

LOCAL DYNAMICS IN THE PROCESS OF CONSERVATION AND  
RESTORATION PROJECTS IN KASTAMONU

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

AYSU KES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
URBAN POLICY PLANNING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

JANUARY 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Ass. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emre Madran (METU, ARCH) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu (METU, SOC) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceylan Tokluođlu (METU, SOC) \_\_\_\_\_

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last name :

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **LOCAL DYNAMICS IN THE PROCESS OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROJECTS IN KASTAMONU**

**Aysu Kes**

**M.Sc., Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments**

**Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu**

**January 2006, 102 pages**

The aim of this thesis is to understand the local participation dynamics in Turkey, especially in the cities with small populations. The conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu were chosen as the case in order to achieve this aim. These projects include the restoration and reuse of historical/traditional houses in Turkey. The research was focused on the stakeholders in relation to these projects in order to be able to examine the social processes with regard to the local participation in Kastamonu.

The major data collection method of this research was interviews with three groups of stakeholders. These stakeholders were the decision- makers, the owners of the houses, and the local people. For the research, 41 interviews were conducted in November 2004 in Kastamonu. The interviews included questions with regard to perceptions of the respondents about the issues of participation and decision-making dynamics, as well as the conception of sense of place, through the conservation and restoration processes. All these interviews were recorded and transcribed for discourse analysis.

There are three major findings of this thesis. Firstly, the stakeholders do not have a consistent perception of what participation is. This leads to the second finding that the level of interaction and the level of participation are low among the stakeholders. Thirdly, the conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu are

perceived as economic investments by the vast majority of people. The heritage and cultural value of the houses are less frequently referred to.

**Key Words:** Local participation, local decision- making, cultural heritage conservation, sense of place, historical towns, Kastamonu

## ÖZ

### KASTAMONU'DA KORUMA VE RESTORASYON PROJELERİ SÜRECİNİN YEREL DİNAMİKLERİ

**Aysu Kes**

**Master, Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler**

**Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu**

**Ocak 2006, 102 sayfa**

Bu tezin amacı, Türkiye’de, özellikle de düşük nüfuslu kentlerde yerel katılım dinamiklerini anlamaktır. Kastamonu’daki koruma ve restorasyon projeleri bu amaca ulaşmak için örnek olay olarak seçilmiştir. Bu projeler Kastamonu’daki geleneksel/tarihi konakların restorasyonunu ve yeniden kullanımını kapsamaktadır. Araştırma Kastamonu’daki yerel katılımın sosyal süreçlerini inceleyebilmek için projelere ilişkin paydaşlar üzerinde odaklanmıştır.

Bu araştırmanın başlıca veri toplama yöntemi üç paydaş grubuyla yapılan görüşmelerdir. Bu paydaşlar karar alıcılar, konakların sahipleri ve Kastamonu yerel halkıdır. Bu araştırma için, 2004 yılının kasım ayında Kastamonu’da 41 kişi ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Görüşmeler denekelerin katılım ve karar alma dinamikleri ile ilgili algılayışları ve de koruma ve restorasyon süreçleri üzerinden kent kimliğini kavrayışları ile ilgili sorular içermekteydi. Tüm görüşmeler kaydedildi ve çözümlenerek analiz edildi.

Bu tezin başlıca üç bulgusu vardır. Birinci olarak, paydaşlar arasında bir katılımın ne olduğuna dair ortak, tutarlı bir algılaşma yoktur. Bu da ikinci bulgu olan paydaşlar arasında etkileşim ve katılımın düşük olmasına yol açmaktadır. Üçüncü bulgu olarak ise, Kastamonu’daki koruma ve restorasyon projeleri çoğunluk tarafından ekonomik yatırım olarak algılanmaktadır. Kişiler projeleri desteklerken

konakların kültürel miras değerine ya da kent kimliğine daha az sıklıkla değinmektedirler .

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Yerel katılım, yerel karar alma mekanizması, kültürel mirasın korunması, kent kimliği, tarihi kentler, Kastamonu

To the memory of my grandparents Hikmet and Mehmet Kes who loved their house



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like first of all to express my highest appreciation to my family for their endless support throughout my studies and their faith in me.

This study could not have been realized without the guidance of Assoc. Prof. Sibel Kalaycıođlu who not only served as a supervisor but also encouraged and challenged me. Her effort and help are gratefully acknowledged.

I would like to thank Birsen and Halil İbrahim okgürses for their precious help during the field research in Kastamonu.

I wish to express my gratitude to R. Erdem Erkul for his moral support and help throughout past two years.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	xv

### CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THEORY.....	5
	2.1. Introduction.....	5
	2.2. Debate on Local Participation and Governance.....	6
	2.3. A Short Historical Overview of the Literature on Conservation.....	8
	2.3.1. The Motivation behind Conservation.....	12
	2.3.2. The Heritage Aspect of Conservation.....	13
	2.3.3. Genius Loci and Sense of Place.....	14
	2.4. International Documents on Conservation and Restoration.....	16
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	19
	3.1. Introduction.....	19
	3.2. Assumptions.....	20
	3.3. Hypothesis.....	20
	3.4. The Setting and the Research Sample.....	21
	3.5. Data Collection Method.....	23
	3.6. The decision- makers and NGOs.....	26
	3.7. The Owners of the Houses.....	26
	3.8. The Local Community.....	27
	3.9. The Legal Aspect of Conservation and Restoration in Turkey.....	27
IV.	THE CITY OF KASTAMONU.....	32
	4.1. The City of Kastamonu.....	32

4.2. The Historic Built Environment in Kastamonu.....	34
4.2.1. A Description of the Restored Houses in Kastamonu.....	37
V. THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF DECISION-MAKERS.....	40
5.1. The Initiation of Conservation and Restoration Projects in Kastamonu.....	40
5.2. The Selection of Houses.....	44
5.3. The Implementation.....	46
5.4. View of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu.....	48
5.5. View of Historical-Traditional Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci.....	50
5.6. Level of Interaction between Stakeholders.....	50
5.7. Conclusion.....	54
VI. THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE OWNERS OF THE HOUSES.....	56
6.1. The Selection of the Houses.....	56
6.2. The Implementation.....	57
6.3. Views of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu.....	58
6.4. Level of Information about the Projects.....	59
6.5. Views of Historic Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci in Kastamonu.....	61
6.6. Level of Interaction between Stakeholders.....	62
6.7. Conclusion.....	63
VII. THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.....	64
7.1. Initiation of the Conservation and Restoration Projects.....	64
7.2. Level of Information about the Projects.....	65
7.3. View of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu.....	68
7.4. Views of Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci.....	70
7.5. Who Decides?.....	70
7.6. Level of Information about the Activities of Governor and Municipality .....	72
7.7. Level of Information about the NGOs in Kastamonu.....	75
7.8. Information Channels that Local People Use.....	76
7.9. The Level of Interaction between Stakeholders.....	77
7.10. Conclusion .....	78

VIII. FINDING AND DISCUSSION.....	80
8.1. The Findings of the Research.....	80
8.2. Lessons and Recommendations.....	86
REFERENCES.....	88
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE DECISION- MAKERS...	91
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE OWNERS OF THE HOUSES.....	95
C. INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE LOCAL PEOPLE.....	97
D. PICTURES.....	99

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MVTASRM	Mimar Vedat Tek Anı, Sanat ve Restorasyon Merkezi Mimar Vedat Tek Memory, Art and Restoration Center
KATSO	Kastamonu Sanayi ve Ticaret Odası Kastamonu Chamber of Commerce
IOI	İl Özel İdaresi Special Provincial Administration
KKV	Kastamonu Kalkınma Vakfı Kastamonu Development Foundation
YSD	Yardımsevenler Derneği Benevolent Society
EO	Eczacılar Odası Chamber of Pharmacists
KEKYD	Kastamonu Evlerini Koruma ve Yaşatma Derneği Association for the Conservation and Sustenance of Kastamonu Houses
CHP	Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi Republican People's Party
CEKUL	Çevre ve Kültür Varlıklarını Koruma Vakfı Foundation for Protection and Promotion for the Environmental and Cultural Heritage

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents.....29

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

D.1. Overview of Kastamonu .....	100
D.2. Picture of Şekerciler House.....	101
D.3. Picture of The House of Liva Pasha.....	101
D.4. Picture of Toprakçılar House.....	102
D.5. Picture of Konyalı House.....	102
D.6. Picture of Eflanili House.....	103

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to understand the social dynamics and practices of local participation in cities with small populations of Turkey. In order to achieve this aim, the conservation and restoration projects which include the restoration and reuse of historic/traditional houses in Kastamonu were chosen as the case study through which the local participation practices were examined. In this respect, the research was designed to analyze the local participation process and the relevant practices, if any, in the case of Kastamonu, with its actors and stake-holders.

Kastamonu is one of the oldest settlements of Anatolia from the Byzantine Empire. It was an important town during the Ottoman Period.<sup>1</sup> It is also one of the provinces that were transferred to the Republican era from the Ottoman Empire. However, after the foundation of Turkish Republic, Kastamonu, which was never an economically significant province, was economically and socially declined. Today it is one of the provinces in Turkey with relatively higher rates of emigration. Therefore, it is in search of new economic investments for development.

According to Kuban (2001), Kastamonu can be considered as a typical Anatolian-Turkish city with its form of settlement (p.218). The city is located in the valley of Kastamonu Creek. The form of the city was not changed significantly for a long time, because of the economic backwardness of the city. However, after the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kuban(2001)



World War II, a relatively rapid change and restructuring was observed (Kuban, 2001:218). The old buildings and structures was destroyed and replaced with the new. However, Kastamonu could keep its historical structure to some extent with its typical Anatolian houses, some of which has the characteristics of Istanbul houses. These were houses of the notables of Kastamonu.

The historic properties within the urban areas and the way in which they should be approached have long been an issue for the cities. These issues have been handled from many perspectives such as urban planning, architecture, cultural heritage and urban identity. It is known that the human beings have always been interested in safeguarding the old by attributing various meanings to it. These meanings were/are sometimes rooted in religious traits, sometimes in tradition and sometimes in identity formation. On the other hand, the type and the extent of the physical intervention to the historic properties and the way in which they will be utilized constituted another aspect of the issue of conservation. Today, the scholars and practitioners of conservation mostly agree on the idea that the conservation must be area based, rather than based on individual properties and the reuse must be adaptive.<sup>2</sup>

The concern for the conservation of historic fabric of urban areas in Turkey dates back to 1960s. However the restoration activities aiming at bringing these historic structures into the economy and social life of the cities is relatively a recent issue for Turkey. The conservation and restoration projects undertaken in Safranbolu are one of the major examples of this trend. Safranbolu was promoted with its traditional Turkish houses and it was inscribed into the World Heritage List in 1994 as the second town after the historic parts of Istanbul into the list.<sup>3</sup> Its popularity as a pioneering movement attracted some attention to the other provincial towns and centers with historic-traditional buildings. Amasya was one of these province centers, which has been through a restoration a process as well.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Larkham(1996) and Kupke (1997)

<sup>3</sup> See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

The conservation and restoration activities in Kastamonu started in 1997 with the initiative of the Governor of the time, Enis Yeter<sup>4</sup>. This was the first significant movement towards the conservation of the historic fabric of Kastamonu. The Governor and the Special Provincial Administration (İl Özel İdaresi) established an office for the conservation and restoration projects called Mimar Vedat Tek Memory, Art and Restoration Center (MVTASRM). This center carries out whole projects from initiation to the reuse activities.

The urban context has gained a new importance in recent decades due to the changes in the government approach and the effect of globalization. With the decline of the nation state, the cities are now significant units of administration as well as politics. The economics and the social complexity of the “urban” paved the way for the local politics. The city is now the new unit of policy planning and decision-making. As Davoudi argues (cited in Healey, Cameron et al., 1995) the concept of governance emerged in response to these developments as a process which is identified with the participation and contribution of multiple actors. The process of governance involves this multi-actor approach in various local issues from service provision to local decision- making. The major principle of governance is handling local issues and processes considering their complexity and conflicts<sup>5</sup>.

Given the fact that conservation and restoration of historic properties is a “local” issue by its very nature (even though they have national and global aspects, as well); they can also be considered as a subject matter of governance. The historic properties are important elements of urban sphere with their existence and the consequences of any intervention and even the lack of such a concern. Therefore, the conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu were chosen as the case to study the local participation processes. The way in which these projects as an issue which supposedly has various social and economic aspects, were undertaken at the local level can reveal the decision- making practices in a city with small population. It should also be noted that this study examines the general picture shortly after the

---

<sup>4</sup> Former Governor of Kastamonu between 1997-2003.

<sup>5</sup> See Kearns and Paddison (2000)

end of Enis Yeter's Governorship. Therefore, the study is expected to cover this time period.

This study is composed of eight chapters. First chapter is the introduction. In the second chapter the theoretical framework of the study is outlined. The aim of the research, the methodology of the study and the details of data collection procedure were explained in the third chapter. Chapter four informs us about Kastamonu with its socio- economic characteristics and history. The historic properties and their significance for the city are also discussed in this chapter. The fifth, sixth and seventh chapters are organized around the multiactor approach which will be explained in detail, later. In these chapters the data is analyzed and the findings are grouped according to the actors involved in the research. The last chapter includes the conclusion of the thesis.

## **CHAPTER-2**

### **THEORY**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

The city or the urban context has always been a significant socio-economic and political space throughout the history. Especially, the local governments and their role within the nation states were a major area of study. However, the city as a political unit or playground was and is still being transformed with the challenges of globalization and the transformations that the nation states have been through. Therefore, the urban politics gained a new importance and became a specific area of study. Urban politics now is especially significant for the study of the theory and practice of the government and specifically that of governance.

According to many scholars such as, Roger Keil (1998), globalization plays an important role in different aspects in the formation of cities as governmental spaces, unlike in the nation states. The city is no more a sub-unit or a submissive part of the wider governmental body. It became a political and economic entity itself, rather than a branch of central government.

According to Kearns and Paddison (2000), the role of economic globalization among globalizations in other fields, is also significant for understanding the tendency towards urban governance. They state that;

We can identify several ways in which the urban context has changed to challenge urban management and has helped to give rise to urban governance. The most momentous shift has been towards economic globalization involving mobile capital investments, the emergence of world-wide economic sectors, international and the emergence of global spectacle. (Kearn and Paddison, 2000: 845)

The impact of economic globalization on the urban governmental dynamics is discussed in terms of several aspects. For example, a competition between cities to attract investments or other economic resources and activities emerged. This includes not only business and commodity production. Tourism is one of these. Many cities compete to attract more tourists by referring to the cultural, historical or other assets. In terms of investment attraction, and entrepreneurial activities, cities are “decoupling” themselves from the central governments. This is in part due to the weakening of nation states and in part resulting from the emergence of localities as economic units with the global flow of money and other resources. Mayer (in Healey, Cameron et al., 1995) argues that this shift can be regarded as a transition to “entrepreneurial city” which goes together with the restructuring of provision of social consumption (p. 232). All these developments occurring within the urban context adds up to a new type of city as a socio- economic and political entity.

As a result of these transformations both in the world economy and the politics, the city now took on a new position in terms of development and government. The ways in which the cities are administered and the political and administrative activities are regulated became important. This situation paved the way for the local governance and participation which is the most frequently discussed approach for government of the city.

## **2.2. Debate on Local Participation and Governance**

The most obvious practices of local governance are in the field of service provision. As a consequence of “decentralization” of the state, some services that have been provided by the central government began to be undertaken by the local state. However, this type of a functional proliferation is not enough to define the theory and/ or the practice of governance. There are two main reasons for this.

Firstly, the existence of local state agencies and the municipalities whose finances and other recourses are provided by the central government or the national state does not correspond to a “locality” in terms of decision- making whatsoever. Secondly, the governance by definition has to have a multi- actor aspect. As Mayer (cited in Healey, Cameron et al., 1995) states both in local economic processes and provision of service, the local state now involves new and non- governmental actors. The public and private sectors as well as the local civil society must take part in the processes. As Davoudi discusses;

Now, the term “governance” directs attention to the proliferation of service delivery mechanisms and regulatory systems which exist to devise and implement policies. It expresses the shift from provision by formal government structures to the contemporary fragmentation of agencies, and of responsibilities between public, private, voluntary and household spheres. The delivery structure of the Universalist hierarchical welfare state. The result has been an increasing fragmentation of agency responsibility within the urban arena (Stoker 1998/91). City governments are no longer the key locus for integration of urban relationships but merely one of many actors competing for access to resources and control of agendas. (Davoudi in Healey, Cameron et al., 1995: 226)

The weakening of the regulations embedded in the welfare state or the Fordist regulations failed to respond to the needs and demands of the new urban context. Davoudi (1995) mentioned that the state’s role in the welfare state shifted by the crises in the Fordist regulations and its failure in meeting various needs, in terms of both economic production and socio- economic needs. This shift also grew out of the crisis in urban government. We can identify this as a shift from urban government to urban governance.

In today’s world the cities are the socio- political units in which one can encounter many conflicts and multiplicities. This complexity of the urban spheres requires more responsiveness than centralized decision- making mechanisms can handle. In this situation, the urban arena becomes a new political arena. Therefore, local governance mechanisms emerge as a solution. Also, given the social and economic complexity and structure of contradictions in the urban scale calls for some political and administrative approaches like participation, multi- actor involvement in decision- making and shared responsibility. These approaches are

combined under the name of local governance. Kearns and Paddison (2000) state that;

Governance is about the capacity to get things done in the face of complexity, conflict and social change: organizations, notably but not only urban governments, empower themselves by blending their resources, skills and purposes with others. The capacity to get things done no longer lies (if it ever did) with government power and authority in one place. (p. 847)

Kearns and Paddison also mentions Stoker's (1995, 1996) viewpoint that "governance" refers to governing with permeable boundaries between organizations in the public and private sectors.

According to Şengül (2001: 53), governance is a process rather than an administrative structure. He claims that "*with the shift from local government to local governance, the local consumption of what is provided by the government was replaced by the local production*". The process of the production of services and the decision- making together with the production of local/urban policy takes place at the local level within the process of local governance. In that manner, the decision-making process taking place at the local level is an important variable to understand the transition.

### **2.3. A Short Historical Overview of the Literature on Conservation**

Saving the cultural property and /or the historic urban fabric has been a social, political and planning concern for a long period of time and still continues to be a significant issue for cities. The debate on the extent and the contents of intervention for safeguarding these artifacts of built environment constitutes to be the heart of the subject. What is understood from safeguarding and if intervention is necessary for this purpose, what will be the contents and the level of this intervention? What will be the priority? Should it be only physical or go beyond the appearance? And if there will be any intervention, who will carry it out? What will follow the intervention? These questions and various answers emerged in response to them altered the overall approach to the issue in the past. This is still the case to some extent. According to Erder (1999), the type of the cultural properties and the

approach towards their conservation is effected by the social structure, artistic and aesthetic trends of the era.

It is known that people always have had interests in the old throughout the history. Many scholars share the idea that the motivations for this interest has shifted in time. According to Delafons (1997) in the seventieth century, an antiquarian interest was significant. He also argues the unwillingness of the governments, specifically the British governments in terms of getting involved with such movements. Therefore, the roots of preservation and conservation in general, lie in the civil society and mainly the upper- class. Delafons (1997) also argues that the legislative action towards the protection and preservation of historic fabric started very late in 1800s, following the civil interest in the issue. In the course of nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the issue of safeguarding the historic or old fabric, especially in urban areas was transformed. The need to rebuild and the tendency to save the old have caused tension. Delafons stated that on that matter.

