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1. INTRODUCTION

“Turkey’s coastline is thankfully not one long stretch of tourist development and it’s still easy to find a traditional little seaside resort where the spread of tourism has yet to compromise the original Turkish character.”

In his book The Conservation of European Cities, Donald Appleyard stated that, “The old city exemplifies the human scale, individuality, care and craftsmanship, richness and diversity that are lacking in the modern plastic, machine-made city with its repetitive components and large scale projects.” However, many historic cities are in danger of becoming plastic because of tourism development despite the distinctive qualities they once had. Recent layers are not valued, faux elements are used to keep historic identity of built fabric, or diversity gets lost by replicating a selected type of architectural form. This thesis looks both into intended and market driven changes before and after “tourism explosion” in three towns in western Turkey, and tries to understand what happened to these “old” qualities in the course of change so that reasons behind homogenized historic settlements can be revealed and proper planning and management can protect against the homogenization process.

Historic towns have always been a destination for inquisitive travelers. With the increasing wealth, elimination of trade barriers, dismantling of political structures

---


and ease of traveling that took place particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, destinations started to compete with each other to attract more visitors. The Oxford English Dictionary defines tourism as “the theory and practice of touring; travelling for pleasure; also, the business of attracting tourists and providing for their accommodation and entertainment.”

Religion- or commerce-based travelling of the pre-19th century was a pleasure-based activity for more than two hundred years. People are seeking leisure, culture and a high quality architectural environment, all of which can only be provided by historic settlements. The decline of the traditional resource-based activities of towns and cities within the last three decades introduced tourism as one of the primary sources for financial progress; and tourism quickly became a major part of the urban economy. Tourism is relied on as a tool for diversification of local economies and is seen as an attractive economic opportunity.

As tourism grows as a component of the economy, historic settlements and urban areas are seen increasingly as assets: readily transformed into products that are sold to consumers seeking an experience. Tourists are not looking only for history or architecture but they are looking for the “experience” provided. Recent international advertising campaigns of some countries present a good example for this: they promote being unique, amazing, incredible, and promise the true experience. Cultural and natural

---


heritage is the most important factor to attract visitors, so landmark buildings and well-known sites appear in many of these advertisements. Heritage is turned into promotional material. If we refer to the Oxford English Dictionary again, heritage is defined primarily as “that which has been or may be inherited; any property, and esp. land, which devolves by right of inheritance.” In 1993, a new definition was added to this entry regarding cultural and natural heritage: “characterized by or pertaining to the preservation or

---

exploitation of local and national features of historical, cultural, or scenic interest, esp. as tourist attractions,” which strongly links heritage and tourism. Preservation and exploitation of these features need to be balanced through careful planning, and heritage should be evaluated as an amenity during this process, not an obstacle to development as it is often be seen.

Tourism is the key factor that transforms a location into a destination. Historic settlements become destinations because they are highly preferred for their scale, individuality and diversity; all of which are harder to find in modern cities. Architectural style and social character are the key elements in the creation of the distinctive character of a place. However, the local distinctiveness and integrity of the settlements start to fall apart when the tourism activity focuses on particular parts and aspects of the built, economic and social environment, and do not envision the place as a whole. These settlements start to lose their distinctiveness which was among the reasons that visitors were attracted in the first place. Tourism carries negative effects similar to urban gentrification in a sense; places lose their long time owners, social life, and physical qualities. Places become monotypic, usually mimicking features from commercially more successful cases or “tried and tested” destinations. Predetermined image, visitor expectations and marketing policies can be listed as major reasons behind this transformation. In order to compete with each other, destinations must be distinguishable but they become more similar in time. Kirschenblatt-Gimblett points out three possible reasons for that:

7 Ibid.
1. Vertical integration in the tourism system placing much of the infrastructure in the hands of few corporations
2. Requirement for a reliable product to meet universal standards
3. Interchangeability of generic products so that we can move from one destination to another when necessary.  

Many historic towns are suffering from this complex of problems, even if they are from different regions and cultures or they are subject to different legal designations. Turkish towns are also suffering from tourism-related transformation and homogenization. The Turkish state has been investing in tourism since the mid-20th century with the goal of increasing gross national product and foreign currency flow. Earlier focus of the development was on coastal mass tourism which largely neglected cultural heritage unless it was the tourists’ cynosure like Safranbolu or Selçuk. The values of traditional settlements are more appreciated lately and architectural conservation projects increased. However, poorly planned projects function like make-up touches which worsen the situation by eliminating the architectural differences and creating copycat towns. Historic commercial districts are also usually filled with very similar retail establishments selling mass-produced souvenir items and restaurants serving generic food. After visiting a few cities, visitors become overwhelmed with the repeating images and could not enjoy the fabric. Places start to lose their local distinctiveness while trying to ‘catch up’ with the tourism wave through foreign investments and trying to be and become someplace else.

---

This thesis examines effects of tourism on local distinctiveness by looking at one type of settlement and its commercial centers. After documenting the places and tourism dynamics, the thesis determines indicators and thresholds of the transformation that result in monotypic destinations: how, when and why do these places become alike? A case study based approach is followed while looking for the answers in order to identify different complexes of problems and see where they coincide and diverge. The case studies are chosen from the Aegean Region on the Western coast of Turkey which is among the busiest tourism zones in the country. The region has a long history and a variety of cultural assets from different historical layers starting from antiquity. This area also encounters a considerable amount of coastal tourism which makes it convenient to compare the responses against different tourism types and their association. In terms of scale, the settlements along the Aegean coast are towns and small cities; İzmir, the third largest city in Turkey, is the only metropolitan area.

With this motive, three case studies are selected from a sample of settlements on the Aegean coast within the boundaries of İzmir city: Çeşme, Foça and Şirince. The case studies are chosen for their size (small scale settlements within the boundaries of a metropolitan area), location (well connected to and easily accessible from İzmir city center), reputation (well-known destinations for both national and international tourists), and for being in different phases of tourism development in terms of physical, cultural, and social changes. These places share a similar regional culture and they are under the
authority of the same national tourism and preservation policies; however their encounter with tourism and accompanied transformation did not happen in the same way because of a complex of reasons which will be discussed in the following chapters. The case studies are analyzed at different scales (settlement in general, center, and traditional commercial area) by looking both into intended and market driven changes before and after “tourism explosion” in order to reveal dynamics behind the tourism related development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ÇEŞME</th>
<th>FOÇA</th>
<th>ŞİRINCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIZE LOCATION</td>
<td>85 km west of İzmir</td>
<td>70 km north west of İzmir</td>
<td>80 km south east of İzmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>Tourism, agriculture, livestock</td>
<td>Tourism, agriculture, fishing</td>
<td>Tourism, agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURIST IMAGE</td>
<td>National and international tourists Large scale tourist facilities and high density of vacation homes</td>
<td>Predominantly national tourists Small scale tourist facilities and high density of vacation homes</td>
<td>National and international tourists (especially package tours), daily trips/short stays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUTATION</td>
<td>Summer resort town, less developed urban structure and preserved landscape</td>
<td>Summer resort town, traditional architecture, environmental values</td>
<td>Traditional village life, architecture and well preserved fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL PRESERVATION STATUS</td>
<td>Partially designated urban site at the center, designated natural and archaeological sites around with different protection levels</td>
<td>Urban, archaeological and natural sites with different protection levels, and Special Environment Protection Area</td>
<td>Built-up areas under urban designation, agricultural land around under natural designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Recently opened marina changing the tourist profile, future plans on bringing cruise ships to the port</td>
<td>Military base and SEPA limiting tourism related expansion</td>
<td>Problematic planning process affecting preservation and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Matrix outlining basic characteristics of the three case studies.
The first chapter sets out the hypothesis about tourism, local distinctiveness and preservation, and introduces issues regarding tourism in historic towns. In the second chapter, the broader topics of tourist-oriented cities, the role of heritage in tourism, and the relationship between tourism and retail are discussed with regard to sources of the last two decades. Tourism development in Turkey is also a part of this chapter; the history of tourism and current approaches toward touristic development are explored by consulting scholarly articles from tourism journals, graduate theses and reports of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

