

(SOMMELLA, 1984: 26)

While dealing with a fragmented context, firstly the significant characters of the context should be revealed. These can be gained from the traces in that context. If the fragmented context is a result of superimpositions of different layers, the problems become more complex. Understanding, assessing and re-presenting should be the main steps so that it could be a basis for future studies or interventions.

These steps begin with the revealing of different hidden layers. In order to put forward them, it is necessary to search back the physical traces of time in the contemporary context. According to Bilgin Altınöz (2014: 31), although there are differences in the definition of stratification in different disciplines, the basic principles of analyzing and representing the spatio-temporal data related with stratified contexts show similarities. That is, gathering data by tracing back the layers one by one from top to bottom, then defining the main time periods generating the formation of each layer, and finally presenting the layers in a chronological order from top to bottom, are the basic steps for understanding and presenting the stratification (BİLGİN ALTINÖZ, 2014: 31). For
the case of multi-layered towns, Bilgin Altınöz (2002) proposes a methodology based of relooking each period layer by layer, together with the main components for defining and understanding the urban form, such as the topography and the natural context as the basis, the settled area and its boundaries, entrances to the settlement, main axis and street network, main buildings and other remains. After defining these for each layer, then they are overlaid with each other and with the contemporary urban form so as to identify the continuities, gaps, changes, discontinuities, fragmentations in this process (BİLGİN ALTINÖZ, 2002).

In this thesis the methodology and approach proposed by Bilgin Altınöz (1996;2002) is used to understand and assess the development of urban form through history and its stratification. Therefore, in order to understand a multi-layered town of Side, analyses about the general features of the town, such as location, natural and topographical features, history and historical stratification, are made. Then, to reveal the historical stratification, extensive historical and archaeological studies are carried on. Different information sources are utilized within this scope, such as written, oral and figurative sources which supply knowledge about the nature, specifications, meaning and history of cultural heritage⁹. Following it, the existing traces and remains of the past periods, standing as fragments disintegrated from the present context of the town, are defined and further studied together with their surroundings.

Within the light of all information, this chapter focuses on the understanding the development of the urban form of Side in time, as well as the existing fragments of its past, in relation with their historical and current context. In this regard, this chapter is mainly structured in three parts. In the first one, the urban context with its location, topography and history is put forward. Therefore, general features of Side and surrounding is explained. After those, the factors as an impact of changing perceptions of the town is taken into consideration. Within this scope, decisions of conservation council, planning and development decisions, researches and projects are explained. Finally, in order to understand the town, the context it exists in is analyzed considering

---

⁹ These information sources are taken from Nara Document on Authenticity, Appendix 2, 1994
all components in terms of their urban, architectural, archaeological and morphological features. This study is considered at two scale; town scale and archaeological site scale. At town scale, general analyses such as open and built-up areas, registration status and legal status of edifices, urban morphology, traffic scheme and density, vista points in open spaces are studied. When archaeological site scale is analyzed, current function, number of storeys, changing open-built-up area density of surrounding buildings of archaeological remains. In addition to that, historical stratification, physical accessibility, visual perceptions and three-dimensional relations near the remains and buildings are analyzed.

2.1. General Features of Side and its Surrounding

In antiquity, today’s plane region of Antalya province which surrounded by Taurus Mountains in the north, Mediterranean Sea in the south and Manavgat River in the east was known as “Pamphylia”, which means the country of all clans. (MANSEL, 1978: 4) (Figure 2. 2).

![Geographical location of Side](image)

**Figure 2. 1:** Geographical location of Side (Google Earth, last accessed on 13.08.2014)
Side had been the most significant and merely harbor town of this region until Attaleia, today’s Antalya, was established. The town was an important trade center among the other coastal towns in Anatolia. It is known that the name of Side leans back to the fruit called “pomegranate”, which is the symbol of fertility in antiquity. The illustration on the ancient coins stand as the proofs of this.

In many sources Side is called “Old Antalya” or “Burnt Antalya”, as the people living in Side until the end of Byzantine period, left the town and moved to Antalya (MANSEL, 1978: 18; İDRİSİ). So the town was abandoned until a new rural settlement called Selimiye Village was established in the same location with ancient Side, during the late Ottoman period. Today, Side is an important touristic settlement having the traces of both its far past, ancient town of Side and its more recent past, the Ottoman village of Selimiye in the same physical context. All these are the reflections of the historical stratification of Side, with continuities and breaks.

2.1.1. Location and General Features

The location of a place is part of its cultural significance (ICOMOS, 1999:5). In addition to that, its natural features of the place, such as the topographical, geological and climatic conditions, play an important role in the formation of a place, as well as in all the studies for understanding its present form while re-shaping its future.

Side is located 70 kilometers from Antalya and 7 kilometers away from Manavgat, which is the administrative province of Side (Figure 2. 1). It is located in Antalya Gulf is founded on a peninsula and stretching from northeast to the southwest. The peninsula is approximately 1 kilometers long and 350-400 kilometers wide in dimensions (Figure 2. 4). The distinctive quality of the town is the natural boundaries and flatness of the peninsula. The highest elevation of the peninsula might be the center place where theatre stands. Natural boundaries determines the size and the macroform of the town. Moreover, the narrowest part of the peninsula, not only provided a well-
defined town center, but also a fortified land in its physical development in history (TOPAKTAŞ, 1997: 79).

The area has a typical Mediterranean climatic conditions with warm-humid winters and long hot summers. Brooks and rills pour down from Taurus Mountains and rain raise the fertility of plain areas in this region. The average temperature does not fall under 10° C all the year round. The months when the temperature is the highest are July and August and temperature is the lowest in January (Yurt Ansiklopedisi, 1981: 757).

The subsoil of the peninsula is formed of hard and dark colored and various sized conglomerate layer that can be seen on the indented coast where is caved by the sea. Above this layer, a thin layer of sand and soil mixture is visible in some areas (MANSEL, 1978: 3).

This region has fertile lands surrounded by many rivers; Katarraktes (Düdensu), Kestros (Aksu), Eurymedon (Köprüçay), and Melas (Manavgat). Its geopolitical location, fertile land that is hydrated by many rivers have made this region settlement area for people throughout the history (Figure 2. 3) (MANSEL, 1978: 1). Physidia, Lykia and Cilicia are the neighboring regions of Pamphylia. In addition to that there are many places those witness many civilizations throughout the history. Attaleia (Antalya), Magydos (today’s Lara Region of Antalya), Perge (Aksu Area), Silyon (Asarköy), Aspendos (Belkis), and Olbia are antique cities of Pamphylia (Figure 2. 3).
Figure 2.2: The location of Pamphylia region and Side located on the coast (from: Side: A Guide to the Ancient Town and The Museum by O. Atvur, 1984, Istanbul)

Figure 2.3: The map showing the cities of Pamphylia and rivers (from the Cities of Pamphylia by John D. Grainger, 2009)
Side ancient town is within the boundary of Selimiye Village, which was founded by the immigrants coming from Crete Island at the end 19th century. Side was administrated by Side Municipality before the local elections in March, 2014. Since that time the town has been a province of Manavgat Municipality.

In conclusion, the strategic position of Side with fertile lands, rivers and the peninsula itself has made Side a valuable settlement throughout the history.

**Figure 2. 4:** A view showing the peninsula with the ancient town, 2009 (from Side Municipality Archive)

2.1.2. **Historical Development of Side**

The history of Side has not been totally enlightened yet; nevertheless the town is indicated as a colony of one of the West Anatolian cities called Cyma (Namurt harbor, near Aliağa, İzmir today) by the antique geographer, Strabo. Although it is not exactly known, the foundation of the ancient Side is assumed to be in the 7th century BC, during the second colonization movement (MANSEL, 1978: 4). Side was the second Greek colony town following Phaselis. After the colonization period, Pamphylia
region had been dependent to powers either which were dominant to Anatolian or the newly established ones (Side Uluslararası Turizm Planlama Yarışması, 1968: 41). On the other hand, according to some resources more reliable knowledge about the history of settlements can be gathered and these prove that Side is one of the oldest cities of South Anatolian. The Anatolian originated word not Greek or Phoenician “Side”, means pomegranate, a familiar symbol of fertility and this fruit is represented on the town’s coin from the earliest down to Roman imperial times (BEAN, 1968). Inscriptions dating to 3rd and 2nd century BC indicate that there was a spoken and written language at Side whose words and script were apparently unique (MANSEL, 1978: 4). This language of Side has not been deciphered yet, today. The historian Anabasis stated that the people came from Cyma to Side had forgotten their language and started to speak the native one. This also shows that, those people had come to Side as immigrants. It means that, the town had been established before they came (BOSCH, 1957).

According to historian Herodot, the king of Lydian Kroissos took Pamphylia to his kingdom, however Lykians had sustained their independency until they fell under domination of Persians with Pamphylia in the 6th century BC. In this period, the town had sustained its freedom to some extent by stamping its own coinage until the invasion of Alexander the Great. In the 4th century BC, while the Anatolian expedition of Alexander the Great, Macedonian King, the town was surrendered without any resistance. Afterwards the town became one of the significant coin mints established by Alexander. Gold coins which have pomegranate depictions on show this clearly (MANSEL, 1978: 8).

After the death of Alexander, Pamphylia and Side subjected to struggles between the Hellenistic Kingdoms. In this period, town fell under domination of many kingdoms such as Antigonos, Pleistarkhos, Ptolemaios and were exposed to the attacks of Seleucids those also had been managing Syrian Kingdom. With the result of the war between Roman-Pergamon-Rhodes and Antiochus domination of Pamphylia was given to the Pergamon Kingdom. In this period, Side experienced most prosperous time in its history. The town became one of the significant trade, culture and art center
among the Mediterranean cities. Moreover, Side was such a developed town with the regard of education and culture that Syrian king sent his son to Side for his education (MANSEL, 1978: 10). It can easily be interpreted that, these developments reflected to the architecture and many advanced buildings were constructed with the regard of the prosperity level in the town

However this wealthy period did not lasted longer after the spread of the pirates that began with the Psidians and Cilians. It is learned from Strabo that, Cilician pirates used the harbour of Side as a dockyard and by agreement with the citizens auctioned their prisoners in the town (BEAN, 1968). Furthermore, the situation became worsened by the fact that, pirates were supported by Mithradates, Pontus King against to Romans. Finally, in 78 BC, the Roman Consul Publius Servilius domineered Side with Pamphylian and Cilian cities to the Roman State. In addition to that, the town which sustained good relationships with the Romans from the beginning differently from the East Pamphylian cities maintained its own freedom until the death of Amyntas. After the year of 25 BC Side became a separate province under the reign of Roman emperor, Augustus.

As a result, in the inscription of 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, the town was indicated as a metropolis ruled by the provincial governor. In the 2nd and 3rd century, Side as the other Pamphylian cities lived its best era of all times through its history. In any time in the history, the town did not experience such a big development and wealthy period. Most of the standing monuments now were constructed within this period (MANSEL, 1978: 13).

In the 3rd century AD, these magnificent periods started to be deflated gradually. The tribes living in the northern mountain region began to spread down to the coastal regions and destroy. After many incursions, the town is divided into two with a constructed wall that was following the axis of theatre scene building with towers. After the construction of this wall called “Philipus Attius” population moved to the south, towards the peninsula (MANSEL, 1978: 15).
The people of Side who worshipped Gods such as Apollo, Athena, until the 4th century, started to adopt Christianity. In the first period of Christianity, the level of welfare in the town is not equal to the period in Roman period (Yurt Ansiklopedisi, C: 2: 771). After all, for the last time in the 5th and 6th century, town lived the prosperity as a Byzantine town until the Arabians raid in the 7th century. However, it was the diocese center of East Pamphylia region for this time. Many of the monuments were repaired and the town was inhabited again. Later on, with the Arabian invasions in the 7th century the ultimate decline of the town set in (BEAN, 1968). It is not obvious when the town was destroyed and people left the town. However, according to the excavations it is certain that none of the Byzantine buildings in Side date after the 9th and 10th century and there are traces of fires on the houses. Depending on these, it can be interpreted that, the destruction realized in the 10th century probably by Arabian raids (MANSEL, 1978: 17). After the disasters the people were transferred to Antalya; from this circumstance it derives its popular name of “Old Antalya”. It can be said that by examining the monuments, the town experienced numerous earthquakes and had not been inhabited until the 19th century. The depictions of travelers about Side at those centuries will be mentioned in the next sections. However, the main common of them is that the town was a forsaken haunted place covered by the sands brought with the winds and hosted to pirates (MANSEL, 1978: 18).

After the conquest of Crete Island in 1669, Turks from many regions of Anatolia such as Konya, Karaman, Trabzon, were sent and placed to the island as a part of a muslimization strategy of the Ottoman Empire (ATVUR, 2011: 44). Between the years 1895-1924 many people escaped from the island because of the torture. In this regard, in 1897, some of them had come to Antalya and by command of II. Abdulhamit, five villages, taking their names from the children of Abdulhamit the 2nd were establihed for them; İhsaniye, Ahmediye, Mecidiye, Kadriye (Belek) and Selimiye which is the core of today’s village on the peninsula inside the ancient town borders.
2.1.3. Evolution of the Physical Form and its Main Components Through History

As it is stated in the historical summary, there is no reliable information about the first settlement of the town. According to Strabon the town was a colony town of Kyme. However Mansel controverts this knowledge that there is no connection between the main town and colonial town in the later periods (MANSEL, 1978: 4). According to Kostof, colonial towns were usually planned cities which were established forcibly with a stroke (KOSTOF, 1985: 139). In addition to that, colonization in antiquity is categorized into two; the early colonized towns like Ephesos in 10th century BC, showing and organic pattern parallel to the ancient times. The later ones comparatively exemplify more quick evolution (Wycherley, 1962: 19-51).

Even though, there is not much information about the urban form of Side and its components in the earlier stages of its development, Side may be thought as one of the colonial planned towns (TOPAKTAŞ, 1997: 84). Mansel also mentions that, there was certainly a settlement in Side before all of these colonization movements (MANSEL, 1978: 4). Though the evidences about the urban form in Hellenistic Period are not clear, it is known that the town started to have a prosperous period under the dominance of the Pergamon Kingdom and became an important trade and cultural center. The harbour was an important component for Side during this period. Although the physical evidences from this period do not exist today, it is thought that, until Roman period, the main borders of the town such as fortification walls, colonnaded avenues and gates were already constructed (MANSEL, 1978: 1-19)

When the urban macroform before Roman period is considered, fortification walls, colonnaded avenues and gates are seen as the components of the town. Two colonnaded avenues extend in two different directions by starting from the main gate. One of them starts from the gate and extend in north-east direction through the theatre and with a curve after theatre, extends to the south until the border of peninsula (Figure 2.5, 2.6). The other avenues also originates from the main gate and directly extends
to south direction. The fortification walls can be regarded in two parts; land and seaward walls. Seaward walls which still can be seen today especially in southern parts of the peninsula encloses the peninsula. As a footnote, it should be said that, in Roman period when the construction actions increased, the material of seaward walls were used for construction of some monuments. Thus, diversity in stone material of walls today explain this. The land walls which can be followed easily today, run in the north-west, south-east direction by separating the peninsula from its periphery. In addition, as Side owed its prosperity to trade, the harbor was constructed on the south-eastern part of the peninsula.

Figure 2.5: The images of Colonnaded Avenue extends in north-east direction by passing through the theatre (from author’s archive, 2013)
2.1.3.1. Roman Period

The knowledge about the urban form of Side is evident from the Roman Period onwards. The town that had been connected to Galatia with Pamphylia region in Emperor Augustus period successed to be independent again in 25 BC. It is referred that, some of the existing monuments today were constructed after this date (KADERLİ, 2009: 17). After Emperor Marcus Aurelius connected the town to his empire, Side again live the heyday of its history.

Figure 2.6: The images of main Colonnaded Avenue in 1950’s, 1960’s and 2013, respectively (from Orhan Atvur archive, Side Excavation Archive and author’s archive respectively)

Figure 2.7: The image of Colonnadded Avenue B
Within this reason; it can easily be guessed that, the greatest development of the town realized in 2nd century AD, in Roman period, considering the buildings those played an important role in the organization of the town (Figure 2. 9).

The contribution of Roman Period to Side was construction of monuments such as, theatre (L), nymphaeum (G), agoras, (J, M), baths (S, T, U), temples (N1, N2, K, P, Q) (Figure 2. 9). Monumental buildings were erected following the main axis such as, fortification walls, colonnaded avenues, and streets. It can be referred that, extensive organization of town planning was considered in Roman period. However, the gridiron plan scheme of the other cities in Anatolia such as Miletus, Ephesus was not seen in Side with the other Pamphylian cities10.

---

10The grid-iron plan will be discussed at the end of this section.
Figure 2.8: The map showing the Roman Period edifices and possible town borders (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.9: (a) Triumphal Arch, (b) Nymphaeum, (c) Vespasianus Monument, (d) Latrin, (e) Agora and Round Temple, (f) Theatre, (g) State Agora, (h) Temples, (i) Harbour Bath, (j) Agora Bath (all from author’s archive, except (f) from Excavation archive)
Figure 2.10: The map showing the edifices of Byzantine Period and possible town borders (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.11: The map showing the monuments and possible town borders after the construction of “Phillipus Attius” wall (prepared by the author)
After the 3rd century, the town were exposed to the attacks of tribes living in the northern mountain region and beginning to spread down to the coastal towns. According to some resources, in this period the wall of “Philipus Attius” was constructed and the town was divided into two parts for easing the defense of the town against to incursions. This wall made from reused material over the scene building of theatre across the narrowest art of the peninsula. However, ongoing excavations do not affirm this information. Because the excavations near the Philipus Attius wall which started in last year has been going on and the information is not certain yet. Thus, the date when the town got smaller with this wall is considered in between the 4th and 7th century within the scope of this thesis\textsuperscript{11}.

2.1.3.2. Byzantine Period

Within the adaptation of Christianity in late Roman period, remarkable construction activities started. Hence, in the 5th century, Side had lived the best times for the third time as well as in the physical appearance. The town arrived the original borders again and in this period the construction activities in the north-eastern part of the town. It is seen that, the street and building organizations did not change in physical but the meaning of them transformed radically. In this period theatre were transformed to a open-air church, therefore some repairs and changes were applied.

Side was a significant diocese center so many religious buildings were constructed in this period. A basilica (aa) was erected over the temples in the harbour. In addition, in the north-east part of the town a great Archbishop’s palace (dd) and the basilica (cc) were the symbols of the new religion. These building complex was perpendicular to the Colonnaded Avenue and connected to the main gate with it (Figure 2.10).