What began as an antiquarian and scholarly pursuit, and became an elitist causes, has developed into a populist movement. As attitudes changed, so did government policy such developments in policy usually reflect wider social or cultural influences. They do not originate solely within government. Now some questions are being asked about the scope and purpose of conservation and its demand on resources. The conflict between the desire to preserve and the need to change generates tensions. (Delafons; 1997:1)

Larkham (1996) also mentions such a tension in the form of a conflict between land and property exploitation as opposed to consideration of art, aesthetic and historical appreciation. He also notes the several aspects of conservation, which can be considered as the reasons for conservation. According to Larkham, psychology is an important factor in determining people's attitude towards the urban cultural property as well as the didactic role of the cultural memory carried by those artifacts. Fashion also effects the way in which people approach the properties. For example, many firms from various sectors move their offices to historic buildings for prestige. Erder (1999) also mentions that people need the attachment and continuity with regard to the past to feel secure.



When we look at the recent history of the subject matter, we see that the issue of saving the cultural properties shifted to a focus on the scale of the interventions, as well as the scope if it. There are some shared arguments on that matter. As Erder (1999) mentioned, in the second half of the twentieth century, the cultural property was begun to be considered as groups of man-made elements that create environment. According to Tiesdell, Oc and Heath (1998), in 1970s historic preservation policy aimed at the protection of individual buildings, structures and other artifacts, in terms of the scale. However, with the pressure of rapid change in urban forms and the social, cultural and physical effects of it, preservation started to get insignificant and problematic. Therefore, area-based approach to “preservation” merged with the title of “conservation”. *The preservation of individual buildings and spaces was regarded as a necessary but not a sufficient condition of conservation. The concept of preservation and conservation also broadened from a special reaction in exceptional cases to an integral part of urban planning (1998:4).* According to Barthel (1996), this movement was a response to industrialization, in relation to its social dislocations and discontents.

Larkham (1996), on the other hand, argues the shift in scale as a broadening of scope. According to him, the preservation constituted an indispensable part of conservation. In that manner, conservation is accepted as a more comprehensive endeavor than the preservation with its concern for the re-use and / or adaptation.

Fitch (1990) also resorts to scope and scale as the two parameters in order to classify the interventions. According to him, the scale of preservation can range from a town to a room in a museum. He adds that the most of the intervention takes place in the scale of historic districts. Mostly these are the historic cores of modern cities and are not economically significant for the urban life anymore. He also distinguishes the conservation from preservation according to the level of intervention.

As understood from the works of various scholars, the differentiation between the concepts of preservation and conservation is not clear. However both

of them are rooted in the concern for saving the historic elements of built environment. In different contexts and in accordance with the aim of the intervention, one can use one or the other term. Therefore, the motive for the intervention is crucial. For example, the cultural and historical identity concerns leads the intervention to a rather preservationist scope, whereas economic motives are likely to broaden the intervention towards conservation. Because the cultural or “heritage” preservation mainly aims at the saving the building as it is, as opposed to conservation which considers the continuing livelihood and the future function of the property.

Valerie Kupke (1997) argues that conservation has a socio- cultural aspect to it. She argues that the objectives of conservation and preservation are different in that manner. Besides the issue of scale and scope, she adds that the townscape is another factor in the definition of conservation.

Townscape seeks to conserve urban environments that bear testimony to the previous lifestyles, building forms and customs of the not so rich and famous- the workers, shopkeepers, trades people and ordinary families that established the character, landscape and history of our early urban areas. (Kupke, 1997: 73)

She also refers to the definition of Australian Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance, the Burra Charter;

Conservation is all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance which include maintenance and may according to circumstances include preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation. (in Kupke, 1997: 73)

In the light of the discussions on the differentiation between the terms conservation and preservation, conservation seems to be more suited for the practices in the case of Kastamonu. Despite the fact that there is intervention in the historic built environment in the building scale, the significance of the reuse aspect carries the practice into the level of conservation rather than preservation. Moreover, the major motive behind the reuse appears to be economic. On the other hand, the Turkish terminology on that subject is not clearly formed yet. Therefore,

the differentiation and/ or the continuity between the conservation related concepts are lacking in the Turkish cases. This and other details of the intervention in the case of historic houses in Kastamonu will be discussed later. The terms conservation and preservation are used together to imply both the physical intervention and the general scope of the projects.

### **2.3.1. The Motivation behind Conservation**

As mentioned before, many factors triggered the attempts towards saving and reconsidering the cultural property, especially in the urban context. Other than the urbanization and growth pressures, some social and cultural factors also altered the approach to the cultural property and provided motivations for saving them.

Tiesdell, Oc and Heath (1998) quotes Rypkema (1992) telling that the “value” of historic properties contains the social value, the cultural value, aesthetic value, urban context value, architectural value, historical value and the value of sense of place. These are considered as the principal justifications for the historic preservation. The aesthetic value grows out of either scarcity or mere beauty of the building and the architectural value refers to the diversity that the building adds to the aesthetic value. In turn, the architectural value contributes to the environmental diversity which also plays an important role in the formation of sense of place. However, they also note that the economic and commercial justifications are also specifically very important for the historic preservation. The economic rationality of the physical intervention is indispensable.

These justifications except for the economic justification are related to each other to some extent. The social and cultural value is significant in relation to the historic value which can also be discussed as heritage. According to Tiesdell, Oc and Heath (1998), the continuity of cultural memory is important in terms of the justification and broadening of the preservation of cultural property. The heritage and the conservation of it as a tangible element of history are also significant in terms of the continuity of a particular local identity. This argument emerged as a response to the concern of universality embedded in modernist urban planning and

urban growth. The shift from modernity to post modernity enhances local identities via local histories in opposition to anonymity of global modern cities. Robert Mugerauer (in ed. Nezar AlSayyad, 2001) also mentions the factors emerging from modernity that are leading to the rise of preservation:

Today environmental designers are well aware of the problem: it is that Modernist environments- because of forms, materials, and modes of construction- by their very success in deploying and symbolizing the international homogeneity of modernized development, tend to displace and ignore local identities and senses of place. This occurs de facto through the character of internationalized technologies. Thus, Euclidean-Cartesian buildings communicate with other elements of the Euclidean- Cartesian environment (infrastructure, transportation systems, etc.) and with internal heating, ventilation and air- conditioning (HVAC) systems that turn their backs to both on bioclimatic conditions outside buildings and on traditional cultural responses to the natural environment embodied in local building traditions. In other words, the modernized technological environment is simultaneously imperialistic (on behalf, variously, of technological modernism, capitalism, or democracy), and oblivious of local identities and places. (2001: 95)

According to Kupke (1997), a “conservator society” has emerged since 1970s due to the exhibition of a growing interest in the past. The family histories, historic events and historic tourist destinations began to attract more and more attention. She also adds that this interest also transformed the conservation policies from an elitist activity to a process which includes the knowledge and the experiences of local people and responds to their views (1997:74).

### **2.3.2. The Heritage Aspect of Conservation**

Here, the definition of heritage becomes an important factor, because today most of the conservation projects resort to that concept in order to legitimize the intervention. Especially the historic sites which are engaged in tourism claim heritage value. However, the definition of heritage and the conservation in the name of heritage preservation are still open to discussion at theoretical level.

Peter Larkham (1996) argues that heritage and conservation are actually quite separate concepts; however they are used together recently. He defines the

term heritage as a matter of consumption which is based on historic and spatial elements. The heritage for him can be considered as the historical processes through mythology, ideology, nationalism, local pride, romantic ideas or just plain marketing. He adds that the heritage was used as a cause for conservation in a controversial way. Because the conservation requires a selection process with reference to what is considered as heritage. At this point, heritage becomes a political issue, in addition to being a physical concern. According to Johnson and Thomas (in Harvey, 2001) the definition of heritage is about the link that is made between anything and the past, no matter weak or false.

Nelson H. H. Graburn (in ed. Nezar AlSayyad, 2001), the concept of heritage requires a sense of ownership and has to be studied in terms of inter- generational cultural continuity. He states:

Indeed, the concept of the “built environment” itself, whether structures or lands, can be examined and elaborated: from a cultural constructivist point of view all environments are “built” in the sense that their perceived forms and, of course, their meanings are constructed entirely by the culturally productive activities of the local people. (Graburn, in ed. Nezar AlSayyad, 2001: 69)

### **2.3.3. Genius Loci and Sense of Place**

Genius loci and the sense/spirit of place is an important concept for the social aspect of conservation and preservation. As argued by Gunila Jivén and Peter Larkham (2003) the concept of genius loci is complex since it has many aspects such as psychology, perception of place and the physical symbols. However, we can use the terms sense of place and the genius loci almost interchangeable, because both can be considered to refer to the collectivity of many factors that shape people’s perceptions and feelings with regard to a place. In other words, we can define genius loci as the character of a place that provides a feeling of attachment to the people who live in it.

The spirit and / or the sense of a place are one of the most significant motives and legitimizing factors of the conservation. The historic value and the cultural

significance become visual by the artifacts that are considered heritage. The collectivity of these elements forms a sense of place which is commonly termed as *genius loci*. Therefore, the continuity of this sense of place is important for the local community. As Tiesdell, Oc and Heath (1998) states:

The spirit of place – the *genius loci*- is an historic urban quarter's most important aesthetic attribute. This should be maintained. The continuity and development of the quarter's *genius loci* is therefore one of the most important design considerations in an historic urban quarter. The maintenance of the visual identity and continuity of an historic quarter's physical character is critically dependent on the preservation and, where necessary, the rehabilitation of the quarter's historic fabric wherever possible. (Tiesdell, Oc and Heath, 1998: 167)

As mentioned earlier, the selection of conservation and preservation sites and the particular buildings to be saved is an important point in the process. The sense of place and the physical elements that make up that "sense" and "meaning" and give the place its distinct "character" are also significant factors in that manner, as well. The conservation and preservation projects and the intervention undertaken in the name of them claim the safeguarding of the sense of place. This claim works for the public support in many cases. The people who live in a particular place tend to believe that when the physical elements of the past are saved and conserved, the spirit of that place will also be saved.

According to Kupke (1997), the conservation concept is related to maintaining some continuity with the past. The rapid and significant changes in the cities mentioned before, evoke a need for a sense of place, familiarity and identity. In turn, this need calls for conservation and the interventions it requires. She puts that;

There is a growing awareness that an architecturally unimposing row of terrace houses or a neglected church hall may represent depth of life and validation of the past for the local and the wider urban community. Buildings and streets of dubious architectural merit are still important as they may hold an area together by providing a continuum between the past, present and future. (Kupke, 1997: 74)

Therefore, the conservation and preservation practices are important processes for the formation and maintenance of the sense of place or in other word the genius loci.

#### **2.4. International Documents on Conservation and Restoration**

The conservation and restoration issues have been within the agenda of international community and organizations, such as UNESCO. These issues were handled in many international meetings of different kinds with their various aspects and after these meetings many documents in different formats were produced. The most important role of these documents was the fact that they were accepted and signed by many states. Therefore, they influenced the practices in many countries; however the level of adaptation may vary. Some of the most important documents are the Venice Charter (1964), the Declaration of Amsterdam (1975), and the Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (Nairobi, 1976). These documents outline the principles and recommend actions with regard to the cultural property. This way, they intend to put international standards to the issues about historical built environment. This intension is clearly stated in the Venice Charter which suggests that the international principles must be applied by all countries within their own frameworks.

The aim of conservation and restoration is put very clearly in the Venice Charter in Article 3 as “*The intention in conserving and restoring monuments is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence*”. In the same manner, the Declaration of Amsterdam emphasizes the importance of architectural heritage by the statement “*Apart from its priceless cultural value, Europe’s architectural heritage gives to her peoples the consciousness of their common history and common future. Its preservation is, therefore, a matter of vital importance.*” The Declaration also claims that the conservation must be considered as a major objective of town and country planning.

The international documents also make some definitions and give specific guidelines for the conservation and restoration practices. For example, the

Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas defines the “safeguarding” as “*shall be taken to mean the identification, protection, conservation, restoration, renovation, maintenance and revitalization of historic or traditional areas and their environment.*” In the Article 7 of the Venice Charter, it is put that “*a monument is inseparable from the history to which it bears witness and from the setting in which it occurs.*” In the Article 8 of the same charter, it is stated that “*items of sculpture, painting or decoration which form an integral part of a monument may only be removed from it if it is the sole means of ensuring their preservation.*”

The Declaration of Amsterdam and the Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas include many principles and statements with regard to the social processes that are involved in the conservation and restoration practices. The statement “*Local authorities, which whom most of the important planning decisions rest, have a special responsibility for the protection of the architectural heritage and should assist one another by the exchange of ideas and information*” in the Declaration of Amsterdam emphasizes the role of local authorities in these processes. In the same manner the Recommendation claims that the immovable situation of the historic areas “*entails responsibilities for every citizen and lays on public authorities obligations which they alone are capable of fulfilling.*”

One of the most significant aspects of these documents is the fact that they emphasize the importance of citizen participation and public opinion for the processes of conservation and restoration. The Declaration of Amsterdam says that “*The architectural heritage will survive only if it is appreciated by the public and in particular by the younger generation. Educational programmes for all ages should, therefore, give increased attention to this subject.*” Another consideration of the same document is as follows; “*Encouragement should be given to independent organizations- international, national and local- which help to awake public interest.*” Declaration of Amsterdam also includes very important statements with regard to the participation one of which is;



Local authorities should improve their techniques of consultation for ascertaining the opinions of interested parties on conservation plans and should take these opinions into account from the earliest stages of planning. As part of their efforts to inform the public the decisions of local authorities should be taken in the public eye, using a clear and universally understood language, so that the local inhabitants may learn, discuss and assess the grounds for them. Meeting places should be provided, in order to enable members of the public to consult together.

In this respect, methods such as public meetings, exhibitions, opinion polls, the use of mass media and all other appropriate methods should become common practice.

In the same line, the Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas also emphasize the role of public and necessity of participation. It says that *“there should be an authority responsible for ensuring the permanent co-ordination of all those concerned, e.g. national, regional and local public services or groups of individuals.”* The document also gives a specific role to the authority for facilitating the participation by recommending that *“the authorities should take the lead in sounding the opinions and organizing the participation of the public concerned.”*

All these statements, principles and suggestions included in the international documents which provide a conceptual framework to the conservation and restoration practices outline the desired attitude towards historic- cultural properties.

## **CHAPTER-3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

The aim of this thesis is to understand the social dynamics and practices of local participation in small towns of Turkey. In order to achieve this aim, the conservation projects which include the restoration and reuse of historic/traditional houses in Kastamonu were chosen as the case study. In this respect, the research was designed to analyze the local governance process and the relevant practices, if any, in the case of Kastamonu, with its actors and stake-holders.

This research was conducted in Kastamonu for various reasons. First of all, Kastamonu is one of the major towns which experienced significant physical intervention in terms of conservation. It can be argued to be in similar positions with other towns such as Safranbolu and Beypazarı, which are relatively known better. Safranbolu and Beypazarı are also known by their historic houses which are restored and reused for mostly tourist functions. However, Kastamonu has a distinctive feature within these examples. Kastamonu is the only town which has the status of being a province center among similar towns in the region. In spite of its significance in that manner, the conservation process and its social- political aspects were not studied before. Therefore, Kastamonu is worth attention.

Other than the significance of Kastamonu as a town going through conservation projects, the existing social network of the researcher was also an important factor for conducting this research in Kastamonu. Especially the access to the key figures to be included in the research sample was considered vital for the success of the research, because the field research was the most important part of this research. The implications of conducting research in a familiar environment will be discussed later.

### **3.2. Assumptions:**

1. The research will be undertaken in Kastamonu
2. It is possible to study the local participation through the conservation and restoration projects.
3. The research on this issue will be qualitative.
4. The research will be based on multiactor approach.

### **3.3. Hypothesis:**

1. Looking to other examples from Turkey, it can be expected that there will be low participation and interaction among stakeholders.
2. The level of information about the conservation and restoration projects will be low among the local people of Kastamonu.
3. Because Kastamonu is a city with small population and face to face and informal relations are strong, the sense of identity will be high, especially reflecting through the historical/traditional houses. Hence, an awareness of cultural heritage is expected to exist among the local people.

4. It is expected that in such a small population with little possibility of industrial investment, the concern for the conservation and reuse of historic buildings should be more economic oriented rather than emphasizing the cultural, artistic and antiquarian value.

5. All people are expected to feel a pride and prestige from the existence of the historical/traditional houses, so the local people will be supportive of conservation.

6. It is expected that the projects will become popular, even though they were started as an elitist endeavor.

7. Conservation and restoration practices are expected to be based on sustainability principles.

8. The conservation and restoration practices are expected to be adapting to the internationally accepted conservation and restoration principles.

9. The economic aspect of conservation is an important input in getting people to participate in the conservation and restoration projects.

### **3.4. The Setting and the Research Sample**

The study of participation as a subject matter of this thesis involves an analysis of approaches of various actors and stakeholders to this issue; it also requires an understanding of contextual processes related to participation. Hence the interactions and relations of stakeholders and their attitudes are important elements in this research. With this regard, I decided to employ a qualitative approach for this study. Miller and Glassner mention the qualitative interviewing in that manner. They state that:

Those of us who aim to understand and document others' understanding choose qualitative interviewing because it provides us with a means for exploring the points of view of our research subjects, while

granting these points of view the culturally honored status of reality. (Miller, J and Glassner, B., in Silverman, 1998)

Given the nature of the subject matter, understanding the governance requires the examination of more than one group. The case itself involves some major actors, because the projects for the conservation process of the cultural heritage in Kastamonu is not organized by one institution. This situation calls for a multi-actor approach. In this context, I decided to design my research on the basis of the three main groups of actors, in other words, the main stake-holders. These three stake-holders are the decision-makers, the owners of the houses and the local community in Kastamonu.

As mentioned before, to understand and examine the attitudes and perceptions of the people is very important for this study. Hence, I decided to conduct interviews with the respondents.

In this research, I employed different sampling methods considering the different natures of the three groups. Firstly, I used purposive sampling for the decision-makers group, because the respondents in this group are highly informative about the conservation projects in Kastamonu. According to Neuman (1994) purposive sampling is suitable for such situations. On the other hand, the conservation projects in Kastamonu are known to be initiated and carried out by members of different sectors, namely the local government and some local agencies of central government as well as some non-governmental organizations. Therefore, I included people that are involved or likely to have been involved in these projects, in order to be able to get first hand information about the case. In addition, the size of the sample was also affected by the sampling method. I intended to reach persons from as many institutions as possible, considering the possibility of obtaining valuable and relevant information. In this respect, I interviewed 18 persons in the decision-makers and NGOs group.

Given the fact that all the respondents in that group were working actively, I had to conduct the interviews in their offices. In addition to that, considering the lengthiness of the interviews, I made appointments with the respondents in the group

of decision- makers. However, due to some factors such as the persons' daily routines and working environments I had to reschedule the appointments. Sometimes, it took days to be able to get an appointment. Also some interviews were interrupted by outside factors such as unexpected visitors. In these situations, the respondent tended to cut the interview short, but I convinced them to continue for a while, or make another appointment.