The next three chapters focus on each of the cases; a brief history of the settlement, tourism development and the current market, significance, and fabric changes are documented. In order to understand the cases, urban history and more recent tourism history are presented through literature survey. Identifying and understanding the tourist, tourism and recreational complexes, tourist behavior in time and space, and changes in architecture and urban fabric helps to record the changes related to tourism and to find possible patterns. Sources consulted during this process included books, journal articles, development and preservation plans if available, media accounts, academic reports, field surveys and short interviews. The field survey of the traditional commercial centers was performed in January of 2011. Buildings along the main commercial axis were surveyed according to their resource type (commercial, residential, mixed etc.), current use (and type of retail if current use is commercial), integrity, condition, and occupancy. In addition, use of commercial centers by locals (both for their daily needs and/or as
gathering spaces), nearby traditional and historic fabric, traditional food and crafts culture and its visibility, and major tourist attractions in the area were also documented and analyzed to have a general understanding of the settlement. Built environment, social structure and economic characteristics are analyzed to find out how well preservation efforts are balancing tourism development and local distinctiveness.

In terms of built environment, understanding the tourist patterns and the relationship between preservation and/or new construction will be crucial: is there a selectivity in terms of land use, architectural form and fabric; is there a standardization (positive or negative) in terms of preservation; and how is the settlement growing? In terms of social structure, local population changes, seasonal or permanent moving in and out, ratio of local people versus out-of-town comers, visibility of local practices (neighborhood gatherings, local food, craftsmanship) are to be the key questions to understand the transformation. The market drives change, but national and especially local governments have a significant role in this transformation too. Their roles as well as past and future visions are also described to cover their effect in this process. In terms of economy, understanding the pre- and post-tourism economical structure in addition to diversification of commercial activity and its content gives an insight into the balance struck between tourist-based or local-based businesses.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

“Tourism is a social, cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes. These people are called visitors (which may be either tourists or excursionists; residents or non-residents) and tourism has to do with their activities, some of which imply tourism expenditure.”

Literature Review on Tourism and Heritage

The perception of tourism in our day is very different from the understanding of travel in the 19th and early 20th century; today, it is very much based on the economy. A brief look at the introductory page of the World Tourism Organization’s (UNWTO) Tourism Highlights Report presents an idea of what tourism is today:

- The number of international tourist arrivals was 880 million in 2009 (and increased to 935 million in 2010).
- The overall export income generated by inbound tourism exceeded US$ 1 trillion.
- Tourism exports account for as much as 30% of the world’s exports of commercial services and 6% of overall exports of goods and services.
- Tourism ranks fourth as an export category after fuels, chemicals and automotive products.
- The contribution of tourism to global economic activity is estimated at 5%. Tourism’s contribution to employment is estimated to be around 6 to 7% of the overall number of jobs worldwide.

Even under the impact of the global financial crisis and economic recession, these striking statistics can explain the demands of and expectations for tourism related development.

As a major industry, there are many actors with different forces in this sector, ranging from international tour companies (external power) to national states (internal power), changing governments, local authorities, inhabitants and certainly, tourists. International tour companies are the main drive for mass tourism; their detection of new destinations changes the fate of places by providing a constant flow of countless tourist groups. The state usually sets an overall tourism policy, but local authorities have gained importance and administrative power as well as a say in decision-making and implementation. Inhabitants have an impact indirectly as voters in the local and national governments and directly as being the owners of the place: their acceptance or rejection of tourism, specific types of tourism or tourist profiles greatly effects the development. All these actors have a role in promoting places whether it is through an advertisement campaign by the tour operator, billboards in cities by the state agencies or previous visitors telling potential tourists about a location.

Started as leisure travel, tourism was seen as a way of escaping from populated cities, especially after the Industrial Revolution. Nature and culture are the two main reasons for tourism and different types of tourism have formed over time such as coastal tourism, winter tourism, ecotourism, cultural tourism and heritage tourism; the last two (for the most part) depend on historic settlements. The National Trust defines “cultural heritage tourism” as traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people, and includes not only cultural and historic, but also natural resources.11

Changing visitor expectations lead tourists and investors to focus more on cultural heritage and places with well preserved historic fabric. Tourism is definitely an opportunity for many places which struggle with economic decline; however, it is seen as the effortless or only income revenue both by national and/or local governments as well as public. In the worst case scenario, the long-term results of tourism are not thought in advance and places are quickly transformed into commercial tourist products. The preexisting quality and life are hollowed to adjust the needs of tourists, and while the selected image is practiced and polished, places and people lose their identities. This scenario is not uncommon; there are many cases around the world where development of tourism is the propulsive force for reproduction of existing culture through which people become consumers of their own culture and heritage.\(^{12}\)

Tourism makes places economically viable by consuming places because of an exhibition of heritage.\(^{13}\) It plays an important role in the life cycle of many places, whether the place was already discovered, waiting to be or does not want to be discovered. Heritage tourism, cultural tourism and sustainable tourism have been on the agenda of preservation and tourism industries for a few decades. The relationship between preservation and tourism used to focus simply on visual impressions and economic gain; the basic idea was that preserving the fabric would be enough to attract more visitors and eventually, more income. However, spontaneous developments resulted in unexpected levels of consumption and destruction of places. Subsequently, the discussion moved to the


\(^{13}\) Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 151.
broader consequences of an influx of tourists, resulting in morphologic, social, and cultural transformations after tourism became a major component in the local and national economic scene.

“Tourism needs destinations”: Many cities, towns or villages have become destinations within the last decades not only because of their historic qualities but mainly for their location, size and above all, accessibility of these places. These settlements started to be cited with an adjective attached persistently attached to them, “historic.” The Oxford English Dictionary defines historic as:

1. Of or belonging to history; of the nature of history; historical; esp. of the nature of history as opposed to fiction or legend.
2. Forming an important part or item of history; noted or celebrated in history; having an interest or importance due to connection with historical events.
3. Conveying or dealing with history; recording past events.