\textsuperscript{11} The information about the “Phillipus Attius” wall is taken from Hüseyin Alanyalı who is the head of Side excavation and within the scope of this thesis it is regarded after Byzantine Period.
As mentioned before, the town borders enclosed smaller area after the construction of “Phillipus Attius” wall which was erected for the solution for defense problems. It is regarded within the scope of this thesis that it was constructed in 7th century. However, it is not certain information because the excavations near the wall have not been resulted yet. In addition to that, the construction date of big basilica in Temples region was in late period of Byzantine and this also affirms the information that the wall was constructed in 7th century. The construction of this wall means that many edifices such as agora, agora bath, state agora, houses and religious buildings of Byzantine period were left out of this boundary Therefore, it can be referred that north-eastern portion of the town had lost its importance and south-western part with colonnaded avenue kept its significance.

2.1.3.3. “Lacuna”

In ancient cities, in a stratified context, some interruptions may occur in a continuous formation process. These cause some gaps and losses of different parts in different layers and periods. The irregularities resulting from the losses are called as “lacunae” if it occurs in a building or a settlement (BİLGİN ALTINÖZ, 2014)12. The period between the dates when the people had lived in Side left the town and Crete immigrants came to town can be defined as “lacunae” in the continuous inhabitation process.

Although the date when the people left the town is not certain, Mansel claims that, there were no buildings constructed after the 10th century and most of the remains traces of fire can be observed. Hence, he guesses people live in Side left the town and moved to Attaleia before 11th century because of Arabian raids. However some sources refer that the population of the town fell down gradually until 14th century and it can be said that some group of people had lived there until this period. Conversely to the common thought, until 16th century coins can be followed without any interruption.

12 The information is taken from the article of Güliz Bilgin Altınoz which is published in “Studio-log”Architectural Design Studios Arch 401-402, DOHA Exploring Artistic Landscapes, Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture
However, there are no existing architectural remains dating to that period, which show that there could be temporal settlement of Turks (YILDIRIM, 2013: 23).

So it is clear that, there occurred an interruption in the continual settlement process of Side and the site was abandoned until the immigrants escaping from Crete Island because of torture of Greeks were brought here at the end of the 19th century.

2.1.3.4. Ottoman Period

Crete Island fell under domination of Ottomans in 1699, and some of Muslims in Anatolia were sent to the island within the scope of the Islamizing policies applied in islands of Ottomans. After the rebellion of Greeks in 1821 to have their independence, the fights between Greeks and Muslims began. Due to this 1890’s great migrations to Anatolia occurred. In order to arrange the migrations and settlement process, a new foundation “İskan-ı Muhacirin Komisyonu” was established during that period. According to the archive records, this establishment was founded not only to help their settlements, but also to provide support in order to survive in Turkey. Some of them can be ordered; they were given remuneration, their houses were constructed, some lands to deal with agriculture and ox, cow and seed were given, they were privileged from military duties for 25 years and tax for 10 years (PAŞAOĞLU, 2013: 351)

With this scope, Aydın Province sent some of the immigrants to the Konya Province so as to be settled in appropriate places in Antalya. The establishments of villages, districts and constructions started after they arrived. These immigrants had lived in Antalya for 2-3 years until villages were established within the command of Abdulhamit the 2nd. According to the sources, in the June of 1900, 367 dwellings had been constructed for immigrants until that date in Antalya and Alanya. Besides, Gönüllü points out that, the construction of 350 dwellings were going on14. As a result,

---

13 This information is quoted from PAŞAOĞLU, D. who indicates The Ottoman Archive of Prime Ministry as a source. The original source could not be reached within this scope.

within the borders of Antalya Province five villages and two districts were established; Hamidiye district near the Şarampol area in Antalya, Sultaniye district near the Hasbahçe area in Alanya Borough. The villages were called İhsaniye, Ahmediyeh, Mecidiye, Kadriye (Belek) and Selimiye.

The rural settlement on top of ancient town of Side was established in this regard. Selimiye as the other villages coped with malaria for long years. In fact, the migration of these people from Crete and living in Side at the beginning of 20th century was completely a tragedy. For instance, the ancient harbour was filled up with water in time and they call here as “Gölcük” (Figure 2.13). Because of the malaria spread from the mosquitos in this puddle, many children died and people embedded them to the coast nearby. When the time they firstly arrived Side, the authority of the region was under Tugayoğulları tribe. They were dealing with agriculture and craft work while they were in the island. Until lands where the 5 stars hotels today stands were given to them for agricultural purposes after the proclamation of the Republic of Turkey, in 1937, they have no income except gathering and selling the salt accumulated on conglomerates (ATVUR, 2011: 45). In 1937, each mature person was given 12 decare land within the scope of land reform (TANAL, 2011: 7).

The urban form of this period is quite well known due to the existing buildings and tissue as well as the early photographs, drawings and plans available. Today’s gridal tissue, is in fact, is a totally new formation during late 19th century. Although it has been generally thought and mentioned as if the existing gridal tissue was the continuation of the gridal tissue of the ancient town of Side in antiquity, it is totally misleading. The ancient gridal tissue, which can be traced from the main archaeological remains and some traces in the current urban tissue, was quite different in direction and form from today’s existing grid.

So on the contrary to the general perception, the existing gridal urban tissue is totally a result of a new planned development in late Ottoman period. Actually, during the same period, there are various examples planned in a gridal form in different parts of Anatolia.
Figure 2.12: The map showing the edifices used in Ottoman period and possible town borders (prepared by the author)
When cities or districts created with grid-iron plan scheme in Ottoman period and its origins are taken into consideration. They are generally late additions to the town in a planned manner with some principles.

Aktüre (1981: 98) mentions the immigrant districts of the Ottoman cities occurring in similar gridal form at the end of 19th century. Most of these immigrants were placed on lands belonging to government and foundations, and are placed out of the settlement areas of Turkmens and natives (AKTÜRKÉ, 1981: 100).

More importantly, the principles which had to be followed while establishing the new districts in cities or villages were written. In this rescript, descriptions which were clarified in detail about the pattern of the settlements. No matter what the features of the region they were placed in; rural areas or near the town boundaries, the tissue of the settlement was distinctively common and differentiated from the other settlements. In spite of the organic traditional pattern in Ottoman cities or villages, street pattern and lots organization within the appearance of checkerboard or grid-iron cause perceived at the first look. This pattern does not only seen in Anatolian cities or rural areas but also the immigrant districts of Syria, Jordan and Palestine are seen with the same feature (AKTÜRKÉ, 1981: 106). W.D. Hutteroth 15 put forward the reasons of this pattern as;

- The result of the inspection mechanism that the government maintains,
- The result of mainly being widespread “fashion” as standard settlement scheme,
- For the reason of creating at one stage and depending on one plan type instead of developing gradually and instinctively,
- Reflecting equal conditions of users such as low level of income, equal social status and undifferentiated social structure.

15 The original source of W.D. Hutteroth could not be reached. This information is cited from AKTÜRKÉ, 1981: 106.
In these rescripts, it is also written that, the residential buildings and the streets should be constructed in a similar type and order. Besides, the process should be as quick as possible and the houses should be given to the people who need them (EREN, 1966: 46).

The structural features of these neighborhoods or villages can be also associated with the written regulation about construction activities called “Ebniye Nizamnameleri” in Ottoman Period. These came into force to arrange the settlements and buildings order. First one was published in 1849 and after the mid of the 19th century, it was applied. Because the date of newly come immigrants and publishing of these regulations intersect, it can be referred that, these principals were mostly implemented in newly established settlements (AKTÜRE, 1981: 106). Thus, these districts or villages indicate the same physical characteristics despite of their different regional conditions.

Within this context, “Bosnian District” in Ankara and İkizce Village in Haymana show the typical settlement of immigrants with checkerboard appearance like Selimiye village although the geography and topography are completely different from each other (Figure 2.14, 2.15). To conclude it can be referred that, this pattern was formed with exterior forces instead interior dynamics in the cities or villages.

![Figure 2.13: The puddle over the ancient harbour called as “Gölcük” by occupants (from Orhan Atvur archive)](image)
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Figure 2. 14: Two examples of Immigrants Settlement from a rural area and near the borders of urban area (from the book of Sevgi AKTÜRE, p.105)

Figure 2. 15: The plan of Selimiye village in 1953 (drawn by the author via the aerial photo of 1953)
2.1.4. Side According To Travelers

It was stated before that it is not known when Side was completely abandoned. However, Emperor Kostantinos Porphyrogennetos indicates Side as “the shelter of pirates” in the 10th century in his book called “De Thematibus”. In addition to that, in the 12th century Arabian geographer İdrisi mentions the town as “Burnt Antalya” and adds that the inhabitants of the town were living in “New Antalya”, which was a settlement at two-days distance from Side. It can be interpreted from the information of those people that the town started to be damaged by attacks in the 10th century and in the 12th century it was completely abandoned (MANSEL, 1978: 19).

The town drew the attention of travelers in 16th century for the first time. Although Evliya Çelebi who was travelling from Antalya- Manavgat highway and Katip Çelebi who gave detailed information about Antalya in “Cihannüma” did not mention about Side, Piri Reis put a map about the Side with its surrounding in the book called “Kitab-i Bahriyye” (Figure 2.17). In the map which shows the coast between Alanya and Antalya, the ruins of Side are represented with small fractures of stone and columns.
and the town is illustrated with a projection between Köprüçay and Manavgat (MANSEL, 1978).

![Figure 2.17: The map of Piri Reis in “Kitab-ı Bahriyye” (from http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Antalya_by_Piri_Reis.jpg, last accessed 14.08.2014)](image)

In 19th century when the researchers and travelers came to the region, first scientific studies started. French Consul L.A.O. Corancez for the first time arrived to the town and determined that the town mentioned as “Sataliadan” is Side itself. He gave scientific information about coins and monuments as not to be underestimated but confusing (MANSEL, 1978).

After all, in 1812, Admiral Francis Beaufort who found out the name of the town “Side” from an inscription drew a planimetric draft of the peninsula with harbors, breakwaters, theatre, agora, city walls, nymphaeum and the round temple in agora (Figure 2. 18). He also drew the theatre and its diazoma and determined that the theatre had been repaired in Byzantine period with the traces of cross scratched on the stones. Beaufort presented significant datas about the town for the beginning.
“…Side stands on a low peninsula, and was surrounded by walls; those fronting the sea appear to have been slightly built; but that which faces the land was of excellent workmanship, and much of it is still perfect. …This theatre is the most striking feature of Side: at the distance of a few miles from the shore, we had mistaken it for a lofty Acropolis, rising from the centre of the town: and as it is by far the largest and the best preserved of any that came under our observation in Asia Minor.”

(BEAUFORT, 1818)

A short time after Beaufort, Charles Robert Cockerell and William Martin Leake respectively visited the town and gave short information that did not add any new in their books and "Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor with Comparative Remarks on the Ancient and Modern Geography of that country".

John Antony Cramer who visited the town in 1832 also mentions about the town in his book called “A Geographical and Historical Description of Asia Minor”. However he repetaed the notes of antique sources and Beaufort.

Charles Fellows who was famous for the excavations and researches in Lykia visited Side in 1839 and in his book he described all of the ruins from the Roman era. He also mentioned about that the monuments and sculptures were constructed with such a rough style that Greek monuments in the inner region of Anatolia.

16 Further information can be reached from BEAUFORT, F. “Karamania, a Brief Description of the South Coast of Asia Minor and the remains of Antiquity”, London, 1818, p:147-170


18 Further information can be reached from FELLOWS, C., "A Journal Written During An Excursion in Asia Minor" , John Murray, Albemarle Street, London, 1838, (P: 200-208)
Figure 2. 18: The town plan and drawings of theatre prepared by Francis Beaufort (from “Karamania, a Brief Description of the South Coast of Asia Minor and the remains of Antiquity”)

Dimitri Danieloğlu who lived in Antalya and traveled with Thomas Abel Brimage Spratt and Edward Forbes analyzed the ruins if the information gave by Beaufort overlapped with his experience. However, because of malaria virus in Side, he died a bit after he went back to Antalya. In the book\textsuperscript{19} of the other researchers, they gave a place of his experience in Side. In addition to that, in 2010 his experiences were compiled in a book.\textsuperscript{20} In these notes, Danieloğlu mentions about the magnificent and unique architecture of theatre and some remains they met while they were wandering in the streets.

\textsuperscript{19} SPRATT, T.A.B., FORBES, E., “Travels in Lycia, Milyas and the Cibyratis”, London, 1847

\textsuperscript{20} DANİELOĞLU, D. "1850 Yılında Yapılan Bir Pamphylia Seyahati", Suna-İnan KIRAÇ Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü, Antalya, 1855
French researcher Charles Texier gave a summary of the researches about the history and archaeology, and did not emphasize on the town although he studied in Pamphylia region in detail.

Figure 2.19: The topographic plan of Lancoronski (Pamphylia ve Psidia Kentleri, LANCKORONSKI, K.G.V., Viyana, 1890

The most important researches done about the Side in 19th century was carried out by a team consisted of archaeologist E. Peterson, architect-artist G. Nieman, some topographers, technical people and Karl Graf Von Lanckoronski who was the head of the research. They had done long-running researches in Pamphylia and Psidia in 1884-1885 and presented them in two set of books. Their studies were important in this respect, they prepared a topographic plan of Side and produced drawings of building survey for some monuments such as nymphaeum and theatre (Figure 2.19). However,

21 LANCKORONSKI, K.G.V. “Pamphylia ve Psidia Kentleri, Viyana, 1890
because Niemann got malaria just like Danieloğlu, they had to give up the studies and after all the town had a bad fame as haunted town (MANSEL, 1978).

At the beginning of the 20th century, the researcher came to the region, Hans Rott, dealt with mostly the buildings of Christianity. Moreover, he witnessed how the people came from Crete Island a little while ago were using the remains as building construction materials. In this way he had a chance of observing the changes.

Table 2.1: Brief history of travelers visited Side (prepared by the author with the assistance of information given in the section 2.1.4. Side According To Travelers)
2.1.5. Evaluation of the General Features, Historical Development and Physical Evolution of the Town

Side is an ancient town that was utilized to settle for inhabitants of many civilizations because of the strategical location. This factor effects the physical appearance, today and components which were constructed in many periods strength the identical features of Side. According to this reason-result relationship, strategical position makes the town which was chosen for settlement by many civilizations. Significant monuments and buildings which has survived until today are the physical witnesses of these civilizations.

Built environment of Side, today is extension of surviving monuments and remains of Antiquity and traditional pattern and buildings of Selimiye village and new constructional developments originated from the new activity after 1960’s; tourism. These components form the multi-layered character of the town. It can easily be seen that, the components and macroform of the town are re-shaped in each period. It is not come across in all archaeological sites that, the plan scheme of the town changed in each period. The grid-iron plan is originated from Ottoman period whereas in Roman period it was differently planned as seen from the directions of the monuments although in the other archaeological cities it is thought that the grid-iron plan is originated from the Roman street networks. These are the factors that strength the multi-layered character of the town. Different plan schemes, archaeological remains and monuments and traditional buildings from different periods are all values of this town, separately. Their contributions to the town are all valuable. Different monuments of different periods also make diversity in buildings within the aspects of construction technique and material. All periods reflect the conditions and architectural character of own conditions. In addition to that, the monuments had been constructed in previous period was repaired by the following ones indicate both the diversity and stratification. For instance, even in traditional houses of Ottoman period the conglomerate and marble pieces of previous periods can be observed.
Figure 2.20: The plano volumetric view of Side with its layers (prepared by the author)
2.2. Interventions as a Factor of Change of the Town in Time

The main aim of this chapter is understanding the Side ancient town with multi-faced features. One of them is the general features of it regarding the geographical features, historical evolution and the town with the view of travelers. These are mentioned in previous section however this part focus on the breaking points on the history of development and planning strategies, researches and studies. Side International Planning and Tourism Competition is regarded as the beginning action as the impact of changing future of Side.

2.2.1. Side International Planning and Tourism Competition

The International Planning and Tourism Competition that was organized by the Ministry of Tourism in 1968 is a critical point for planning and construction activities of Side. The project encompasses the area in between Kumköy in the west and Manavgat River in the east. Related to the scope of the project, 12,000 total bed amount was targeted. Within the scope of the project, Ancient Side and Selimiye village were determined as the center point of the project because the existed magnificent monumental buildings were effective at choosing this place as the heart of the project. Tourism settlements regarded within the scope of the project are remarked below;

1. Kumköy – Bingeşik – Yeni Selimiye:
2. Ancient Side
3. Titreyengöl
4. Kemer and Sorgun villages
5. Acısu-Sorgun

171 projects were accepted within the scope of the competition. International jury members; Tuğrul Akçura (from Turkey), Prof.K.Ahmet Aru (from Turkey), Bülent Berksan (from Turkey), George Candilis (from France), Michel Ecochard (from France), Yılmaz Gürer (from Turkey), Prof.Johnson Marshall (from England),
Prof. Marc J. Saugey (from Switzerland) were met for the purpose of assessment of projects under the chairmanship of Prof. Giovanni Astengo (Arkitekt, 1970-01: 5). The winning project team was composed of the people below:

- Nihat Güner : Architect from I.T.U.,
- Mehmet Çubuk : Architect and City Planner from D.G.S.A. and I.U.U.P.,
- Ersen Gürsel : Architect from D.G.S.A.,
- Altan Gürman : Assistant Painter from D.G.S.A.,
- Ayhan Çalışlı : Assistant Economy Specialist from I.U.I.F.

(Arkitekt, 1970-01: 7)

In the project report, the team clarifies that they approach to the region in three main subjects. The first one is decisions of touristic settlement arrangements for Antalya region. The evaluation of the team is that two sides of the gulf indicate different characteristics within the context of being base for the tourism. Therefore, in the project, Antalya town is analyzed with regard to 450 kilometers long shoreline and two parallel zones. They are called “seaboard” 1 kilometers width from the sea and “deeper band” that is stretched through deeper regions after 1 kilometers strip (Figure 2.21). They explain that these decisions are produced for the plan at 1/400.000 scale.