For the group of house owners, I started by using my existing network and then utilized snowball method. I reached to two persons one of whom sold her house for restoration and the other one paid for some repairs in the house. These two respondents directed me to other persons who are in similar situations with regard to the restoration and conservation processes. By using this sampling method, I also had an opportunity to observe the existence of a social network between these house owners. This way, I interviewed a sum of 6 house owners, out of about 25 restored houses. Among these 6 interviews, only one of them took place in the house that the respondent owned. Also, I had a chance to visit two of the other restored houses.

Lastly, as for the local community, I employed accidental sampling, because the main purpose of conducting interviews with local people was to understand the viewpoint of the people that are not directly involved but effected by the conservation process as the people living in the same environment physically and socially. However, because they are the people who are living in Kastamonu, I considered them as the eye witnesses of the conservation projects and the outcomes of it, if any. This group of respondents consisted of 17 people.

### **3.5. Data Collection Method**

The main data collection methods used in this research were interviews, literature review and observation. However, among these, the most important technique was the interviewing, because people's experiences and the processes that they witnessed revealed the vast majority of the information with respect to the case.

As mentioned before, three groups of actors were included in this research. Given their different natures and the nature of the case of conservation projects itself, three separate sets of questions were utilized. These interview forms included open-ended questions, some of them specific to each group and some of them are common to all three. The purpose was to find out and understand the practice within its social context with reference to answers which the respondents gave. In addition, the perspectives and the way in which the people who are involved perceived the process were also important for this research. Due to the major problem of the research, the interview questions were in line with some themes, such as governance and participation and in relation to the conservation.

The respondents most willing to be interviewed were the owners of the historic houses. They did not hesitate to answer any of the questions. During the interviews, most of them reflected their pride with regard to their houses and they were enthusiastic to talk about the significance and the restoration of their houses.

During the interviews with the decision-makers, some respondents from the public sector were concerned about the interviews being tape recorded. Therefore, I had to convince them that no one but me would listen to the interviews and I would not disclose their names. Only one of the respondents rejected the tape recorder, so I conducted interview by taking notes. On the other hand, some local persons were also hesitant to answer my questions. In such cases, I did not insist and moved to another person.

The analysis of the data gathered through interviewing was analyzed using basic qualitative data analysis techniques. All the interviews, except for the one interview which was not allowed to be taped by the respondent, were taped. These taped records were transcribed. After the transcription, I studied the drafts in terms of the themes involved in the interviews and I grouped the discourses and the words of the respondents on the basis of these themes. For example, all the answers about the issue of reuse of the houses were considered as one theme and grouped under the same title. This way, I could understand whether some common tendencies and/or

conflicting opinions exist related to a specific issue. The themes that the interviews were analyzed accordingly were as follows.

- 1- The initiation of conservation and restoration projects.
- 2- The selection of houses
- 3- The implementation
- 4- View of cultural heritage in Kastamonu
- 5- View of historical-traditional houses as symbols of genius loci
- 6- Level of interaction between stakeholders
- 7- Level of information about the projects
- 8- Who decides?
- 9- Level of information about the activities of governor and municipality
- 10- Level of information about the level of NGOs in Kastamonu
- 11- Information channels that local people use

It is important to note that, all of these themes were not relevant for each one of the stakeholders. For example, the level of information about the projects is not a question for the decision- makers. However, many of these themes cover all three groups. On the other hand, these themes correspond to the hypothesis of the thesis, as well as the major arguments in the literature.

The literature review provided me with the theoretical background regarding the conservation philosophy and the concepts of governance as well as the basic concepts with regard to the conservation and restoration processes. The debates from the literature are integrated into the research, starting from the formation of open-ended questions to the discussion of the results.

During the field research, I had the opportunity to make observations about the whole process of conservation projects in Kastamonu. In addition to the interviews, I witnessed the work of people who are involved in the projects. For example, I observed the working environment in the MVTASRM and the functions that are carried out in some of the houses which are restored. I visited some of the restored buildings in Kastamonu some of which belonged to the respondents.



### **3.6. The decision- makers and NGOs**

The decision makers and the representatives of some NGOs constitute the first group of actors. The respondents in this group range from the mayor to the members of local charity organizations. On the other hand, the vocational organizations such as chambers form an important part of this group, considering their effectiveness in the social and economic life of community. Although, the primary aims and /or duties of these institutions and the persons are various, most of them are involved in the conservation with different roles. The aim of the interviews was to understand whether this role taking existed and if so, to what extent. Also the interviews aimed to find out the dynamics which determined the inclusion and exclusion from the process of conservation. In that respect, some probable stake holders were included in the sample purposefully, such as the chamber of architects and the local development agency.

Due to the sampling approach, the gender distribution was ignored for this group. Among the group of decision- makers and NGO representatives, 14 respondents were male and four of them were female. The other socio-demographic indicators showed that 13 of the respondents had university degrees and three had high school degrees. One respondent had a two- year vocational school degree and one respondent's educational status is unknown. Also eight of them were self- employed within the group. Others were employed in public sector and one was retired.

### **3.7. The owners of the houses**

The second main group of respondents is made up of the owners of the restored houses. The most of these respondents are the ones who already sold their houses for restoration. In this context, the house owners are the directly effected group from the conservation project. Therefore, the information they provide is first hand and refers to a different aspect of the case, compared to the decision- makers.

The socio- demographic profile of the house owners shows that the ages of the respondents range from 51 to 72. This age profile made it possible for me to learn more about the history of the houses with reference to the people's own experiences. The three of the total six respondents in this group were female, and three were male. This distribution was not intended but coincidental, because the sampling was made by snowball method, as I mentioned before. The education and occupation data for house owners were disperse, given the size of the group.

### **3.8. The Local Community**

The local community is considered as a key actor in any case regarding governance, due to the very essence of the subject matter. In case of conservation projects in Kastamonu, the daily lives of local people are most likely to be effected, because the conserved houses are located in different parts of the town. Plus, the reuse functions that are given to these houses may effect the social and economic life of them.

As mentioned before, the sample from the local community consisted of 17 people. Eight of the respondents were male and nine were female in this group. The ages of the respondents ranged from 20 to 70. While they had different educational backgrounds, all were educated at some level. The respondents' occupations and jobs were also various. For example, three of the women that I interviewed were unemployed housewives. On the other hand, most of the respondents (13 persons) were either self- employed or had jobs in private sector.

### **3.9. The Legal Aspect of Conservation and Restoration in Turkey**

The regulations and laws with regard to the conservation of cultural heritage in Turkey can be dated back into the last century of the Ottoman Empire. According to Madran and Özgönül (2002), the very first regulations were made in 1869. However, the first detailed document took effect in 1906. The regulations made by this document remained as the only document until 1973. Recently, various legal regulations were made in the conservation and restoration regulations, especially

with the law numbered 5226. These new laws and regulations emphasized the locality of the conservation issue and the importance of its public acceptance (Madran and Özgönül, 2002)

According to Law 2863 Article 10, the municipalities can establish Conservation, Implementation and Monitoring offices. Also the Law 5197 assigns responsibilities to the Special Provincial Administrations with regard to culture and tourism. The Law 2863 also paves the way for opening project offices for conservation and restoration purposes.

**Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents**

	Name	Age	Sex	Education	Occupation
Local People					
	Mustafa	23	Male	University	Self-employed
	Nurten	20	Female	In Distant Education	Shop-keeper
	Ali	70	Male	Primary School	Retired worker- taxi driver
	Ayşe	46	Female	High School	Housewife
	Hasan	34	Male	High School	Waiter
	Fatma	27	Female	High School	Secretary
	Hüseyin	27	Male	Middle School	Worker
	Hatice	50	Female	University	Teacher
		68	Male	Primary School	Transporter
	Perihan	32	Female	High School	Housewife
	Halil	34	Male	University	Self-employed
	Birsen	23	Female	University	Manager
	Serpil	37	Female	Vocational School	Housewife
	Cemile	38	Female	Vocational School	Teacher
	Ashlı	45	Female	High School	Clerk
	Ercan	27	Male	High School	Worker
	Süleyman	29	Male	High School	Self-employed
Decision-makers					
		35	Male	University	Architect- The Head of Restoration MVTASRM
		45	Male	High School	Secretary General of KATSO
		54	Male	University	Local Director of Cultural Affairs
		40	Male	University	Deputy

					Governor
		34	Male	University	Civil engineer of IOI
		61	Male	High School	Chair of KKV
			Male	University	Retired Director of Development in the Municipality
		56	Female	Vocational School	Chair of YSD
		49	Male	High School	Chair of KESOB
		35	Female	University	Board member of EO
			Male	University	Founding member of former KEKYD
		49	Male	University	Mayor
			Female	University	Director of Development in Municipality
		37	Female	University	Architect-Local Representative of CEKUL
		52	Male	University	Deputy Director of Settlement
			Male		Owner of Local Newspaper
		47	Male	University	Provincial Chair of CHP
		37	Male	University	Chair of Chamber of Doctors
Owners of The Houses					
		72	Female	Vocational School	Tourism Manager
		52	Male	High School	Self-employed
		64	Male	Middle	Self-

				School	employed
		63	Female	Vocational School	Retired Teacher
		51	Female	High School	Retired bank clerk
		54	Male	University	Self- employed

All names of local people are pseudo names.

## CHAPTER-4

### THE CITY OF KASTAMONU

In the administrative structure of Turkey, the main administrative unit is the province (il). A province is composed of the province center (merkez ilçe) and the provincial towns (ilçe). The numbers of these provincial towns change from one province to another. In addition, the province and its provincial center carry the same name. In this study, “Kastamonu” refers to the provincial center because the subject matter of the thesis, namely the conservation and restoration projects take place in the provincial center. The provincial center of Kastamonu is also mentioned as the city of Kastamonu at times.

On the other hand, the city of Kastamonu is considered as a city with a small population. This is due to the fact that the city of Kastamonu has a small population as compared to metropolitan cities with large populations such as Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir.

#### 4.1. The City of Kastamonu

Kastamonu has long been a significant settlement. The Turks first settled in the region in the Seljuk Empire period. Later Kastamonu became one of the first Turkish provinces in Anatolia. Seljuk Empire formed a system of “Uç”<sup>6</sup> for defending the Empire against the Byzantine Empire. Kastamonu was a very

---

<sup>6</sup> Uc: Edge/ boarder cities as military centers in Seljuk Empire

significant military and administrative center in this respect (Turan R., 2000). Therefore, it has been a province ever since.

In the ottoman period, Kastamonu was an important center of trade, industry and culture until the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century. However, it started to decline due to the economic and the political changes in the Empire. Kastamonu was inherited by the Turkish Republic as a relatively poor province which is economically dependent on agricultural production.

Today, Kastamonu is one of the relatively less developed cities of Turkey. Its population is decreasing due to migration towards more developed cities such as Istanbul and Ankara. According to the Cencus 2000, the population of Province of Kastamonu is 375.476 with a 46.35% of urbanization. The urbanization rate of the province is slightly below the regional average (49.03%) and well below the national average (64.90%). The indicators provided by State Planning Organization show that 71.14% of the employed population is employed in the agricultural sector, which brings Kastamonu up to 13<sup>th</sup> place among the 81 provinces of Turkey. The education figures indicate that 80.80% of the population is literate. When we look at the indicators of industry, we see that Kastamonu is 51<sup>st</sup> province in Turkey in terms of organized industry. In addition there are 1086 small industry workplaces which put Kastamonu to 29<sup>th</sup> rank. These numbers show that Kastamonu is one of the less developed provinces of Turkey in terms of industry. The economy is still dependent on the agricultural production. This is also evident by the indicators of infrastructure because they show that the percentage of the population to which enough drinking water is provided is 79.49. This number is below the regional and national averages. When the socio-economic indicators are examined as a whole, Kastamonu is in the 51<sup>st</sup> place in terms of development among the 81 provinces of Turkey, according to the State Planning Organization<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.dpt.org.tr>



## 4.2. The Historic Built Environment in Kastamonu

The valley of Kastamonu Creek is the major factor in shaping the physical structure of the city. Therefore, the significant elements of the built environment are found in the valley and they fit the slope of the hillside (Eyüpgiller, 1999:30). They are usually double or three- storied. The extensions of the houses are the most common architectural features of the houses in Kastamonu. They are found on almost all sides of the houses. According to Eyüpgiller (1999), these extensions are the results of the combination of the idea of privacy and overcoming the constraints of the topography of the land. The base floor is closed to the neighborhood, whereas the upper floors are open to the landscape and daylight. The windows of the upper floors are larger than the ones in the base floor. The ornaments and the decorations are usually based on woodwork, especially on the ceilings (Eyüpgiller, 1999: 387).

Today, the local heritage of the town is mostly consisting of the historical houses and administrative buildings. These houses were mostly built in the Ottoman period. Because of the status of Kastamonu as a regional administrative center, most of the houses were built as the residences of local elites and administrators. Therefore, the local houses are different in terms of architecture. For example, they are bigger and their details and ornaments are significant. The interview forms included questions about ways how the respondents perceived this local heritage. In some cases, people mentioned the architectural and distinctive qualities of the historic built environment while answering other questions. In this respect, some respondents mentioned these aspects of the Kastamonu houses and other elements of the built environment. Chairman of Kastamonu Development Foundation (Kastamonu Kalkınma Vakfı- KKV) stated,

Now, we call our houses as “pasha houses” and “sir houses”. For example, Safranbolu houses are simple and dull compared to our architecture of houses.

Şimdi bizdeki konaklar efendi ve paşa konakları olarak tabir edebiliriz. Mesela bir Safranbolu bizim konak mimarimize göre daha basittir, daha kabadır.

In the same manner, Ms. Nuray from CEKUL and a member of Chamber of Architects told about the historic significance of Kastamonu;

It has the quality of being a city of 500 years. And it is a city with identity. In the Historic Cities project, Safranbolu is included, Amasra is included and Istanbul may be included but, the quality of Kastamonu is that it has a form with its squares, civil buildings, inns, baths and mosques, which deserves to be a town. Even though the population is small; it is a city that reached today with its identity. This attracted my attention in the first place. From Candaroğulları Lordship, we see the Seljuk architecture, Ottoman architecture and especially the architectural features of the republican era, together.

500 yıllık bir il bir kent olma özelliği taşıyor. Ve kimliği olan bir şehir. Tarihi kent projesinde de Safranbolu var Amasya var, İstanbul var belki ama Kastamonu'daki özellik meydanları, sivil binaları, hanları, hamamları, camileriyle hakikaten bir il olmayı hak eden şekli var. Nüfusu az olsa da tarihten bugüne gelen bir kimliğiyle gelmiş bir şehir. Öncelikle o dikkatimi çekti. Candaroğulları'ndan bu yana Selçuklu mimarisi, Osmanlı mimarisinin özellikle de cumhuriyet döneminin mimari özelliklerinin hepsini bir arada görüyoruz.

On the other hand, the owners of the houses involved in the projects consider the significance of their houses. Many of them mentioned the historical and architectural distinctions of their houses. For example, Mr. Coşkun mentioned the ornaments outside their house, which is called “Liva Paşa Konağı”, because was built as the residence of a local administrative in the Ottoman period. *“There were aslanlı yağmur olukları and a rotating closet in the house for haremlik and selamlık”.* The main door also had lion motifs. Mrs. Güliz specifically talked about the interior of the Konyalı house; *“There was a big bath in the basement and all the ceilings were covered with cavitations”.*

The interviews with the owners of the restored houses revealed that the houses had specific meanings for each family as heritage. Other than the esthetical qualities that the owners mentioned, the family history added value to these houses. All the house owners mentioned this aspect. Mrs. Sabiha told that they decided to renew their houses only because it was a family heritage. *“Our only concern was to hold the family house together.”* Mr. Coşkun also mentioned that they lived in the Liva Pasha Konağı all his life. *“The history of our house was almost 100 years. My sister is 75 years old. We all were born and lived here.”*

Traditionally, all the old houses in Kastamonu are known and recorded by the names and/or nicknames of the families that own them. In some cases, the oldest buildings are named after the first owners as in the example of Liva Pasha Konađı. Therefore, the names of the houses are valuable for those families and form an important part of the family heritage. The owners of the houses stated that they were proud because their family names were “conserved” as well. Mrs. Gülten said that they were very happy because their houses were named after their family as “Toprakçılar Houses”. Mrs. Güliz also emphasized that, a room in the house were saved as the Konyalı family room, with her grandmother’s properties in it. Mr. Eflanlı mentioned that their house which is known as “*Eflanili Konađı*” was at least 100 years old but his family bought it in 1950s. While he was talking about the history of their house, he mentioned some historically significant visitors, such as Celal Bayar.

Such memories that people have in the family history which are attached to the environment play an important role in the value attribution. People consider these events as a part of the family heritage and want to transmit that heritage to the next generations. Since they relate such incidences to the built environment, they form a motivation for conserving the building. The physical restoration of the house gives a sense of restoring all the meanings attributed and the memories to the owner of the house. With the influence of this viewpoint, the owners of the houses legitimize the restoration process for themselves.

Another issue with regard to the local heritage in Kastamonu is the impact of planning practices of 70s, when there was no concern for conservation. As implied by some respondents who are relatively old aged, Kastamonu had been through a physical restructuring or re generation in the past. Today, with the affect of conservation and preservation activities for the old houses, people reconsider this experience and criticize it. Mr. Hüseyin who worked in the municipality at that time tells that;

In 1970, I was appointed as director of development. There was not a conservation plan in those years. Conservation plan was made in 1984. Of course, meanwhile, all these piles of concrete. Actually Kastamonu was

very beautiful. Safranbolu was nothing compared to Kastamonu. But we could not protect it. People liked concrete buildings. Very beautiful houses were torn down. Very beautiful buildings were torn down. Piles of concrete took their place.

1970 yılında fen işleri imar müdürü olarak göreve geldim. O yıllarda koruma imar planı yoktu. Koruma imar planı 1984 de yapıldı. Tabi o arada, bu gördüğünüz beton yığınları. Aslında Kastamonu çok güzeldi. Bir Safranbolu falan Kastamonu yanında esamesi bile okunmazdı. Ama tabi biz koruyamadık. Millet betonarmeye heveslendi. Çok güzel konaklar yıkıldı, çok güzel binalar yıkıldı. Yerine beton yığınları doldu.

We made big mistakes at that time. These streets were pavement. We ripped them out and laid down concrete cobblestone pavement. I mean, we made mistakes as the municipality. Those rough cobble stone pavements should have been saved. Safranbolu made a mistake, too. But the people are come and go insisting that they want cobblestone pavement. Now, we regret 30 years later.

Biz tabi büyük hatalar yaptık zamanında. O sokaklar Arnavut kaldırımıydı. Biz onları söktük yerine beton dediğimiz beton parkeleri döşedik. Yani bizim belediye olarak da hatalarımız var. Bu Arnavut kaldırımları duracaktı, Safranbolu’da büyük hata yaptı. O da beton parke döşemiş. O Arnavut kaldırımlar hepsi duracaktı. Ama vatandaş geliyor gidiyor ille beton parke isteriz düzgün olsun. Eve rahat gidiyim diye. hep söktük attık. Şu anda kafamıza vuruyoruz yani aradan 30 sene geçince.