The use of this adjective can be justified if the second definition is accurate, if the place forms an important part of history or if has a connection with historical events, e.g. the historic city of Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was signed. If the first definition is the case, then every place is a part of history or a subject in its own story. However, what is meant by the term “historic town,” as it is used in most of the written literature, is explained by Aylin Orbaşlı in her book Tourists in Historic Towns: an urban environment that is associated with “a set of values based on building stock,

14 Orbaşlı, 38.
historic or other associations and life.” The emphasis is usually put on building stock or single buildings by place promoters. However, urban heritage exists in the physical attributes of buildings, public spaces and urban morphology as well as users and visitors that form a whole new layer of intangible heritage together with ongoing life. Orbaşlı examines different case studies in order to gain an understanding of the transformation from an historic town to tourist-historic town and then to tourist town, as well as the decision making and planning for historic environments. She explains that tourism can be used to generate awareness, local involvement and preservation through promotion of heritage values. While the author acknowledges that cultural tourism is an opportunity for historic towns, she posits that tourism and preservation as well as needs of tourists and communities can and should be well balanced to prevent over-commercialized end-products.

The task of balancing everyday life and tourism pressure is hard to handle; therefore, in a lot of cases, efforts are focused on touristic expectations, and the significance and needs of the actual inhabitants are neglected or undermined. Other than physical artifacts, visitors look into these places to witness and share the everyday life of people at a distance. Inhabitants and human activity are significant components of historic towns as well as tourism. Also, the continuation and preservation of urban heritage depends on the participation of the local population. The fragile relationship between tourism and community can evolve in different ways as described by Peter T. Newby:

16 Orbaşlı, 13.
1. Coexistence: Tourism does not dominate the economy and ongoing pattern continues.
2. Exploitation: Culture is used to generate cash flow and commerce, and presentation for external market.
3. Staging of culture as imaginary reconstruction: Recreation of culture by shaping and packaging it to a recognized formula for the benefit of market.17

In *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett discusses the concept of heritage and its associations with tourism. She claims that heritage is “a mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past” and used to give cities with declining economies a second chance by displaying themselves as heritage objects.18 The author states that heritage is a way of adding value to existing assets which turns locations into destinations; cities display what they once were to revitalize their economies. The industry finds solutions to density problems (linking low-density attractions or marketing exclusive sites to high-end tourists who want to run away from saturation).19 Natural and cultural heritage is under the rule of the tourism industry for the most part, especially if places need it desperately for economic gain. Heritage is utilized for its monetary value in weaker economies as a support. However, there is a risk and reality of destroying the existing economic structure by overcapitalizing tourism and overlooking, e.g. in the case of losing agriculture or livestock tradition. As standardization becomes a part of tourism, the industry faces the problem of sameness. However, as the author notes, destinations have to be unique and clearly distinguishable

---

18 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 7.
19 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 146.
for better marketing and chance of survival while competing with each other; and according to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, identical destinations are still being manufactured because:

- Corporations hold many of the tourist amenities in their hands.
- There is a need for reliable products in universal standards.
- Interchangeability of generic products is a lifesaver that allows for the shifting of destinations if needed in case of a crisis.20

Corporation ownership is definitely an issue, in addition to tour companies who are leading the local business owners according to their needs and tourists’ stereotyped expectations. Even if corporations do not own the amenities, most of the remaining tourism investors are directed by tried and true formulas and trends in developing similar approaches.

In his article “Cultural Tourism,” Dean MacCannell examines the original basis for culture, cultural tourism and its transformation. Tourism is seen as a response to the decline of historic towns and tourists optimistically assume that this income will be used to preserve culture and heritage. However, as the author cites from Lanfant, “tradition, memory and heritage are not stable realities” and touching the existing fabric by means of restoration and breaking the chain of heritage construction might actually result in artificial experiences and artificial places. MacCannell references Torremolinos in Spain as an example of transformation from a mere place, a fishing town, to a crowded tourist destination where fishing became the object of exhibition. A New York Times journalist

20 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 152-153.
described this transformation in 1988 by calling Torremolinos “a former sleepy fishing village that is now a developed-some say overdeveloped-resort.”\textsuperscript{21} Such is the case for many towns on the Mediterranean coast of Turkey as well. Discovered mainly for their unspoiled cultural and natural beauty, Marmaris, Hisarönu and Gümbet were marketed to tourists for their small size and “charm.” After being heavily promoted to tour operators, these places became major destinations for European working-class vacationers, especially from Britain. They were reconstructed to meet the expectations of new visitors: now, bars serve “a varied menu with typical English and continental dishes alongside traditional Turkish cuisine” or “Chinese, Indian, Italian, Mexican, Japanese, Thai or Turkish,” and English pubs are broadcasting Premier League games.\textsuperscript{22}

MacCannell points out that a new kind of metastatic anti-culture has developed that replaces the culture that once attracted visitors in the first place: museums substitute the actual objects with electronic entertainments and Las Vegas is full of cultural destination copies.\textsuperscript{23} An example of this in Turkey is Topkapı Palace in İstanbul. One can visit the palace complex and spend hours in the historic peninsula, or go to Miniaturk park for a five-second version with a poor 1/25-scale model, or spend a summer vacation in Topkapı Palace Hotel in Antalya and “stay in the Harem, have food from the great Palace Kitchens and Hagia Irini, drink tasteful wine at the Justice Tower.”\textsuperscript{24} In order to reverse

\textsuperscript{22}Gumbet, Turkey, www.gumbet.org.uk and Hisaronu Online, www.hisaronu.co.uk
\textsuperscript{23}MacCannel, 26.
\textsuperscript{24}World of Wonders Resort Hotels, http://www.wowhotels.com/wowtopkapipalace.asp.
the damage of cases like the ones above, the author suggests that we need to develop a strong cultural theory, education programs to understand cultural heritage and reinvent the representation of heritage, tradition and memory. For example, he proposes that appreciation of cultural heritage should not be based only on the emotional impact which leads to commercialization; heritage should be received with respect and admiration for its creators and the reasons behind that creation.

G. J. Ashworth and J.E. Tunbridge question what a “tourist-historic city” is in their book *The Tourist-Historic City: Retrospect and Prospect of Managing the Heritage City*. The authors define tourist-historic city in three ways: first, an urban morphology and urban
activity; second, a particular type of city and a specialized region within a city; and lastly, the use of history as a tourism resource and use of tourism as a means of supporting conservation/preservation and justifying attention to the historicity of cities.\textsuperscript{25} While explaining the land use selectivity of the tourist movement, they try to find the reason for

a limited knowledge of the place, expectations of visitors and time-space-cost constraints.

Orbaşlı, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Ashworth and Tunbridge have a similar approach to the threat that comes with excess commercial activity. Places are being diminished to their few characteristics through a “commodification” process; on a visit to İstanbul, one will definitely visit the Hagia Sophia, Blue Mosque or Grand Bazaar in the historic Peninsula but would hardly be aware of the residential neighborhoods a few streets away from these attractions. Ashworth and Tunbridge state that a tourist-historic city is shaped by the choices of the resource manager, the assembler of the saleable tourism package and finally, the tourist. A clearly branded final product has predefined routes such as the loop tourists from cruise ships follow in Kotor, Montenegro or the linear movement along Main Street of Alaçatı in İzmir. Commercial centers are usually a part of this or a new commercial axis forms rapidly as an attachment to the proposed route. These towns are not limited to beaten tourist paths, but selected paths and attractions are imposed on visitors one way or another.