![Figure 2.21: The scheme showing the general decisions about Antalya region in the winning project of the competition](image-url)
The following stage is arrangement decisions of Side-Sorgun-Manavgat and surrounding. In the report, the team defines this stage as zoning plan of Manavgat-Side, Sorgun Forest at 1/5000 scale (Figure 2.22, 2.23). At this stage, substantial decisions those have an effect upon the future of Side are were taken. In the project report, items below are identified;

1. 6,000 total bed amount of Titreyengöl touristic station is located absolutely on the public land and it is a waterfront settlement.
2. 4,000 total bed amount of Acısu touristic station also is located on the public land and a waterfront settlement. It is regarded as one of districts of Side and within the green tissue which will be recreated it is planned to connect to ancient Side.
3. The other touristic station adjacent to Kumköy is planned to reserve 4,000 bed amount (Figure 2.23).
4. Kumköy settlement is planned to be a developing village which will supply residential buildings to the people compel to move from ancient Side within the scope of evacuation decision for the antique town. The reason why Kumköy are determined for this target is that most of workplaces of people who live in Side are located here.
5. The fundamental aim for Side is evacuation and of Selimiye village and museumification of the ancient town. However, it is approved that some part of the population for instance fishers may go on staying at the town for the purpose of that it should not be a dead place. In addition to that, some recreation buildings and public buildings for the use of visitors or researchers such as archaeologists and staff are planned as so to be in harmony with the town. Furthermore, it is defined that buildings should be prefabricated, dismountable and heightened from the ground.
6. The administrative buildings such as PTT, customs house, police or military police station, civil offices and tourism information centers are planned to take location out of fortification walls and main gate of ancient Side.
7. The area between Side and touristic station in the west, summer villas zone are planned to construct with a definite holistic architectural understanding.

8. The secondary zoning bands, Kemer and Sorgun villages will serve for redundant population in the future.

(Arkitekt, 1970-01: 10-11)

Figure 2.22: The plan produced by winner showing the touristic decisions about Side-Manavgat and surrounding (from Arkitekt, 1970-01: 6)

After the competition had ended up, High Council of Immoveable Monuments and Antiquities²² started to conservation studies parallelly to decisions of winning project. EPA planning group consisted of the project team prepared both Master Plan at 1/5000 scale and Conservation and Planning Project of Side (Figure 2. 24).

---

²² Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu
2.2.2. 1982 Conservation Master Plan and First Conservation Actions

Ministry of Public Works and Settlement approved the 1/5000 Master Plan of Side and surrounding that had been prepared by Ministry of Tourism. According to the decision of High Council of Immoveable Monuments and Antiquities in 11\textsuperscript{th} of March, 1972 depending on the design of EPA, evacuation of Selimiye village settled at Ancient Side was found the best solution to prevent the destruction of ancient ruins. However, demolition of not all buildings from Ottoman period, just some of them settled at the ruins was decided. It was decided that the buildings which were planned to be conserved would maintain their life with a convenient function. In addition to that, some specific projects such as a complex for archaeologists were allowed with the approval of the committee. According to the result of studies done by Ministry of Conservation Decisions taken from Antalya Conservation Council of Cultural Assets archive in march, 2013. Further information can be reached from the decisions in Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{23} The sections from this point of the thesis to the current state are prepared with the help of Conservation Decisions taken from Antalya Conservation Council of Cultural Assets archive in march, 2013. Further information can be reached from the decisions in Appendix A.
Tourism, Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, project owner, and with the approval of the committee, the west of necropolis area was chosen for the new construction activities for natives of Side. This decision had been planned in the scope of the Side International Tourism Planning Competition before. However in 1974, a revision was handled about the expropriation and demolishment of the buildings. It was indicated that, it was impossible to evacuate the whole town at once. Then, it was agreed to realize the evacuation step by step and begin with the buildings that had been constructed with new techniques and materials and settled on any archaeological ruin. In addition to that, the council emphasized the necessity of conservation master plan for Selimiye village at 1/1000 scale to decide the future of building activity.

The decision of the council about the preliminary conservation plan of Side prepared by Epa planning group in 1975 approved those subjects;

- Conservation of 98 residential buildings by the reason that document the social, economic and cultural level of a particular period of our society,

- Remaining the original (residential) functions of those buildings because of the impossibility of functional change in such a short period,

- Expropriation and demolishment of the other buildings that harm the integrity,

- Construction of new buildings that supply the integration with old village buildings with the applied projects by the committee,

- Ban of entrance from the city walls for big vehicles and permission for smaller vehicles,

- Restoration and reuse of old ancient shops aligned on the colonnaded avenue.

In addition to that, it was remarked that, preparation of 1/500 scale Old Side Conservation Plan was inevitable.
As a turning point through the conservation history, in 1976, the Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments registered the conservation site borders and buildings24.

In 1978, 1/1000 scale Conservation Master Plan of Selimiye (Ancient Side) Village was approved by the High Council of Immoveable Monuments and Antiquities (Figure 2. 24).

In 1979, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Village Affairs arranged a protocol about Old Side and new settlement area. Regarding as that decision, the expropriation implementations of the buildings except the 98 registered ones had to be scheduled through the year of 1979. The expropriation of private estates in the new settlement area also would begin in the same year and be managed by the Ministry of Village Affairs.

Planning notes of 1/1000 scale Conservation Master plan were revised in 1982 in some aspects;

- The borders of monuments and registered buildings were re-determined.

- The obligation of the expropriation for the lots situated on the colonnaded avenue were indicated.

- The whole building lots except the registered ones and the ones which will be demolished within the scope of evacuation were pointed out in the plan as “the lots that keep buildings which can be made convenient with the environment and vacant lots which are appropriate for new buildings harmony with the environment."

- Because of the opening of new construction area, new circulation routes with minimum harm to the colonnaded avenue were predicted.

24 Further information and list of the buildings are given in 2.3.4. Registration Status of the City and Buildings
-In this revision, Side was handled to be planned in two regions; Necropolis area which was forbidden to constructions as an archaeological sites and Selimiye village which was an area for new constructions in harmony with the environment.

The next revision in the master plan were handled in 1985 after the 2863 numbered law had gone into effect and the subjects below were regarded;

- The decision about the buildings that were predicted to be expropriated and demolished was stopped until they would complete their existences.

- Expropriations of the building lots stated on the colonnaded avenues would go on in the excavation process.

- The decision about the necropolis area that was out of the borders of plan revision had to be regarded after the drilling activities.

The necropolis area and its construction conditions caused a debate throughout many years between the municipality and Antalya Regional Conservation Council of Cultural and Natural Assets. In 1986, it came up an issue again in the aspect that, in the whole lots of necropolis area scientific excavations would be arranged with the condition that the cost of the excavations would be provided by the owners. In the case they found a moveable cultural property it is obligatory to hand in Side Museum or in the opposite the issue about the immovable cultural property found in the excavation had to be carried to the Conservation Council.

25 Antalya Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Bölge Kurulu - After the 2863 numbered law, The Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments divided in two council as Antalya Regional Conservation Council of Cultural and Natural Assets and High Conservation Council of Cultural and Natural Assets.
Figure 2.24: The conservation and planning project of EPA Planning Group prepared for the competition (from Orhan Atvur archive)
Figure 2.25: The first Conservation Master Plan of Selimiye village prepared by EPA planning group
In 1989, as the council had always insisted on that issue, the council gave a warning about the illegal constructions in the 1st degree archaeological site especially constructed adjacent to the West Mausoleum, city walls and the other archaeological properties. Also they remarked the significance of Side as a cultural property that had to be transferred to the next generations.

A considerable change in the border of 1st degree archaeological site of Side was seen in 1990 because of the inconvenience between the conservation sites defined by the conservation master plan and buffer zone borders that had been determined by the 8994 numbered decision (13th of March, 1976). The 1st degree archaeological site was enlarged to the new borders that involved the East and West Mausoleum. The council had said before, the borders would be regarded again after the scientific excavations in the necropolis area.

2.2.3. 1998 Conservation Master Plan

The conflict between Side Municipality and conservation council can be read from all decisions. For instance in a decision, the council warned the municipality that had built a temporary car park notes on to the necropolis area inconsistently with the plan and opened a new road passing near the nymphaeum that gave a serious harm to the aqueducts and city walls. Furthermore, the municipality again poured concrete to the area covered with sands which had not been excavated yet and regarded as East Necropolis area without the permission from the council.

After all, Side Municipality went out to tender for revision of the Conservation Master Plan and Eren KALE started off the studies in 1992. In a copy of this contract was sent to the conservation council by Side Municipality. Therewith, the council insisted on that according to 2863 numbered law, it was obligatory to prepare conservation master plans in conservation sites. And also, each conservation site had been distinctive from the others in the terms of characteristic features. Moreover, the problems and solutions
had to be differentiated and it was impossible to produce standard suggestions to all of them. Therefore, the council found the revision decisions of the plan positive and it emphasized that the only authority for determination of principles, control of planning stages and implementations.

When the studies about the plan were completed, it was handled by the council and despite of the approval of the revision for Conservation Master Plan by the Antalya Regional Conservation Council, Side Municipal Council rejected the decisions of plan.

This doubt for the plan lasted quite a long time. In 1995, the mayor wrote an elaborative petition that explained the reasons why they wanted to realize constructions for touristic purpose on the West Necropolis area. The Municipal Council supported this idea to ease the intensive constructions inside the village and provide a conjunction with the archaeological sites and accommodation buildings. In fact in this intention letter the council and mayor emphasized their purpose clearly that they went out to a tender for plan revision because of the dissatisfaction about the borders of the 1st degree archaeological site. For the reason that the project owner did not make a change about the borders, Municipal Council rejected the plan.

Furthermore, they criticized plan notes and the decisions, related writings of Antalya Conservation Council. They said that if they had applied the warnings of the council about the demolition of illegal constructions, the ancient Side would have been a place where no tourist wanted to visit, there were no night clubs. And what is worse that they described the town "dollar factory". In summarize, they wished to handle the plan in these conditions again by the project owner and have a "Conservation Master Plan for Touristic Purpose" made involving especially the West and East Necropolis.

After this "request for just touristic purpose", the council criticized Side Municipality about the attitude that caused make the cultural properties annihilated. Although the positive relationship between the project owner and municipality. As a consequence, the council reminded that the plan approved in 1982 would have been valid until the approval of a new plan notes.
Figure 2. 26: The Revision Conservation Master Plan of Kale Architecture, 1998 (from Side Municipality archive)
Figure 2.27: The Revision Conservation Master Plan of Side Municipality, 2014 (from Side Municipality)
In 1998, Side Municipality carried the process and its protest to the judgment. Parallelly to this, the Regional Conservation Council issued a decision as an answer to the demand of Side Municipality for the "Master Plan for Touristic Purpose". In that principle, the council said that they had consulted to Legal Consultancy Department about the demand of the municipality and according to the decision of this consult, the Conservation Master Plan prepared by Eren KALE and approved by the Regional Conservation Council in 1995 became valid (Figure 2.26). The reason was that; the 2863-3386 numbered law was a special law and had to be applied primarily. 17th subject of this law said that the change offers agreed by the council had to be made certain by the Municipal Council within a month following. Otherwise, the Conservation Council had a right to make the principle valid without taking the opinion of municipality. After all, the lawsuit that had been brought by Side Municipality for the cancellation of the conservation council decision ended up in favor of council and also approved by Council of State.

### 2.2.4. The Last Revision Conservation Master Plan of Side in 2014

After a long time, in 2006 Side Municipality applied to the Conservation Council for "Selimiye Village East Necropolis Area Conservation Master Plan" revision for the degree change for the conservation sites again. However, the regional council refused the application with the same reasons and demand for opinion from the High Council. The Conservation High Council also rejected this with the reason that there had not realized any scientific excavations yet in East Necropolis Area according to the decision dated to 2007.

In March 2014, the last revision of the master plan prepared by the Side Municipality was approved by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Figure 2.27). The municipality created a multi-disciplinary team composed of archaeologist, architects, city and regional planners etc. The aim of the team is standing against the plans prepared by ignoring the people live in Side. The common thoughts of the people are the current
conservation master plans and site borders effect the illegal constructions and overuse of the town.

Within the scope of the revision plans, a critical decision about the borders of archaeological sites came into force. The boundary of Selimiye village is defined as 3rd degree archaeological and urban site. Besides it is decided that, the rest part of the ancient town involving the necropolis areas continues to be 1st degree archaeological site enclosing the new finding which is thought to be a bath from Roman period in the north east part of the town. The near environment of the monuments such as harbor bath, great bath, temples region are determined as conservation areas with the help of demolition of some constructions. This debatable decision according to the legislative framework is the conservation areas inside the 3rd degree archaeological and urban sites. The monuments and immediate surroundings should be considered as 1st degree archaeological site so as to prevent the construction activities.

In summarize, the council has sent many principles, regulations involving warnings about the East and West Necropolis Area, the borders of conservation sites and illegal constructions inside the 1st degree archaeological sites until today. However, municipality ignored all of these warnings about demolition of illegal buildings although the regulations instruct that local administrators have to respect the decisions of Regional and High Conservation Council (Table 2.2).

2.2.5. The History of Researches and Projects in Side

The Italian team, R.Paribeni and P. Romanelli who came to Side in 1913 to make researches mostly dealt with the inscriptions and via their book, they introduced some important ones to the world. These team considered the new immigrants and kilns near the town as a threaten for the conservation of remains. Therefore, they wished to start excavations and researches in the town. However, because of the invasions of Italians in the World War I, they got rejections from the related institutions (MANSEL, 1978: 328).
Table 2.2: Brief history of the planning and conservation activities in Side (prepared by the author with the assistance of information given in the section 2.2.2.1982 Conservation Master Plan and First Conservation Actions, 2.2.3.1998 Conservation Master Plan, 2.2.4. The Last Revision Conservation Master Plan of Side in 2014)
No researches were conducted until Turkish Historical Society sent Halit Uluç and Arif Müfıd Mansel sent to the region in order to investigate the antique cities and evaluate the excavation opportunities. After they prepare a review about the studies, they started to excavations and researches in 1947 with a team and sustained them until 1966. In 1964, the first comprehensive restoration project was carried out by Ragip and Selma Devres and implemented to the Agora bath which was converted to a museum in order to meet needs of the town.

The years between 1966-1975 when Mansel died, Jale İnan went on the excavations because Mansel concentrated on the excavations in Perge. After 1975, no researches were conducted until Ülkü İzmirligil started to perform the studies in 1983. In addition to that, restorations at the region of temples realized by Zeynep Ahunbay. The studies which were carried out under the subject of excavations, restorations and landscaping theatre and surrounding lasted for 25 years continuously. From 2009, the conservations and excavations have been going on by Hüseyin Sabri Alanyalı.

Table 2.3: Brief history of researches and projects (prepared by the author with the assistance of information given in the section 2.2.5. The History of Researches and Projects in Side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Researches and Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>R. Paribeni and P. Romanelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Appliances for excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Mansel and his team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Arif Müfıd Mansel – Head of the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Dr. Emin Basch – Epigraphist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Dr. George Ewart Beal – Epigraphist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Lars Molin – Archeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Jale İnan – Archeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Ağdibi Akarca – Archeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Sultan Ali – Archeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>First comprehensive restoration project by Ragip and Selma Devres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The restoration of Great Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Jale İnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Romaite Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Temples of Athena and Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1993</td>
<td>Zeynep Ahunbay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The restoration of temples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-2008</td>
<td>Ülkü İzmirligil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Excavation and restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Sofis Tholos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Commercial Agora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Temple of Tyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Laika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Street of Dionysus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Citironded Avenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Deniz Odul and the Excavation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The recreation of Temple of Tyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>Hüserys Sabri Alanyali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Ongoing Researches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Excavations and Documentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>*The restoration of Bodicus AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The restoration of Monumental Fountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.6. Evaluation of the Impacts of Each Intervention and Decision

“Before heritage places are promoted or developed for increased tourism, management plans should assess the natural and cultural values of the resource. They should then establish appropriate limits of acceptable change, particularly in relation to the impact of visitor numbers on the physical characteristics, integrity, ecology and biodiversity of the place, local access and transportation systems and the social, economic and cultural well-being of the host community. If the likely level of change is unacceptable the development proposal should be modified” (ICOMOS, 1999)

The changing perception of Side and current state provide a basis for the start point of this thesis. Within this context, it is no doubt that the international competition and conservation council decisions has affected the process somehow. In this section it will also be approached in two parallel evaluations.

Mehmet Çubuk who was a member of the winning project team performed a presentation which include his evaluations about the project and process for Side in a symposium called “Side’ye Emek Verenler Sempozyumu”, in 2007. His assessments have importance as a person who prepared the project and has an opportunity to observe the stages, implementations and current image of the town. It is indubitable that, the international competition was a turning point in the development process of Side. However, as Mehmet Çubuk was saying, the role that tourism highlighted as a propellant power has realized much more different than intended (ÇUBUK, 2007: 145)\(^\text{26}\). Therefore it is necessary to propound negative or positive analyses and

evaluations how competition effects the process which started from a small village to a touristic pillage. In the book of the competition, climatic, natural, cultural and archaeological aspects in Side bring values and supply benefit to both Turkey and Antalya in terms of touristic development. Moreover, it is stated by Ministry of Tourism in the book that, the tourism policy of Turkey foresees to establish two touristic “boom towns” where tourism investments and mass tourism actions become concentrated with the users from Turkey or abroad in Aegean Region shores and Mediterranean Region shores until 1972 (Side Uluslararası Turizm ve Planlama Yarışması, 1968: 147). This assertive name for the towns indicates that Side was planned as a place where mass tourism actions are concentrated intentionally. Related to this, Çubuk also reminds the items in the specifications of competition which involve some ideas to canalize the project owners prepared by Ministry of Tourism. For instance, it is stated that, because new construction techniques and materials were not appropriate with the traditional pattern, it was asked for competitors to present the comments to evacuate the town to anywhere with a conservative understanding (ÇUBUK, 2007: 145). It means that some of the decisions made by winning project had already been determined by the ministry in specifications. In contrast with that, significant contributions to the conservation field, incontestably. The decisions and their impacts should be evaluated related to the conditions of those years. Within this scope, plan of conservation site for Side which was approved by the Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments and High Council realized with the outcome of the project for the first time in Turkey. Furthermore, the name given by the project team “The Plan of Side Conservation Site” were changed with the reason of that that name was not mentioned in the Public Housing Laws and called as “Side Selimiye Village Public Works Implementation Plan” (ÇUBUK, 2007: 146).

Another contribution was about being basis for preparation of laws about shorelines. In contrast, the most debated decision in the project was evacuation and museumification of the village. In the condition of the date, it seems a great solution to conserve the edifices and remains however thinking hardly about the construction of “new” within the frame of conservation plans and supply continuity of the life could be better. Despite of positive intents of the team, legal reasons such as change of
tourism ministers many time or decline in the amount of budget affected the applications of decisions negatively.

Figure 2. 28: Images showing the density of constructions in the peninsula in 1965 and 2013 (from Orhan Atvur archive and Side Excavation archive)

It is not an accurate approach to make interpretation by studying merely conservation council decisions. The conservation policy of Turkey, legal framework, definitions and vacancies should be analyzed deeply to make reliable evaluations about the process. The Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments which was established in 1951 had sustained its existence until 2863 numbered law, Conservation of Natural
and Cultural Assets Law became valid. Within this law, GEEAYK\textsuperscript{27} which was authorized for both setting principles and making decisions aimed at supervising the implementations were transformed into two establishments called Conservation High Council of Natural and Cultural Assets which was responsible for setting principles and Regional Conservation Council of Natural and Cultural Assets authorized for making decisions about implementations.