#### **4.2.1. A Description of the Restored Houses in Kastamonu**

Besides the heritage values attributed to the historic built environment in Kastamonu, each house has a story of its own. As mentioned before, each respondent in the group of the owners of the house mentioned the significance of their houses, but additionally each building has a “biography”. In the interviews, the respondents in the group of owners of the houses were asked to tell the “history” of their houses, especially the age and the former owners of the houses as well as people’s personal experiences. The following statements are from their responses.

##### **The İzbeli House**

The house was build for the farm bailiff of the İzbeli Farm which was fully destroyed by a fire and not existing today. The house is approximately 200 years old. The farm was given to the İzbeli family by Mehmet the Third about 350 years ago.

#### The Şekerciler House

The age of the house is not known by the current owner but the house is still called after the Şekerci Hoca who had the house built. He was one of the imams of a major local mosque. The father of the owner today bought the house from the first owner at least 50 years ago.

#### The House of Liva Pasha

The house is called after the local military authority who had the house built. The house of Liva Pasha is more than 100 years old but the certain age is not known. The latest owner of the house before it was expropriated told that his family owned the house for more than 80 years.

#### The Toprakçılar Houses

The House was built as two parts about 120 years ago. One part was used as coffee house and “han”, which functioned like a hotel. When the house was purchased by Toprakçılar family, the second part of the house was not completely built. The latest owner of the house who sold the building for restoration stated that she herself lived in the house for about 35 years.

#### The Konyalı House

The house was built around 1933 by the grandfather of the latest owner, who was known as Konyalı Abdullah Efendi. The house was to replace an older one.

#### The Eflanili House

The age of the house was indicated to be about 110 years. The house was bought by the family in 1950s. The latest owner of the house before it was restored told that he lived there for almost all his life.

This information about the houses reveals that all the houses had some historic value in terms of their age and the purposes that they were built for in the time period that they were build. Even tough they were family houses; they had some unique features of their own other than the family legacies. On the other hand,

the statements of the respondents reveal the fact that all of them lived in the houses for some time.

## **CHAPTER-5**

### **THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF DECISION-MAKERS**

The decision- makers is the primary group in terms of obtaining first- hand information about the actual processes. Therefore, the key persons in the key positions were tried to be included in the group. Therefore, the respondents in this group have a different position than the other actors. The interviews with the decision- makers involve the explanations and the experiences with regard to the actual practices with regard to the conservation and restoration projects, in addition to the attitudes and views. Therefore, the information they share is specifically important for understanding what has been going on in Kastamonu.

#### **5.1. The Initiation of Conservation and Restoration Projects in Kastamonu**

The initiation of the projects for conservation of historic houses in Kastamonu and the introduction of the idea to the local community together with the other stakeholders has various dynamics. It is known that the first conservation projects started in the last quarter of 1997, by the initiative of the governor, Enis Yeter. However, the local and national attention was attracted to the historic houses in Kastamonu earlier. This first incident was rooted in civil society, unlike the second movement initiated by the governor.

The interviews with the decision- makers and the representatives of some NGOs revealed the process towards the initiation of the conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu. According to the experiences shared by Mr. Atıf and Mr. Hüseyin, in 1995 a local civil organization was initiated for the conservation of the Kastamonu houses. Mr. Atıf tells the process that he was involved from the very beginning;

We founded an association called Association for Conserving the Kastamonu Houses with a couple of friends. Totally spontaneous. I even announced it by an ad in the newspaper. Anyone who is willing to volunteer to meet at that time in that place. We met in the municipality. 15- 16 people attended. We found it with them.

Kastamonu Evlerini Koruma Derneği diye bir dernek kurduk bir grup arkadaşla, tamamen spontane, İlan ettim hatta gazetede dedim böyle bir dernek kurmak istiyoruz. Arzu eden gönüllü olan şu saatte şurada toplansın. (Belediyede) toplandık. 15-16 kişi katıldı. Onlarla kurduk.

According to Mr. Hüseyin, in 1995 this organization started working with nine or ten people. This organization communicated with Foundation for Protection and Promotion for the Environmental and Cultural Heritage (CEKUL). This national NGO visited Kastamonu with a group of representatives from different institutions and professors from related departments of universities. The aim was to attract the attention to the heritage potential in Kastamonu.

The organization could not function well, so it was closed off after a while. Mr. Hüseyin stated that the problem was mostly financial. *“Because everything is based on finances, the association couldn’t be active and closed due to economic problems”*. On the other hand, Mr. Atıf mentioned the negative attitude of the mayor of the day. *“The mayor did not pay attention, even sabotaged...”*

The interviews with the decision- makers, representatives of NGOs and vocational organizations revealed that this civil movement aiming at the preservation of historic houses in Kastamonu remained pretty much remote, even isolated. The interviews with the other decision- makers, who did not take part in this movement, showed that they were not even aware of this initiative. This is also the case with the other stake- holders.



Ms. Nuray was also one of the members of Association for the Conservation and Sustenance of Kastamonu Houses (Kastamonu Evlerini Koruma ve Yaşatma Derneği-KASEYAD). She points out the mayoral contribution to the idea and practice of preservation in Kastamonu; *“The mayor and the governor and a few architects, we started the KASEYAD... It did not last long...”* She also mentions the first restoration project; *“The municipality gave the first try, they restored the former municipality building and named it as Ottoman Palace. It set an example, people liked it.”*

During the interviews, I realized that most of the respondents identified the initiation of conservation of historic houses in Kastamonu with the activities of the governorship. Mr. Ahmet who is the head of MVTASRM mentioned the beginning of the projects as follows; *“...Our governor opened up the restoration center five years ago... as the infrastructure, because he saw the potential in Kastamonu.”* Mr. Hüseyin, who also participated in the first movement as well as the recent projects, acknowledges that the conservation as an activity started by the initiative of the governorship, but also mentions the first initiative;

Now, in Kastamonu, there is a thing for the restoration of houses started with Enis Yeter. And since we love our governor, we are not feeling indisposed, we are even pleased. But that is not the truth. First attempt to houses begins with the Association for the Conservation and Sustenance of Kastamonu Houses, founded by the mayor Süleyman Yücel and Mr. Atif Uğurlu in 1995. KASEYAD. At that time we were in the formation of this association. Nine or ten volunteers from Kastamonu founded that association. Because he was the governor, he had the facilities and financial resources of the state. He forced the conditions as far as he could within limits of his authority. He brought the foundations and associations in to this job. He created resources. And the project of Kastamonu houses was finally realized.

Şimdi Kastamonu’da herkes Kastamonu konaklarının restorasyon işinin vali Enis Yeter’den sonra yapıldığı gibi bir şey oluştu. Ha biz de valimizi çok sevdiğimiz için bundan rahatsız olmuyoruz hatta memnun oluyoruz. Fakat doğrusu bu değil. Kastamonu konaklarına ilk sahip çıkılma olayı 1995 yılında dönemin belediye başkanı Süleyman Yücel, Atif Uğurlu başkanlığında onların önderliğinde oluşturulan Kastamonu evleri yaşatma derneği ile başlar. KASEYAD. O zaman da bizler de bu derneğin oluşumunda vardık. Kastamonu’dan yaklaşık 9–10 kişilik bir gönüllü grubu bu derneği kurmuştu. Vali olması sebebiyle elinde devlet imkânları olduğundan bu projeyi sahiplendi ve kendi yetkisi çerçevesinde

zorlayabildiği kadar sınırları zorladı kaynak tarattı, vakıfları dernekleri devreye soktu. Özel idare kaynaklarını devreye soktu. Ve Kastamonu konakları projesi nihayet hayata geçti.

Even tough the first movement of preserving the historic houses in Kastamonu was a civil initiative; it was not known to or recognized by other civil organizations or local NGOs. When they were asked to tell about the history of conservation of historic houses in Kastamonu, almost none of them mentioned KASEYAD. For example, Mr. Zühtü (Local Director of Cultural Affairs) stated that the conservation projects emerged as the projects of governorship. Mr. Eşref Can also indicated that the governor's initiative was the first. Similarly, Ms. Zuhâl... who is in an executive position in the chamber of pharmacists told that the former governor triggered the restorations. Also Mr. Melih who owns a local newspaper pointed to the role of the governor; *“the beginning was with the emergence of the governor as the civilian authority...”*

The chairman of Kastamonu Developmant Foundation (KKV) explained the process by reference to early individual cases.

There were a couple of examples before. For example, a person I know near by Hz. Pir, contracted loan. He also had some money of his own. He set the building afoot. Now, with Enis Bey's coming to Kastamonu, within his area of interest, the one he was most interested was the houses. (At that time, they were against the projects) We gossiped like this won't work out either, the money is being spoiled, to tell the truth.

Daha önceden bir iki örneği vardı. Mesela şahıs benim tanığım bir kişi bu Hz. Pir tarafında, kredi aldı. Biraz da kendi parası vardı. Binayı ayağa kaldırdı... Şimdi içinde de kendisi oturuyor. Şimdi Enis beyin Kastamonu'ya gelmesiyle ilgi alanı içerisinde en çok üzerinde durduğu bu konaklar oldu. Ve o zaman çok kişi de ya bundan da bir şey olmaz, para boşuna gidiyor falan gibi dedikoduları da yaptık yani. İşin gerçeği.

On the other hand, Mrs. Seher who is the head of development department in the municipality of Kastamonu talked about two kinds of restoration projects; the ones that were carried out by the governorship and the individual restorations sponsored by the owners.

All the statements above show that the restorations and conservations are recognized and carried out as the projects of the governor, and also the Special Provincial Administration (İl Özel İdaresi- İÖİ) to some extent. Some respondents mentioned individual initiatives, but they seem to be detached incidences. Therefore, we can argue that the hypothesis that the interaction and participation among stakeholders will be low is verified. On the other hand, the earlier civil movement was recognized only by those who were involved, and no physical enterprise took place within this movement. It is understood that it was the actual practice of conservation what made the idea of it obvious to people of Kastamonu. The statements of the respondents from the group of local community, which will be discussed later also, support this conclusion.

## **5.2. The Selection of Houses**

As discussed by many scholars, conservation projects towards the protection of cultural and historical heritage always had to face the difficulty of priorities about which artifacts should be selected. In a historic town or quarter, many artifacts may coexist. These artifacts can be in different forms such as houses, castles, religious buildings etc. Other than the form, they can be differentiated by the age that they belong to. Therefore, they can be products of different communities and cultures. In such cases, the conservation of the artifacts has to be selective due to practical and financial reasons as well as the planning concerns and political preferences. Also the aim that is put for the conservation is important for the selection. Therefore, the criteria for the selection are an important issue of discussion.

In the case of Kastamonu, the selection of the houses to be restored is also an issue. In Kastamonu there are 534 listed buildings. However, the budget and the other resources such as personnel are not enough to handle the restoration of all these listed buildings at once. Therefore, a process of selection and prioritizing was necessary. Mr. Hüseyin who works as a civil engineer in the Special Provincial Administration and in the conservation projects explained the selection process.

When we decided on this project, with Enis Bey's request we identified all the houses in Kastamonu. One by one. A very serious archive was made. Each has a very good file with the ownership status, photographs and the financial possibilities of the owners. From among these, the ones with special qualities were distinguished. We decided which house to buy according to this. We did not buy any random house. We were determining these houses, distinguishing the ones with some quality and among these we determined the ones which are easier to restore. We also determined the ones with less damage and in better condition. From these, we were identifying the houses whose owners would or would not sell, by consulting the families. After that, by talking to the ones who intend to sell one- to- one and the governor did this himself.

Biz bu projeye karar verdiğimiz zaman Enis beyin talimatıyla biz Kastamonu genelindeki bütün konakları tespit ettik. Tek tek. Ve ciddi bir arşiv oluştu. Mülkiyetleriyle, fotoğraflarıyla sahiplerinin maddi olanakları. İyi birer dosyası vardır hepsinin. Bunların içersinden özelliği olanlar bir kere ayrıldı. Satın alacağımız konaklara buna göre karar verdik. Herhangi rasgele özelliği olmayan konağı almadık. Şimdi bu konakları tespit ediyorduk, özelliği olanları ayırıyorduk onların içersinden, restorasyonunu daha kolay yapabileceklerimizi de ayırıyorduk. Az hasarlı daha iyi durumda bakımlı binaları da ayırıyorduk. Bunların içinden ailelerle görüşerek kim satar kim satmaz bunu da tespit ediyorduk. Ondan sonra satma niyeti olanlarla birebir görüşerek ki bunu da bizzat kendisi yapıyordu sayın valim.

The statements of the decision- makers that are involved in the restoration and conservation projects reveal that the selection process for the historic houses in Kastamonu was rather pragmatic. As mentioned before, due to the scarcity of the resources, the decision- makers opted to start with the less expensive and less laborious restoration projects.

When the respondents in the same group, but not directly taking part in the projects were asked to explain the selection process for the houses to be restored, they tended to repeat or rephrase the initiation process of the projects. Many of the respondents did not give a specific explanation for this question. This situation also showed the ambiguity of the selection procedure, even the lack of it. This finding is in line with the hypothesis that the level of interaction between the stakeholders was low, even in the same group. On the other hand, the selection process of the houses verifies the hypothesis that the conservation of historic- traditional houses in Kastamonu is economic oriented.

### 5.3. The Implementation

The process of restoration of houses is determined and effected mainly by the decision- makers. As discussed in the previous section, the selection of the houses to be restored had a rationale in itself due to various factors. The important point is that the decision- makers played the key role in determining and evaluating these factors. In relation to that, the implementation of the projects was also under the direct control of the decision- makers. Therefore, the experiences of the decision- makers reveal the implementation processes in conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu.

Some statements about the actual practice in the restoration process by decision- makers are as following.

Mr. Ahmet (Head of Restoration Center)

First is the project, second is the repair, third is giving a function according to the project. I can say the project is the most important. The future of the building is determined in the first step. Then we decided what function to give to the buildings. Hence, we made their projects even before the project has started. For example, you cannot give an inn the same function with the same features. Today's inns are hotels and motels. Therefore, there need to be work towards this. Besides, there are demands due to the conditions. For example, the visitor wants bathrooms in the room which inns do not have. In the old houses there are parts called "gusülhane"<sup>8</sup>. You cannot expect a visitor to take a bath in it. You have to put the conditions of new technology. Therefore, the first step is to give settlement to the places in the project and than to develop the project. The proje itself has three stages. Building survey is to document the current situation and transcription on the paper. Reports and analysis from A to Z. Restitution, is finding out the conditions when it was first built. For example we have big rooms but people divide them to give to their children out of necessity. Thus, the building gets destroyed. Some people sublet the building to three separate tenants, so they shot the stairs and divide the floors and add stairs from outside, so they destroy the building. Therefore, we make a project of the way in which it was first built. Lastly, we project how we are going to repair it and what function do we want to give, that is restoration. Three projects are prepared, which are documented with analysis and reports. We don't put down what is in our mind at once. We find the former owners. We find the documents and than there are some procedures in Kastamonu. Permissions are taken from the cultural affairs

---

<sup>8</sup> Gusülhane: zinc plated cabinet for washing

and from the municipality. Then, we go to Ankara Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Kurulu. If the kurul approves, we have to do the repairs in a certain time period.

Eski eserlerin birincisi proje ikincisi onarım üçüncüsü projesine göre işlev verme. En önemlisi proje diyebilirim. Zaten binanın geleceği o ilk adımda belli oluyor. Ondan sonra projesini yaptığımız binalara proje daha başlamadan, ne fonksiyon vereceğimizi oturup karar verdik. Mesela bir hanı tekrar o özellikle han gibi işlev veremezsiniz. Bugünün hanları oteldir, pansiyonlardır. Dolayısıyla bunlara yönelik çalışmalar yapmak gerekiyor. Bir de tabii yeni istekler doğmuş şartlara göre. Mesela duş tuvalet istiyor gelen konuk odasının içinde, hanlarda böyle bir şey yok, örnek veriyorum. Aynı şekilde konaklarda her odanın içinde küçük gusülhane denilen yerler vardır. Bir konuğun o gusülhanenin içinde tasla duş almasını bekleyemezsiniz. Ona göre yeni teknolojinin şartlarını koymanız gerekiyor. Dolayısıyla ilk adım projede yapılacak yerlere iskan verilmesi, sonrada proje geliştirilmesi. Projede tek başına üç aşama. Rölöve su andaki durumunu belgeleme, kağıt üzerine dokum. A dan Z ye raporları analizler...Restitüsyon ilk yapıldığı anki durumun bulunması. Mesela bizim büyük odalarımız var ama insanlar ihtiyaçtan bölüyor odaları çocuklarına veriyor. Dolayısıyla yapı bozulmaya gidiyor, bazı kişilerde üç katlı ahşap binasını kendisi binadan çıktığı için 3 ayrı kişiye kiraya vermeye çalışıyor. Nedir aralarını bölüyor, merdivenleri kapatıyor, dıştan merdiven veriyor ve dolayısıyla yapının bozulmasına sebep oluyor. Yani ilk andaki yapılaşma şeklini yine projelendiriyoruz. En sonunda biz bu konağı nasıl onarmak istiyoruz, nasıl işlev vereceğiz onun belgelenmesi- restorasyon. Üç proje hazırlanıyor.. bunlar hep analizlerle raporlarla belgeleniyor. hemen kafamızdakini dökmüyoruz araştırıyoruz eski sahiplerini buluyoruz. Dokümanlarını buluyoruz, sonra da Kastamonu'da bazı işlemler var. kültürden belediyeden izin alınıyor. Sonra Ankara kültür ve tabiat varlıklarını koruma kuruluna gidiliyor. Kurul onaylarsa belli bir süre içinde onarımını yapmanız gerekiyor.

Mrs. Seher, who is the director of development in the Municipality of Kastamonu also mentioned the practices of restoration, in reference to her observations.

In it, there are the ones that the governorship prepared and the ones that the owners did. Ones that the governorship pioneered and done by the Special Provincial Administration. There is the Vedat Tek workshop, they work. They have good works.

Onda vilayetin hazırladıkları ve özel şahsın yaptıkları var. Vilayetin öncüsü olduğu ve özel idarenin yaptığı. Özel idarenin mimarı var, atölye kurdu onlarla. Vedat Tek atölyesi var, onlar çalışıyor. Güzel çalışmaları var.

As mentioned before, the selection of the houses revealed a lot of information about the procedure that has been followed throughout the restorations. As Mr. Hüseyin mentioned while explaining the selection procedure for houses, the restorations were made in accordance with the financial and other resources. In addition to that, he mentioned a research process with regard to each house that can possibly be selected for restoration. However, the way in which these two factors are processed within the procedure is controversial. Even though the decision-makers emphasize the attention paid to the heritage and architectural value of the houses to be restored; they admit the negative impact of the limitations of the resources. Therefore, we can argue that these limitations played the most determinant role in the physical intervention. Meanwhile, the expectation mentioned in the hypothesis that the projects would be economic oriented is reaffirmed.

#### **5.4. View of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu**

The decision- makers were asked their opinion with regard to many aspects of Kastamonu given the fact that they are key figures in various activities in Kastamonu. The decision- makers' opinions about Kastamonu in general reveal their viewpoint with regard to the historic and cultural potential in the town. When they were asked about the potential of Kastamonu and its strengths as a town, many of them mentioned the cultural and historical potential of the town. However, their responses show that they consider this potential as an economic resource rather than mere cultural and historical heritage. The following statements which are provided in response to the question; "*What do you think are the potentials and the strengths of Kastamonu as a town?*" clearly support this viewpoint.