Since shopping and eating are the most popular activities for visitors, retail is a significant part of destinations and tourist experience. Historic attractions might have been the primary reason for a visit but visitors spend most of their time and money on secondary

facilities.27 Traditional commercial quarters transformed to serve tourists whereas local businesses move away from these established location to the edges. Kuşadası is a very good and unfortunate example of this. It is located on the southwest coast of Turkey and it was a resort town for domestic tourists until the 1980s when the Turkish government started investing in international mass tourism. Today, Kuşadası is the destination for international package tourists (who represent 82% of total visitors), especially from cruise ships.28 As a result of this continuous flow, the historic quarter of the town was transformed into an open air shopping mall that mainly caters to international tourists. The local commercial district was moved to a recently built section, and the boundaries of both are evident. The historic fabric of Kuşadası is nearly gone; it is very hard to see traditional details through newly constructed replicas or over-restored structures. Also, a visit in January and July will be completely different experiences: during the off season, countless shutters are down and streets are dead quiet; during high season, streets are crowded with tourists of different nationalities shopping and eating in restaurants serving international and Turkish cuisines. The lack of regulation and tourism planning resulted in a new type of urban morphology, a tourist-historic city as Ashworth and Tunbridge put it. The authors characterize the tourist-historic city as a place where tourism plays an important role in the development of historic resources while at the same time historical resources form a growing tourism industry; thus, the symbiosis of both is a major force in the design and structure of the city.29

27 Urry, 61-62.
29 Ashworth and Tunbridge, 3.
The relationship between retail and tourism is also brought to our attention by John Urry in his book *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. He mentions the importance of developing necessary regulations for the tourism market, such as infrastructure planning, visitor management conservation, etc. in order to avoid the self-destruction of places, particularly by mass tourism. An example that of a place that lacked early precautions could be Pamukkale in the southeastern Aegean region of Turkey. The site is famous for its hot springs, travertines and the ancient city

Figure 5. Commercial center of Kuşadası; *above*, shutters are down and no one is walking on the streets during the low season; *below*, a view during the high season while shops and restaurants are open, attracting tourists with signage in English and stalls full of generic gifts and fake-brand clothing. Source: Author, 2011; http://www.flickr.com/photos/54813587@N07/512590632/in/set-72157625050337261.
of Hierapolis. In the mid-20th century, a number of hotels were built on and around the archaeological site. Water was relocated to private pools, roads were built over terraces and tourists were allowed to walk on the travertines without any restrictions. As a result, the natural and cultural heritage suffered great damage and tourist numbers dropped severely. Delayed regulations were declared within the last decade, and Pamukkale recovered from the damage before it was too late.

Another topic Urry identifies is the complex relationship between tourists and indigenous populations. He argues that the reasons for artificiality of places should be searched for in social associations. The number of tourists versus locals, the predominant object of touristic activity, the effects of tourism on the preexisting agricultural and industrial activities, and the degree to which the government promotes or prevents tourism developments are some of the determinants he uses to understand plasticated places.30 These criteria are central to understanding not only the social but also the physical changes in towns and the tourism-related transformation process, and are used in the documentation and analysis of the case studies selected for this thesis.

Myriam Jansen-Verbeke states that traditional urban centers offer possibilities of combining shopping, sightseeing and leisure activities, and she sees tourism as an opportunity to revitalize and improve the quality of these centers.31 However, she also

30 Urry, 56-59.
presents the downside wherein a particular type of retailing dominates the market-like gift shops and results in overwhelming environments for both visitors and inhabitants. The balance of positive and negative effects of tourism depends on the qualities of the destination (physical features, economic and social structures and level of economic and tourist development) and also on the type and characteristics of tourists (the socio-economic classification of tourists, the level of use of the destination, length of stay, type of tourist activity and their satisfaction levels). The physical features of the environment are still very effective as key motives and qualities provided by traditional commercial centers (accessibility, aesthetic value, architecture, pedestrian priority, street retailing, etc.) put them on the top of the list despite the transformation they are going through.

**Literature Review on Tourism Development in Turkey**

John Urry defined Turkey as a major developing tourist destination in 1990; however, the country moved into seventh place on the list of “International Tourist Arrivals” with 25 million visitors in 2009, approximately five times the number in 1990, making it one of the major tourist destinations in the world. But even more than 20 years ago, the deterioration of small towns was noted by the author: these places were discovered and targeted for select, upscale tourism for being “small and pretty,” but lost their previous visitors after invasion of mass tourism, leaving unplanned developments behind.

It is very hard to find a specific definition for mass tourism; it is usually described chronologically and by a number of attributes: mass tourism started after World War II and peaked around the 1980s and 1990s. It involves a large influx of visitors, usually has a predetermined program lead by tour companies, and is frequently associated with the resulting rapid development that focuses on economic revenue. “Select tourism,” mentioned above, was not particularly defined by Urry but can be linked to the “special interest” and “place specific” tourism descriptions of Ashworth and Tunbridge. Special-interest tourism is driven by individually motivated interests and results in highly diversified products. Place-specific tourism utilizes the tourism attraction as the genius loci, using unique qualities of the place rather than generic characteristics.34

It is important to understand Turkey’s tourism past in order to assess its evolution and the transformation of historic towns as touristic destinations. Interest and investment in the tourism industry emerged in the 1950s, with the aim of increasing gross national product and foreign currency flow as well as creating new employment opportunities and providing vacation opportunities for Turkish citizens. The state pioneered establishment of tourism facilities as models for the private investors and built nine hotels in metropolitan cities and three holiday villages in coastal towns (self-contained commercial establishments near the beach where visitors stay in villa-type structures and use amenities without leaving the complex).35 Early attempts to regulate the tourism industry
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34 Ashworth and Tunbridge, 55.
included the enactment of the Law for Encouragement of Tourism Industry in 1953 and initiation of five-year development plans in 1963. The very first development plan concentrated on utilizing natural and historical resources and investing in areas with high tourism potential, namely the Marmara region, Aegean region and Antalya. The second plan declared the three kilometer-wide coastline along the Aegean and Mediterranean seas (from Çanakkale to Mersin) as the main development area for mass tourism.

Figure 6. Hatched area showing the 3-km wide coastline from Çanakkale to Mersin which was declared as the tourism development area for mass tourism by the Second Five-Year Development Plan in 1968. Source: Edited from the base map from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:BlankMapTurkeyProvinces.png.

The 1980s was called the “First Attack in Tourism Development;” it was a governmental project which was supported with physical plans, legislative improvements and infrastructure upgrades. In 1982, the Tourism Encouragement Law, which declared the