Within this regard, it will be useful to mention about the resolutions in the law. In 658 numbered resolution, \textit{“archaeological site”} is defined as “settlements and areas which any cultural property reflecting the economic and cultural features of their periods and the old civilizations’ productions those have sustained up to now under ground or above ground are situated. According to this definition it is clear that, Side is an archaeological site. However, this item puts forward to two conflicts. One of them is lack of criteria in the determination of degrees for the archaeological sites. According to the laws and resolutions in Turkey, there is no scientific research and valid principles to ascertain the degrees (MADRAN, 2011: 28). According to this decision, Side is a 1\textsuperscript{st} degree archaeological site and within this context; any construction is forbidden. At this point, it can be said easily, in these resolutions ignore the whole layers of the sites and make those settlements dead places. Because, the unpermissive decisions make natives leave those places. In this context, it entails to produce indigenous decisions and principles for conservation and supplying sustainable environment.

When the conservation decisions and master plans are analyzed, it can be referred that, being 1\textsuperscript{st} degree archaeological site of Side has always brought problems and illegal constructions. When the problems of these settlements which have incontrovertibly significant archaeological values on the other hand it is inevitable to be together with the contemporary life are regarded again, two main concepts should be reviewed again; \textit{“multi-layeredness”} and \textit{“urban archaeology”} (MADRAN, 2011: 30). Because \textit{“urban archaeology”} cares about the remains at different scales and qualifications and also

\textsuperscript{27} Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu (The Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments)
conservation of sites which those differentiated remains compose by associating. This concept also aim both to reveal the history and stratification of the town and define a new role to the remains in new contemporary life with a holistic view. This issue came into force to the legislation of Turkey with 702 numbered resolution as “Conservation conditions of urban archaeological sites”.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 2.29:** Images showing the changing physical context of remains in car park area in 1970’s and 2013 (from Side Excavation archive)

The other effect in the process of development of Side is disagreement between the Conservation Council and Side Municipality and their non-agreeable attitudes. When the decisions of the council from 1972 to today are investigated, the conflict between the council, Ministry of Culture and local administrations especially Side Municipality
can be easily read. The municipality performed illegal steps and did not try to stop illegal constructions which were completely against the decisions of the council and conservation plan notes. On the other hand, non-conciliatory attitude of the Regional and High Conservation Council and also legislations may have dragged the people to illegal steps. A statistic information can give the scene strikingly, in 1992, in Selimiye village inside the city walls only 16 of the building lots there were constructions legally and in accordance with the 2863, 3386 numbered laws and registered Conservation Master Plan. Outside of the city walls, except the bus station building all of the constructions were illegal. According to this number, it was clear that 90 % of the buildings were illegally constructed. In addition to that what is worse, today this percentage is not much different from that date28.

In conclusion, with the light of all this information it can be said that the conservation and planning studies up to date do not state any significant discourse regarding the multi-layered character of the town. These decisions concern the importance of existence of the historical edifices and archaeological remains not to be lost and the restorations of some of them for touristic purposes, however conservation and the continuity of togetherness and especially the multi-layeredness character of these edifices are not evaluated in the scope of such studies.

Figure 2.30: Images showing changing aspects of Side from the main street in 1981 and 2014 (from Orhan Atvur archive and author’s archive)

28 Further information about the legal and illegal constructions will be given in detail in the section 2.3.1.1.Registration Status of the Town, Buildings and Changes in Time
2.3. Understanding the Current Urban Context and Assessing the Changes in Time

“Interpretation and presentation should be based on evidence gathered through accepted scientific and scholarly methods as well as from living cultural traditions “(ICOMOS, 2007)

The town is the result of a historical development process that has specified the present appearance and urban morphology through the continuity or transformation of the physical existence (BILGİN, 1996). In order to reveal the cultural significance, values potentials and problems of Side for re-integration of remains, it is necessary to make analyses for understanding the town. For this aim, general features, a brief history of Side, historical development of Side and the illustration of Side with the eye of travelers visited the town were summarized at the beginning of this chapter. Then, the factors effected the present existence of the town such as, tourism competition, the decisions of conservation council were explained. Thirdly, it is indispensable to analyze and propound the current state of the town at different scales.

Specific qualities which had to be preserved including the historic character of the town and all components that express this character which had to be investigated was ordered in Washington Charter in 1987. According to the charter the items which create the character of the towns should be analyzed and preserved;

- Urban pattern defined by lots and streets
- Relationships between buildings and green and open spaces,
- The formal appearance, interior and exterior of buildings as defined by scale, size, style, construction materials, color and decoration,
- The relationship between the town or urban area and its surrounding setting both natural and man-made, the various functions that the town or urban area has acquired over time. (Washington Charter, 1987)
With the light of all information, the main objective of this section is to exhibit the physical structure of the town in its contemporary fragmented context.

2.3.1. The Built-up Environment and the Changes in Time

Archaeological remains, traditional buildings of Crete immigrants and new irregular and intense constructions compose of the built environment of Side. If the balance between the open and built areas are observed according to the specific years, it can easily be seen the effect of tourism development project. This investigation is done by the aerial photos of 1953 when Side was a modest village of immigrants, 1975 when the development and conservation activities got started, 1992 when the effects of tourism and rent was easily be read from the pattern and 2010 when the town was about to fill up its capacity for constructions (Figure 2. 31.).

Including the village houses, 228 buildings were identified in the settlement in 1973. According to the conservation council decisions 98 of them registered in 1976. According to a survey, 59% of the buildings were served for residential purposes, 8% storage, 7% commercial, 7% temporary uses, 6% pension, 13% other uses. In order to understand the density of constructions, the changing population may be examined. 64% with more than half of the 579 numbered population was immigrants in 1973, in Selimiye village (TOPAKTAŞ, 1997: 100). According to the statistic information of the census in 1935, the population of Selimiye village was composed of 122 men, 132 women and totally 254 people (KARACA, 2008: 240)
Figure 2.31: The maps showing the change in construction density of the town by analyzing the open and built-up area balance (prepared by the author)
2.3.1.1. The Conservation Status and Changes in Time

The registration process in Side started from the preparation of the Conservation Master Plan at 1/1000 scale. Within this context, Side ancient town and Selimiye village were registered as 1st degree archeological site. Following this, the decisions of registration of archaeological assets and traditional buildings were carried on. The remains and edifices written below with descriptions were registered in 1976 with 8996 numbered decision of the Committee of Ancient Real Estates and Monuments;\(^{29}\)

- City walls (Enclose the east of peninsula.)
- Nymphaum (Main gate on the city walls)
- Colonnaded Avenue
  1. Lie down from the main gate to the area covered with sand (not be excavated)
  2. Lie down from the city gate to the square of temples
- Bath On the colonnaded avenue, opposite to agora
- Houses On the two sides of colonnaded avenue
- Agora In the city center
- Great Bath Between the city wall from the late period and temples
- Men Temple At the end of colonnaded avenue
- Athena and Apollo Temples On the south edge of peninsula
- West Mausoleum On the behind of sea walls

\(^{29}\) Copies of the Committee’s Decisions are given in Appendix A.
- East Mausoleum  1 kilometer far away from the east gate
- East Gate  Near the southeast city walls
- Necropolis  Outside of the city walls
- Great Basilica  150 meters far away from the colonnaded avenue that has not been excavated yet
- Cistern  On the west of museum
- Vespasianus Monument  Between the theatre and triumphal arch
- Harbor Bath  Behind the bath
- Harbors  1. On the southwest of the peninsula (Great Harbor)
            2. near the Great Bath

28 residential buildings, of which survey sheets were presented to the committee, were regarded as old buildings those had to be conserved as they were and registered with dwelling numbers and lots. About the rest of 70 buildings the committee insisted on the 1/50 scale survey drawings and restoration projects before any implementation.


---

30 The list of registered archaeological monuments is given in Appendix B.
Figure 2.32: The analysis showing the registered traditional buildings and archaeological site borders (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.33: The photos of registered buildings with numbers which can be followed from the map (from author’s archive)
Figure 2.34: The photos of registered buildings with numbers which can be followed from the map (from author’s archive)
Figure 2.35: The photos of registered buildings with numbers which can be followed from the map (from author's archive)
Figure 2.36: The photos of registered buildings with numbers which can be followed from the map (from author’s archive)
Within a decision in 1994, 505 numbered lot was decided to be abrogated from registration for the reason that there is no building on the lot. Although the registration sheets of 364 numbered lot were prepared, 365 numbered lot was registered. Thus, it was decided to change the numbers so as to correct the confusion. In addition to that, 290, 383, 385, 414, 419, 430, 451, 474, 481-482-483, 485, 487 numbered lots were registered with 2093 numbered decision of the Conservation Council (Figure 2. 32)31.

Finally, in 2014 of August, 873 and 874 numbered lots were registered. These lots take place in the south part of Agora Bath and opposite the theatre and remains which were constructed in Byzantine Period were known as “old rendering plant building”. Because the building had been used for this function for specific years and also the current function of the building is cafe and restaurant.

The radical change within the archaeological site borders occurred in the revision of Conservation Master Plan approved in 2014. Selimiye village and its boundaries were changed to 3rd degree and urban conservation site. Not only the natives but also Side Municipality demands for this decision and struggles for many years. In 1990, only a little change but enlargement had been decided in the 1st degree archaeological sites. Within the last plan, the 1st degree archaeological site borders were enlarged so as to involve a bath which was found with excavations in the north-east of Side.

When the registered buildings are analyzed in Side, it can easily be realized that, most of the buildings had restorations and the authentic characteristics almost got lost. Only too few of them keep their authenticity and original features. It can be referred that, the ones situated on commercial axis and be used for commercial purposes have been changed more. It is also seen that, some of the new ones are built by imitating the traditional ones. Therefore, it is almost impossible to distinguish the new and traditional ones which were restored if the inside of the buildings are not examined.

31 The whole list of registered traditional buildings is given in Appendix B.
Figure 2.37: The building registered in August 2014 (from author’s archive)

Figure 2.38: The map showing the archaeological site borders of the town declared in the Official Journal in 2012
According to the revision Conservation Master Plan approved in 2014, except the registered buildings, some buildings are determined as “traditional buildings”. The convenience of the buildings with the traditional pattern and their quality have influence on this definition and criteria of the determination.\footnote{List of the traditional buildings taken from Side Municipality is given in Appendix B.}

\textbf{Figure 2.39:} The buildings described as “Traditional Buildings” within the Conservation Master Plan notes (from the author’s archive)
The determination of legal status of the buildings also gives striking results. The buildings except the registered ones and “traditional buildings” defined by Side Municipality are all regarded as illegal buildings. Information about this analyses which is gathered from the revision of Conservation Master Plan prepared by the municipality were taken from Side Municipality. The municipality defined this analysis as “building determination”. They firstly determine the registered buildings and be categorized in two; one of them is buildings constructed with a project and without a project. “Project” word mentioned here indicates the buildings those were repaired with restoration projects. Except registered buildings, the unregistered buildings on the other hand constructed with a project and the buildings in a harmony with the traditional tissue were determined and except all of these were regarded as illegal buildings in analysis of Conservation Master Plan. After all, the striking point is the result of this analysis, most of the buildings in Side is illegal in the year of 2014 although all principle bodies are aware of the situation (Figure 2. 41).

**Figure 2. 40:** The illegal building examples of 510, 325, 393, 453 lot numbers with their inharmonious appearance (from author’s archive, 2013-2014)
**Figure 2.41:** The analysis of the legal status of the buildings (prepared by the author)
2.3.1.2. Current Functions of Buildings

The determination of utilization types of buildings gives significant information about the village because the impacts are serious for conservation of the site. When land use survey is analyzed, it indicates the dominant uses of commercial features. Commercial buildings give service for especially gastronomic features and leisure activities such as restaurants, cafes, bars and discos. The accommodation buildings used for touristic features or used by researchers follow the commercial usages. Although the density of them is not high, buildings utilized for residential features are seen. There are also some administrative buildings such as museum, PTT, military police station and buildings of municipality. In the village, there is just one mosque as an example of religious buildings.

It can easily be referred from the map that (Figure 2. 42), the distribution of commercial features concentrate on the main axis starting from the entrance and extending towards the harbor. Besides, the density is high in secondary streets which are perpendicular to the main street. In the regions nearer to the sea such as in the south east and south west part of the village, accommodation buildings like motel, hotel or small scale pensions are met very often. The street pattern where it gets organic rather than orthogonal pattern, the residential buildings are constructed with wide open spaces.

Existence of such a commercial zone in the main axis causes disruptions of the characteristic features of the village. Moreover, it causes many problems because the commercial features necessitates additional facilities such as car park areas, service and density in vehicular and pedestrian traffic. For the reason of the need to those facilities, unqualified open space and built areas started to occur in the village as a threat.
Figure 2.42: The analysis of the current functions of buildings (prepared by the author)
2.3.1.3. Heights of Buildings

The building height survey shows that most buildings are mainly one or two storeys high (Figure 2.44). However, there are three, and four storeys in some buildings as an extreme case for an archaeological site which had been 1st degree archaeological site until the last revision of Conservation Master Plan in 2014. If the land use survey and building height survey are intersected, it can be referred that, the commercial buildings like shops are mainly one storey height or two storeys height with a different usage in the second flat. Besides, the accommodation buildings like motel or hotel have three or over three storeys height because of their needs. The residential buildings are generally two storeys height with a wide or small green areas.

As a result of this analysis, it can be said that the density in the village indicate distributions which extends towards both vertically and horizontally.

Figure 2.43: An example of an accommodation building with three storeys height (from author’s archive, 2013)
Figure 2.44: The analysis of the building heights (prepared by the author)
2.3.2. Open Spaces of the Town and the Changes in Time

The open spaces of Side can mainly be categorized in two; private and public open areas\(^\text{33}\). Additionally, public open areas are regarded in three categories. Parks or green areas, streets and open areas of archaeological remains and their surroundings are the main elements of this category. If the variety and qualification of the open areas are examined, it is possible to say that the private open areas are slight amount. As they are seen in the maps (Figure 2. 31), backyard of the buildings are nearly full up with the constructions.

It is referred from this map that, in the regions where the pattern shows organic character, the open spaces, inside of the lot boundaries cover more places. The north-east of temples region and southwest of the theatre can be given as example.

Streets, squares and parks constitute the public open areas of the village. Moreover, archaeological remains itself which mostly have no roofs and surroundings should also be regarded as within these open areas (Figure 2. 51). It can easily be understood that, public green areas such as parks take too little space in the village. It means that, there is no qualified public open spaces for people in the village because of the dense constructions. Although, the surrounding of archaeological remains are full up with unqualified buildings which also physically threaten the existence of remains, it can be seen in the map that, there are still remarkable spaces around the remains. Furthermore, the biggest part of the open spaces are enclosed by the open areas of archaeological remains.

Public open spaces are significant elements of the town because the density of private ones is high and it is more difficult to interfere to them. For this reason, public open

---

\(^{33}\) The definitions “private” and “public” are not shaped with the assistance of types of occupancy in this study. The utilization of spaces are the essential factor for the definitions.
areas and their main components are main tools of the study to make the implementations easier.

![Figure 2.45: The images of public open spaces (from author’s archive, 2013)](image)

2.3.2.1. Street Network of the Town and Changes in Time

When the street networks are analyzed, different approaches planned in different periods throughout the history draws attention. There are some thoughts among the people who studied the village and archaeological sites in some way. Atvur says that as the town has not been completely excavated, it is not at present possible to say whether like Priene and Miletus it followed the so-called “Hippodamus” plan, regular town plan or like Pergamon, it followed the contours of the land. However, it is very likely that as was the case during the Hellenistic Age in Anatolia, the regular town plan was used (ATVUR, 1984: 11). Kaderli also put forwards a close approach parallelly with Atvur that; the plan of the town has developed by continuation of previous one.
The town also shows a character far from the Hippodamus plan typology, intersecting streets perpendicularly and modular lot typology (KADERLĪ, 2009: 13). However another source controverted these supposal by emphasizing that the plan of the town is straight grid-iron plan (Hippodamus plan organization). KARACA, 2008: 176). It is a common expression about the pattern of the cities that, the street and cadastral organizations follow the pattern of the previous one. When the case of Side is analyzed, the pattern of grid-iron is highlighted (Figure 2. 46). It can be thought that, this tissues is the witness of previous periods such as Roman periods. However, the directions of the Roman and Byzantine edifices do not follow the contours of this pattern. In order to have a better understanding, firstly the grids of all physical components of the town are propounded. The streets, edifices and archaeological remains, open areas and natural elements of it created the base of these lines. All of the assets were categorized according to the directions of them and then each of them are again separated as the source of the grid such as archaeological remains, buildings, streets or open areas and natural elements (Figure 2. 47, 2. 48, 2. 49). As a result of this study, three main grids in different directions as forming the current urban pattern (Figure 2. 50).

When all of these grids and the periods of all remains and edifices are intersected, it is not possible to distinguish the grid one and two according to their periods. For instances, the temples in the edge of the peninsula and archbishop’s palace or basilica follows the same grid. Thus, it cannot be referred that, the grid one or two belongs to this period. However, it is clear that, the grid three which follows the buildings of immigrants and be realized mostly today was the product of Ottoman period. Contrary to common opinion that, the grid-iron plan seen today shows similarly to Roman street networks, it is formed when the immigrants arrived the town and be placed here.
Figure 2.46: The analysis of the current street networks in the town (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.47: The analysis showing the traces of grid 1 which is situated north-east and south west direction and the physical assets forming this grid (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.48: The analysis showing the traces of grid 2 which is situated north and south direction and the physical assets forming this grid (prepared by the author)
Figure 2. 49: The analysis showing the traces of grid 3 which mainly follows the borders of Selimiye village buildings and the physical sources forming this grid (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.50: The analysis showing all the re-traceable grids with different angles (prepared by the author)
The existed remains of Roman and Byzantine period and edifices from Ottoman period compose the urban macroform. The colonnaded avenue from Roman period and main street of Ottoman period and side streets perpendicular to that form the main structure of the town. The theatre constructed in the narrowest and the highest part of the peninsula is one of the significant remains from the Romans. East necropolis is totally without any function today. On the other hand, West Necropolis exhibits a different character. Taking the advantage of the sea and the beach, narrow and thin plots are situated perpendicular to the coastline. Moreover, touristic accommodation and restaurants with remains are constructed over the necropolis area. In the process, starting with a temporary, light, wooden bungalows without foundations, the necropolis area is transformed and attains a different character today. The archaeological remains of Harbor Bath, the Great Bath, Byzantine Villa, Basilicas, and City Walls are endangered by urban expansion today with no function.

