

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and effort and that it has not been submitted anywhere for any award. Where other sources of information have been used, they have been acknowledged.

Signature:.....

Date:.....

ABSTRACT

A COMPERATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOUSE(ING) DEVELOPMENTS IN LAPTA TOWN AND KAYALAR VILLAGE, KYRENIA DISTRICT

Supervisor: Dr. Asu TOZAN

The aim of the study is to discuss potential ways to deal with the impacts of dramatic changes of traditional dwelling environments while highlighting the issues of adaptability and continuity. The study deals with the “Lapta” main town and suburb village “Kayalar” cases that exists near the city of Kyrenia in North Cyprus.

The thesis consists of two parts in general. The first part including parts 1-3, is the theoretical part that investigates the user needs and the needs of human and studies the deficits of some basic concepts. In the second part, consisting of chapters 4-5, the user environment research approaches and data collection methods used in the theoretical part of the field work data is discussed and interpreted in the light of the concepts mentioned.

In the first chapter, the problem will be tried to put forward and the aim of the study will be specified. In relation to this, the methodology, in other words, which techniques were used for literature survey, and which techniques were used for different groups during the field survey will be explained shortly.

Since the general starting point of the study is environmental psychology, giving some information about behavioral sciences will form a theoretical background. In addition the relation of dwelling, house, and home with psychological concepts such as privacy, personal space, territoriality, proxemics and neighborhood will be put forwarded as well.

In the fourth part, case study and analysis will be explained in detail. In this chapter, all the steps will be mentioned one by one. Preliminary study, field survey, techniques, analysis, evaluation and conclusion will be given. Additionally, the area is being thoroughly analyzed in order to determine the physical, functional, architectural as well as socio-

economic characteristic. In this context, the present situation is discussed in the village(s) of Lapta town, and the Kayalar, followed by the section that includes the examples of residential samples and related data and then the factors are examined affecting residential housing development on the findings of fact with examples, in which local and modern housing are compared.

Finally, in the last chapter, a general conclusion will be stated. In the conclusion part, how the study is shaped, the main considerations of this study and the outcomes will be pointed out. As a result of the comparison and analysis, many of the settlement in Northern Cyprus with the architecture of the texture architecture and residential space-bounded understanding is changing, but also popular pursuits during the new requirements and interbred with the traditional architecture of a structure on lost identity, the authenticity of these tissues by the logic of public housing and the current conception of life, an attitude contrasts with the new developments were made. With different location and size of the settlement of two (Lapta, Kayalar) the settlement are analyzed in detail and determinations made in this case. Although this transformation process shows similarities in the settlements, there are important differences that differs them from each other.

This section will focus on detecting the proposed preservation and development plans for the future which are expected to constitute an important infrastructure. Also identified specific examples of local architectural designs assimilated by the architects' for the future designs continuity would be supplies and starting from the resident scale would play a very important data base task would ensure the continuity of the local language.

Key Words: Lapta town, Kayalar village, Rural settlement, Vernacular house

ÖZET

GİRNE BÖLGESİ, LAPTA KASABASI VE KAYALAR KÖYÜNDE KONUT GELİŞİMLERİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Asu TOZAN

Bu çalışmanın amacı, geleneksel konut çevrelerinde meydana gelen değişimlerin saptanıp, konut sürekliliğinin ve uyarlanabilirliğinin irdelenmesidir. Çalışma alanı olarak Girne'ye bağlı Lapta kasabası ve Kayalar köyü seçilmiştir.

Bu tez çalışması genel olarak iki kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Bunlardan birincisi 1-3 bölümlerini içeren, kullanıcı gereksinimlerini ve insan ihtiyaçlarını araştıran çalışmalar ve bazı temel kavramların açıklamalarının yapıldığı kuramsal kısımdır. İkinci kısım ise, 4-5 bölümlerinden oluşan, kullanıcı-çevre araştırmalarında kullanılan yaklaşımlar ve veri toplama yöntemleriyle gerçekleştirilen alan çalışması verilerinin kuramsal kısmında bahsedilen kavramlar ışığında tartışılarak yorumlanmasını içermektedir.

Bu bağlamda birinci bölümde, problemden yola çıkarak çalışmanın amacı, kapsamı ve yöntemi ele alınmıştır.