---

37 Tezcan, 55-56.
Ministry of Culture and Tourism as the main body to geographically define tourism regions and brought incentives to support private investors, was issued. These incentives resulted in rapid and accumulated development along the coast and unexpected rates of urbanization. A number of tourism-oriented seaside facilities were built both by national and international investors in the coastal towns, illegally enclosing the beach for their private use. Tour operators promoted and sold package holidays which kept tourists in the facilities, so hinterland settlements, let alone residents of other parts of the country, could not benefit from the tourism development that was happening next to them. Although a lot was going on within the boundaries of the towns, the centers did not drive direct benefits from tourism. They tried to hold on to this expansion by offering lower-rate accommodation facilities, vacation homes and touristic retail opportunities, so economic and social structures began to transform around tourism development. Domestic tourism was another rising issue in Turkey, with the nonstop building of vacation homes in coastal areas. The landscapes were, and still are, invaded by construction firms and hundreds of identical houses in beach towns. A positive aspect of tourism development for these towns was the state’s infrastructural upgrading through the Southwest Coast Environmental Project that was initiated in 1989, allowing for the planning, designing and construction of water supply and sewerage systems, wastewater treatment, disposal facilities etc.
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38 Cooper and Özdil, 379.
39 Tezcan, 70.
All five-year plans focused on sea-sand-sun mass tourism, although the preservation of cultural and natural resources as well as alternative forms of tourism were always on the agenda. In the 1990s, the state changed national tourism policies: they remained as the main body to decide on the physical boundaries of tourism areas but pulled back from investing except in unfinished projects. To slow down the pressure on the coast, incentives for the Aegean and Mediterranean regions were aborted during this period.\textsuperscript{40} The late 1990s and the first years of the 2000s witnessed a slowdown in the tourism market due to the Gulf War, the 1999 earthquake and terrorism. The number/quality of foreign tourist arrivals and subsequently, economic gain, decreased.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{40} Tezcan, 73.}
Even if the focus of tourism development was always on the Mediterranean and Aegean coasts, it did not happen equally in all places. Tosun, Timothy and Öztürk point out overriding coastal tourism development and geographic disparities among regions. Coastal cities have always been wealthier than inner regions but still receive privileged treatment from the government because of pressure from international tour operators.

Gezici, Gül and Akay analyzed coastal development patterns in Turkey based on tourism variables (the number of arrivals, nights spent, average length of stay, occupation rate, and bed capacity) as well as socio-economic development indicators (population, rate of urbanization, rate of unemployment etc.) and revealed different patterns. The first group they studied covers Antalya (Kemer, Alanya, Manavgat) and Muğla (Bodrum and Marmaris) where the tourism demand is the most intense. Antalya developed as a result of Tourism Development Projects of the state with a special emphasis on mass tourism, whereas Bodrum and Marmaris developed impulsively without any tourism or even urban planning. All these places are main destinations for international tourists and hold the highest number of arrivals and nights spent. They have been facing environmental problems as a result of tourism growth because they urbanized before restrictions regarding new development or infrastructure were imposed by the government.

41 Tosun, Timothy and Öztürk, 133-157.
43 Cooper and Özdil, 380.
second group includes relatively small towns (Kaş, Ayvacık, Köyceğiz, Finike and Fethiye) that are close to the tourism centers mentioned above. International tourist numbers are lower but periods of stay are longer in these locations. These places do not provide large-scale hotels; they are still smaller communities with a low level of development funded by tourism income. The third group includes the two case studies of this thesis, Çeşme and Foça, together with Kuşadası, Ayvalık and Didim. These towns have a relatively high level of development and are preferred for short-term holidays or summer houses by inhabitants of larger metropolises. They still receive a higher ratio of foreign tourists with longer stays.

In her article “Domestic tourism: a chance for regional development in Turkey?” Astrid Seckelmann, who specializes in urban and regional development along with social geography, criticizes the role of Turkish government in tourism planning. She posits that the centralized government dominated the planning process, disregarded local people and dealt with potential large-scale investors during the expansion phase. Therefore, small local investors who were the basis of the early tourist developments were replaced by large (out-of-town or foreign) capital owners and locals became the workforce. She also points to the way in which centralization of planning and implementation alienates local people and results in low acceptance of these plans. Even in those situations, the author claims that residents support tourism development and agree to the small income

they derive from it with hopes of receiving greater incomes from tourism in the future.

Tosun and Jenkins cite many other authors as well in their discussion of how touristic
destinations have the potential to destroy themselves through over-commercialization
and loss of unique qualities.46 They support this idea with examples from Turkey,
Marmaris, Bodrum, Kuşadası or Ürgüp, some of which are discussed on the previous
pages of this thesis, and emphasize a common feature as the main factor for damage:
all of these destinations receive visitors through all-inclusive tour packages. Companies
carry out ready-to-consume tours during which visitors stay in their hotels all the time
or visit predetermined destinations by passenger coaches and are directed to contracted
dealers for their shopping by tour guides. Turkish culture is reduced to a collection of
well-known images and consecutively presented but disconnected activities such as
whirling dervishes, Turkish folk dances, reenactment of a traditional wedding and belly
dancers. Tosun criticizes this vulgarized culture as a tourism resource which results in
a misleading and damaged image of a place.47 The commodification process results in
standardizing places and it is one of the most obvious threats to the cultural significance
and distinctiveness of different towns. It becomes difficult for the visitor to recognize
where he/she is while surrounded with duplicate cultural components in different
locations. As a result, destinations compete not in terms of product differentiation and
quality but only through price.48 It would be better if this competition could be directed
to promote and preserve differentiation and the local distinctiveness of places through the

46 Cevat Tosun and C.L. Jenkins, “Regional Planning Approaches to Tourism Development: the
Case of Turkey,” *Tourism Management* 17, no. 7 (1996): 525.
47 Cevat Tosun, “Challenges of Sustainable Tourism Development in the Developing World: the
Case of Turkey,” *Tourism Management* 22, no. 3 (2001): 297-301.
48 Tosun, 301.
preservation of tangible and intangible heritage. In this way, tourists who go to Kuşadası will have the motivation to visit Marmaris as well without feeling as though they are seeing the same place twice.

In “Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: the case of Turkey,” Cevat Tosun, professor of tourism research and management at Mustafa Kemal University in Turkey, explores the reasons behind Turkey’s struggle with sustainable tourism. He claims that the state made many mistakes during the process, the major one being that it considered the earning of foreign currency and employment opportunities on the national scale above the preservation and fair distribution of growth among regions and cities. Although the Ministry now develops tourism plans, this vision has not changed dramatically in the last decades. The author lists the current problems of national tourism development as lack of flexibility and decentralization, lack of integration, lack of community perspective, being dominated by international tour operators, major domestic business interests and central government and finally, lack of consistency, coordination and cooperation.49

In order to renew previous tourism policies, the “Second Attack in Tourism Development” started in 2002 under the supervision of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Major changes in the new vision included encouraging entertainment-education-environment tourism besides sea-sand-sun tourism, highlighting the historical

49 Tosun, 292.
and cultural identity of Turkey as a trademark and diversifying and spreading tourism geographically as well as seasonally. Amendments to the Law for the Encouragement of Tourism were approved in 2003, and brought the new institutions of the Culture and Tourism Preservation and Development Regions (CTPDR) and Tourism Centers.

Cultural and Tourism Preservation and Development Regions: The regions having a high potential for tourism development, and/or having intensive historical and cultural importance, that are to be evaluated for the purpose of preservation, utilization, sectoral development and planned improvement. Boundaries of these regions are determined and declared by the Council of Ministers upon the proposal of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

Tourism Centers: The places with important tourism movement and activity and having priority in terms of development. They can be located inside or outside the Cultural and Tourism Preservation and Development Regions, and their boundaries are determined and declared by the Council of Ministers upon the proposal of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.50

The new law declares the Ministry as the only authorized body to make, modify, and approve plans of all scales. There are 25 CTPD regions today, declared between 2004 and 2007 according to a list on the official website of the General Directorate of Investments and Enterprises, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and less than half of them are located outside the western and southern coastal areas. However, tourism centers are spread throughout the country.