Mr. Zühtü (Local Director of Cultural Affairs)

The positive aspect of Kastamonu is the fact that its cultural assets and rich nature is not damaged. The environment can be put to use for tourism purposes. This is an advantage.

Kastamonu'nun olumlu tarafı kültür varlıklarının ve tabiatın zenginliğinin bozulmamış olması. Çevre turizm amaçlı değerlendirilebilir. Bu bir avantaj.

Mr. Şeref (deputy governor)

A virgin place. I think Kastamonu has an advantage in that manner. There is also some increase in variety in terms of tourism. Tourism is oriented towards natural beauties rather than sea, sun and sand. Kastamonu is rich in potential with this aspect.

Bakir bir yer alan. Bu yönde de Kastamonu büyük bir avantaja sahip bence. Turizm alanında da bir çeşitlenmeler söz konusu. Turizm sadece deniz güneş kumdan ziyade doğal güzelliklere yönelik. Kastamonu'da bu yönüyle zengin bir yer, potansiyele sahip.

Mr. Eşref. (President of Kastamonu Association of Chambers of Craftsmen and Artisans) (Kastamonu Esnaf ve Sanatkarlar Odaları Birliği-KESOB)

Kastamonu is a virgin region. Its history, geography and spaces are high in number. There are almost 1600 historic artifacts. It has listed artifacts.

Kastamonu bakir bir bölge. Tarihi kültürü coğrafyası mekânları yerleri çok var çok sayıda. 1600 civarında tarihi eseri var. Tescilli eserleri var.

Mr. Turan (Mayor)

Kastamonu is a place which needs to be advertised with its environment, nature, culture, historic heritage and on the other hand is one of our provinces that can reach tourism potential.

Kastamonu çevresiyle doğasıyla kültürüyle tarihi mirasıyla hem tanıtıma ihtiyacı olan hem de bununla birlikte turizm potansiyelini yakalayabilecek illerimizden bir tanesi.

At the same time, the artifacts that marked the history were brought until today. Kastamonu is one of the 16 provinces that were transferred from the Ottomans to in the Republican Era. Therefore, Kastamonu is a city which is significant with its historical and cultural riches.

Aynı zamanda o tarihe damgasını vurmuş eserlerle de günümüze kadar gelmiş. Cumhuriyet döneminde Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e intikal eden 16 vilayetten bir tanesi Kastamonu. Dolayısıyla Kastamonu özellikle tarihi ve kültürel zenginlikleriyle ön plana çıkan bir ilimiz.

Mr. Ahmet (Head of MVTASRM)

But in the first part of the Republican Era, there has been emigration from Kastamonu since no interest was shown to industry. Actually it is not bad I think it is good. Because we are in an advantageous position compared to many towns. The cultural heritage which is our future, 534 listed buildings would not exist. There would be 50, for example, it would decrease. If there had been money everyone would tend to new buildings. The interest in old houses would decrease. We are advantageous, I mean. If the industry had come, it would not be such a virgin town.

Ama bu cumhuriyet döneminin başlarında sanayi pek ilgi göremediği için Kastamonu'da göç olmuş. Aslında kötü olmamış aslında bence iyi olmuş. Çünkü birçok ile göre avantajlı durumdayız. Bizim yeni geleceğimiz olan bu kültür mirasımız, 534 tane tescilli bina olmazdı. 50 tane olurdu mesela, düşerdi. Para olsaydı herkes yeni yapılaşmalara gidecekti. Eski



evlere ilgi azalacaktı. Avantajlıyız yani.. sanayi gelseydi bu kadar bakir bir kent olamazdı.

As understood from the statements of the decision- makers, there is a tendency to recognize the historical and cultural properties in Kastamonu as an economical asset. They acknowledge the importance of the properties as they are, however they indicate that they are specifically good if/ when they are utilized for economic activity.

### **5.5. View of Historical-Traditional Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci**

As mentioned before, the decision- makers' and NGO representatives' who are also included in the same actor group, perceptions about Kastamonu as a town was quite related to the historical properties in the town. Even tough, these respondents mentioned this historical built environment as an economic resource, we can still track down some hints of a sense of place. While these respondents within the group of decision- makers and NGO representatives explained the value of the historic built environment, they also indicated a pride and sense of locality and even uniqueness between lines. Despite the fact that they tend to consider the cultural property in Kastamonu as an economic potential, they implied that the traditional-historic houses worth being an asset with their aesthetical and identity- forming features. In that manner, they emphasized that the existence of these properties was an extraordinary feature of Kastamonu. They saw it as a privilege among similar towns, especially within the region. This way, they attribute a symbolic value to the traditional- historic houses in Kastamonu, as forming a distinctive identity for the town.

### **5.6. Level of Interaction between Stakeholders**

Since the process and the practice of governance by definition involves more than one actors, the perceptions about and the way in which they approach to the concept of participation can be very determining for the process itself. Plus, differences between the stake holders in that respect, if any, may give rise to different outcomes mainly in practice. In order to understand the perception and

conception of the stakeholders with regard to the participation and governance, each of all three interview forms included some questions. The decision-makers and the representatives of NGOs were asked if they communicated with various social groups, in other words the stake holders, such as the local community or the owners of the houses throughout the conservation and restoration process, from the emergence of the idea to the actual physical intervention and giving new functions to the buildings. They were also asked to share their experiences with regard to the reactions of other stake holders and how they have responded to it. Also, in cases where such an interaction has occurred, the way in which it occurred was also questioned. Some significant answers were as follows.

Mr. Ahmet (Head of the Restoration Center)

Actually we were together with the people during the work. There are four or five people in Kastamonu who can do the wooden frame building. We already took three of them as permanent staff. These are people 65-75 years old, so there is no future. We gave the graduates of old vocational school of industry. We are training them on the side. In turn, I learned that what I called nail was “mih”<sup>9</sup>. When we were there, there was wondering by the people. The guillotine windows were replaced by normal sliding doors and windows. Easy to clean. When we replaced them we the older ones, we got reactions. We could convince them that this was the aim; concrete buildings could be designed as they wish but these buildings should be like this. That was, since we were one to one together with the people, we did not have disconnection. There are some contractors coming from out of the town here and they do some repairs. They are different. Because they belong to a different region their contacts with people are different. I mean they have some disconnection with the people.

Biz aslında o çalışmalar sırasında o halkla beraberdik. Bu eski eseri ahşap karkas yapıyı yapacak usta Kastamonu da 4-5 kişi var. Bunlarda 3 tanesini biz zaten kendi kadromuza aldık. Bunlarda 65 -75 yaşında insanlar yani geleceği yok. Bunların yanına da eski Endüstri meslek lisesi ahşap bölümü mezunu öğrencileri verdik. Bunları yetiştiriyoruz yine bir taraftan. Dolayısıyla benim çivi dediğimin mih olduğunu öğrendim ben. Halk biz oradayken mesela bir dönem merak vardı mesela. O giyotin pencere yerine normal sürgülü kapılar pencereler takılıyordu. Temizlemesi kolay. Biz onları tekrar eskisine döndürdüğümüzde yine eskisine donduruyorsunuz bu ne diye tepkiler geliyordu bize. Biz onu bunun amacı bu zaten. siz betonarme evinizde istediğiniz gibi dizayn edin. Ama bu bina böyle olmalıdır diye sonunda ikna edebiliyorduk. Bu şekilde halkla da birebir içinde olduğumuz için çok bir kopukluğumuz olmadı. Burada il dışından gelen müteahhitler var bir takım böyle onarımlar yapıyorlar. Onlar daha farklı. Farklı yöreye ait

---

<sup>9</sup> Mih: traditional word for large nail

oldukları için irtibatları farklı oluyor insanların yani halkımızla onlar biraz kopukluk yaşıyorlar.

Mr. Mustafa (Secretary general of Kastamonu Chamber of Commerce)  
(Kastamonu Sanayi ve Ticaret Odası-KATSO)

We don't think so. I said before. It can be buying an office building and making a hotel or buying an old house and opening it to tourism, by multi- parter cooperations. Since people do not trust each other, It is not happening. It happened by the efforts of Mr. Governor.

Düşünmüyoruz. Daha önceden konuşmuştum. Çok ortaklı şirketler kurulup bir iş hanının alınıp otel yapılması olabilir, bir konağın alınıp turizme açılması olabilir. İnsanlar birbirlerine güvenmediği için maalesef bu olmuyor. Vali beyin kendi çabalarıyla oldu.

Mr. Şeref (deputy governor)

Absolutely there has been the dialog. Our former governor tried to get the support from parts of society to be successful in the job he started and this support was given to him. The thing that some houses were done by NGOs is a sign of this support. The contact was maintained with certain NGOs. For the period of last five years, everyone who was reachable was reached. I mean, in those conditions, the society could carry that much. I mean, what it could accept was that. And I think, it was realized. After this point, it must be socialized. From now on, there is no sense in governorship's getting the houses repaired. Governorship has leaded the society in that issue. As a result of this leadership, the society must attend to it and continue himself. I mean, I think we have done our job as the governorship.

Mutlaka diyaloglar oldu. Giden valimiz yaptığı işin, giriştiği işin başarıya ulaşabilmesi için toplum kesimlerinin desteğini almaya çalıştı ve bu destek de kendisine verildi. Bazı konakların sivil toplum kuruluşları tarafından yaptırılması konusu bu desteğin bir göstergesi. Hep belli sivil toplum kuruluşlarıyla temasa geçildi... O dönemkinde geçmiş beş yıl içinde ulaşabileceği kadar ulaşıldı. Yani o şartlarda toplum ancak onu kaldırabiliyordu. Yani kabul edebileceği şey oydu. O da gerçekleştirildi bence. Bundan sonraki dönemde zaten topluma artık mal olması gerekiyor. Artık sürekli valiliğin konakları onarttırmasının bir anlamı yok. Valilik olarak bu konuda topluma öncelik edilmiştir. Bu yapılan öncülük neticesinde toplumun bu konuya sahip çıkıp artık kendisinin sürdürmesi gerekiyor. Yani valilik olarak biz görevimizi yaptığımız düşüncesindeyim.

Mr. Hüseyin (Special Provincial Administration)

Now, the channels that we mostly used were the NGOs. Chamber of Commerce for the dialog with the small retailers. Chambers of small retailers and the KESOB, association of "muhtar"s<sup>10</sup>. Under the management of Association of "muhtar"s, this issue was discussed regularly. Also there are the meetings within the union for bringing services to villages which the "muhtar"s attended twice a year. 178 village "muhtar"s of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Muntar: locally elected administrator of village or neighbourhood.

province center attends. Information is given in these meetings. Or there is the presentation CD prepared by the governorship. About the Kastamonu houses, it was distributed to all the NGOs, to their managers. Shows were made. I mean it was told many “muhtar”s. Other than this, we have a bus for about 30 people. Regularly, city tours were organized with a guide... I think, no more can be done.

Şimdi burada bizim en çok kullandığımız kanal sivil toplum kuruluşları oldu. Ticaret odası esnafla diyalog için. Esnaf odaları KESOB, muhtarlar derneği. Muhtarlar derneğinin yönetiminde bu konular düzenli görüşüldü konuşuldu. Ayrıca köylere hizmet götürme birliği çalışmaları içinde muhtarların katıldığı senede iki defa olan bir meclis toplantıları var. Merkez ilçenin 178 koy muhtarı katılır. Bu toplantılarda bilgilendirmeler yapılır. Ya da vilayetin hazırladığı bir tanıtım CD si vardır. Kastamonu konakları ile ilgili bütün sivil toplum kuruluşlarına yöneticilerine bunlar dağıtıldı. Gösterisi yapıldı. Bir çok muhtara anlatıldı yani. Bunun dışında bizim bir tane otobüsümüz var 30 kişilik falan. Düzenli başında bir rehber olmak şartıyla şehir içinde turlar yapıldı... Bence daha fazlası olamaz bunun.

Mrs. Ferhan (Local president of Benevolent Society) (Yardım Sevenler Derneği- YSD)

The dialog was sometimes maintained and sometimes not. I mean if you are asking whether the opinion of the people was asked during these restorations, I don't think that it was asked that much.

Diyalog zaman zaman kuruldu zaman zaman kurulmadı. Yani bu restorasyon çalışmaları yapılırken halkın fikri soruldu mu diyorsunuz da, çok fazla sorulduğunu zannetmiyorum yani.

As understood from the five examples out of the group of decision- makers and the NGO representatives, people have different conceptions about the terms “participation” and of “dialog” in relation to it. Mr. Ahmet as one of the key figures in the projects implied that the participation meant convincing people and utilizing the local human resources. On the other hand, Mr. Elmas as a representative of a local vocational NGO said that the participation was about entrepreneurial activity and actual involvement of the private sector in the projects. Mr. Hüseyin, had another conception, especially in terms of the dialog between the public and the decision- makers. He emphasized that the dialog meant providing information to the people and telling them what they have been doing.

Mr. Şeref as the deputy governor told that the NGOs were involved in the process as a proof of the participation and dialog. However, he did not mention which NGOs and how they were involved. This is particularly important given the nature and the function of these NGOs, which is explained within the process of

project realizations. We know that these NGOs were founded by the local state agencies for some other and mostly solidarity functions and they were used as intermediate institutions to overcome the legal and bureaucratic limitations, as well as the financial shortcomings.

### **5.7. Conclusion**

When we examine the way in which the decision- makers approach to the issue of conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu, we can talk about some obvious facts about the projects. For example, almost all of the respondents emphasized the role the governor in the initiation of the projects, even though some of them mentioned the previous attempts, as well. In addition, the interviews revealed the fact that the process of selection of the houses was only recognized by the implementers. Many of the persons who are in the group of decision- makers were unaware of these processes. This finding also shows that this process was determined by the practices of these specific persons. This trend is evident in the implementation process, as well. This situation shows that the first hypothesis of the study is verified, because the expectation that there would be low participation and interaction between stakeholders was fulfilled. In addition, we can argue that the attitude of the projects are not parallel to the participation principles put forward by the international documents, which show that the last hypothesis of the study regarding the adaptation of these principles was falsified.

On the other hand, the statements of the decision- makers who were directly active in the projects revealed the fact that the economic aspect of the conservation and restoration was emphasized as the main concern of the projects. Therefore, the hypothesis which expected the projects would be economic oriented rather than emphasizing cultural, artistic and antiquarian values was proved to be valid, as well.

It must be taken into consideration that the leadership of the local decision- makers, especially the local administrators plays an important role for the participation of the different segments of the local community. This is due to the fact that people will be more supportive of the conservation of the houses when they

see the examples of actual implementation. People will understand the benefits of the conservation through the outcomes of these examples.

## **CHAPTER-6**

### **THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE OWNERS OF THE HOUSES**

The owners of the houses which were restored within the conservation activities in Kastamonu constitute the second group of respondents. The owners of the houses are the stakeholders who are considered to be affected by the conservation and restoration projects in the first place. The decision-makers are the actors who determine the process itself, and the owners of the houses are the immediate persons who are most likely to be affected. Therefore their experiences in the personal and/ or family level are important to be able to evaluate the process from the view point of adverse party. The physical and tangible process of restoration from the selection of the house to the end of the restoration can be examined from the view points and with reference to the experiences of these respondents.

#### **6.1. The Selection of the Houses**

From the viewpoint of owners of the houses, the selection process was not significant. During the interviews, most of them stated that the esthetic and historic value of their houses were the only criterion for the selection of the houses. Mrs. Ankaralı told that the offer came from Kastamonu Development Foundation and they accepted because their house was decaying day by day. Mrs. Güliz also stated that the governor liked their house while he was touring the historic houses in

Kastamonu and made an offer to buy and restore the Konyalı House. Liva Pasha House which belonged to Ataoğuz family was expropriated by Council of Monuments (Anıtlar Kurulu) because of its historic value. On the other hand, the owner of the Eflanili House told that they referred Kastamonu Development Foundation to sell the house for restoration. KKV accepted the offer and bought the house and restored it. Thus, when we look at four cases, we see that the selection criteria were not put forward in advance. These experiences that are quoted by the people who owned the restored houses support the conclusion that the selection process was based on the pragmatic concerns.

When the respondents were asked to explain the selection process for the houses to be restored, they tended to repeat or rephrase the initiation process of the projects for the restoration of the houses of their own. Many of the respondents did not give a specific explanation for this question. This situation also showed the ambiguity of the selection procedure, even the lack of it.

## 6.2. The Implementation

The interviews with the owners of the houses also involved questions about their experiences and opinions with regard to the restoration processes. The statements below explain the process of implementation from the viewpoint of the owners of the houses as another stake-holder in the same project.

Mr. Coşkun (Liva Pasha House)

In the restoration, unnecessary things were done. As far as I see, it was to make the contractors earn more. I went there, and they said they replaced with oak posts. I look inside, they put wood again but painted them with the oak paint. I mean when we lived there in our childhood, for example you would fill the upper floor with water; a single drip would not get downstairs. It happens in concrete, but not there. There was a rotating closet for “haremlık- selamlık”<sup>11</sup> in it, they are all lost. They were there in our time. There were rain channels with lion motifs outside, they are lost. It is not repaired exactly as the original.

Restorasyonunda lüzumsuz şeyler yaptılar. Muteahhitlere para kazandırma amaçlı gibi oldu benim gördüğüm kadarıyla. Ben gittim dediler ki meşe direklerle değiştirilmiş dediler, içerisine bakıyorum gene ahşapla

---

<sup>11</sup> Haremlık-selamlık: parts of the house for women and men to sit separately



değiřtirmişler de meşer boyası sürmüşler. Yani pinoteksin meşer olanını sürmüşler. Yani bizim çocukluğumuzda mesela biz yaşadığımız zaman üst kata hortumla suyu doldursan bir damla su aşağı geçmezdi. Yani betonarme binada geçer orada geçmezdi.. içerisinde dönme dolap vardı haremlık selamlık için, onlar hep kayboldu. Bizim zamanımızda mevcuttu. Dış cephede aslanlı yağmur olukları vardı, onlar kayboldu. Tam aslına uygun olarak yapılmadı.

Mrs. Konyalı whose family owned the Konyalı House also said that minor repairs were carried out in the restoration. She added that the house was given several different functions since it has been restored.

Mrs. Gülten sold her house (Toprakçılar Houses) for restoration. She said that the restoration was carried out according to the old photos of the house. She said that the form of the house was not changed.

The statements of the house owners with regard to the restoration projects indicated that they were observing the physical intervention to their houses. They followed the process to some extent, and shared their observations with regard to the physical outcomes of the restorations. However, it is also obvious that they had concerns about the restorations, because they mentioned some restoration mistakes. Therefore we can argue that, eventough their information about the restoration process was limited, they were sensitive to the quality of the restorations, especially that of their own houses

### **6.3. Views of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu**

The interviews with the respondents in all three groups revealed the way in which they perceived the historic artifacts in Kastamonu. The interviews did not involve any straightforward questions on this issue; however some questions led people to explain their viewpoints. For example when the owners of the houses were asked why did they wanted their houses to be restored, some stated the value they attributed to the houses. Mrs. Sabiha told that they did not want the house which was a family legacy to decay. She said that this was their only concern. Mrs.