2.3.2.2. Vista Points of the Streets

Vista points in the village are defined as points and areas where visual values and problems seen well. In Selimiye village because of the density of constructions, the remains get fragmented from the context and not be perceived. The gridal street pattern also effects the points because unexpected perspectives are not created as the other traditional settlements with organic pattern. However, the diversity in the plan and grids of different periods relatedly the orientation of archaeological remains provide the vista points. Especially while walking in the street near the intersection points of the remains and traditional buildings, remains meet the people suddenly if they look aside. Besides, while walking in the street, in some points an archaeological remain which is quite far away can be seen at the end of the street.
Figure 2.51: The analysis of the categories of open spaces (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.52: The photos of vista points in open spaces (from author’s archive, 2013)
2.3.2.3. **Street Sections**

The relations between the buildings, the streets and garden walls present the diversity in street sections. Diversity in the perspectives of the streets is one of the characteristic features of the Selimiye village (Figure 2.53). Depending on the changing height of the buildings, functions of them and position of the buildings if they are in a courtyard or adjacent to the street create the diversity. The dominant street section in the village is determined by buildings on two sides of the street (Figure 2.54). In this section, buildings are mostly used for commercial purposes and in the first floor of the edifices showcases and eaves over them cause difficulties and prevent the integrated perception of the buildings.

The second street section type is composed of buildings on one side of the street and courtyard wall in the other side (Figure 2.55). In the third one, only courtyard walls and green elements draw the borders of the street (Figure 2.56). These two types are not seen too often in the village. The streets which are situated in the area where the street pattern changes and become organic give these two types of sections. Besides, it is realized that these section types are met in the streets closer to the seashore. In the third type, it can easily draw attention that, density of the green areas rises in all of them. Moreover, plants prolapsing from the courtyard walls form the streets and streets get thinner. The size of most of them do not allow entering of vehicles. Within these reasons, this type of streets differentiate more from the first type.

Existence of the sea and coast create one more type of street section. The streets in the boundaries of the peninsula mostly show the characteristics of this type if it is accessible for people (Figure 2.55). They are also used for mostly gastronomic commercial purposes such as restaurants. Therefore, in some points it is almost impossible to perceive the sea because of the unqualified constructions. However, tables and chairs in open areas and difference in elevation draw the borders of one side and the buildings on the other side.
Figure 2.53: The analysis and schematic drawings indicating the street characteristics (prepared by the author)
Figure 2. 54: The photos from the streets which have buildings on both sides
Figure 2.55: The categorized photos of streets depending on the colours
Figure 2.56: The photos from the streets which have courtyard walls on both sides
2.3.2.4. **Vehicular and Pedestrian Density of the Streets**

“Traffic inside a historic town or urban area must be controlled and parking areas must be planned so that they do not damage the historic fabric or its environment” (ICOMOS, 1987)

As it is stated in Washington Charter, traffic is the most important and had to be well-controlled issue of the historic towns. In Side, between the main gate and the beginning of the main street the vehicle traffic density gets highest (Figure 2. 59). Inside the village the vehicle traffic is controlled between specific time periods. However, vehicle can reach every place in streets of the village. Usage of the ancient way; Colonnaded Avenue by vehicles bring many serious problems especially the triumphal arch is exposed to physical problems originated from these vehicles. In addition, insensibly created the parking areas are placed over the areas which reserve significant remains underneath. According to Atvur, the main parking area opposite the theater was constructed at one night depending on the request of village headman from the governor of that date in 1980’s tragically 34(Figure 2. 57).

![Figure 2.57: The car parking area opposite the theatre and its relation to the remains, 2013 (from Side Excavation Archive)](image)

34 The information was taken from Atvur during an oral conversation with him.
Pedestrians arrive to the village by using the coast way which is newly arranged or Colonnaded Avenue. In the main street, the pedestrian density reach highest amount and be scattered to side streets by showing decline. Especially at nights in summer, the number of visitor reached over the capacity of the village.

One of the problems the village faceted with is the seasonal differences of user density. In winters, the village is transformed to an isolated town without any users. The population of the village between seasons reveals the serious gap in the terms of numbers (Figure 2. 58).

**Figure 2. 58:** The images showing the seasonal differences in the aspect of density (from http://static.panoramio.com/photos/large/85782334.jpg, last accessed in 09.12.2014 and author’s archive)
Figure 2. 59: The analysis of the traffic scheme and density (prepared by the author)
2.3.3. Social Structure of the Town

The characteristics of social structure of Selimiye village is composed of immigrants came from Crete island at the end 19th century. However the social structure has changed over time and immigrants do not exist anymore in the town. Tanal mentions in her book about the people whose parents came from Side and live in Side for her book between 2002 and 2011. She published her reports from those people and their numbers do not climb over ten (TANAL, 2011). Depending on the information; 64% with more than half of the 579 numbered population involves immigrants in 1973, in Selimiye village (TOPAKTAŞ, 1997: 100). According to the statistic information of the census in 1935, the population of Selimiye village was composed of 122 men, 132 women and totally 254 people (KARACA, 2008: 240). Today, it is almost impossible to determine the natives came from Crete because the people live in Side for their work and touristic purpose are dominated to the population. Depending on a field survey for the thesis in February of 2014 and February of 2013 in winters, it is difficult to find people live in Selimiye village in streets. Thus, it is difficult to mention about the stationary population which forms the characteristics of social structure. The changing population depending on the specific periods also show the increase in population within the touristic activities. However, most of them live in new settlement of Side or in different cities in winters. Contrary, the population increases in summer and changes the social structure.

When the table is interpreted the population explosion can be realized between 1975 and 1985. This time period is also parallel to the radical steps in conservation such as registered buildings and the decision of “archaeological site” and tourism development projects.
Table 2.4: The statistics information of changing population in Side (prepared by the author with the assistance of information of the web site: http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/nufusmenuapp/menu.zul, last accessed 07.12.2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yıl</th>
<th>Erkek</th>
<th>Kadın</th>
<th>Toplam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965 (Selimiye Köyü)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 (Selimiye Köyü)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 (Selimiye Köyü)</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 (Selimiye Köyü)</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>3.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 (Side Belediyesi)</td>
<td>7.335</td>
<td>3.998</td>
<td>11.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 (Side Belediyesi)</td>
<td>12.189</td>
<td>8.762</td>
<td>20.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other significant analysis to understand the current conditions in the town is the state of occupancy. The reason why this analysis is significant in this study is that the implementations to lots belong to treasury and municipality are easier than the private lots. It is seen in the map that, there are intensive private ownerships among the traditional and new buildings inside the village. On the other hand, most of the archaeological sites except commercial agora and state agora belong to treasury. It is also curious that the lands which municipality have are all in the center of the village. Besides, it is referred from the map that, inside the Selimiye village boundaries the private lots covers more spaces (Figure 2. 60).
Figure 2.60: The analysis of the types of occupancies. (prepared by the author)
2.3.4. Evaluation of the Contemporary Urban Form and Changes in Time

- The cultural heritage both sites and objects are isolated and be faced with the threat of disappear.
- As a result of mass tourism, the monuments and buildings are in danger and about to lose their cultural and historical significance.
- Some of the monuments and buildings are effected by the new constructions and be in bad conditions as structurally and physically.
- The present high densities as a result of high lot coverage and building height and lack of open and green spaces have a negative effect on visual qualities of the town.
- The characteristics of new constructions are completely incompatible and ignoring the archaeological and historical features of the town.
- Uncontrolled traffic and car parking areas make the process of deterioration faster of cultural heritage.
- Overuse of the town by pedestrians and vehicles make the perceptions of the town difficult.
- Social structure of the town had been identical until 1960’s, the social character of the town has changed as a result of touristic developments.
- The dense usage of single artifacts such as Apollon temple, theatre and the main street as a result of the mass tourism policy cause the overuse of those places and ignore the other values of the town.
- Excessive density is not only observed on building lots but also seen in building heights and these bring integration problems.
2.3.5. Focusing on Fragments and Their Contexts

Archaeological remains of Side are the evidences of historical periods. However these archaeological remains have been abandoned for years and their relation with the context are broken off. One of the important problems is, these sites are not integrated with urban context and they became “fragmented” pieces. To evaluate and supply their integration, it is crucial to understand the context they are in. Therefore, in this part of the thesis, some of the archaeological remains are taken into consideration separately and their conditions will be described within their surroundings. Understanding an archaeological site thoroughly necessitates, understanding the context it exists in. Besides, all of the components in terms of architectural and archaeological features should be considered, analyzing the current state and their relationship with the current urban context.

In order to understand and present the current state of the remains, some criteria is determined. Within this scope the archaeological areas are analyzed in terms of physical, visual and functional relations with the environment. Physical and visual integration aspects are directly related with the natural and man-made environment.

Within the scope of understanding the physical and visual integration, the environment, spatial organization, density of built-up areas and the balance between open areas are analyzed. Besides, the borders and accessibility also effects the physical integration of the sites. Thus, within the physical aspects of the site two subjects are analyzed for all sites; physical relation and accessibility.

The visual relationship of the sites is one of the important factor for integration. Because this visual relation is directly depending on the perceptibility of the remains and sites. Within this context, it is important how the remains are perceived as a single element, or a whole with its environment. Furthermore, the visibility of the site and
remains is also important for visual integration. They can be seen and visible from far away or cannot be realized until approaching near the site.

For the last one, the utilization of the remains and surroundings is also crucial for the integration of them. Because, the edifices and their surroundings should be used for related purposes with the cultural properties. Within this scope Burra Charter mentions that, a compatible use is necessary to reveal the significance of the cultural heritage. The other item to be considered in this scope is types of users whether they are specialists, tourists or inhabitants. In addition, the frequency of the usage is also important and should be analyzed for the functional integration.

Social integration and to raise inhabitant’s awareness and participation of them to the process is very important within the conservation of the cultural heritage. However, the analysis aspects should be defined by considering the characteristics of the place. In Selimiye village, almost all of the people are not from Side and they even do not live in Side. Most of people come Side for commercial purposes in touristic season and go back to their hometowns in winter. Some of them live in new settlement of Side not in the ancient Side and come to the village for their works. Only few families live in Side in both winters and summers. It means that, there is not much people to embrace the town and participate for the conservation of the town. Thus, within this study, social aspects for analysis are not minded.

2.3.5.1. Great Bath and its Surrounding

Great Bath is one of the “fragments” of Side which lost its unity and meaning in its current context.

In ancient period, it was the biggest bath in Side and situated near the Colonnaded Avenue in its construction date. Today, it can be arrived to the bath by following main street and turning left to a side street perpendicular to the main one. The only mosque
of the Selimiye village is very close to the bath. According to Mansel it was constructed in 3rd century when the prosperity time of Side in Romans.

It is crucial to mention about the current condition of the bath and especially the context it existed in. It is forbidden to enter the bath and also all entrances are locked. A mentioned above, while walking in the side street after passing the mosque in the right, the only some parts of one facade of the bath can be realized by turning the head to the left. Besides, only south-west elevation of the bath is accessible. From the south-east it is accessible with some obstacles because of the difference in the ground (Figure 2. 67: 8). This section of the edifice is also faced with significant physical problems. The new constructions are built in immediate surroundings of the bath (Figure 2. 65: 6, 2. 67: 7-9). They completely covered some part of the south-east facade. In front of the rest of south-west elevation there is a building and its open areas which are utilized for gastronomic purposes. Furthermore, the wall with approximately one meter height is built adjacent to the building. Thus, this part of the facade is not adequate for accessibility.

Figure 2. 61: The google earth image showing the location of Great Bath in the village (from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)
The other integration aspect to understand the site is visual perception and visibility. It is not difficult to guess the results depending on the construction stacks almost completely enclose the bath. It is possible to say that, the perception of the whole parts of the building in a unity is impossible. Only in some points in the street, facades are perceived particularly. In front of the restaurant in the street, the starting point of the curved street in front of the bath, and at the end of the street from the sea side are the points where walls or arches or doors are seen. Besides, from the street in the north-west part of the bath with a wall remain on it, the highest level of the north-west elevation can be caught sight of.

**Figure 2. 62:** The google earth image showing the near environment of Great Bath ((from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)

If the building character is monitored in immediate surroundings, it is possible to say that the buildings for commercial purposes are predominated. Although the balanced relation of open and built-up areas in the northern-west part, high buildings with over three storeys and utilized as tourism accommodation places such as hotel or pension are encountered intensively. There are also registered lots and modest buildings which do not ignore the existence of the bath.
The functions of the buildings near the bath are not compatible with the buildings and they even do not mind the existence of the building. The all buildings turn the backs to the monument and be orientated depending on the street and people passing from there. Moreover, it is more critical that the building has no function and no user group. Because there are no excavation goes on here relatedly no researcher and specialists also do not use the building. It is already close to the visits of tourists because the inactive state of the building and physical problems may cause dangers for people. Only the accessible surfaces are used for people only to take photos and watch.

**Figure 2.63:** The model showing the relations of the bath with its near environment (prepared by the author)

**Figure 2.64:** The model showing the relations of the bath with its near environment (prepared by the author)
To conclude, it is possible to say that, the building block which the bath is placed on is surrounded by buildings with one to three storeys adjacent. This built environment has directly influence on the bath and makes revealing its cultural significance difficult. Only north-west part of the building block has more permeable character. Within the light of all analysis, the conservation of the building is endangered by these problems not only physically but also visually. It has been an object of a scene which people pass nearby, looking around and taking photos.
Figure 2.65: The photos of Great Bath showing the current condition it exists in (from author’s archive)
Figure 2.66: The analysis of the physical and visual context of the Great Bath and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
2.3.5.2. The Harbor Bath and its Surrounding

As it is understood from the name, it was erected near the harbor in the 2nd century. Mansel claims that it can be the oldest bath of the town depending on the construction technique used in the vaults as the other ones; theatre, nymphaeum etc (MANSEL,
The characteristic architectural feature is utilization of the vaults in all sections of the bath. Besides, a remarkable part of the bath still exists and the vault system is visible transparently from the main facade.

If the bath is analyzed within the physical aspect, the access into the buildings is forbidden as the great bath. Two surfaces of the bath are accessible from the street passing in the south direction. However, the wire fence in front of this facade prevents the people approach near the building. There is also a level difference between the bath and the other buildings behind it. The north facade of the building can be accessed from the stairs in the street and a platform behind this surface of the bath. It is possible to say that, the building gets isolated from the immediate surroundings of it.

![Google Earth Image of Harbor Bath](image)

**Figure 2.68:** The google earth image showing the location of Harbor Bath in the village (from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)

When the visibility level of the bath is analyzed it can be seen that, the bath is visible from the points closer to it. However, it is not seen from the main street or the others except in front of it. The main facade of the bath composed of three vaults is perceived
from the street in front of it. However, if people arrive the bath by using the main street and turning left, the north-west facade of the monument with three spaces formed by arches is met (Figure 2. 71: 4). It is nearly impossible to have a sense about the other elevations by walking in the street. The north-east facade can be accessed from the stairs. The level difference is created behind the bath by elevating from the ground. It is also difficult to perceive the southeast facade of the monument totally. From the small open spaces of the buildings in this line, walls can be seen partially.

Figure 2. 69: The google earth image showing the near environment of Harbor Bath (from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)

Figure 2. 70: The model showing the relations of the bath with its near environment (prepared by the author)
In the village almost none of the archaeological sites are not in an environment which have related functions within the archaeological heritage as it is seen in the bath. The platform and surroundings behind the bath is served for the storage of the restaurants. Thus, the buildings in the backyard of the bath also never mind the bath and turn their back to the bath by erecting walls. The building block the bath exists in is completely composed of the commercial buildings. Therefore, the open spaces of the bath satisfy their storage needs. They do not damage the bath not only visually but also physically by the constructions adjacent to the bath (Figure 2. 71: 6, 2. 72: 7).

Figure 2. 71: The images of harbour bath showing the current context it exists in (from author’s archive)
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Figure 2.72: The images of harbour bath showing the current context of it (from author’s archive)
Figure 2.73: The analysis of the physical and visual context of the Bath and its surrounding. (prepared by the author)
Figure 2.74: A view from 1950’s showing the traditional buildings of Selimiye village and Harbor bath (O.Atvur Archive)

Figure 2.75: Sketches produced for Harbor Bath and surrounding in field survey (prepared by the author)
In conclusion, the Harbor Bath lost its unity in urban context and perceived as a single element isolated from the current context. It lost not only its physical relationship with the sea but also its visual connection with it. It is almost impossible to guess the context it existed in its original conditions.

2.3.5.3. The Temples Area of the Harbor

In this area the remains of Roman period and Byzantine period reveal the historical stratification of the site where is at the end of the Colonnaded Avenue and south of the peninsula. Mansel describes this site as a square which is situated at the end of the Colonnaded Avenues and temples on each side of the square (MANSEL, 1978: 121). On one side of the space, two temples one of them is smaller and the other bigger, dedicated to the Gods Apollo and Athena are erected. In the other side, the semi-circular temple of Men which is positioned in approximately east-west direction. In Byzantine Period, it is thought that a basilica was constructed in the east of the temples within the borders of temenos (YILDIRIM, 2013: 178)

It is necessary to give information about the history of the site. It is guessed that this site is an authentic place which was the center of religious activities. However, it is guessed that it was used for different purposes for some time periods. For instance, after the abandonment of temples in Roman period until the construction of basilica, it could be served for the harbour and used for temporal functions (YILDIRIM, 2013: 179). After the arrival of immigrants at the beginning of the 20th century, it is guessed that, the workers of constructions utilized the site as “stone quarry”. Thus, this site is mentioned as “mermerlik” among the inhabitants. The workers, divided the big marble architectural fragments into the small pieces so as to make the transportation easy. Then, by burning them they were producing lime (AHUNBAY, 2007: 105)\(^{35}\). After the excavations started by Mansel in 1947, the findings and the site get attraction of

\(^{35}\) This information is taken from the journal of Zeynep Ahunbay which was presented for “Side’ye Emek Verenler Sempozyumu” and then published in a book.
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the people and visitors. Thus, an anastylosis project which is implemented in a corner of the small temple came to an issue in 1977 with the assistance of Jale İnan. Then, between 1977 and 1991 the researches and implementations were done by a team under the presidency of Zeynep Ahunbay were completed. Within the result of the study, Apollo Temple became a symbol with the sunshine over the sea for Side ancient town and Selimiye village (Figure 2. 81: 16).