A more recent document is *Tourism Strategy of Turkey 2023, Action Plan 2007-2013*, prepared and published by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. This plan aims to provide

---

a sustainable, healthy growth of the tourism sector, and summarizes its goals as

“evolving possible tourism alternatives (such as health and thermal tourism, winter sports, ecotourism, golf tourism, cruise ship and yacht tourism etc.) in addition to coastal tourism, and wiser use of natural, cultural, historical and geographical assets with a balanced perspective addressing both conservation and utilization needs spontaneously and in an equitable sense.”

The plan also proposes forming tourism corridors, cities and ecotourism areas along the development axes rather than plot-scale planning. They are well aware of the problems caused by unplanned tourism development in the past (mass concentration along the Aegean and Mediterranean coasts, distorted urbanization in the nearby areas, and

---

deficient infrastructure and environmental problems) but do not address the threats of commercialization and homogenization.

The strategic plan sets future goals and is positive in terms of understanding the problems inherent in and created by earlier tourism development, pointing out the importance of integrated planning, diversification of tourism types and distribution of touristic activity throughout the year. However, the Ministry has absolute power which flows from large-scale plans (declaring all tourism development regions, corridors and tourism cities) to very small-scale implementation proposals such as the “construction of five 18-hole golf courses in Cappadocia” rather than strategies and comprehensive plans.52

---

52 Ibid., 29-34.
3. ÇEŞME

Çeşme is located very close to İzmir, the third largest city in Turkey, and other significant towns with whom it shares a historic, cultural and natural continuity and identity. It is easily accessible by land or sea and visited by both domestic and foreign visitors from late spring to early fall. Although sea-sand-sun tourism was the driving force of its initial tourism development in 1950s, cultural and natural heritage are also seen as major attractions. Çeşme has a continuous settlement throughout the history, since pre-Roman times, the traces of which are legible in the center and its immediate vicinity. Traditional architecture, namely monuments, houses, and fountains that gave the place its name, of a later period (starting from the 16th century) is still a part of the current urban fabric. Although many buildings were destroyed after the 1980s with the increasing demands of tourism, there are remaining structures with high integrity that help keep the fabric in place. The commercial center that starts at the coast and heads to the northwest is still a part of busy daily life during both high and low tourism seasons. The physical landscape is a vital part of the built environment and community, and is protected by designations on the national scale. Agriculture ranks second in terms of income source after tourism, and locals grow olives, melon, mastic and artichokes, all of which are claimed as Çeşme’s specialized products. Agriculture has a significant effect on the local cuisine which focuses on use of fresh vegetables, olive oil, different herbs and greens, as well as mastic. It is also affected by migrations and cultural changes throughout history which added new recipes and flavors. Although the consequences of tourism are visible through
the construction of vacation homes and hotels, Çeşme still preserves its distinctiveness but struggles to balance the increasing demands of tourism and local needs. The lack of proper preservation/development/tourism planning makes it even harder for local, regional and national governments.

**History and Development**

Çeşme is a coastal town located 85 km west of İzmir, on the western-most end of . It is part of the Karaburun Peninsula which is surrounded by the Aegean Sea. Administratively, it is a township with two municipalities (Çeşme and Alaçatı) and four villages (Ovacık, İldırı, Germiyan ve Karaköy). This thesis will focus on the district center of Çeşme and its commercial center which covers the northern part of the township and has a population of 20,700.53

Tourism is among the main means of subsistence in Çeşme, along with ongoing agriculture and livestock practices. The types of agricultural products have changed in the last century, starting with vineyards and olives in the early 1900s, moving to tobacco in the 1950s and recently to melon and artichokes. Olive orchards still constitute a major part of the agricultural landscape but have lost their importance and dominance compared to the early 20th-century. The changes in products were due to different technical and economical problems: the phylloxera epidemic destroyed most of the vineyards during

Figure 9. Location of Çeşme and Karaburun Peninsula in relation to İzmir. Source: Edited from Google Maps, 2011.

Figure 10. Aerial view of Çeşme district center showing main roads connecting to İzmir, and some of the landmarks. The commercial area surveyed for this thesis is illustrated by a dashed line. Source: Edited from Google Maps, 2011.
the 1930s, and the hard work of tobacco cultivation was not economically viable anymore and was discontinued in the 1980s. The mastic tree is another significant element of native vegetation and used to be an important agricultural product. However, this tradition has been largely abandoned. Mastic gum is still promoted and sold as a region-specific ingredient in many products in Çeşme, but it actually has been imported from Chios. Wild mastic trees need to be inoculated in order to be cultivated for mastic gum, its aromatic resin. Recently, projects supported by Ege University of İzmir and local organizations seek to revive this tradition in the region.

The history of the settlement goes back to the seventh century BCE, to the pre-Roman period, but development of the current town center occurred mostly after the 14th century as a result of the increasing sea trade. Çeşme Castle and Caravanserai were both built in the first half of the 16th century and triggered the urbanization of the area. There was a very active trade between Çeşme and the Greek island of Chios, which is only eight nautical miles away. Agriculture and livestock were other means of living for the inhabitants. The popularity and population of the town fluctuated due to changes in commerce; in the 17th century, many merchants moved to İzmir due to the increasing importance of its harbor. Later, the town gained a military importance with naval forces, and in the 18th century, immigrants from Greek islands came to Çeşme because of its fertile agricultural lands. All of this movement resulted mostly in economic progress in the settlement, but at the same time disturbed the stability of its population and urban
The compulsory exchange of minorities between Greece and Turkey in the 1920s, after the Independence War, was the last significant population movement until the seasonal changes of the late 20th century that were caused by tourism.

When the Turkish government started to invest in tourism in the 1950s, coastal settlements in the hinterlands of metropolises received great attention and Çeşme was one of them for its proximity to İzmir. The very first tourist facilities were built on the northern coast of Çeşme in İlica neighborhood because of its hot springs. In time, visitors discovered the sea and beaches; the focus of tourism shifted from the hot springs to sea-sand-sun. In the 1950s, construction of İlica Şantiye Evleri brought the idea of vacation homes into being. Şantiye Evleri, meaning construction site houses in Turkish, was the first housing complex of vacation homes along İlica beach, constructed by wealthier families of İzmir. (They are still very popular, now because of their location, mid-century architecture and established, residential feeling.)

The first development plan of Çeşme was also introduced in this period. The plan of 1951 proposed a preservation area around the Castle (which is still valid today) including a portion of the commercial center, and it was implemented for more than 30 years.

55 After Turkish Independence War, Greece and Turkey signed an agreement in 1923 for compulsory exchange of the Greek Orthodox citizens in Turkish territory and the Muslim citizens in Greek territory. Agreement excluded the Greek inhabitants of İstanbul and the Muslim inhabitants of Western Thrace. About 1.5 million people were involved in the movement. (Renée Hirschon, “‘Unmixing Peoples’ in the Aegean region” Crossing the Aegean: an appraisal of the 1923 compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey, ed. Renée Hirschon, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 3.
The plan received many revisions due to tourism development, especially in the İlçca neighborhood. A later plan study was initiated in 1981 as tourism investments gained speed. The second development plan was approved in 1984 and it remains in effect until today. The 1984 plan listed “preserving agricultural lands” as one of its priorities while encouraging tourism development along the coast. However, a certain amount of fields were sacrificed for new constructions. The plan has been unable to meet the current development and/or preservation needs of the settlement for almost a decade now, therefore, a new master plan study started in 2002. The long-expected plan was still in the approval process while this thesis was being written.