Gülten, on the other hand explained that to see their houses in bad condition was very upsetting.

Mrs. Gülten (The Toprakçılar House)

We understood that we would not be able to handle the restoration. It was not possible for us. A big amount of money was needed. It was upsetting to see our house in that condition was upsetting, tough. KKV made such an offer and we sold our house thinking that our house would better.

Biz evi onarma işini yapamayacağımızı anladık. Yapmamız mümkün değildi. Çok büyük bir para gerekiyordu. Onu yapamayacaktık. Evimizin o halde durması da bizi üzüyordu. KKV den böyle bir teklif geldi. Biz de evimizin daha güzel olacağını düşünerek sattık.

As mentioned before, these statements reveal that the family legacy was an important factor for the house owners to agree to the restoration idea. From the view point of the owners of the houses, the major motivation for restoration was to protect the family heritage, rather than the cultural heritage. They tended to express their psychological and emotional attachment to their own houses. Therefore, they considered the offer that came from the governor as an opportunity to save the property they have as family heritage. Eventough their approach to the restoration idea and the motive behind it is not adequate to understand their view about the traditional/ historic houses in Kastamonu; we can argue that the attachment of people to their houses is an important factor in shaping their general view.

#### **6.4. Level of Information about the Projects**

The owners of the houses were interviewed mainly about their own experiences with regard to their own houses and relevant restorations. In addition, they were asked to share the information they have with reference to the observations they made on the other restoration practices. The following statements are taken from the responses to this question.

Mrs. Sabiha (The İzbeli House)

I think that, even if they are very old, even if they are much deteriorated, the houses should be repaired. New law is very good, you can not tear down, if you tear down you have to build the same. We must save

our history; this is the duty of all of us. How good it is to fix something and put aside instead of throwing away because it is old. Finances should be provided to people who say I will repair it, no matter what.

Şimdi ben şöyle düşünüyorum mutlaka çok eski de olsa çok harap da olsa konaklar tamir edilmeli. Yeni kanun çok güzel, şimdi yıkamıyorsunuz, yıksanız da aynını yaptıracağız. Tarihimizi korumalıyız, bu hepimizin görevi. A eskimiş diye bir şeyi atmaktansa onu düzeltip bir köseye koymak ne kadar güzeldir. Ne yapıp yapıp tamir ettireceğim diyene mutlaka teşvik verilmeli.

Mr. Burhan (The Şekerciler House)

I mean, now, for example, the house next to the museum, The Liva Pasha House. We started at the same time. I finished in one year, he finished in eight years. I finished for 100 billion. Who knows for how many billions they finished in eight years.

Yani şimdi mesela valilik yaptı müzenin bitişiğinde, Liva Paşa konağı. Aynı zamanda başladık. Ben bir yılda bitirdim, o sekiz yılda bitirdi. Ben 1 yılda 100 milyara bitirdim. Onlar 8 yılda kaç milyara bitirdi kim bilir.

Mrs. Güliz (The Konyalı House)

None. There is the Sirkeci House belongs to a friend of my father's, but I did not enter. They made it a preschool. They did another place down the Hepkebirler Mosque.

Yok. Sirkeci konağı var eski babamın arkadaşlarının ama hiç onun da içine falan girmedim. Yuva yapmışlar. Hepkebirler camisinin altında gene bir yer yaptılar.

Mr. Eflanili (The Eflanili House)

There is nothing being done right now. Work stopped after Enis Yeter has left.

Valla şu anda herhalde hiçbir şey yapılmıyor. Enis Yeter gittikten sonra bu işler durdu.

These statements show that the owners of the houses do not have comprehensive information or made detailed observations about other practices. Some know the similar houses that were restored, mostly belonged to the acquaintances. Others responded the question in a more general sense, so they shared their ideas about the whole process. These responses also show the lack of unity among the owners of the houses as a group of stakeholders in the conservation and restoration projects. However, it can still be argued they have a positive attitude and willingness towards conservation among the owners of the houses.

## 6.5. Views of Historic Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci in Kastamonu

During the interviews, the respondents specifically indicated the significance of the historic houses in terms of economic resource and also as family legacies. On the other hand, between lines they implied that the houses had a meaning for Kastamonu as a town as well. Especially the house owners were more conscious and aware of the value of the built environment. The following statements revealed that awareness.

Mrs. Sabiha said;

I am upset for one thing. Now I think that if the houses along the river side would remain, then why Safranbolu which was one of our counties would be selected as one in the world by UNESCO. I guess we couldn't think at that time and those houses were demolished during the insurrection and apartment buildings were built in their place. We sad how nice, the decayed houses are gone, apartment buildings are built. Now I think and I get upset. I wish we had the houses riverside.

Ben bir Őeye ok zlyorum. Ben Őimdi dŐnyorum da ay boyundaki Kastamonu'nun ortasından akan suyun etrafındaki konaklarımız dursaydı da o zaman UNESCO tarafından Safranbolu bizim ilemiz olan Safranbolu niye dnyada tek seilecekti diyorum ben. Biz o zaman aklımız ermiyormuŐ herhalde o konakları ihtilal dneminde vali yıktırdı kestirdi, apartmanlar dikildi. Biz de aman ne iyi oldu dedik klstr evler gitti apartmanlar dikildi. Őimdi dŐnyorum iim yanıyor. Bu ay boyundaki konaklarımız olabilseydi.

Mr. CoŐkun and Mrs. Glten also stated the significance of the historic houses in Kastamonu and the value of the town as a whole by comparing it to other similar towns. Mr. CoŐkun told that Beypazarı, which is historic provincial town of Ankara gained popularity with its house restorations recently, was actually nothing compared to Kastamonu. He told that there was nothing there 35 years ago and he mentioned the rooftops of the houses there as an example of the insignificance of the architecture. He also added that there was nothing in the houses, just the exteriors were fixed. Mrs. Glten also said that Kastamonu was no worse than Safranbolu, even better houses are there. Mr. Eflanili also mentioned Safranbolu as one of the former counties of Kastamonu and pointed out the change in the built environment. He said that Kastamonu was a unique historic town and emphasized the importance of conserving what is remained from the old Kastamonu.

These statements points out the fact that the formation of the sense of place for Kastamonu is also effected by the comparisons people make between the similar towns. In addition, the similarity of the cultural heritage in terms of the type (house) and the architecture (of the houses) seem to be a factor in this comparison. On the other hand, the sense of place for the people in Kastamonu lied in the historic artifacts. The new and “modern” built environment is referred to as destroying the beauty or the identity of the town. Therefore, people, especially the owners of the houses support or favor conservation and restoration as a way of regaining and conserving the sense of place. From their point of view, the historic houses they had are not only significant as family heritage carrying their names, but also they contribute to Kastamonu as a town.

#### **6.6. Level of Interaction between Stakeholders**

The owners of the restored houses were also asked whether the decision-makers consulted them during the restoration projects on issues such as the original form of the house and the new function to be given to it after the restoration.

The owners of the restored houses were asked if they were involved in the decision- making process with regard to the restorations of their houses. In that manner, they were asked if their opinions about the restoration projects and the reuse functions to be given to the house after restoration were taken into account. When they were asked whether the decision- makers asked them anything about the house and the restoration process, such as the information about the original form of the house, some said that nothing was asked. Mr. Coşkun who was the owner of the Liva Pasha House said; *“I am 65 years old, my sister is 80. We are the people living there. No one asked what was there etc.”* Also Mr. Eflanili of the Eflanili House told that only the history of the house was asked.

The participation of the owners of the houses in the process of decision-making process with regard to the reuse function of the houses was also questioned. The respondents indicated that their opinion was not asked on that issue, either. They told that the governorship or the institution that purchased the houses decided

the reuse functions for the houses. They also said that they were only informed about the function to be given to the houses but the functions changed later in some cases. Mrs. Gülten, for example, told that the house was bought to be used as a tourism facility. Mr. Eflanili specifically indicated that he had his own plans for the reuse of his house, but he said he could not realize it. These statements show that the decisions with regard to the reuse of the restored houses were taken by the decision-makers themselves, without consulting the former owners of the houses.

### **6.7. Conclusion**

The evaluation of the data in this chapter shows that the owners of the houses were not as active as expected in the conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu. From the selection of the houses to the reuse of them, we can observe that this group of stakeholders did not play a significant role. Therefore, it can be argued that the first hypothesis of the study is confirmed one more time, because the level of participation and interaction among the stakeholders is low. When we look at this group's attitude to the historic/traditional houses in Kastamonu we see that the owners of the houses are more conscious of the houses as family heritage. However they are aware of the sense of place generated by the houses. Plus, this awareness plays a very significant role in shaping persons' opinions about the conservation and restoration practices. In that respect, it was understood that they supported the projects referring to heritage value and local pride, to a certain extent. Therefore, it can be argued that the fifth hypothesis of the study which expected that all people would feel a pride and prestige from the existence of the historical/traditional houses was verified.

On the other hand, the statements of the owners of the houses revealed that they were informed and conscious about the conservation and restoration processes in general, especially with regard to the houses of the acquaintances. This finding verifies the hypothesis that an awareness of cultural heritage is expected to exist among local people due to sense of identity reflecting through the historical/traditional houses and strong informal relations due to face to face relations.

## CHAPTER-7

### THE ISSUES OF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

The third group of stakeholders is the people of Kastamonu as the people who live in the urban built environment in which the conservation and restoration projects take place. The interviews with the respondents in this group involved relatively more general questions. They were asked their level of information and the way in which they perceived conservation and restoration projects. In addition, their involvement in the local decision- making processes was also questioned.

#### 7.1. Initiation of the Conservation and Restoration Projects

Among the 17 respondents in the group of local people, 11 stated that the governorship and special provincial administration (özel idare) are responsible of the restoration and conservation projects. The remaining seven respondents either said they did not know or they speculate. Even some of the persons who said that the governor carried out the projects were not certain, they said they made guesses. Two of the responses that were given to the question, “*Do you know who is carrying out these projects?*” reveal inconsistency.

(32, F, High School)

As in all other places, The Ministry of Culture would attend to them. Other than this, I don't know if the municipality took in hand.

Her yerde olduğu gibi herhalde turizm bakanlığıdır bunlara sahip çıkan. Başka bilmiyorum belediye mi üstlendi tam olarak bilemiyorum.

(34, M, University)

I can say the state did most of what was done. All of them, I can say. I mean in cooperation with special provincial administration (özel idare). With the efforts of our former governor and with intermediation of the foundations of local state offices; there, the house behind the Gazi Paşa School was restored by Health Foundation. Generally, by purchasing and restoring by the governorship and special provincial administration (özel idare).

Yapılanların çoğunu hep devlet yaptı. Hepsini diyebilirim. Özel idare iş birliğiyle yani diyebilirim. Bir önceki valimiz Enis Bey'in çabalarıyla resmi dairelerin vakıfları aracılığıyla işte Gazi Paşa okulunun arkasındaki konak sağlık vakfı tarafından restore edildi. Genelde hep valilik tarafından özel idare tarafından satın alınarak ve restore edilerek.

## 7.2. Level of Information about the Projects

The respondents in the group of local people of Kastamonu were asked more than one question with regard to their information about the projects. They were asked if they knew who carried out the projects and why the projects existed, in two different questions. Some of the respondents provided the following responses when they were asked if they knew who were carrying out the conservation projects and the restorations.

(23, M, university, self- employed)

Usually special administration and the governorship taking care.  
Genelde özel idare ve valilik ilgileniyor.

(20, F, student, shopkeeper)

I don't know. I don't know who is doing but sometimes I see them. Old historical artifacts are being repaired. I see sometimes.

Bilemiyorum. Kimin yaptığını bilemiyorum da bazen görüyorum yapılıyor. Eski tarihi eserler yeniden onarım oluyor yapılıyor. Görüyorum bazen

(34, M, university, pharmacist- self- employed)

The state did most of that is done. I can say all of it. I can say in cooperation with special administration. With the efforts of our former governor, Enis Yeter, the foundations of state agencies, here the house behind the Gazi Paşa School was restored by the health foundation. Generally, by being purchased and restored by governorship and special administration.



Yapılanların çoğunu hep devlet yaptı. Hepsini diyebilirim. Özel idare iş birliğiyle yani diyebilirim. Bir önceki valimiz Enis Bey'in çabalarıyla resmi dairelerin vakıfları aracılığıyla işte Gazi Paşa okulunun arkasındaki konak sağlık vakfı tarafından restore edildi. Genelde hep valilik tarafından özel idare tarafından satın alınarak ve restore edilerek.

(45, F, high school, clerk)

Governorship and Foundation of Culture do the repairs, as far as I know.

Zaten valilikle kültür vakfı bildiğim kadarıyla onlar onarımını yapıyorlar.

The demographic information of these respondents indicates that neither gender nor age is a significant variable for the awareness of the local people with regard to this specific question. The level of information with regard to the institution which is carrying out the projects was not effected by the age, gender or even the level of education.

The responses show that many of the respondents knew that the governor played a part in the conservation projects. Eight of the respondents mentioned the governor as the institution that is responsible of the projects, yet some just guessed so. Some of them within these eight people indicated that the governor or the special provincial administration as a closer institution had the role of organizing the activities. On the other hand, some people indicated that the municipality might have been involved as well. This idea may be argued to be resulting from the other activities of the municipality with regard to the physical/ built environment in Kastamonu.

Another question included in the interview form in order to understand the level of information and awareness with regard to the conservation and preservation projects in Kastamonu. Also the reason and/ or the purpose of the projects were asked. The responses to these questions were discussed to some extent to make a comparison to understand people's views about the local heritage in Kastamonu. Some of the responses were as follows.

(23, M, University)

The Purpose of these projects is to contribute to Kastamonu, and its tourism, to attract more tourists. In the last two- three years, there is tourist boom. No tourists would come here before. But every weekend we see two-three tourist buses. The number of our houses to visit increased. In that manner, it is good that our houses being restored. Our museum is being restored, not opened yet.

Bu çalışmaların hedefi Kastamonu'ya turizmine katkı sağlamak, daha çok turist çekmek. Son 2-3 yılda Kastamonu'da bir turizm patlaması yaşanıyor. Eskiden buraya hiç turist gelmezdi ama her hafta sonu 2-3 tane tur otobüsü görebiliyoruz. Gezecek görececek konaklarımız da fazlalaştı. Yani o açıdan konakların restore edilmesi güzel. Müzemiz restorasyon aşamasında hala açılmadı. O sıkıntı var hala 4 senedir 5 senedir ödenek bekliyor.

(37, M, primary school, working in the ticket office)

To make the name of Kastamonu known. Before, not many people knew. Could you know? Even I did not know. You wouldn't guess until you see.

Kastamonu'nun adını duyurmak için. Evvelden pek bilen yoktu. Siz bilebiliyor muydunuz? Ben bile bilmiyordum. Bu kadar olduğunu tahmin etmiyordunuz görene kadar.

(34, M, university, pharmacist- self- employed)

I mean the aim is generally their current functions. There, one that is done is used as "Hekim Evi". As far as I know, governorship again had it restored. One was being used as a hotel, again done by governorship. Now it is being used as preschool. Again there are ones being used formally and like museums.

Yani amaç olarak genelde şu anki kullanımları. İşte bir tane yapılan Hekim Evi olarak kullanılıyor. Onu da bildiğim kadarıyla yine valilik restore ettirdi. Bir tanesi otel olarak kullanılıyordu, yine valiliğin yaptırdığı. Şu anda okul öncesi çocuklar için yuva olarak kullanılıyor. Yine resmi olarak kullanılan, müze gibi kullanılanlar da var.

(23, F, University)

Maybe for safeguarding the history. Actually, Kastamonu is a town which is known very different from outside in terms of tourism. I mean, I know it is visited a lot. How much can it respond? Maybe, to contribute to this tourism; to advertise it.

Yani, tarihe sahip çıkmak belki. Kastamonu aslında dışarıdan çok böyle farklı tanınan bir şehir turizm açısından. Yani çok ziyaret edildiğini biliyorum. Ne kadar cevap verilebiliyor, belki o turizme biraz daha katkı sağlamak açısından, tanıtılması için olabilir.

Four out of 17 respondents in the group of local people of Kastamonu did not answer this question or indicated that they did not have any idea. On the other hand, the responses given by 13 people shows that people associated the activities to

tourism. This tendency can be regarded as a consensus. Even though, they had different ideas about the institutions carrying out the projects, they agreed on the general purpose of them. This agreement can be due to the observability of the outcomes of the projects, because people can see the restored houses being utilized as tourist facilities and interpret it as the major aim of the activities.

### 7.3. View of Cultural Heritage in Kastamonu

Also some questions were asked to reveal the local people's conceptions with regard to the heritage value attributed to the houses in Kastamonu. However, many respondents implied that the values attributed to the houses in Kastamonu were either economical or aesthetical. Between lines, the respondents indicated their pride with regard to the historical houses, but they tend to emphasize the tourist and economical significance of the restorations. In that manner, the public agreement on the restoration projects can be claimed to be growing out of the pragmatic factors. When the people of Kastamonu were asked the benefits of restorations and conservations, most of them stated that more tourists visited the town after the projects. They also openly implied that the restorations were good for economic reasons. Some respondents from the group of people of Kastamonu provided the following responses to the question; *"Is there any benefits of these restoration and conservation projects to Kastamonu? If so, what are they?"*

(27, M, Primary School, working in the ticket office)

Normally, there was no tourist flow before. Thanks to the houses and the governorship there is a flow of tourists. Of course, for sightseeing and visiting and to know the historic value here. They are coming from various places all over Turkey.

Haliyle eskiden turist olarak akımı yoktu. Konaklar artı valiliğin sayesinde turist akımı var. Tabi gezmek için görmek için tarihi değerlerini bilmek için buranın. Türkiye genelinden çoğu yerden geliyorlar.

(45, F, High School, clerk)

I mean, tourists coming to Kastamonu means money is coming. It is very very good for Kastamonu. At least our retailers would benefit from it. When the retailers benefit, the social life would be a bit better.

Yani Kastamonu'ya turist gelmesi para gelmesi demektir. O da Kastamonu için çok çok güzel. En azından esnafımız bundan yararlanacaktır. Esnaf yararlanınca diğer şeyler de, sosyal hayat biraz daha güzel olacaktır.

In the same manner, most of the respondents in this group told that the aim of these projects was to advertise the town and increase the tourist activities. The following statements were the answers to the question; “*What for, do you think, the restorations are carried out?*”

(23, M, University)

The Purpose of these projects is to contribute to Kastamonu, and its tourism, to attract more tourists. In the late two- three years, there is tourist boom. No tourists would come here before. But every weekend we see two-three tourist buses. The number of our houses to visit increased. In that manner, it is good that our houses being restored. Our museum is being restored, not opened yet.

Bu çalışmaların hedefi Kastamonu’ya turizmine katkı sağlamak, daha çok turist çekmek. Son 2-3 yılda Kastamonu’da bir turizm patlaması yaşanıyor. Eskiden buraya hiç turist gelmezdi ama her hafta sonu 2-3 tane tur otobüsü görebiliyoruz. Gezecek görececek konaklarımız da fazlaştı. Yani o açıdan konakların restore edilmesi güzel. Müzemiz restorasyon aşamasında hala açılmadı.

(23, F, University)

Maybe for safeguarding the history. Actually, Kastamonu is a town which is known very different from outside in terms of tourism. I mean, I know it is visited a lot. How much can it respond? Maybe, to contribute to this tourism; to advertise it.