İkinci bölümde, konut, ev, ve yuvanın tanımları yapılarak, mahremiyet, kişisel mekan, alansal sahiplenmenin yanında mahalle ve komşuluk üzerinde durulmuştur.

Üçüncü bölümde ise, Kıbrıs adasının konumu, geçirdiği tarihsel süreç, sosyo- politik tarihi ve konut tarihi ele alınmıştır. Çalışma alanı olarak ele alınan Girne yerleşimi hakkında bilgi verilmiştir.

Dördüncü bölüm, alan çalışması ve analizdir. Bu bölüm de çalışma alanı olarak seçilen Lapta sınırları hakkında bilgi verilmiştir. Devamında ise; ön çalışma, alan çalışması, teknikler, analiz, değerlendirme ve sonuçlar ortaya konmuştur. Ayrıca bölgelerin fiziki, işlevsel, mimari ve sosyo-ekonomik özellikleri yapılan detaylı araştırmalarla belirlenmiştir.

Bu kapsamda, Lapta kasabası ve Kayalar köyünün günümüzdeki durumu anlatılmakta, arkasından çalışma kapsamındaki konut örnekleri ile ilgili verilerden oluşan kısım ve sonra da konut gelişimlerini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenen konut örnekleri üzerindeki saptamaları ile, yerel ve modern konutlarla ilgili bölüm yer almaktadır. Bölüm sonucunda ise elde edilen sonuç ve tartışma kısmı ile konutların zaman içerisindeki gelişimleri irdelenmiştir.

Beşinci kısımda ise, elde edilen genel değerlendirmelere yer verilmiş ve saptamalar yapılmıştır. Bunun yanında, bu ölçüt ve koşullar değerlendirilmiş ve bunlar doğrultusunda seçilen bölgeler arasında karşılaştırılmalı analizler yapılmıştır. Yapılan karşılaştırma ve analizler sonucunda ise, Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta özgün mimari dokulara sahip birçok yerleşimin hem konut mekan-mimari ilişkisindeki anlayışın başkalaştığı, hem de yeni ihtiyaçlar ve popüler arayışlar sırasında geleneksel mimarinin melezleşerek kimliğini yitiren bir yapısının bulunduğu; toplu konut mantığı ile bu dokuların özgünlüğüne ve mevcut yaşam anlayışına tezat bir tutum ile yeni gelişimler yönüne gidildiği saptanmıştır. Farklı konum ve yerleşim büyüklüğüne sahip iki (Lapta, Kayalar) yerleşimde bu durumlar detaylı bir şekilde analiz edilmiş ve saptamalar yapılmıştır. Bu dönüşüm sürecinin her iki yerleşimde benzerlikler gösterse de birbirinden ayrılan önemli farklar da barındırdığı saptanmıştır. Bu kısımda ele alınacak saptamaların geleceğe yönelik yapılması önerilen koruma ve gelişim planlarında önemli bir altyapı oluşturması beklenmektedir. Ayrıca saptanan özgün yerel mimari örneklerin mimarlar tarafından özümseyip geleceğe yönelik tasarımlarda yerel dilin sürekliliğinin sağlanarak, konut ölçeğinden başlayarak kimliksizleşmeyi önleme amaçlı önemli bir veri tabanı görevi göreceği öngörülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Lapta Kasabası, Kayalar Köyü, Kırsal yerleşim, ve Yerel konut

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my profound appreciation to Dr. Asu Tozan, my supervisor, without whose patient supervision, invaluable guidance and continuous encouragement this work could have never been accomplished at all. It has been a pleasure to work under her supervision. Thank you...

I would like also to thank Dean of the faculty Prof. Dr. Harun Özer, faculty of department chairman Doc. Dr. Türköz Kolozalı, Prof. Dr. Harun Batırbaygil, Prof. Dr. Nuran Kara Plehvarian, Kozan Uzunoğlu (M.arch) and all faculty instructors who have always given their full support to this project . Thank you all.

In addition, I would like to mention that at beginning of this study, unfortunately, there were lots of unwanted problems in term of our family that affected us in deep. For teaching me to be strong, optimistic, and calm; and for their supports throughout my life; and for their being always behind me, I would like to thank my mother, my father, my brother and my sister. Thank you so much!