After the construction of Şantiye Evleri, the resort-town potential of Çeşme was discovered by inhabitants of İzmir, and the town became a highly preferable destination, especially for vacation homes. Construction activities along the coast line gained speed especially during the 1980s and 1990s with the increasing demand for second-home ownership (the national government of these decades focused on free-market economy and private ownership). In addition to vacation homes, many tourist facilities encouraged by the incentives of the Ministry of Tourism were also built during this period. Tourism areas were expanded throughout the coast and in addition to İlçca, the center of Çeşme, Alaçatı town and other villages became attractions and received investments after the 1980s.
The settlement initially attracted people from the İzmir area for day or weekend trips and certainly for vacation homes because of its proximity and easier accessibility compared to other resort towns on the Karaburun peninsula. Çeşme’s port was built in 1991 and provides major commercial activity and transportation between Greece, Italy and Turkey with ferries and ro-ro ships. The harbor restored the tradition of overseas commerce in the town’s history. Another large-scale investment was the six-lane highway between Çeşme and İzmir which was constructed in the early 1990s by the Turkish state to improve ground transportation. Easy access accelerated the construction facilities and resulted in the expansion of land designated for vacation homes and consequently the loss of more agricultural land. The danger of losing the landscape triggered the government’s attention and initial preservation decisions of Çeşme Township were announced in 1992 and 1995 when the majority of the peninsula was designated as natural and archaeological sites of varying degrees. The central district was also attempted to be preserved by partial urban designations and single building registrations but most of the historic fabric was already lost in the 1980s due to tourism development along the commercial axis and the coast and residential development away from the coastline.

---

57 Refer to Appendix for definitions of different types and degrees of designations.
Figure 11. Partial aerial view of the district showing vacation homes; the highway connection of Çeşme to İzmir can be seen on the right. Source: Çeşme Belediyesi, http://www.cesmebelediyesi.com/index.php?page=p_galeri_havafoto.

Figure 12. Natural, archaeological and urban sites in and around Çeşme district center which are under different levels of protection by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; data from METU Çeşme Studio Report, 2011.
Today, 70% of the total dwellings are vacation homes that are occupied at most for three or four months a year.\textsuperscript{58} These homes result in high summer populations in the area and increase the need for municipal services which puts pressure on the limited budget of the Municipality like many other resort towns in Turkey. Tourism also increased property values and caused difficulties in the purchase of homes for inhabitants. The lack of adequate number of dwellings in the center of town due to designated sites is another reason for high real estate prices. İzmir’s Chamber of Commerce criticized vacation homes for their unplanned development and how they limit the available land for larger tourist facilities as a result.\textsuperscript{59} According to a recent survey, there are 174 touristic accommodation facilities of different scales (hotel, motel or guest houses) in Çeşme which provide more than 7,000 beds, the highest number in İzmir after the center city.\textsuperscript{60} Çeşme is chosen by visitors for its less developed urban structure and preserved landscape despite the great number of vacation homes.\textsuperscript{61} Small scale boutique hotels in the area are highly preferred by both domestic and foreign tourists. Dense built environment and larger facilities do not fit in the image and identity of the town and their development will be a threat to its natural fabric as well as to tourism.


\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} There are 26 facilities licensed by the Ministry, survey date unknown (www.izmirkulturturizm.gov.tr/belge/1-87469/belgeli-konaklama-tesisleri.html, accessed on March 12, 2011); 148 facilities licensed by the Municipality according to 2006 survey (www.kultur.gov.tr/TR/belge/1-63769/tesis-istatistikleri.html, accessed on March 12, 2011).

\textsuperscript{61} Compared to other resort towns such as Bodrum, Marmaris or Kuşadası.
Çeşme used to be a quieter summer resort that mostly served İzmir until the early 1990s, but gradually, especially within the last decade, it became one of the most fashionable destinations in Turkey with increasing media interest from newspapers and television. Its climate allows for an active tourism season of up to five or six months and the driving source has been coastal tourism. The state and the municipality both work on extending the season and bringing different types of tourism to the area: hot springs and surfing are the two major components of this plan together with golf, convention and yachting tourism. Çeşme’s marina was opened in the spring of 2010 at the district center, on the coast across from the Castle and commercial center. It has an open all-year-round shopping area and a capacity of 400 berths, creating “a recreational and social focus for
the town with shops, boutiques, restaurants, and a yacht club.” The positive aspects of the marina are its architecture in terms of scale and material use that pay respect to regional characteristics, and its management which tries to connect to the town center by promoting heritage, local amenities and activities on its website. As the mayor and urban planner of Çeşme Municipality stated, recent planning activities focus on bonding the commercial center (İnkılâp Caddesi) and the marina, and creating a continuous axis in the town. The marina will definitely attract more visitors in the future; it is already listed as one of the landmarks of the town with its “sophisticated” shops, restaurants and cafés, but it should not compete with the historic commercial center and accelerate its decline by decentralization. The harbor and marina form a major entryway to the town but their capacity has to be controlled to preserve the identity of Çeşme.

A future plan of bringing cruise ships to Çeşme port raises a question about the tourism capacity of the town. Çeşme Port was constructed and managed by Turkey Maritime Organization, a public enterprise until its privatization in 2003. Operation rights of the port were assigned to Ulusoy Çeşme Port Management Inc. for 30 years. The company announced their future plans to expand the port and bring cruise ships to Çeşme. Currently, ships visiting the immediate area bypass Çeşme and stop in Kuşadası and İzmir.

Negative effects of cruise ship tourism in Kuşadası are summarized in the second chapter of this thesis.
Current Status, January 2011

A field survey of the commercial center of Çeşme was performed in January 2011 to understand the physical fabric and changes in the market related to tourism. İnkılap Caddesi was selected as the target area for being the historic commercial corridor and 88 properties were surveyed on both sides of the street starting from Cumhuriyet Meydanı to Uzun Sokak. The survey revealed that 58 percent of the buildings are recent concrete constructions, 28 percent are either intact or have some alterations and the remaining 14 percent have many alterations which makes it harder to see the historic quality in those buildings. It can be clearly stated that the traditional fabric is mostly gone due to the replacement of historic buildings by the contemporary constructions of the last decades. However, the remaining historic buildings have high integrity and new constructions preserved the lot boundaries as well as building heights along the street, soothe morphology of the place has not changed dramatically.

Cumhuriyet Meydanı is the main square of the district center which is surrounded by the Municipality, Çeşme Castle, several banks and other commercial uses (Figure 14). The square illustrates the preservation and planning history of the town. If one looks from the sea toward the Castle, the traditional fabric is clearly visible but the additions of the last century are also evident. The new buildings are two or three story constructions with reasonable proportions, so they usually do not show up dramatically. (The Municipality, Belediye, a concrete frame building imitating traditional architecture with a mix of contemporary material, is more on the incompatible side.) A view from the square toward
the sea tells a different story. There are two six-story high hotel buildings from the second half of the 20th century that dominate the square. They are the only high-rise buildings in the immediate surroundings; Çeşme was fortunate enough to keep the building heights low even with new constructions. There are better infill projects as well; Ziraat Bankası, the Agricultural Bank of the Republic of Turkey, located right next to the hotels, is a good example of mid-century institutional architecture.