Yani, tarihe sahip çıkmak belki. Kastamonu aslında dışarıdan çok böyle farklı tanınan bir şehir turizm açısından. Yani çok ziyaret edildiğini biliyorum. Ne kadar cevap verilebiliyor? Belki o turizme biraz daha katkı sağlamak açısından, tanıtılması için olabilir.

The responses to these questions show that the local people of Kastamonu considered the conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu as economic oriented activities, especially through tourism. Therefore, their positive attitude towards the conservation and restoration projects stems from the expectation of economic development.

#### **7.4. Views of Houses as Symbols of Genius Loci**

The viewpoint of the local community in Kastamonu with regard to the question of formation genius loci is interesting and worth attention. The interview with the local people included questions about the significance and importance of the restorations of the historic built environment. The respondents in this group did not talk about the identity of the town or any aspects in terms of formation of sense of place. As mentioned, they implied that these restoration activities were economic, and specifically tourism oriented. Many of the respondents even could not name any projects or any restored houses. This tendency reveals the fact that perceiving the sense of place or identifying the factors determining it requires other preconditions than just living in that town, at least in the case of Kastamonu. However, there are exceptions. Five out of 17 respondents in the group of local community mentioned, very briefly, the historic value of the built environment. They said that the purpose of the restorations might be safeguarding the historic artifacts, in addition to activating tourism and contributing to local economy. On the other hand, one person from this group told similar things to what the owners of the houses said.

At that point, we can argue that the third hypothesis of the thesis which included the expectation that because Kastamonu is a city with small population and face to face relations are strong, the sense of identity would be high, especially reflecting through the historical- traditional houses. Hence, an awareness of cultural heritage is expected to exist among people, is not fully verified but there are the hints of this expectation. On the other hand, the hypothesis that all people would feel a pride and prestige from the existence of historical/traditional houses, so the local people would be supportive of conservation is attested.

#### **7.5. Who Decides?**

The previous responses show that the local community of Kastamonu and the owners of the houses are significantly not effective in the decision making process. However, their opinions with regard to the effective figures worth

consideration. Therefore, the respondents in the groups of owners of the houses and the local people were asked who they think were effective in the decisions taken in Kastamonu. The Following responds were provided by the local people of Kastamonu. They were asked the question with reference to some examples such as the new bus station and the redevelopment projects in the downtown.

(23, M, university, self- employed)

The governor comes first, the mayor. I mean the authorities, the leading authorities in the administration. Perhaps they may be consulting with the rich of Kastamonu.

Başta vali bey önde gelir, belediye başkanı. Yetkililer yani ileri gelenler idari anlamda. Belki Kastamonu'nun ileri gelen zenginleriyle de fikir alışverişinde de bulunabilirler.

(32, F, High school, housewife)

Perhaps, the leading businessmen here. I don't know the name of their institution but the association of businessmen and the municipality should be doing something there.

Herhalde önde gelen iş adamlarıdır buranın kurumlarının ismini bilmiyorum ama iş adamlarının derneği falan belediyeyle ortak bir şey yapıyorlardır orada.

(34, M, University, pharmacist- self- employed)

It is a decision of the municipal committee as far as I know. Of course there is big account of the mayor there. Because of the committee or his party. Of course it is mayor's since he is gathering his own staff. Things are going accordingly. They are able to get things done with their authority. That is the way I know it. Let me put it that way. Since it is an issue about the local governments, so I say that the municipality is effective. But I think it can be done with wider participation.

O bildiğim kadarıyla belediye encümeninden çıkan bir karar. Tabi orada da belediye başkanının büyük bir tasarrufu oluyor. Çünkü encümen ve ya partisinin. Tabi bu büyük ihtimalle başkanın çünkü ekibini kendisi seçtiği için. Onun doğrultusunda şeyler yapılıyor. Ağırlığı doğrultusunda, kendi ağırlığını koyarak işlemleri yürütebiliyorlar. Ben öyle biliyorum. Tabi şöyle söyleyeyim, belediyenin sözü geçiyor derken yani yerel yönetimlerin yaptığı bir iş olduğu için belediyeyle ilgili. Ama daha geniş bir katılımıla yapılabilir diye düşünüyorum.

(37, F, higher education, housewife)

Şu anda belediyenin elinde. Bu zaten belediye seçimlerinde çok söz konusu oldu. Bütün başkan adayları tarafından teşhirleri yapıldı, planları çizildi. Alınacak kişiler, verilecek kişiler hepsi kararlaştırıldı. Şu anda biliyorsunuz belediye başkanımız Turan Bey. Onun taktiri, encümenin taktiri, belediye meclisinin taktiri. Artı dediğim gibi kimin daha çok gücü yetecekse orayı bence o alacak.

These responds of the local people show that they have a preference for the formal administrative institutions. People consider the municipality and the governorship as the major decision- making authorities. There were only a few remarks about other figures such as the local rich or the business associations. However, people may have had tended to relate their answers to some specific incidences, while answering.

The responses given to similar questions such as “Who decides?”, “Who is carrying out the conservation and restoration projects?” and “Was your opinion asked during and after the restorations?” revealed the fact that people consider certain institutions and figures as the major authorities for decision- making and activities.

#### **7.6. Level of Information about the Activities of Governor and Municipality**

The local people of Kastamonu as relatively the most “outsider” stakeholder were interviewed in order to understand the level of their involvement in the urban policy making and decision- making processes. As mentioned before, the conservation and preservation projects were used as a means for this purpose. In addition, specifically the local people of Kastamonu were also asked other questions with regard to the local decision- making and local government in a more general sense, by including other activities in Kastamonu.

One of the questions that were asked in that manner was the level of information people have about the activities of municipality of Kastamonu. The following answers were given in response to the question “What do you know about the activities of municipality in Kastamonu?”

(23, M, university, self- employed)

Our municipality is working a lot, arranging the parks and gardens. Arranging the environment. They did greening activities and panted trees. They restored many parks and opened to the service of people.

Belediyemiz bol bol çalışıyor, parkları bahçeleri düzenliyor. Çevre düzenlemesi yapıyor kaldırımları düzeltiyorlar. Yeşillendirme çalışmaları

yaptılar her tarafı ağaçlandırdılar. Bir çok parkı restore ettiler ve halkın hizmetine sundular.

(20, F, student, shopkeeper)

There were some things some time before the elections. He would do many things but I don't know if he is doing now.

Bir ara seçimden önce vardı. Baya bir şey yapılacaktı ama su an ne durumda bilmiyorum, yapılıyor mu yapılmıyor mu... For example, there is the Cumhuriyet Meydanı, it was going to be rebuilt. Old historical artifacts were going to be rebuilt. They gave us something, there were many things in it. There were the things that the mayor would do when he becomes the mayor. I saw them, therefore I know. But I don't know if they are done or not.

Mesela Cumhuriyet Meydanı var, orası yeniden yapılacaktı. İşte eski tarihi eserler yeniden yapılandırılacaktı. Bize bir şey vermişlerdi, onda bayağı bir şey vardı. Belediye başkanının yapacakları işte belediye başkanı oldukları zaman yapacakları şeyler vardı. onları görmüştüm oradan biliyorum. Ama su anda yapılır mı yapılmaz mı onu bilmiyorum.

(38, F, higher education, teacher)

Thankfully the municipality made Kastamonu beautiful. I mean it gave importance to the environmental arrangements. It made the parks usable. At least, it made them places where people go out and rest in the summer. Other than this, it does its work.

Sağ olsun belediye güzelleştirdi Kastamonu'yu. Yani çevre düzenlemesine önem verdi. Parkları özellikle yani çalışır hale, kullanabileceği hale getirdi. İnsanların yazın en azından çıkıp dinlenebileceği hale getirdi. Onun dışında işlerini yapıyor.

These responses reveal the fact that the visible activities and the interventions are known to people to a greater extent than the other activities. The local people of Kastamonu tended to associate the municipal activities only to the activities and their outcomes within their daily lives. In other words, they are only aware of the activities that effect their daily lives. Therefore, almost all of them mentioned the activities with regard to the appearance of the city, such as parks and gardens. As mentioned before, the local people also indicated that they thought the municipality was responsible of the conservation and restoration projects. These two results can be argued to be related in terms of people's perception, because the conservation and preservation projects and the restoration activities included in them are also observable activities. Therefore, the people might be assuming a relationship between these activities and the municipality.



In order to be able to understand this argument from another viewpoint, we can look at people's statements about the governorship. During the interviews with the local people of Kastamonu, they were asked to tell what they knew about the activities of the governor in Kastamonu. The following answers were provided by the respondents in response to the question "*What do you know about the activities of governor in Kastamonu?*"

(34, M, high school, waiter)

Governorship is doing things for culture. Historical artifacts and their repairs etc. Governor has changed, the new governor came. He is continuing from where it was left. Cultural activities. There is the special administration. It is participating in its work. Some meetings are held. Governorship is doing many things.

Valilik kültürel amaçlı şeylerle uğraşiyor. Tarihi eserler, onların onarımı falan. Vali değişti yeni geldi vali. O da onun kaldığı yerden devam ediyor çalışmalara. Kültürel faaliyetler böyle değişik. Özel idare müdürlüğü var. Onların çalışmalarına katılıyor, toplantılar falan yapılıyor. Baya bir çalışma yapıyor yani valilik.

(34, M, university, pharmacist- self- employed)

There is nothing coming to my mind now but there are some things that we follow from the local press. But what comes to my mind is it is organizing the government's distribution to the poor. Through the "sosyal yardımlaşma vakfı". It was not distributed to the villages. Governor gave directions for distribution to the villages, as well. It is directing the "köylere hizmet götürme birliği" together with the special administration. Controlling the working of all state offices is also its own duty.

Şu anda aklıma gelen bir şey yok ama basından yerel basından takip ettiğimiz faaliyetleri var ama direk şu anda aklıma gelen hükümetin fakirlere yönelik kömür dağıtımını organize ediyor. Sosyal yardımlaşma vakfı vasıtasıyla. Hatta en son köylere dağıılmıyordu bu. Köylere dağıtılması konusunda burada vali beyin direktifi oldu. Yani özel idare ile köylere hizmet götürme birliğini yine başkanlık ediyor. Bütün devlet dairelerinin işleyişini denetleme görevi zaten o asli görevi.

(38, F, higher education, teacher)

Improved the houses and beautified. Gave importance to the restoration. Giving importance to planting trees, greening the environment. Of course, employment rate and job rate increased with the opening of the houses. Personell is working.

Konakları geliştirdi, güzelleştirdi. Restorasyona önem verdi. Ağaç dikmeye önem veriyor, yeşillendiriyor etrafı. Tabi konakların açılmasıyla iş oranı da, işe yerleştirme oranı da artmış oluyor dolayısıyla. Elemanlar çalışıyor.

About the activities and services of the governorship, 12 people said that they had some kind of information. Other five people in the group either said that they did not know anything, or provided irrelevant answers. As in the case of activities and services of municipality, the local people of Kastamonu tended to focus on the visible activities of the governorship, as well. They interpreted the activities and services and also the duties of the governorship in two ways. First are the regular duties as the top administrative authority in Kastamonu and as the extension of the central government. Second are the local practices of the governorship together with the special provincial administration as a related institution. In the local scale, people focus on the restoration activities and tourism related facilities that are opened by the governorship. This tendency shows that again people are more inclined to be aware of what they see. Therefore, people tend to associate the governorship and the municipality in terms of the physical interventions.

#### **7.7. Level of Information about the NGOs in Kastamonu**

Given the significance of the non- governmental organizations in the processes of governance and participation in the local decision- making, the relation between the local community and these NGOs, if any, requires examination. Therefore, the respondents in the group of local people of Kastamonu were asked to share their knowledge about the non- governmental organizations which are actively working in Kastamonu. The following responds were obtained when they were asked what they knew about the activities of associations and foundations in Kastamonu.

(50, F, University, teacher)

There is the Benevolent Society and December 10, Woman's Platform. There is the Association of University Graduates". I mean, we follow from the press. Benevolent Society has some activities.

Yardımsevenler Derneği var, 10 Aralık Kadın Platformu Derneği var. Üniversiteliler Derneği var. Yani basından takip ediyoruz. Yardımsevenlerin etkinlikleri var.

(34, M, University, pharmacist, self- employed)

I cannot say anything about their activities but there are vocational organizations, chambers, and at least there is the chamber of pharmacists that

we belong to. Chamber of Doctors, Chamber of Agriculture and a vocational organization of drivers called Taşı- Ko. Generally the chambers. Most recently, Association of Fenerbahçe Fans was founded. It may count as a NGO, perhaps.

Faaliyetleri hakkında çok bir şey diyemeyeceğim ama meslek kuruluşları, odalar, en basitinden bizim bağlı bulunduğumuz eczacı odası var. Tabip odası, ziraat odası, işte Taşı-ko diye şoförlerin bağlı bulunduğu bir meslek birliği. Genelde meslek odaları. En son Fenerbahçeliler derneği kuruldu. O da herhalde bir sivil toplum örgütü sayılabilir.

(38, F, higher education, teacher)

There is the Benevolent Society which provided education for one of our students. Other than this, they have visits to rest homes. Also, Association of Consumer Protection is also interested in the problems of the people.

Yardım sevenler derneği var, mesela bir öğrencimizin eğitim görmesini sağladı. Bizzat yaşadığım. Onun dışında huzur evlerine ziyaretleri var. Başka, tüketici koruma derneği de zannediyorum halkın sorunlarıyla ilgileniyor.

As understood from the responds, people of Kastamonu have little to say about the NGO activities in Kastamonu. Moreover, the information they have is not that detailed. Almost all of the responds included remarks about charities such as student scholarships and aid to the poor. Therefore, it can be argued that people have a strong tendency towards perceiving the civil society organizations or the NGOs as charity organizations. Only a few of the respondents in the group mentioned vocational organizations and chambers. Another significant outcome of the responds given to that specific question is the fact that none of the respondents mentioned any relationship between NGOs and conservation and preservation projects. Even the respondents, who said that some foundations of specific state agencies, such as the health foundation which belongs to the Directorship of Health in Kastamonu took part in the projects, did not mention that while answering this question. This may be due to their perception of these foundations as governmental or state- related institutions. However, it is not clearly stated in responds.

## **7.8. Information Channels that Local People Use**

At this point, the information obtaining channels is another question to understand the perceptions of the people with regard to the local governmental practices and services. The respondents in the group of local people of Kastamonu

were asked how they learned about the practices which indicated that they knew. Many of them (12) indicated that they learned the projects such as the new bus station built outside the city by word of mouth. Eight of the respondents said that they learned about the project either by witnessing them during the construction or by visual advertisements such as the posters and the models of the buildings exhibited as in the case of bus station. On the other hand, some respondents mentioned that they also used the local newspapers to be informed about the projects and activities of municipality and the governorship. However, the number of these respondents was only seven that is less than half of the group. One of these seven respondents indicated that the projects of municipality or the governorship would take place in the local newspaper only when they were completed.

### **7.9. The Level of Interaction between Stakeholders**

The local people of Kastamonu mostly indicated that their opinion was not asked at all. Most of them mentioned that they were provided with some information every once in a while and during the elections. Five people said that they did not witness any efforts for consulting or getting feedback from the public, but they indicated that they believed the decision-makers asked someone else, if not them. Some responses given to the question “Is your opinion being asked while big decisions are being taken in Kastamonu?” by the respondents in the group of local people of Kastamonu was as follows.

(27, F, High school, clerk)

It must be asked, one way or the other. I mean, they should not be deceiving on their own. That what I think. I did not hear myself, I don't think so either. They should not be the decisions given by them alone.

Soruluyordur illa ki. Yani sonuçta kendi başına karar vermiyordur herhalde. Bence yani. Kendim şahsen duymadım. Ama öyle olabildiğini de düşünüyorum. Tek başlarına verilen kararlar değildir herhalde.

(27, M, primary school, working in the ticket office)

My own opinion may not have been asked but some people's may be asked. It may be asked to many people but, how should I say, we may not be able to see Kastamonu with open eyes. But the ones with high social activities can see Kastamonu open and clear. It may be asked to those people.

Benim kendim olarak sorulmamış olabilir ama bazı kişiler olarak sorulmuştur yani. Çoğu kişilere sorulmuş olabilir ama nasıl diyeyim yani Kastamonu'yu biz belki mesela açık gözle belki göremiyoruz. Ama sosyal faaliyeti yüksek olanlar açık ve net olarak Kastamonu'yu görebilir. O kişilere sorulmuş olabilir.

(34, M, University, pharmacist- self- employed)

No, as far as I know but I am not in NGOs in terms of administration. But I don't know whether there is an exchange of opinion with them. But there has to be.

Bildiğim kadarıyla yok ama ben sivil toplum örgütlerinin yönetimde olarak içinde değilim. Ama onlarla fikir alışverişi yapılıyor mu bilmiyorum. Ama yapılması gerekir.

(38, F, higher education, teacher)

They come and tell some things during the elections. Other than this, no one is coming and explaining anything.

Seçim zamanlarında gelip bir şeyler anlatıyorlar, Onun dışında da kimsenin gelip bir şey açıkladığı yok.

As understood from the statements of the local people, there is a tendency to admit the necessity of a dialog between the local community and the decision-makers. However, people indicate that they have never been in such an effort. Despite this fact, people imply that there must be someone whose opinion was taken into account during the decision- making process. In that manner, they implied that local elite was effective in the decision- making processes in Kastamonu, in various projects.

## **7.10. Conclusion**

The interviews with the local people of Kastamonu revealed the fact that the local people were pretty much isolated from the conservation and restoration projects. The level of the information they have is low and the content is limited. In addition, the local people mentioned that they were not involved in the decision-making. Therefore, we can argue that the first hypothesis of the study that the level of participation and interaction between the stakeholders would be low is attested once again. On the other hand, the local people's view about the historic/traditional houses showed that they perceived the existence of the houses as an economic asset, rather than cultural property. This perception also determined their attitude towards

the conservation and restoration projects. They considered the projects as economic activities aiming at local development through tourism. This tendency verifies the hypothesis that in such a small population with little possibility of industrial investment, the concern for the conservation and reuse of historic buildings should be more economic oriented rather than emphasizing the cultural, artistic and antiquarian value.

The local people's observations and perceptions about the local decision-making processes indicated that there is a local elite considered powerful by the local people. Despite the fact that this group is not identified clearly, local people believe that they are effective in decision-making processes. The local administrators take their opinions into account. Therefore, we can argue that the hypothesis that the projects would become popular, even though they were started as an elitist Endeavour is falsified.

## **CHAPTER-8**

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **8.1. The Findings of the Research**

The interviews with the three groups of stakeholders, namely the decision-makers, the owners of the houses and the local people, revealed some overall results with regard to the local participation and decision-making processes in Kastamonu and specifically in conservation and restoration projects. These findings can be discussed around the hypothesis of the study.

It seems that the participation and awareness level of the actors with regard to the case varies significantly between different groups of stakeholders. The level of participation and awareness with regard to the conservation and restoration projects are very much affected and determined by the proximity, both physical and practical. The more people are related to the issue, especially physically, they tend to be more involved in the processes. In that manner, the house owners were comparatively more informed about the conservation and restoration process than the local people and even some of the actors in the decision-makers group. The information they had included more details than the local people of Kastamonu have. For example, they knew the restored houses by name and they had information about the reuse functions. Also the owners of the houses could relate different variables such as the heritage value, tourism and conservation, unlike the local people who tended to focus on one or the other. This situation can be attributed to the immediate relation of these people to the projects.