My great depth goes to my husband, who has put enormous time and effort in the completion of this thesis.

It is impossible to forget my great friends who are always with me. They have helped me either by providing resources, giving support, listening to me, doing nothing, but just being with me every time. I would like to thank them all.

TO MY MOTHER AND FATHER.....

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
DEDICATE.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xv
ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	xvii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Aims of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Research Methodology.....	5
CHAPTER 2 FACTORS THAT EFFECT BUILDING CHARACTERISTICS.....	7
2.1 Meaning of House, Dwelling, and Home.....	7
2.2 Traditional and Vernacular Architecture.....	8
2.3 The Decisive and Impressive Factors on House and the Built Environment.....	10
2.3.1 User Requirements and Satisfaction.....	10

2.3.2 Physical User Requirements.....	13
2.4 Psycho-Social Needs of the User in Built Environment.....	15
2.4.1 Privacy.....	15
2.4.2 Territoriality.....	20
2.4.3 Personal Spaces.....	23
2.4.4 Proxemic Theory.....	24
2.4.5 Neighbourhood.....	26
CHAPTER 3 INFORMATION ABOUT CYPRUS, AND KYRENIA DISTRICT.....	32
3.1 General Information about Cyprus.....	32
3.2 Historical Background of Cyprus.....	34
3.3 Socio-Political History of Cyprus.....	35
3.4 Historical Background of Domestic Architecture in Cyprus.....	37
3.4.1 Domestic Architecture in Early Periods of Cyprus.....	37
3.4.2 Ottoman Period.....	40
3.4.3 British Period.....	46
3.4.4 Republic of Cyprus and Period After (1960-1974).....	52
3.4.5 Turkish Federated State of Cyprus and Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.....	55
3.5 Information about Kyrenia District.....	57
CHAPTER 4 CASE STUDY.....	59
4.1 Historical Information about Lapta (Laphitos) and Kayalar (Orga).....	59
4.1.1 Lapta (Lapithos).....	59

4.1.2 Kayalar (Orga)	64
4.2 Settlement Pattern of Lapta Town and Kayalar Village	65
4.2.1 Lapta Town.....	65
4.2.2 Kayalar Village.....	69
4.3 Evaluation of Housing Unit, Space Organisation.....	73
4.3.1 Dwelling Selection Criteria and Classification in Case Study.....	74
4.3.2 Spatial Analysis in Housing Units.....	75
4.3.2.1 Analysis of One Storey Dwelling Type (Gr1).....	76
4.3.2.2 Analysis of Two Storey Dwelling Type (Gr2).....	79
4.3.2.3 Analysis of Multi Storey Dwelling Type (Gr3).....	83
4.3.2.4 Evaluation of Plan Characteristic and Spatial Organization for all Dwelling Types.....	84
4.4 Evaluation of Questionnaires.....	84
4.4.1 Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics of Lapta District (Lapta Municipal Area).....	84
4.4.2 Demographic Feature of the Population.....	85
4.4.3 Size of Family and Household.....	88
4.4.4 Marital Status.....	89
4.4.5 Nationality.....	89
4.4.6 Socio-Economic Characteristics.....	90
4.4.7 Social Relations.....	93

4.5 Findings and Discussions.....	93
4.5.1 Traditional Dwellings.....	98
4.5.2 Early Modern Dwellings.....	104
4.5.3 Modern Dwellings.....	108
4.5.4 Contemporary Dwellings.....	112
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS.....	117
REFERENCES.....	122
APPENDIXES.....	128
APPENDIX A (Detailed information card of the 83 houses subject to this case study).....	129
APPENDIX B (Questionary used).....	213

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1	Lapta Town's Population Based on Years.....	66
Table 4.2	Kayalar Village Annual Population.....	70
Table 4.3	Dwelling Variation in Lapta Town.....	75
Table 4.4	Dwelling Variation in Kayalar Village.....	75
Table 4.5	One Storey Details of Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	76
Table 4.6	Two Storey Details of Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	80
Table 4.7	Multi Storey Details of Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	83
Table 4.8	The Gender Percentages in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	86
Table 4.9	Graphic of Age Status in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	87
Table 4.10	Graphic of Ethnicity in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	88
Table 4.11	Household Sizes in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	89
Table 4.12	Marital Status in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	89
Table 4.13	Variation of Nationality in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	90
Table 4.14	The Variation of Employment in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	91
Table 4.15	The Educational Level in Lapta Town and Kayalar Village.....	92
Table 4.16	Traditional Resident Samples from LA and KA Settlement.....	95
Table 4.17	The Development of Housing Types Based on Periods.....	98
Table 4.18	Traditional One Storey Central Living Room Plan Order.....	100