Figure 2. 76: The google earth image showing the location of Temples in the peninsula (from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)

If the site and monuments are analyzed within the aspect of accessibility, it is possible to say that between short periods of time the accessibility may change. When the thesis study starts in summer 2012, the entrance to the site was free and open to public. However, its accessibility was supplied with some obstacles because of the gravels and sands on the ground. In 2013 when the restoration implementations and excavations conducted by Side Excavations start in the basilica, the entrance is restricted. The surroundings of the site was hedged by wire fence and entrances were subjected to fee.
It had lasted for some period. In the February of 2014 when one of the field surveys within the scope of the thesis occurred, the borders surrounding the site were removed again. Therefore, the analysis is done depending on this information. On the other hand, for the reason of the wire fences and level of difference from the street level, the temple of Men is completely not accessible.

![Image showing the near environment of Temples region](image1.png)

**Figure 2.77:** The google earth image showing the near environment of Temples region (from Google Earth, last accessed in 20.01.2015)

![Image showing the model of the temples region](image2.png)

**Figure 2.78:** The model showing the relations of the temples region with its near environment (prepared by the author)
The site is generally visible from the southern part of the peninsula at close range, however it is not visible from the harbor and the other streets of the village except the one, stretching from the great bath downward to the temples area (Figure 2. 82). The temple of Men is also not visible far away from its location because of the unqualified constructions in immediate surroundings. Hence, the visual and physical integration of it is totally lost. Besides, the relation of the temple with the other temples and site also is broken for these reasons. The temples area is visually and physically integrated within their own context, despite of the disconnected relation with the buildings and village.

Most of the buildings nearby are used for commercial functions especially gastronomic purposes. According to Ahunbay (AHUNBAY, 2007: 105), when the site drew attraction of visitors in 1970’s, the number of rambling buildings constructed for people who came to visit the site

As a result of the high attractions of the site, the site and monuments are overused by especially visitors. Besides, some social activities are arranged at this site such as shows, wedding ceremonies
In conclusion it is possible to say that this site is the mostly used part of the village with the theatre. Because of the uncontrolled use of the site and presentation problems the site has lost the physical and visual integrity with the town and environment. On the other hand, the edifices and remains keep their unity at site scale. The disconnected relation of temple of Men and the other buildings is a significant problem. Within this scope, the site lost its unity and authenticity, today. It is important to reveal the cultural significance of the site and presentation of the multi-layeredness character.

When all archaeological sites are evaluated, it is a common problem that, the sites have lost their characteristic features and become a scene which people take photos and pass nearby. Lack of presentation principles and disintegrated environment, their cultural properties are trivialized. Multi-layeredness character of them are not understood and not presented. The potentials of their open spaces are utilized for secondary purposes of commercial buildings. Because they are the alive witnesses of the history and their period, it is important to present their cultural significance and create qualified spaces for both visitors and occupants.
Figure 2.80: The photos from the immediate surroundings of Temples Area (from author’s archive)
Figure 2.81: The photos from the immediate surroundings of Temples Area (from author’s archive)
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Figure 2.82: The analysis of the physical and visual context of the Temples region and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
CHAPTER 3

ASSESSING THE FRAGMENTED CONTEXT OF SIDE AND DEFINING PRINCIPLES AND PROPOSALS FOR ITS RE-INTEGRATION

“The conservation of archaeological remains and their integration into the town may allow the creation of major cultural facilities and constitute an important basis for the deployment of efforts towards recovery of the ancient town”.

(Council of Europe, 1991: 2)

Side has been settled from many civilizations with an interruption between the 12th and 19th century. It has always kept its significance despite of the earthquakes, wars and attacks. The buildings from Ottoman period and remains of Roman and Byzantine era constitute the multi-layered character of the town. However, the excessive developments in tourism for the last 40 years and the temporal inhabitants of Side make the assessment process difficult in the terms of common conservation principles. Therefore this chapter is structured as two parts. Firstly regarding the significance of the town, the values, potentials and problems of Side will be handled as the basis of both conservation principles and urban design principles. This section constitute a base for decisions for integration of the fragmented context of the town. After that, the fundamental principles for integration proposal, the aim of the project and the proposal comprising the identity areas will be presented.
3.1. Assessments of the Fragmented Context

Within this scope, the first part of the chapter “Assessment and for the integration of fragmented context” is prepared by the assistance of “Understanding the fragmented context: The Case of Side” presented in Chapter 2. In that respect, the titles and elements explained in that chapter are re-evaluated depending on the values, potentials and problems. As the other chapter these elements are also separated and studied in different scales.

3.1.1. Values, Problems and Potentials of Side

According to the structure of the thesis, the determinations are regarded at two scales, Selimiye village scale and archaeological site scale. Therefore, this section of the chapter, values, potentials and problems of the town and sites are considered both separately and connected to each other at these scales.

3.1.1.1. Values

“Assessment of the values attributed to heritage is a very important activity in any conservation effort, since values strongly shape the decisions that are made.”

(MASON, 2002: 5)\(^{36}\)

**Side is a multi-layered town with its significant monuments and buildings as evidences of its history.**

\(^{36}\) The article of the author is published in “Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage”.
Different historical and archaeological layers constituting the urban identity of the town indicate the civilizations which contribute the town in different time periods. The buildings of Ottoman period and remains which have survived until today are the evidences of these periods and different cultures.

Side is a town of which the urban morphology and street patterns are created and planned differently in each period.

To evaluate the grids of the town it can be seen that there are three grid directions in the town. When it is intersected with the historical periods of the buildings and grids, it is not possible to say that each grid belongs to a period. However, two of them are distinguished easily and follow the buildings and streets of specific periods. Within this scope; it is clear that, the grid three which follows the buildings of immigrants and be realized mostly today was the product of Ottoman period. Contrary to common opinion that, the grid-iron plan seen today shows similarity to Roman street networks, it is formed when the immigrants arrived the town and be placed here.

In order to compare the grid-iron plan in Roman and at the end of 19th century. Depending on the grid-iron plan, Favro controverts the ideas about the extensive utilization of grid-iron plan in Roman period. She claims that, various alternatives were used off the grid. Moreover, especially occupants were trying to produce new forms to disturb the sharp-cut geometries of the cities. Because the origin of that plan which enables the order and control is Roman military camps. In fact, he tries to emphasize the imperative usage in cities. Thus, he claims that even Vitruvius do not emphasizes on the grid-iron plan in city planning (FAVRO, 2013: 141). Vitruvius set out the steps for establishing a town; firstly selection of a site considering many complex natural problems, secondly, erection of the fortification walls in relation to military needs. In this part he reminds that the geometry of the town is important for defense. For instance, square or determined angles are not flexible to defense even simplify the attack of the

37 The maps of grids are given in Chapter 2 under the section 2.1.3. Evolution of the Physical Form and its Main Components through History
enemies. The third stage is laying out the street organizations and orientating them depending on the climatic conditions especially, winds (Vitruvius, 2005: 15).

**As an immigrant village of the 19th century, the town is differentiated from the other Ottoman villages and traditional fabrics as being a town which is formed by a different social groups under a regulation.**

Selimiye village which was established for immigrants came from Crete island shows characteristics features of 19th century immigrant’s districts and towns as the aspect of grid-iron plan scheme. It is also valuable that the constructions indicate traces of the regulations of that period called “Ebniye Nizammameleri”.

**The traditional buildings of Selimiye village are valuable as an indicator reflecting the construction technology and daily life of their context existed in before.**

![Figure 3.1](image)

**Figure 3.1:** The registered residential building in 366 numbered lot (from author’s archive)

Although some of them did not keep their authenticity because of the wrong implementations, they are valuable for the reason that they were constructed for specific social group; came by migration from a different country. It is not analyzed within the scope of this thesis if the reflections of their life in Greek can be realized in their houses. However, even if the houses were given them after construction, the traces of their culture can be followed in ones which keep their authenticity. It is also
important that, they were constructed depending on a regulation published in Ottoman period by the emperor, explaining the requirements.

**Figure 3. 2:** The registered building keeping the original features in 432 numbered lot (from author’s archive)

The archaeological monuments and remains are valuable for reflecting not only the technology of their periods, but also reserving social and cultural traces of their periods.

Side has many archaeological sources which have been able to survive up to now despite of natural disasters or manmade deteriorations. These are valuable for being uniqueness and an indicator of a specific feature of its period or reflecting the typical architectural and archaeological features of its period. These remains and edifices have unique features. For instance, the theatre is differentiated from the others which are erected in the same period in Anatolia as being unique example. The second tier of the cavea is superimposed on vaults whereas the first one is built over the natural slope as most of the others in Anatolia. However, all of the others have different features with
their material, architectural features or construction technique. Thus, Side is a historic town which have all of these values in urban context.

3.1.1.2. Problems

“The problems presented by the integration of scattered remains, mainly brought to light on that occasion of development or construction work in an urban environment, are more complex. Integrated remains constitute reference elements which throw light on the development of the town even if they do not reveal the complex overlapping of the successive urban fabrics; they help to give the town its personality and its identity”.

(BARRUOL, 1984).

Side as an ancient town and coastal town receives great attention for touristic purposes and has become one of the main tourism destinations in the southern part of Turkey. Mass tourism and increasing numbers of tourists threat the conservation of the village.

As the witnesses of continuous inhabitation process and parts of a historically stratified context, archaeological remains and historical buildings get fragmented objects in current context.

As mentioned before “fragmentation” is a significant conservation problem in historical sites which are the physical evidences of successive continuous inhabitation process. When some disruptions and irregularities occur in this process, the components of the context start to get fragmented pieces. The archaeological remains and historical buildings in Side are the fragments in the current context. “Lacunae” period guessed between the 11th and 19th century may be accepted the initial step of this period in Side. However, the noteworthy date for fragmentation is 1960’s
indubitably. The process started with “Side International Tourism Competition” causes irreversible results for the cultural heritage in Side. Thus, they are situated in current context as fragmented objects.

Physical existences of different historical and archaeological layers constituting the identity of Side is under threat of being lost.

Multi-layered towns are the outcomes of the successive historical periods. The construction of “new” occurred regarding the integration of the remaining elements of the previous period. In the case if the integration cannot be achieved, the remains of the former periods become alienated with their current contexts. After this, the process of being lost and becoming fragmented of the archaeological remains and historical buildings starts. Parallelly, in Side, the process started with the tourism competition in 1968 support the development of town and the town has become one of the significant tourism destinations.

The facilities necessitated for development of tourism cause irreversible transformations in the spatial setting of the town.

“The natural and cultural heritage, diversities and living cultures are major tourism attractions. Excessive or poorly-managed tourism and tourism related development can threaten the physical nature, integrity and significant characteristics. “

(ICOMOS, 1999)

Side is both an ancient town which reserve many significant cultural properties and a coastal town with its location which is surrounded from three sides with the sea. Thus, the requirements of a touristic coastal town and a historic significant town contravened. As a result of this and as it is stated in “ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism
Charter”, tourism is dominated and the uncontrolled development of it and its necessities change the character of the town and threaten the future of cultural heritage.

The wrong attitude in regarding the conservation as the protection of one monument or specific building/period instead of considering the continual historical development process of Side.

“The contributions of all periods to the significance of a site should be respected. Although particular eras and themes may be highlighted, all periods of the site’s history as well as its contemporary context and significance should be considered in interpretation process.”

(ICOMOS, 2005)

In multi-layered cities, the conservation implementations are considered only regarding the monument or building itself. The surrounding environment, its context, functional, physical and visual relations with the environment are generally not minded. When the researches and projects are evaluated, it can be realized that, in different time periods, different teams dealt with monuments and their implementations. However, integrated conservation approaches are yet new concept for Side. On the other hand, the common problem in multi-layered cities, some implementations are intended to emphasize for a specific period, event or a person, isolating the properties their continual historical context. It is not an intentional attitude in Side, however the archaeological remains and monuments get attraction and be dominated among the traditional fabric and buildings of Ottoman. For instance; the visits, simply to the theatre or to the temples of Athena and Apollo are chosen for great number of people. However, it is essential not to attribute more significance to any period, evaluate and present their significance with its all layers in current context.
The unqualified and tourism focused new constructions effect the physical, visual and functional relation of the monuments and buildings within the environment.

Tourism development activities have a destructive influence on the new constructions. When the new constructions are evaluated three types of buildings are met; the first group is defined by buildings which are harmonious with the environment within the aspect of mass, proportions and architectural features. Some of the buildings those are defined as “traditional buildings” within the scope of conservation plan notes can be given as examples (Figure 3. 3). The other new buildings utilized for touristic purpose have generally over three number of storeys and inharmonious with the environment as the mass proportion. The third category of buildings are composed of replica buildings which are constructed by imitating the traditional ones with the means of physical appearance. They are constructed with reinforced concrete system and stones are attached to the facade in order to appear similar with the others (Figure 3. 4).

Figure 3. 3: An example of “traditional buildings”
Side ancient town suffers from the lack of unqualified and inadequate open areas to spend time in.

When the open areas are analyzed it is categorized in two types; one of them is defined by lots and private areas, the other is utilized by public. However, the area which is covered by open spaces is limited in both types. In built-up area analysis, it can easily be realized that, the building blocks are almost completely covered by buildings and there are no open spaces behind the lots, in the middle of the building block. Besides, green areas and parks which are spared for public use are also limited. It is a serious problem that the occupants and visitors have no open areas to spend time in.

The vehicle traffic and its density inside the ancient town and overuse of some areas by pedestrians give physical damage to the cultural properties.

“Traffic inside a historic town or urban area must be controlled and parking areas must be planned so that they do not damage the historic urban fabric or its environment.”

(ICOMOS, 1987)
As it is stated in Washington Charter, the traffic density gives physical damage to the significant buildings. The road starting from the main gate of the ancient Side and come through the beginning of the village is exposed to intensive vehicle traffic in specific time periods. The asphalt material which is transmitted the vibrations of the vehicles physically give damage to all monuments and sites in its near environment such as commercial agora, agora bath, theatre, temple of Dionysos, Vespasianus monument etc. Although, it is limited to enter the village between specific time periods, circulation of vehicles in narrow street and also increasing number of pedestrians in summer cause problems. The car parking areas are also not planned or not created intentionally. The main parking area opposite the theatre is built over the Byzantine remains and all of the vehicles which cannot be entered into the village are left in that car park. Inside the village, there are some areas which are not thought for parking intentionally, however they are used for this purpose. Within this scope, the town faced with many problems.

The changes in social structure of the town, seasonal or temporal occupants of the town make conservation difficult since the participation of inhabitants in conservation process is essential.

As it is stated in many charters and regulations such as “Washington Charter”, the participation of the residents are essential to reach a successful conservation programmes and they should also be encouraged for conservation of the site. Because the conservation of the town, its benefits and outcomes concern them first of all. However in Side, the authentic social group of immigrants are almost in a slight number. Besides, it is impossible to say that the population of the town is stationary in Side. Most of the people live in the new settlement of Side or Manavgat or the other come from other cities seasonal. Only a few number of them live in Side through the year. The lack of the number in stable population make the participation and conservation process difficult.
3.1.1.3. Potentials

The location of the ancient town and Selimiye village, being settled over a peninsula depending on that being surrounded by the sea from three sides. Each point of the peninsula present different perspectives and relations about the manmade and natural features.

Side has a rich and different traces of history however it is difficult to understand what the source of these traces are and what the physical context they existed in was. Therefore all of the physical existed components of Side ancient town and Selimiye village are potentials which have to be handled in an integrated way and as a part of urban context.

The open areas of the archaeological sites encompass big places in the town, however they are not evaluated in convenient purposes.

The archaeological remains and sites are also reserve areas which have potential as being built-up area and utilized in an appropriate purpose.

Although mass tourism caused irreversible effects on cultural heritage of Side, tourism may be a potential for presentation and preservation of Side as a tool. Because, utilization of a historical physical structure or historic sites is a significant tool for conservation. However, it should be emphasized that the type of tourism has to be determined and defined well and its impacts should be evaluated regarding the features and conditions of Side.

The archaeological fragments are not situated in private occupancy that has to be regarded as a potential because expropriation is not needed.
3.1.2. Focusing on Fragments: Values, Problems and Potentials

After all determinations about the quality areas are evaluated according to their features. It is important in determination process that firstly togetherness of archaeological areas and historical buildings involving problems, values and potentials inside Selimiye village borders. Because archaeological areas with presentation problems do not involve complex problems and only reveal the characteristics of multi-layered cities. Archaeological areas inside the village indicate the physical, visual and functional integrity aspects. As a result of this, great bath, harbor bath and temples region and their immediate environment are focused as specific areas.

3.1.2.1. Great Bath and its Surrounding

Great bath is a valuable monument from Roman period and was utilized throughout the history. The bath and its surrounding reflect the multi-layered character of the town together with the traditional registered buildings. Byzantine villa and the other remains of Byzantine period support this feature. The orientation of the monument differently from the other buildings and street pattern also create diversity in visual perspectives. These points strength the perception of the building.

The building itself is a big potential with its near environment and its open areas. They cover a big space in the urban context together with many complex problems. Furthermore, when the open spaces are analyzed in surrounding the big spaces can be easily realized however, they are not used appropriate purposes and compose problems.

When the problems are focused in great bath the accessibility problems drew attention. Because the excavation and scientific researches are not completed, it is forbidden to enter the edifice. Besides, the accessibility to reach near the facades in north west and south east. The other facades are also accessible with some obstacles because of the material of the ground and level difference in the ground. The buildings and
unqualified new constructions prevent the visibility of the monument. It is also
difficult to perceive visually from the streets and far from the monument. Only two
facades of the edifice can be perceived at the points close to it. Furthermore, the
buildings adjacent to the south west elevation give physical damage to the building.
Vehicular traffic density in the near environment of the monument both give physical
damage to the monument because of the vibrations and prevent the visual perception.
For instance, car park areas and the cars eased close to the building. If the functional
relation of the building is analyzed utilization of buildings and open areas for touristic
purpose have a big impact on the building within an overuse aspect. It can easily be
realized the density of commercial buildings in near environment.

3.1.2.2. Harbor Bath and its Surrounding

In general, harbor bath faced with similar problems and indicate similar values and
potentials with the great bath. It was also constructed in Roman period near the harbor.
This feature is significant for this monument however it is so difficult that the relation
between the sea and the building is completely disintegrated. The building itself, its
open areas together with the buildings of immigrant village are the values of the site.
Moreover, the open areas in close environment such as streets and open areas defined
by lot boundaries are potentials for utilization however, they are used for service and
secondary functions of new constructions ignoring the building.

The level difference between the ground and open areas of the monument in north west
part and the wire fence prevent the accessibility. It is also forbidden to enter the
buildings as a visitor. The density of the buildings breaks the physical integration of
the building in its urban context. The building in the north east facade threatens the
future of the monument with the aspect of physical damage. If the visual perception is
analyzed, only two facades near the street in front of it are perceived at close range
however, is not seen far from the building. Besides, it is very difficult to see the two
elevations look at the backyard of commercial buildings. At some points from the
streets and other open areas they can be seen between physical structures. The open areas in near environment of the monument there are open spaces utilized for car park areas and open areas of commercial buildings enclose big spaces as potential to supply the physical integration however, with this usage they create problems with the aspect of physical, functional and visual.