The local people of Kastamonu seemed as mere observers of the conservation and restoration activities and they did not have any intentions to take a significant part in the related processes. They perceived these activities as processes that they have nothing to do with. Therefore, the local people were satisfied with what is written in the local newspapers. On the other hand, they regarded these conservation and restoration activities as investments for the development of Kastamonu rather than a local matter, so they did not expect any role in the decision-making processes.

The same relationship of proximity was also obvious for the decision-makers. As mentioned earlier, there was a differentiation within the group of decision-makers. Some of the respondents in this group were the people who were known to be involved in the projects with several roles. The rest were the ones who were the potential contributors. Many of the representatives of NGOs can be considered in the later part. Their viewpoints and the level of awareness with regard to the case were also determined by their proximity. The respondents who had some kind of a contact or was effected by the projects, either as a decision-maker or in some cases as a local person, had more comprehensive information and their remarks were comparatively more consistent.

As for the main question of the thesis, the perception and the experiences of the three groups of actors were revealed through the interviews. The responses show that there was not much difference between the three groups of actors in terms of the way in which they perceived the concept of local participation and the dialog embedded in it.

In relation to the participation, two major findings seem to arise. First of all, the decision-makers have inconsistent opinions about the meaning of participation. Some understood it as cooperation and some as not resisting to the authorities. Even some decision-makers told that employing local people could be regarded as participation. The most widespread perception about the participation concept was related to feedback, however one-way. The vast majority of the decision-makers implied that giving information to people and telling them what they had been doing



was participation itself. Moreover, many of them stated that the level of participation in that manner was optimum. They told that the public knew what it should know and nothing more than that was necessary according to them. This situation shows that the hypothesis that conservation and restoration practices are expected to be based on sustainability principles was falsified, because the key decision-makers neither did nor attempt to formulate a participation procedure. In that manner, we can also argue that the attitude of the local decision-makers to the participation did not fit the principles of international documents regarding conservation and restoration, because these documents included clear statements about the participation and collaborative decision-making. Hence, the hypothesis that the conservation and restoration practices are expected to be adopting to the internationally accepted conservation and restoration principles was not verified.

Secondly, the local people of Kastamonu had a different conception about the participation and especially about the dialog between themselves and the authorities. Their responds and reactions to the questions with regard to the decision-making processes in different fields than conservation projects were also in the same lines. Even though they told that they did not take part in such a process; they implied a trust in the certain institutions and authority figures. These were the governorship and the municipality. Their responds revealed that they did not have any concerns about the decision-making procedures and they were sure that their demands and interests were taken into account. When the local people of Kastamonu were asked the communication between them and the authorities, they referred to the elections. It is clear in the statements of the local people that the election campaigns were almost the only interaction means between the public and the authorities, even though this is true for only the municipality. Given the fact that the mayor and the municipality are significant decision-making authorities in the minds of the local people, this interaction is also considerable for them. In that manner, we can argue that the main hypothesis of the thesis which included expectation that the level of participation and interaction among stakeholders would be low is verified.

The only respondents who had different points of view in terms of participation and dialog were the owners of the houses. They did not mention any direct concerns about the participation and the communication within the processes of conservation and restoration projects. However, they shared some complaints about their not being involved in the decision- making process with regard to their own houses. In that manner, their concern mainly stemmed from their emotional attachment to the houses. The statements of these respondents revealed that they expected some consultation and feedback out of respect to the family heritage and the experiences in terms of their past in the house. Especially the reuse functions given to the houses were the major concern of the owners of the houses. Mostly, they were not satisfied with the new uses of their houses. In some cases, they implied that they were glad that their house was serving to the benefit of Kastamonu in terms of tourism and advertisement. When we look at the view points of the owners of the houses with regard to the decision- making process, we can argue that the first hypothesis of the thesis is verified once again, because the level of participation and interaction are low among the groups of stakeholders.

The practice or the realization of these perceptions of the concept of participation and involvement in the processes of decision- making is also revealed in the experiences people shared. It is understood that the initiation of the conservation and restoration activities did not involve any other actors than the top authorities in Kastamonu. The idea of such an intervention to the historic built environment was firstly put forward by a group of volunteers; however it could not go further from being an idea. This situation may be considered as related to the lack of possible interaction between the possible actors which would be also obvious in the actual practice later. The relative success of the initiative of the governorship can be associated with the position of this institution at the local level. It is obvious by the statements of the decision- makers that they did not seek any support from the public at any stage of the projects. Therefore, we can argue that the expectation indicated in the hypothesis that the projects would become popular, even though they were started as an elitist Endeavour, is not fulfilled.

The selection process for the houses to be restored was also another issue in terms of understanding the decision- making procedure within the conservation and restoration projects. According to what the decision- makers and the owners of the houses said, the selection process was almost completely pragmatic and to some extent random. The decision- makers structured a selection procedure according to the financial and other conditions and applied it. This procedure was based on the criteria set by the decision- makers. The first one of them was the budget required for the restoration of the particular house. Secondly, they checked the availability of the building and opted to take the houses which are idle. In that manner, the decision- makers did not pay any effort to asses other features of the house, such as its architectural or the heritage value and the suitability of the building for the future reuse function. Even tough, the decision-makers told that the new function to be given to the house was planned in advance; they did not mention any concerns in this regard during the selection process. These findings points to the verification of the hypothesis that the concern for conservation and reuse of historic buildings should be more economic oriented rather than emphasizing the cultural, artistic and antiquarian value. However, the hypothesis that the international standards would be applied to the projects was proved invalid.

The decision- makers and the owners of the houses were asked to share their experiences with regard to the process of restoration as a physical intervention. The responds provided by the key figures in the restoration projects showed that the projects were carried out by a small group of authorities and a few personnel to undertake the technical aspects. These people were gathered under the MVTASRM. This center was formed by the efforts of the governorship and the special provincial administration in a collaborative manner. All the decisions were given by the group of authorities or officials. The owners of the houses also confirmed this information by telling that the restoration center was responsible of all the activities and they did not get to be involved in any aspect of the process, once their houses were bought by the governorship. The low level of participation and interaction is proved at that point, as well.

As discussed earlier, the formation of sense of place is closely related to the built environment. Especially in the historic towns or the older parts of the cities are keys to such a formation. In Kastamonu, specifically the historic houses located in different parts of the core of the city are the most significant elements of the built environment. The citadel, the clock tower and the creek that the city was formed alongside are the other elements that give the city its identity. Within these elements, the houses have a different part because they have been and still are literally a part of people's lives. Therefore, the people's point of view with regard to the houses and the way in which they perceive the sense of place in Kastamonu is important.

The interviews with the three groups of respondents showed the decision-makers and the owners of the houses were more aware of the heritage potential of the town, compared to the local people. For the owners of the houses, this awareness was not merely about the sense of place, but the family heritage was an important factor, as well. The perception of the historic houses as heritage and the formation of sense of place have a correlation. Therefore, the owners of the houses are more aware and concerned about the future of the historic houses in Kastamonu. Some of the decision-makers, on the other hand, are more inclined towards perceiving the sense of place and the elements that shape it as a whole. They see the houses only as a part of it. As mentioned before, their motivation for supporting the idea and the practice of conservation was rather economic, due to the tourism opportunities. The most interesting responds about this issue came from the local people of Kastamonu. They implied that they perceived the heritage in Kastamonu as an economic resource, as well. Looking at these findings, it can be argued that the hypothesis which involves the expectation that the sense of identity reflecting through the historical/traditional houses would be high is not verified.

On the other hand, the formation of sense of place was also related to the case of restoration and conservation projects by the respondents who were relatively more involved in the processes. The group of local people which is the most isolated group did not relate the sense of place of Kastamonu with the historic houses, at all. The group that put forward that association most strongly was the

group of owners of houses. They tended to relate the value of their own houses with the similar houses and they implied a conclusion that these houses formed significance for Kastamonu. This can obviously be considered as an outcome of taking tangible part in the issue. Moreover, it can be argued that this viewpoint exceeded the financial interests of the owners of the houses. Because they did not stress the financial gain they earned during the interviews. Rather, they emphasized the esthetic value of the house and the benefits of the restoration in that manner. In that manner, we can argue that the owners of the houses are feeling a pride and prestige from the existence of the historical/traditional houses and therefore they are supportive of the conservation and restoration projects. Hence, we can argue that the fifth hypothesis of the study is partially verified.

## **8.2. Lessons and Recommendations**

When we look at the findings of the research on conservation and restoration projects in Kastamonu from a general perspective, we can argue that the lack of participation and interaction between the stakeholders is the most obvious fact about the practices. This situation and the lack of interaction even within the same group from time to time, leads to the isolation of local people from the processes. In relation to that, the elitist-like nature of the initiation of the projects remains. The repercussions of the lack of interaction between local decision- makers and the local people are observed in the low level of information about the aims and outcomes of the projects. This finding points out an inconsistency with sustainability principles, therefore the continuity of the conservation and restoration activities are problematic.

Another major finding of the thesis is the fact that the people from various segments of the local community, either a decision- maker or a local person, tend to consider the conservation and restoration practices as economic investments for the development of tourism as an income generating activity. Despite the fact that this type of a conception leads to the ignorance of the heritage value of the built environment, the economic aspects is an important motive for public support and sustainability.

In the light of these major findings, some recommendations for the future of the projects in terms of goal attainment and sustainability can be made. In that manner, training activities for different segments of the local community can be beneficial. Adult education activities must be organized in order to provide the necessary level of information among the local people of Kastamonu.

First of all, the decision- makers and the local NGOs should be trained in terms of the meaning and practices of participation. They must be aware of the significance of the multi-actor approach in terms of collective decision-making for providing the public support. Secondly, the owners of the listed houses should be trained in order to raise their consciousness with regard to the heritage value of their houses. Their opportunities and legal ownership rights with regard to the reuse and restoration of the houses must be told. In addition, they must be informed about the income generating opportunities, which brings conservation and reuse together. As for the third party, the local community in Kastamonu should be told the economic and cultural gains of the conservation projects, as well as their role in it. The history of Kastamonu and the significance of the historic- traditional houses must be told to all people. The education of the younger population is especially important for the sustainability of the conservation awareness.

## REFERENCES

AlSayyad, N. (ed.) (2001) *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage. Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism*. London: Routledge

Barthel, D. L. (1996) *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

Delafons, J. (1997) *Politics and Preservation: A Policy History of the Built Heritage, 1882-1996*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Erder, C., (1999) *Tarihi Çevre Kaygısı*. Ankara: ODTU Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları

Eyüpgiller, K.K., (1999) *Bir Kent Tarihi: Kastamonu*. İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık

Fitch, J.M. (1990) *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Build World*. Virginia: The University Press of Virginia

Harvey, D. C. (2001) Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* , Vol. 7, No:4, pp 319- 338.

Healey, P., Cameron, S., Davoudi ET AL (Eds) (1995) *Managing Cities: The New Urban Context*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Jivén, G., Larkham, P. (2003) Sense of Place, Authenticity and Character: A Commentary. *Journal of Urban Design*. Vol. 8, No: 1, pp. 67-81.

Kearns, A., Paddison, R. (2000) New Challenges for Urban Governance. *Urban Studies*. Vol. 37, No: 5-6, pp. 845-850.

Keil, R. (1998) Globalization Makes States: Perspectives of Local Governance in the Age of the World City. *Review of International Political Economy*. 5:4, pp. 616-646.

Kuban, D., (2001) *Türkiye’de Kentsel Koruma: Tarihi Kentler ve Koruma Yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 116

Kupke, V., (1997) Interpreting Townscape as a Means of Conservation in the Built Environment: A South Australian Case Study. *Urban Design International* 2:2. pp. 73-79

Larkham, P.J. (1996) *Conservation and the City*. London: Routledge

Neuman, W. L. (1994). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Silverman, D. (ed.) (1998) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage

Şengül, H. T (2001) *Kentsel Çelişki ve Siyaset: Kapitalist Kentleşme Süreçleri Üzerine Yazılar*. WALD, Demokrasi Kitaplığı

Tiesdall, S., Oc, T., and Heath, T. (1996) *Revitalizing Historic Urban Quarters*. Oxford: Architectural Press.

... (2001) *Birinci Kastamonu Kültür Sempozyumu Bildirileri, 21-23 Mayıs 2000*. Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi



<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/> (Accessed November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005)

<http://www.kastamonu.gov.tr> (Accessed October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2005)

<http://www.dpt.gov.tr> (Accessed October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2005)

The Venice Charter

[http://www.icomos.org/docs/venice\\_charter.html](http://www.icomos.org/docs/venice_charter.html), 1964

The Declaration of Amsterdam

<http://www.icomos.org/docs/amsterdam.html>, 1975

Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas

[http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/historic/html\\_eng/page1.shtml](http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/historic/html_eng/page1.shtml), 1976

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A**

#### **INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE DECISION- MAKERS**

##### **I-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

1- Age

2- Gender

3- The most recently graduated school

4- Occupation

5- Are you from Kastamonu?

5a- If not, please tell the migration processes.

6- How long have you been living in Kastamonu (provincial center)?

7- Where did you live before? How and why did you come/returned to Kastamonu?

8- Is there migration in the past of your family?

8a- If yes, when and from where (a provincial town or another province)

9- What is the type of the housing that you live in now? (traditional house, apartment etc.)

10- Do you have any real estates such as a house or land?

11- Where did you work before? In what positions did you work?

11a- If different from the current, why did you change and how?

11b- Could you tell the job you are doing right now?

11c- Did you get any training about the job you are doing right now?

11d- Are satisfied with the job you are doing right now? How do you see it?

11e- How do you see your future in this job? Do you have any expectations? If yes, what are they?

12- Do you make the decisions in your job? What is the procedure?

## II- INFORMATION AND ATTITUDE

13- What do you know about Kastamonu? (its history, social structure, migration, socio- economic conditions etc.)

14- What are the positive aspects of Kastamonu?

15- What are the negative aspects of Kastamonu? (Does it have problems? If yes, what are they?)

16- What are the development opportunities that Kastamonu has? (what kind of transformations and changes are happening in Kastamonu?)

## III- SOLUTIONS AND ACTIVITY

17- What should be done to solve these problems? Who must be in charge for that?

18- In what areas do you and the NGO/platform that you are in have activities?

19- What is the aim of foundation of the NGO/platform that you are in?

20- Does your NGO take part in projects in Kastamonu? If yes, which projects?

21- What kind of projects are produced? What is your role in these projects?

22- How are these projects produced? How does the initiative emerge?

23- Is there demand? If yes, from who and how does it reach you?

24- How do you decide which projects are suitable or necessary?

25- Who decides? Do these people have relations with Ankara or any place outside Kastamonu?

26- What is the scope of these projects? How is it determined?

27- How are the goals of the projects determined?

28- Do you reach these goals? If no, why?

29- With whom do you cooperate in the initiation and implementation of the projects?

29a- Could you tell the process of cooperation?

30- In what areas do you cooperate? (Finance, equipment, employee etc.)

### III- CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

(For the decision- makers who are directly involved in the projects)

31- How did the conservation and restoration projects start?

32- Who initiated?

33- How were the priorities, where and from which house to start decided?

34- How did you reach the owners of the houses?

35- How the owners of the houses were convinced?

35a- Did you have difficulties about that? If yes, how did you resolve it?

36- Did any legal adjustments take place?

37- How did you provide finances?

38- How the reuse functions for the restored houses are decided?

39- Who makes this decision?

40- Do you identify priorities for restoration and reuse?

40a- If yes, how do you decide?

(For other decision- makers)

41-Is there any conservation and restoration projects carried out in the province center of Kastamonu? Do you know any? Does your institution take part in these projects?

41a- If yes, which projects?

42- What do you think about conservation and restoration? Are there any examples you can tell?

43- Who is effective in the conservation and restoration projects?

44- Why do you think these people/ institutions are effective? What can their benefits be, do you think?

45- Do you think these restorations were necessary? Why?

#### IV- PARTICIPATION

46- What do you think about the local people's level of interest to these projects?

47- Are there any groups who were immediately effected by these projects?

47a- If yes, who are they?

48- Do you think the projects effected people's daily lives?

49- What is the reaction of the people to the implementation of the projects?

How do the neighborhood and the local people of Kastamonu look to the projects?

50- Do you think the people could participate in the processes and tell their opinions through dialog?

51- Do you think the local people's opinion should be asked? What do you think?

52- Are there any negative reactions or resistance?

52a- How do these reactions emerge and reach you?

52b- What do you do in such cases?

53- What do you think about the bus station moving to a new location? What are its positive and negative aspects?

54- What do you think about the shopping mall to be built? What are its positive and negative aspects?

## APPENDIX B

### INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE OWNERS OF THE HOUSES

- 1- Age
- 2- Gender
- 3- Education
- 4- The most recently graduated school
- 5- Are you living in the province center?
- 6- Could you tell the history of your house? How old is it? Who used it? For how long did you own it?
- 7- What was the condition of your house before the restoration?
  - 7a- Were you living in it?
- 8- Did you attempt to restore or repair the house before?
  - 8a- If yes, what did you do?
- 9- Did you apply yourself for restoration?
  - 9a1- If yes, who did you reach? How did you apply?
  - 9a2- If no, you made the offer to you? How did the process develop?
- 10- Why did you want to sell your house for restoration and/ or accepted the offer?
- 11- Who purchased your house?
- 12- Was your opinion asked with regard to the function to be given to your house after the restoration?
- 13- What is the function given to your house? What do you think about it?
- 14- Do you know other restoration activities other than your own house?
- 15- What do you think about other restoration activities?

16- Do you think the restoration of houses or other properties have benefits for Kastamonu?

16a- If yes, what are they?

## APPENDIX C

### INTERVIEW FORM FOR THE LOCAL PEOPLE

- 1- Age
- 2- Gender
- 3- Education
- 4- The most recently graduated school
- 5- Are you living in the province center?
- 6- Do you know the activities of the governor in Kastamonu?
- 7- Do you know the activities of municipality in Kastamonu?
- 8- Do you know the NGOs in Kastamonu?
  - 8a- If yes, do you know their activities?
- 9- Do you have information about the restored houses in Kastamonu?
  - 9a- Who is restoring the houses? What do you think the houses are restored for?
  - 9b- Do you think they have benefits for Kastamonu?
  - 9c- If yes, what are the benefits?
- 10- Do you know other restoration activities?
- 11- What do you think about the bus station moving to a new location? What are its positive and negative aspects?
- 12- What do you think about the shopping mall to be built? What are its positive and negative aspects?
- 13- Who do think makes the decisions for such projects?
- 14- Who are powerful in influencing the decisions in Kastamonu?
- 15- Are the people of Kastamonu consulted by the decision- makers?
- 16- Do you get information about the projects, in advance?



16a- If yes, how do you get the information?

## APPENDIX D

### PICTURES

#### D.1. Overview of Kastamonu



**D.2. Picture of Şekerciler House**



**D.3. Picture of The House of Liva Pasha**



**D4. Picture of Toprakçılar House**



**D.5. Picture of Konyalı House**



**D.6. Picture of Eflanili House**