Table 4.19	Traditional One Storey Courtyard Plan Order.....	101
Table 4.20	Traditional Two Storey Plan Order.....	102
Table 4.21	Traditional Two Storey Hanaylı Plan Order.....	105
Table 4.22	Early Modern One Storey Dwelling Plans.....	107
Table 4.23	Modern One Storey Dwelling Plans.....	109
Table 4.24	Modern Two Storey Dwelling Plans.....	110
Table 4.25	Contemporary One Storey Dwelling Plans.....	113
Table 4.26	Contemporary Two Storey Dwelling Plans.....	114
Table 4.27	Contemporary Multi Storey Dwelling Plans.....	116

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	North Coastal Line.....	1
Figure 2.1	Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Needs.....	11
Figure 2.2	Vichers' Diagrams of Seven Sets of Variables Which Contribute to Understanding of Resident's Satisfaction.....	13
Figure 2.3	Life Cycle of Urban Neighbourhoods.....	28
Figure 3.1	The main physical features of Cyprus Island.....	33
Figure 3.2	Round Shape Home	38
Figure 3.3	Cypriot Rectangular Houses.....	38
Figure 3.4	In the City of Nicosia, the Street View of Traditional Cyprus City Houses in the Beginings of the 20 th Century in Ottoman Period.....	42
Figure 3.5	In the City of Nicosia, the Street View of Traditional Cyprus City Houses in Ottoman Period.....	43
Figure 3.6	Eaved House (Saçaklı Ev) from the Ottoman Period.....	43
Figure 3.7	The Sample of Two Storey Rural House in Ottoman Period, Fikardü Village, Trodos.....	45
Figure 3.8	Samanbahçe Public Housing	48
Figure 3.9	Limasol Officer Residence, 1978.....	49
Figure 3.10	In Nicosia Administration Street.....	49
Figure 3.11	Standart Public Housing.....	51
Figure 3.12	In Arcon Building Types, the Roof Solution Used and a Sample Plan, 1948.....	52

Figure 3.13	A view from 1960s Residences.....	54
Figure 3.14	In Years 1970a View from Apartment Type Residential Units.....	54
Figure 3.15	State Public Housing (Famagusta).....	56
Figure 3.16	The Location of Kyrenia in Cyprus.....	58
Figure 4.1	Location of Lapta (Laphitos).....	59
Figure 4.2	Lambousa Settlement Example of Acropolis, Fish Tanks, Tomb and Cave Church.....	61
Figure 4.3	The Complicate Settlement Pattern of Lapta (LA ¹).....	65
Figure 4.4	The Complicate Settlement Pattern of Lapta (LA ²).....	65
Figure 4.5	The Complicated Settlement Pattern of Lapta.....	67
Figure 4.6	Detached House Sample.....	68
Figure 4.7	The Organic Settlement Pattern of Kayalar Village.....	71
Figure 4.8	Center Settlement Area of Kayalar.....	72
Figure 4.9	Center Settlement Area of Kayalar.....	72
Figure 4.10	Detached House Sample.....	73
Figure 4.11	A Lapta Housing Built by Traditional Construction Technique and Material.....	96

ABBREVIATIONS USED

EU	:	EUROPEAN UNION
KA	:	LAPTA VILLAGE CASE AREA KAYALAR
LA	:	LAPTA TOWN
LA¹	:	LAPTA TOWN CASE AREA 1
LA²	:	LAPTA TOWN CASE AREA 2
SPO	:	STATE PLAN ORGANISATION
TFSC	:	TURKISH FEDERATED STATE OF CYPRUS
TRNC	:	TURKISH REPUBLIC OF NORTH CYPRUS
TR	:	TURKISH REPUBLIC
UN	:	UNITED NATION