In conclusion, as the other qualified areas harbor bath lost its physical, visual and functional integrity in urban context together with its meaning. It is important to handle the evaluations and traces in an integrated way and solve presentation problems to reveal its cultural significance and make it become a part of daily use for both visitors and occupants.

3.1.2.3. **The Temples Area of the Harbor**

The Athena, Apollon and Men Temples are the components of this region. The site is significant with its location as being settled at the most valuable area of the village. It is also valuable when it is evaluated with the time period constructed and existed in. The temples and registered buildings in near environment of the site, open areas, street pattern and the sea can be regarded as the strength of the site. The vista points created by this urban pattern and open areas also supply diversity for visual perception of the site. The walking route in the border of the peninsula make easy the circulation and give these different perspectives with the streets in the north direction.

Great open areas of this archaeological site and the other buildings are significant potentials of the site. Being near the sea or water source is also a big potential although the physical relation is broken.

This site also reserve many complex problems as the other archaeological and multi-layered areas. The buildings located adjacent to the remains prevent the establishment of visual, physical and functional relation. From the street which is connected directly
to the main street the site is started to perceived visually. And from the top of the street which is a conjunction between the great bath and this area, the sites and especially the anastylosis of Apollon temple and its structure is perceived. However, the case is different for temple of Men within the aspect of visual perception and visibility. It is lost in physical built environment and cannot be perceived at close and far range. The wire fence encloses the temple prevents the accessibility. As the other sites, the commercial buildings especially utilized for gastronomic purposes prevent the functional relation. Furthermore, the remains settled in an open area of restaurants can easily be realized. This attitude is the result of an understanding of looking at the remain as a decorative object.

To conclude, although the site is valuable as revealing the cultural significance of the town with Apollon temple as the symbol, the site is not handled in an integrated way.
Figure 3. 5: The representative section of multi-layeredness of the town (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.6: The analysis of the values and potentials of Great Bath and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
Figure 3. 7: The analysis of the problems of Great Bath and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.8: The analysis of the values and potentials of Harbor Bath and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.9: The analysis of the problems of Harbor Bath and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.10: The analysis of the values and potentials of Temples Region and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.11: The analysis of the problems of Temples Region and its surrounding (prepared by the author)
3.2. General Principles and Proposals for Re-integrating Side’s Fragmented Context

Historic towns and archaeological areas are part of the daily environment of human beings everywhere that they represent the living presence of the past. They have survived for the ages as the most tangible evidence of the wealth and diversity of cultural, religious and social activities. However, in the development process of towns their cultural significance is neglected. As a result they lost their unity in urban context. However, as it is stated in many recommendations, their safeguarding and their integration into the life of contemporary society is a basic factor in town planning and land development. (Nairobi Recommendation, 1976)

The case of Side, within the scope of development strategies especially tourism strategies the conservation of cultural heritage reserve many complex problems in physical context.

Within the light of all information mentioned in previous chapters which involve all these analysis and evaluations on general features and current state of Side ancient town is prepared in order to propose a project for integration of remains and buildings from all periods. In this part of the thesis, the fundamental principles for integration proposal, the aim of the project and the proposal comprising the identity areas is presented.

The towns are the formations superimposed by the deposits of different contributions of a process. Each component of them has a role for togetherness and coherence. And any intervention in this process may cause transformations and disintegrations. Then, the disintegration brings the fragmentation with itself. The components of the town get fragmented pieces and lose their meaning in its own context. No matter if it is an archaeological or historical property. For instance a modern sculpture constructed in a context may lose its meaning with the loss of any elements of the town in its
environment such as a plant, a tree or a building, a street. Their existence is possible with their physical context.

Within the light of this process, it can be said that the fragmentation process which archaeological sites and historical towns usually face with is the fundamental problem for cultural heritage because their existence is meaningful with their integrity. Not only cultural heritage itself, their all physical existences in nearby surrounding make them meaningful.

However, it is absolutely difficult to supply re-integration of them as they were in original urban context in their periods. Moreover, it is impossible in multi-layered cities because of the diversity in contributions of different periods of the town.

Within the evaluation of all of these, the main of the proposal to for Side ancient town is re-integrating the components of all periods with the help of existence physical elements of the town by increasing their values. The integration of fragments from different periods in their own historical context is not aimed within the scope of this thesis. By following some traces of the fragmented pieces, their integration to each other in the “new urban whole” is the main concern of the proposal. Within this scope, some additions and removals are supported to supply integrity.

Within this scope, the meaning of “defragmentation” in computational science is also utilized a significant tool and basis for the proposing and presenting re-integration principles for Side. “Wasted space” and “open spaces” of the town are utilized for “defragmentation” in both of them.

Thus, the fragments of Roman period, Byzantine period, Ottoman period and current physical elements of the town which are the components of the proposal. Open spaces, green areas, manmade and natural elements are all a part of the proposal.
• It is essential to preserve all remains and edifices related to the layers of different periods.

• It is one of the fundamental targets of the project to make the history of Side understandable with the whole layers of different periods.

• It is also aimed to make all of these remains a part of people's daily life.

• It is essential that all interventions have to be applied with the means of open spaces arrangements. This present qualified open spaces to both local people and visitors.

• All interventions have to be flexible and reversible according to the conditions of the ancient town. Because in these cities the knowledge is dynamic depending on the result of new excavations and researches. In this regard project proposal should be moved with the same aim and methodology.

• It is essential that interventions should prevent the highlight of any period among the others. The treatment should be equal to all of the buildings and remains from different periods.

• Within this project proposal, unqualified new constructions which give physical damage to remains and prevent visual perception of remains can be demolished.

• The qualified buildings with no function can be utilized with convenient purpose within the scope of project.

• One of the fundamental targets of the project is that the increase of visual perception of buildings and remains so as to strength the visual relation.
• It is essential to interpret the vista points so as to give different perspectives of buildings and remains to users.

• Proposal aims to have people touch and contact with the cultural property in some points where it is not hazardous and allowed for entrance in order to make people experience the site.

• It is essential to make the riskless area accessible to draw attention of natives and visitors.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 3.12**: The conceptual drawing of the proposal

The conflict between the legislative framework and the decisions for the borders of archaeological site in the revision conservation master plan approved in 2014 was mentioned in previous sections. In order to propose a project for re-integration of the context the cultural properties exist in, it is necessary to conservation of them and transferred to the next generations. For this purpose, the problem of the border of archaeological sites should be solved. The conservation areas cannot be situated inside of the 3rd degree archaeological and urban site borders. The monuments and their surroundings should be regarded as 1st degree archaeological sites inside the borders. Firstly, it is necessary to approach the proposal from this view.
Within the scope of the project proposal the specific project areas are determined in evaluation section. The existing main street is planned to be connected with the “new” axis which is a conjunction between the great bath, harbor bath and byzantine villa as a layer of contemporary context. It is also connected to the temples region with the current street stretching from the great bath to the temples region. These axes are planned within the scope of this thesis however they do not have to be stable and should be changed according to the future information gained from new researches and excavations. Because the information in archaeological sites and historic areas are dynamic and changeable. These axes should be considered in this scope.

In this regard, the open spaces has a big role for re-integration within this proposal. For this reason, the aim of the proposal is established depending on the arrangement of open areas defined as potentials in previous section. Because the archaeological sites and remains exist in big open spaces in current urban context. And according to the results of the analyses, the limited open spaces cover more areas in nearby surrounding of archaeological remains with themselves. It is proposed to supply connections physically with open spaces by some interventions to the unqualified constructions by removals of mass and demolishment of some of them. Two existing streets, a new axis and the borders of the peninsula are the main lines of the project. As it was stated before, they are determined according to the conditions of today, existing information and the scope of this thesis. They should be flexible with the changing knowledge about the town.

These axes are defined by some components as borders such as walls or green elements .like trees Besides, difference in ground material is utilized for the presentation principles to reveal the traces from different periods. The lightening elements are also physical components of this proposal. And they are fed with the functions of the buildings nearby them. In addition to that, archaeological remains and monuments are given appropriate functions such as exhibition areas, small scale cafes or information centers. These functions supply qualified open spaces to the people which is occupants of Side or visitors to spend time in. Differently from the existed
ones, the open spaces and their functions are organized to reveal the values and visual perceptions of the cultural properties.

Figure 3.13: The image of project proposal showing the axis and its components (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.14: The image of proposal (prepared by the author)

Figure 3.15: The image of proposal (prepared by the author)
Figure 3.16: The image of proposal (prepared by the author)

Figure 3.17: The buildings which are planned to be removed partially or totally within the project proposal (prepared by the author)
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

Towns are complex and heterogeneous organisms as a result of a collective creation process over a period of time. In this regard, urban morphology is the product of an historical development process. These all constitutes the multi-layered characteristic of the town.

The remains of the periods can be conserved and transferred to the future, as long as they can be integrated to the urban context. However, the integration of archaeological sites and remains are the main issue of conservation field. Therefore, these discussions firstly are handled in the scope of this thesis. They all help the process of accurate assessment and production of a proposal.

Knowledge of a town’s history and features is an indispensable basis for the planning of any urban development and conservation. The town of Side which has significant cultural properties and be faced with integration problems is analyzed in this regard in the second step of this thesis. In order to have a comprehensive understanding of the case, analysis studies which realized in three stages. In the pre-survey step, accessible written and visual sources were gathered and analyzed before the field survey. The base maps, conservation master plan and its revisions were examined so as to create a basis for the field survey. In the field survey, the base map was updated according to the current town and photos of the site and buildings were taken systematically. Besides, in order to have detailed information about the archaeological sites, survey sheets were applied to the remains and their immediate surroundings. The physical,
visual and functional aspects are analyzed within this scope. The accessibility and physical relation of the site and its surroundings were the fundamentals of the physical integration assessment. Visual perception and visibility of the remains and the sites are inputs of the visual integration assessment. Besides, the current functions of the sites and buildings near the sites, user types and its density are essential for the functional integration aspects. The analysis of the archaeological remains and sites are done within the light of these aspects.

The evaluations of Side ancient town and analysis are defined by value assessment method. The values, problems and potentials are interpreted in both town scale and archaeological area scale within the help of information in analysis section. In this part it is easily seen that, the archaeological remains and historic buildings lost both their unity and meaning in urban context while in 1950’s the modest village buildings and remains lived together in balance with open and built up areas.

After the values, problems and potentials of the town are revealed the identity areas which indicate the multi-layeredness character of the town and their problems. In analysis section, all of the archaeological remains and their surroundings such as east gate, nymphaeum, and archbishop’s complex, state agora, theatre, agora bath, byzantine remains and their surroundings. However, only the identity areas which indicate the cultural significance and characteristics features of the town are presented in analysis, evaluation and integration part. In this regard, the great bath, harbor bath, temples region and their surrounding are defined as identity areas.

Within the light of analysis and evaluation step, it is decided that, some of the universal site conservation methods especially conservation master plans at 1/1000 scale may not help for the conservation and re-integration of remains in physical context. Because, preparation and application of conservation master plans in Side draw a general framework for conservation principles however, in implementation process, some architectural and urban design principles at more detailed scales should be proposed so as to be a model for integration. In this regard determination of identity
areas and considering all analysis and evaluations, a proposal is developed for re-integration. This project implicitly deal with the current status of the town and archaeological areas. It does not focus on the edifices and their structural and material problems. The proposal consider the main project areas and Selimiye village itself so as to be model for all of the others. As it is stated before, although all archaeological sites are analyzed in order to understand the physical context of them, the areas selected for project proposal are focused within the scope of thesis. On the other hand, this thesis covered just a preliminary discussion on the re-integration strategies and tools.

Accordingly, this thesis had contributions to the understanding of the urban form of Side and its change together with its causes through the historical development process. At that point, it has a specific contribution to the understanding of the gap between the 10\textsuperscript{th} century to the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century in the history of Side and to the re-formation of the Selimiye Village on ancient Side at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Another contribution of this thesis have been revealing the traces of the past in contemporary context by finding out different grids in the urban form, those of which should be considered by the archaeologists to better understand their meaning in history. The final contribution of the thesis have been the analysis and assessments of the values, potentials and problems of the fragments in relation to their historical and contemporary context in Side all of which lead to the development of principles and proposals for their re-integration with the contemporary context, specific for the case of Side.

In conclusion, although this thesis could just be an initial onset to establish a comprehensive methodology for the integration of fragmented archaeological remains and historic buildings, it revealed significant outputs and create a basis for the future studies on this issue as well as for the case of Side ancient town. However, it should be emphasized that this is an initial research and study for this proposal. This involves multifaceted complex aspects which have to be handled in a multi-disciplinary researches and further studies at different scales such as planning studies, conservation
studies and architectural projects are necessary to have a detail integration proposal. Besides, this project proposal may not be valid for all multi-layered towns. The methodology and stages can only be a model for the others because comprehensive analysis is necessary in order to produce a proposal for integration for all cities.
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APPENDIX A

DECISIONS OF REGIONAL CONSERVATION COUNCIL AND HIGH CONSERVATION COUNCIL RELATED TO SIDE AT THE SITE SCALE

Visuals are presented in the following pages.
Figure A. 1: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
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-Göyvaşkol Eski Köşeleri ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu'nun 9.10.1992 gün ve A. 1992 sayılı kararını ile uygulan Side Koruma ve Uygulama İlamın Planı Rezisyonunda Antık yapılının koruma alanı Trọng içinde kalmaları nedeniyle kamulaştırılarak kalınlığı koşul getirilen yapılara özdürlerini tamamlayacak kadar kamulaştırma ve yıkım işlemelerinin dönürlümesine, bu yapılara ait tëncer, yenilene ve büyük onaran yapılamayacağına, koruma alanlarında kalan boğ parselerde ise yeni yapılamaya gidilemeyeceğine, gerekli yolumu açılması için yapılacak karı çalışmalarını sırasında gerekli kamulaştırılarak işlemlerinin yapılabileceği,

-Side Koruma ve Uygulama İlamın Planı Rezisyonunda kamu yararları için sağlıklı ve uygulanoluk kamulaştırma ve yıkımların gerçekleştirilmesi

-Yukarıda değişilen hususların dışında Side Koruma ve Uygulama İlamın Planı Rezisyonu Plan Köşeleri çerçevesinde uygulamalarının gerçekleştirilmesine,

-Sız konusu plan rezisyonu sınırları dışında kalan nekropol alanını kapsayan Sıt alanlarının değerlendirme sonucunda değerlendirilebileceğine kadar verildi.

Antalya İli, Manavgat İlçesi, Selimiye (Antik Side) Küyü, Nekropol Alanında bulunan bütün parcelerin;

a) Maarafların sahiplerince kargılamış koyulu ile, parcelerin 100/100 oranında tamamında kapsayan alanlarda bilimsel kazı yapılmamasının, bu parcelerde restlamanın olan taşıın nitelikteki korunması gerekli kültür varlıklarının Side Müzesine nakledilmesine, taşınması nitelikteki korumaya gerekli kültür varlıklarında konunun Yüksek Kurul'a getirilmesine,

b) Kazı yapımaya izin verilmesine parcelerde ingaete izin verilmesine, kazı çalışmalari tamamlanıktan sonra, söz konusu alanın ilgili konuma amaçlı imar planı yapılıp uygulanmaya planlanı after geçilmesinin uygun olduğuna,

Figure A. 10: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu'nu n 13.3.1976 gün ve 8994 sayılı kararı ile belirlenen arkeolojik sit simirlerinin geçerli olduğuna,

Side Köyü yeni yerleşim alanında 31.IV.-A pastasındaki kilise- nin tesciline, kilise ve koruma alanı dğındaki alanların korunması gerekli tasarım kültür varlığı özelliğini taşımadığına, karar verildi.
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Antalya İli, Manavgat İlçesi, Selimiye (Antik Side) Kıyı Nekropol alanının mevcut yapılacak incelemeye sonucunda, suçların ve kesin koruma alanı sınırlarının tespit edilmesi, Side Nekropol alanı ile çevresindeki diğer kalıntıların işarenin alanları (Kıyı yeralması alanını hariç) Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Planlama ve Yatırımlar Dairesi Başkanlığının hazırlayan kuruluş amacı imar planının Kuru Lumpur getirilmesine, planın uygulanmaya konulmasından sonra yapılacak turistik tesirlerin temel hâriyatinin Müze elemanlarıyla denetiminde yapılabileceğine karar verildi.
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Başkan Prof. Dr. Taha ATALIK

Başkan Yardımcısı Prof. Dr. Hürriyet BARışTA

Üye Mithat ESER

Üye İbrahim SÜZEN

Üye Mersin Müzesi Müdürü

Üye İnanç Belediye Başkanı (BULANMAV)

Üye Prof. Dr. Gündüz ATALIK

Asistent

Antalya ilin, Manavgat ilçesi, Selimiye köy, Antik Side kökenine ilişkin, Antalya Koruma Kurulu'nun 28.1.1989 gün ve 314 sayılı karara ile önerilen ve Kültür ve Tatbikat Vakıflarını Koruma Yüksek Kurulunun 2.2.1990 gün ve 112 sayılı karara ile uyum bulunan arkeolojik sit alanı sınırlarının kararını eki 1/1000 ölçekli pastada belirlendiği şekilde 1. derece arkeolojik sit alanı olarak tescil edilmek üzere,

Antik Side köken Koruma Planına ilişkin yürütülükteki tüm kurul kararlarının geçerli olduğu,

Side Belediye Müdürlüğüne 27.6.1989 günü raporla belirilen 2863 ve 3136 sayılı yasalarla ve bugünkü kadar alınan Kurul kararlarına aykırı uygulamalar, Belediyesine ve Valilikçe derhal yiktırmalsına sağlanmasına, bu tarihden sonra yapılmalı çağık uygulamalarına da Belediye, Manavgat Belediyesi ve Antalya Koruma Kurulu hizmetlerinin onaylanması ve teşvik edilecek, yiktırmalısının sağlanmasına, sorumluluk hakkında yasal işlemler yapılmasına,

Bugünkü kadar alınan Kurul kararlarının Antik Side'nin korunmasına belik olması rağmen kararlar uygulanması nedeniyle çağık yapılmanın altıncısı ve Side'nin bugünkü olumsuz görünüşüne ulaşığı, bunun onlenmesi için kararların daha dikkate alınması gerektiği,
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Antalya ili, Manavgat ilçesi, Antik Side Nekropol alanında, Kurulnumun 12.12.1989 gün ve 567 sayılı kararı ile Antik Side’nin çok yoğun olan trafiğinin yönlendirilmesi için geçici olarak kabul edilen otopark kullanımlarına ilişkin vaziyet planına ayakta uygulan yapıldığını,

Sorgu yol üzerindeki 284 parasaldan kamu ve topрак alını nedeniyle antik yapılar ait duvarların tahrip edildiği, Sorgu yol üzerinde Kurulnumun izin alınmasını.Intervalotok alanın hizmetlerine ayakta uygulan yapıldığını,

Kurulnumun 12.12.1989 gün ve 567 sayılı kararı eki projede bulunmamasına rağmen Antalya Nimpheum’un önünde yol geçirilerek, yol üzerindeki çalı kemerleri ve sur duvarlarının tahrip edildiği,

Yapısalma olun otopark düzenlenmese ile büyük plais birbirine bağlanmak amacıyla yapımı Kurulnumun izin alınmasını yol açtığı, böylece yoğun kalıntıları bulunduğu ve bukinsa kadar kapatı yapılamaların gelmesi bu bölgesinde aynı sonuçla karşı karşıya biraktığı Kurulnumun yerinde tespit edilmiştir.

2863 ve 3386 sayılı yasalarla ve Kurul kararlarına temassen ayakta olan bu uygulamaların derhal durdurulacak, sorumlular hakkında Valiliğe

---
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Antalya ili, Manavgat ilçesi, Side antik Köruma İmar Planına ilişkin Antalya Köruma Kurulu'nun 11.5.1993 gün ve 1852 sayılı kararı okundu burada karar gereği hazırlanmış olan planın düzenlenmesi planının açıklamaları dilinde; Turizm Bakanlığı ile BG Boğaz Müdürlüğü Uzmanları tarafından açıklanmıştır. Diğer alanlarda ise, antik imkanların yalnızca bazıları olarak düzenlenmesini ve bu amaçla kullanılarak özel projeler planlanması ve plan olarak şekillendirilmesi, 36 ve 48 nolu yasal adımların öncülü bulunması, imar alanlarında her parselin planin içindeki çözümünün netleştirilmesi, bu düzenlemelerin etkili olabilecek alanlara getirilmiş bicimdeki 350 cm. taşıya yükseklik vermesini, bu görüşmelerin doğru şekilde alınması, Antalya Köruma Kurulu'nun 28.3.1990 gün ve 733 sayılı kararı ile I. Derece Arkeolojik Sat alanı olarak belirlenen Batı Nekropolün getirilen plan kararlarının I. Derece Sat Alanı kararları kapsamında değerlendirilmelere uygun bulunmadığı, bu görüşmelerin doğru şekilde alınması, antik imkanların tarafından açıklanmıştır, bu görüşmelerin doğru şekilde alınması, yinecen düzenlenmek planın Kürulumuza getirilmesine karar verildi.
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Yukarıda belirtilen başvurular ile 2811 sayılı kanunun 6. maddesi uyarınca, Side Antik Kenti 1. derece arkeolojik sit alanı içinde kalan Batı Nekropolünün yapılan emniyet ve sondaj kazalarını aşağıda görüldüğü verilirken, Yüksek Kurulda değerlendirilmesi sonucunda alınan 01.08.1986 gün ve 2549 sayılı kararla, Yüksek Kurulun 13.03.1986 gün ve 1984 sayılı kararla ile belirlenen 1. derece arkeolojik sit alanlarının genellikle olgusuna, sondaj kan gelişmesi tabanlarında mareasıdır emlak emlak (Batı Nekropolünün) "Korusu Anaşığı Kala Plani" yazılardan uygulanıyo planları sonuna geçiçlikinin uygulanması karar verilmiştir.


Sön Beldeyimizin yaratılan ve Antalya Kültür ve Tabiat Vakıfları Korusu Kurulları, Korusu Kurulunun 07.06.1995 gün ve 2584 sayılı kararlı ile uygun bulunmaktadır olup, beldeyimiz üzerinde Beldeyimizin gönderilen "Korusu Anaşığı Revizyon Kora Planı" de Beldeyimizin meclisinde uygun görülmüşdür.
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MUHALEFET ŞERHİ

Antalya Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Kurulu'nun 25.03.1998 gün ve 3771 sayılı kararına mühahifim. Şöyle ki:

Kurulu'nun Revize İmar Planı hakkındaki 7/6/1995 gün ve 2564 sayılı kararı Side Belediyesi'ne 23.06.1995 gün ve 1252 sayılı yazı yazısı ekinde gönderilmiştir.


Gördüğüm gibi, 3386 sayılı yasaya ile değişik 2863 sayılı yasamanın 17 nci maddesinde öngörülmüş bir ayıktı süre içerisinde revize İmar Planı hususunda karar atmak ve gereği yapılmak üzere hem Kuruluşuna hem de Kültür Bakanlığına gönderilmiştir.

Bu sahat sekizik Meclis kararımızda söz konusu revize Koruma Anaşılı İmar Planı neden ve de "sümdük" sayıldığa iki 10 yıldan bol mağdurlarını Plan başlandıktan ve Plan Hükümlülerindeki naklipler ve haritalarda gösterilmesi suretiyle açıklanmıştır.

21.07.1995 günü yazımın son bölümünde de:


Bu ve Meclis kararımızda açık-şekik yer alan yilleştirme ve düzeltmeler yapılmadığın "bu havaata bir ay içerisinde herhangi bir Meclis karari alınmadığından bahşele" Kuruluşunun 7.5.1995 gün ve 2564 sayılı karar ile onaylanan revizyon koruma İmar planının "zeminleştirmesi" karar verilmesine mühahifim. Karşınız.
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Side Belediye Bşk.
IMZA

ASLIGİBDİR.
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Antalya İl, Manavgat İlçesi, Side Beldesi 1. Derece Arkeolojik Sit Alanına yönelik hazırlanan ve Antalya Koruma Kurulu'nun 7.6.1995 gün ve 2564 sayılı kararıyla uygulan ve 15.3.1998 gün ve 3771 sayılı kararnınapatible olduğu belirtlen Koruma Amaçlı Rezerv'e imar planına ilgi̇n, Kültür ve Tabiat Vakfı'nnın Koruma Genel Müdürlüğünün 15.6.1999 gün ve B.16.0.KTV.06.05.00.2721/2860 sayılı yazısi, Antalya Koruma Kurulu Müdürlüğü uzmanlarının raporu okundu, dosyası incelendi, yapılan görüşmeler sonucunda;
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T.C. KÜLTÜR ve TURİZM BAKANLIĞI
KÜLTÜR VE TABIAT VARLIKLARINI KORUMA YÜKSEK KURULU

Toplanti No. ve Tarihi : 74 03.04.2007
Kanun No. ve Tarihi : 726 03.04.2007
Toplantı Yeri : ANKARA

KARAR

Side Belediyesince hazırlanan Side- Selimiye Köyü Doğu Nekropol Alanı Koruma Amacı İmam Planı Revizyonu ve buна dayanarak sit alanı derece değişikliği önerisinin Antalya Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Bölge Kurulunun 10.11.2006 tarih ve 1278 sayılı karar ile reddedilmesi üzerine Side Belediye Başkanlığında Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Yüksek Kuruluna yapılan itirazın değerlendirilmesi sonucunda;

Nekropol alanlarının, 2863 sayılı Kanunun 6 numaralı maddesinde korunması gereken kültür varlıklarından olması,

Yüzeydeki mevcut yapısı kalanları ile Side Antik Kenti bünyesinin bir parçası olduğu anlamda Doğu Nekropol alanında kanıt çalışanması veya kapsamlı bir arkeolojik belgelene yapılamaması olması,

Sit derece değişikliğinin talebinin bilimsel gerekliliklerine dayanılmasası, alanındaki mevcut izinsiz yapılmasına dayanılarak önerilmesi,

hasilatı göz önüne alındığında, Antalya Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Bölge Kuruluna alınan 10.11.2006 tarih ve 1278 sayılı kararın uygunduğu,

Doğu Nekropol alanında onaylı Koruma Amacı İmam Planında yer alan geçici otopark, izinsiz yapılan futbol sahası ve tribünleri ile arkeolojik sit alanı olumsuz etkileyen Fen İşleri yapılanın kaldırılmasının sit alanı doğru tasnifinın gerektirip gerektmediğiweisinesi

karar verildi.
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görüşmeler sonucunda;

Antalya ili, Manavgat İlçesi, Selimiye Köyü, Side Antik Kenti Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Antiklar Yüksek Kurulunun 13.03.1976 gün ve 8994 sayılı karar ile tescil edilerek nekropolü ve korunması gereklı arkeolojik alan için koruma alanının uygun bulunduğu, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Planlama ve Yatırımlar Dairesi Başkanlığına hazırlanan “Koruma İmzalı Uygulanma Planı” Yüksek Kurullu 09.10.1982 gün ve 3829 sayılı karar ile onanarak uygulanma konulduğu,

Antalya Koruma Kurulunun 28.03.1990 gün ve 733 sayılı karar ile de Side Antik Kenti 1. Derece Arkeolojik Sıt Alanı sınırlarını 3/1000 ölçekli parçasında gösterildiği şeklile son haliına aldıgı,


Antalya ili, Manavgat İlçesi, Side Beldesi, Side Antik Kenti 1. Derece Arkeolojik Sıt Alanında “Mevcut hâlî ile korunanak sit alanı” kararları getirilen Doğu ve Batı Nekropolünden yer alan bazı parcelerindeki insiziz uygulanmaların Side Müzesi Müdürlüğü uzmanlarına tespit edilerek Antalya Koruma Bölge Kurulu Müdürlüğü bildirildiği, Antalya Koruma Bölge Kurulu Müdürülüğünün 20.03.2008 gün ve 752 ve 03.04.2008 gün ve 941 sayılı yazılar ile insiziz uygulanmaların kaldırılmasında yönelik alamış kurul kararları doğrultusunda Side Antik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karar Tarihi ve No.</th>
<th>Toplantı Tarihi ve No.</th>
<th>Toplantı Yeri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.05.2008/68</td>
<td>01.05.2008/2332</td>
<td>ANTALYA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A. 42: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figure A. 43: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figure A. 44: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figure A. 45: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Antalya ili, Manavgat İlçesi, Side Beldesi, Side Antik Kenti 1.Derece Arkeolojik Sit Alanında bulunan ve Antalya Koma Kuruluşunun 25.3.1998 gün ve 3771 sayılı kararı ile onaylanmış Side Koma Amaçlı İmar Planında bir kısına "Rekreatif Amaçlı Ticari Kullanım" bir kısınına da "Araştırma ve Çevre Düzenlenmesi Yapılacak Alan" karar getirilen 303 parole verilen 28.02.2005 tarihli inşaat ruhsatı ve Antalya Koma Kuruluşunun 05.03.2004 tarih ve 6210 sayılı kararın nedeniyle Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı karşı açılan iptal davasının Antalya 1.Daire Mahkemesinin 06.03.2008 tarih ve E/2007/553,K.2008/467 sayılı karar ile Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı aleyhine sonuçlanması neticesinde Kuruluşunun 01.05.2008 tarih ve 2307 sayılı karar ile 303 parole ilişkin Antalya Koma Kuruluşunun 05.03.2004 tarih ve 6210 sayılı karar ile uygululan projenin iptal edildiğine,
Kültür Varlıklarını ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü'nden 23.11.2009 tarih ve B.16.0.KVM. 0.11.02.0007.11.13-223209 sayılı yazarı ve eki Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Hükuki Müşavirliğinin 03.11.2009 tarih ve B.16.0.KVM.0.030.641.02-2009-75/206488 sayılı yazarı eki 03.11.2009 tarih ve B.16.0. HKM.6.030.641.02-2009-75/206488 sayılı Makam Olur'u incelendiginde; Antalya Koruma Kurulu'nun 25.3.1998 gün ve 3771 sayılı kararı ile onaylanmış Side Koruma Amacılı Revize İmar Planı ve plan hükümleri doğrultusunda yürütülmediği halde söz konusu plan ve plan hükümlerinin dikkate alınmadığını;

Damsıyak onun karısı ve Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Makam Olur'unda Side Antik Kenti L Derece Arkeolojik Sit Alanındaki tüm uygulamaların Antalya Koruma Kurulu'nun 25.3.1998 gün ve 3771 sayılı kararı ile onaylanmış Side Koruma Amacılı Revize İmar Planı ve plan hükümleri doğrultusunda yürütülmediğini halde söz konusu plan ve plan hükümlerinin dikkate alınmadığını,

Damsıyak Onun Karısı nedeniley Side Antik Kentinin tescil ve planlamada süreci incelendiğinde;

Side Antik Kenti sınırlarının ilk olarak Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Antlar Yüksek Kurulu'nun 13.03.1976 gün ve 8994 sayılı kararı ile tescil edildiğinde, bu karara uyup arasında 'Eski Side Şehri Koruma Planı'ın ca kası sürede oluşturulmasını istendiğinde,


Koruma Yüksek Kurulu'nun 2.2.1990 tarih ve 112 sayılı kararı doğrultusunda Antalya Koruma Kurulu'nun 28.03.1990 tarih ve 733 sayılı karar ile de Side Antik Kenti L Derece Arkeolojik Sit alanları genişletilerek Antik Side Kenti Koruma İmar Planının ilişkin yürürlükleri tüm koral kararlarnın geçerli olduğu karar verildiği,

Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Antlar Yüksek Kurulu'nun 09.10.1982 gün ve A-3829 sayılı karari ile onaylanmış Koruma Amacılı İmar Planının Side kentiindeki yoğun gelişmeler nedeniyle revizyon çalışmalarının başlatıldığı, bu kapsamda Side Belediyesi Side Antik Kenti planlama çalışmalarının iliksin 'Koruma Planı Sırbılmıştır'ın bir örneği Antalya Koruma Kurulu Müdürlüğüne gönderilmesi, yapılan inceleme sonucu Antalya Koruma Kurulu Müdürlüğü'nce 29.05.1992 tarih ve 943 sayılı yazarı ile Kültür ve Tabiat Vakıfların Koruma Genel Müdürlüğü'nün bu alanın özel koruma nedeniyle planlanma alanı olarak belirlenen L Derece Arkeolojik Sit Alanından plan kararlarının 2863 sayılı yasa ve ilke kararları ile gelişmesi için nasıl bir kullanım kararı dizisi içinde planlanacağını açıklanmasının istendiğine,


Side Antik Kenti Koruma Amaçlı plan revizyonunun Antalya Koruma Kurulunun 07.06.1995 günü ve 2584 sayılı kararına uygun bulunduğuna, Antalya Koruma Kurulunun uygun bulunma planını Side Belediye Meclisince onaylanması sonrasi Belediyenin bu alanında "Turizm Amaçlı Koruma İmar Planı" yapınının için Bakanlığın yetki istemesi üzerine khẳngık Kültür Bakanlığı Hukuk Müşavirliğinin makam onaylı görüşlerini 14.01.1998 ve 287 sayılı yazarında: 2863 sayılı yasanın özel bir yasa olduğunu ve özel kalite uygunlanması gerektirmesi, o dönemde yürütülecektir yasanın 17. maddesi gereği, Koruma Kurullarına uygun bulunan değişiklik tekliflerini bu tehlilattan en geç bir ay içerisinde Belediye Meclisine karara bağlanması, karar alınmadığı takdirde Belediye meclisi koruma iliçma kalkışacaksa Koruma Kurullarına karara bağlanan hususlarda değişiklik teklifinin kesinleşmesine, belirtildiğini,

Hukuk Müşavirliğinin 28.03.1998 tarih ve 3771 sayılı karari ile Antalya Koruma Kurulunun 07.06.1995 günü ve 2584 sayılı kararına uygun bulunma 1/1000 ölçekli Koruma Amaçlı İmar Planı revizyonunun geçerli olduğunu karar verildiğini,


Figure A. 48: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figura A. 49: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figure A. 50: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Figure A. 51: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council


BAŞKAN
Prof. Dr. Ziya GENCEL
(BULUNMADI)

Üye
Prof. Dr. Nezvat ÇEVİK
İMZA

Üye
Prof. Dr. Hamit DEMIR
İMZA

Üye
Doc. Dr. H. Sabri ALANYALI
İMZA

Üye
Gülşen TAŞ
Side Bld. Ter.İMZA

Üye
Güner KOZDEREF
Side Müze Md.IMZA

BAŞKAN YARDIMCISI
H. Bilent BAYKAL
İMZA

Üye
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zekeriya ŞİMŞİR
İMZA

Üye

Üye

Figure A. 52: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
Kuraları’nın 26.12.2011 tarih ve 225 sayılı kararı ile belirlendiği gibi Side Köyçi mevkii’nde yer alan Apollon Tepeleri, Liman Hamami, Büyük Hamam gibi arkeolojik yapı kalıntıları çevresinde önkkı planlarda getirilen ve arkeolojik rezerv alanı nitelisi ile tayypan “Arastırma ve Çevre Dizenlerine Çalıştırmaları Yapılacak Alan” karar sınırlarının hazırlanılmakta olan Revize Koruma Amacı İmar Planında aynı şekilde korunmasının temel prensip olması; ancak, arkeolojik yapı kalınlığına ait mevzu ve olası arkeolojik izlerin Kazı Başkani için gurup gauge birlikte değerlendirilerek bu plan kararı sınırların revize koruma amaçlı imar planında geliştirelibileceğine,

Figure A. 53: The decisions of the High and Regional Conservation Council
APPENDIX B

THE RELATED LISTS TAKEN FROM SIDE MUNICIPALITY

Visuals are presented in following pages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra No</th>
<th>Evanter No</th>
<th>Adı</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antalya, Manavgat İlcesi, Selimiyede Köyü (Side) Birinci Derece Arkeolojik Sit Alanı ve Antik Limanı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Liman Hamamı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vespasianus Anıtı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Üç Havuzlu Çeşme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Büyük Bazilika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nekropol Alanı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Doğu Mavзолcem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Batı Mavзолcem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Athena ve Apollon Mabetleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Men Mabedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Büyük Hamam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Su Kemerleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tiyatro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M Binası (Devlet Agorasi, Külliye Anıtı)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hamam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Direkli Cadde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nimpheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Şehir Kapısı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kara Sirtarı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Doğu Kapısı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bizans Evleri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B. 1: The list showing the registered archaeological edifices
Ek2
Tescilli Sivil Mimarlık Örneği Yapılar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra No</th>
<th>Evvanter No</th>
<th>Adı</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>494-495-496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>503-504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B. 2: The list showing the registered buildings and lots
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>481-482-483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B. 3:** The list showing the registered archaeological edifices
### Ek3
#### Geleneksel Yapılar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sıra No</th>
<th>Adı</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure B. 4:** The list showing the “traditional buildings”
Figure B. 5: The list showing the “traditional buildings”
APPENDIX C

EXAMPLE OF A SURVEY SHEET

![Survey Sheet Table]

---

**Figure C. 1:** The survey sheet prepared for field survey