Figure 14. Building integrity in the study area as of January 2011. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; plan from Çeşme Municipality; data collected through field survey by the author, January 2011.
Building integrity mapping along İnkılap Caddesi reveals a clearer pattern: new constructions are concentrated on both ends of the street, especially to the east, which are open to busier commercial areas used by the local population. These portions of the street cater more to the inhabitants with banks, shops selling clothing and shoes and eating places. A more active retail area might be the reason for a higher market value and the construction of new buildings instead of keeping traditional ones which need more maintenance and attention from their owners.
In terms of building use, the street preserves its identity with commercial and mixed-use buildings. Approximately 50 percent of the buildings are used only for commercial purposes (retail, bank and dining) whereas the other 50 percent is used for both commercial and residential purposes. The commercial center is not limited to İnkilap Caddesi, it also continues along the coast and on the western end of the street. Moreover, commercial activity is scattered all around the township after the construction of vacation homes and the formation of new sub-centers. Still, İnkilap Caddesi serves the needs of inhabitants together with the seasonal population. Among all stores, 16 of them are retail that cater to tourists. These stores sell generic, mass-produced gifts like magnets, hookah,
decorative tiles and Turkish delight. Leather is another popular item for tourists visiting Turkey; most of the stores selling shoes or bags appeal to locals and tourists but there are a few which target only foreign tourists (there are promotional signs in Greek and many stickers of Scandinavian tour companies on the shop window). There are only a small number of restaurants that serve local cuisine or places that sell local food such as herbs or mastic flavored ice-cream.

Figure 17. Building use in the study area as of January 2011. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; plan from Çeşme Municipality; data collected through field survey by the author, January 2011.
Vacancy is another problem in the commercial district: Within the survey area, 45 percent of buildings were partially or completely vacant in January due to the low season. There is not an apparent pattern in terms of ground floor, upper floor and total vacancies; however, the issue is more common in the central part of the street. This is probably caused by both ends of the street opening to commercial areas that serve the needs of year-round inhabitants.

Figure 18. Views from İnkilap Caddesi. Above, a leather shop targeting mostly international tourists; below, one of the very few shops selling local goods, different jams in this case. Source: Author, 2011.
Figure 19. Building vacancy in the study area as of January 2011. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; plan from Çeşme Municipality; data collected through field survey by the author, January 2011.

Figure 20. Vacancy is an important problem that both traditional and new buildings suffer from. Source: Author, 2011.
Analysis

Tourism is one of the major income sources in Çeşme, and both national and local governments propose investments in tourism as a part of their long-term plans. Although preservation of natural and cultural heritage has been emphasized in many documents, in reality, tourism investments are usually understood as construction of large-scale facilities rather than small-scale tourism planning.

The transformation of Çeşme into an actual touristic destination started in the 1980s with the Turkish state’s push for tourism and incentives given for the Aegean region, and gained speed in the 1990s. Nevertheless, Çeşme remained merely a resort town of İzmir for quite some time, a status that changed only upon the flow of Turkish “socialites” from İstanbul and increased media attention to the town.

At this point, Çeşme is in the exploitation stage, the second stage of culture, community and visitor relationship continuum defined by Peter T. Newby: “Culture is used to generate cash flow and commerce and consequently presentation is predominantly for the external market.” In Çeşme, natural sources are more dominant than culture for generating cash flow but the result is very similar. The Aegean Sea, its climate and the beaches have led to nature-oriented tourism, and its proximity to İzmir and easy accessibility accelerated its popularity. Since sea-sand-sun was the focus of tourism, built heritage was not seen as a component of touristic growth. Çeşme Castle, the
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66 Newby, 208.
Caravanserai and the Church of Agios Haralambos are promoted as landmarks and must-see attractions. Therefore, they receive more attention; conservation and adaptive reuse projects were carried out for each (the Castle is an open-air museum and houses the local archaeological museum, the Caravanserai is used as a boutique hotel, and the church was being used as an art gallery but is currently under restoration). However, a large amount of the traditional residential and commercial fabric was lost during the 1980s and 1990s. Today, a limited portion of the town center is designated as an urban site but it is difficult to see and feel the past, especially in the commercial area, because of the new construction and harshly restored or ruined historic buildings that now constitute the majority of the built fabric.

Figure 21. Although much of it was demolished in the past, the traditional residential fabric of Çeşme is still visible in some parts. Source: Author, 2011.
Tourism is the primary income source in Çeşme but fortunately still has not wiped out the agricultural production in spite of the many fields sacrificed to build vacation homes. There are lots of projects proposed by local and national governments and investors related to the tourism future of Çeşme: building an airport in the town, bringing cruise ships to the port or even building a holiday village in the form of an Ottoman town.67

Another factor that expedited the loss of the town’s individuality is the lack of comprehensive preservation, development or tourism plans, or any plans really at all. The latest plan was prepared in 1984 and has been out-of-date for a long time; a new plan has been in the approval process for the last three years, leaving the town with no valid zoning code. Its listing as a tourism center by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism only encourages more tourism facilities, and does not prioritize protection of nature and/or culture. Designations and zoning are the ways to preserve but they are not reliable since they have been changed by the State in the past to provide more land for construction.

In terms of the commercial center, local vendors and shops have been displaced and moved to the edges to provide more space for touristic retail. This area might be more alive during peak season, but low season reveals significant problems related to underutilized spaces and vacancy. Çeşme tourism only focuses on bringing more tourists

---

and building more and larger touristic facilities throughout the year, not preserving the significance and distinctiveness of the place. Although they have dispersed building restoration projects, social or physical continuation of the place is not the main goal of development.
4. FOÇA

The proximity of Foça to the metropolitan areas of İzmir and Manisa and highways providing connection between these locations makes it a popular recreation area and summer resort. Interest in the town started in the 1970s and peaked during the 1990s, targeting both foreign and domestic tourism, but today it mainly receives domestic tourists as vacation home owners or weekenders. Foça has archaeological, historic and natural associations with nearby landscapes and heritage places, all of which are distinguished as “Aegean culture.” The town has been continuously occupied since the 11th century BCE, with various rises and falls in population. Remnants of different layers such as an archaic wall, Persian tomb, Roman mosaics, Ottoman mosques, etc. are visible in the city center. Its traditional urban fabric is preserved for the most part, especially in the northern part of Foça around Küçük Deniz, despite the demolitions and new constructions of the 1980s and 1990s. Traditionally, Foça has had a commercial character, which was first replaced by agriculture and fishing, and then by tourism. However, the commercial center continues to be very lively and is used heavily by local people for their needs throughout the year. The natural landscape of the area and the fact that it is an habitat for Mediterranean monk seals brought another layer of significance to the area and special environmental protection by the Turkish state. The local cuisine is a version of the typical Mediterranean diet influenced by fishing, olive oil, herbs and vegetables, and is served in many restaurants along the coast.
Modern day Foça, or ancient Phokaia, is situated along the Aegean coast of Turkey, about 70 km northwest of İzmir. It is a township with four sub-districts (Bağarasi, Foça, Gerenköy, Yenifoça) and four villages (Ilıpınar, Kozbeyli, Yenibağarasi, Yeniköy) within its boundaries, and it is under the jurisdiction of the İzmir Metropolitan Municipality. Foça’s district center has a population of 40,600 and an autonomous municipality.68

---

68 Three military bases in Foça play an important role in high population. This is more obvious if one looks at number of men and women, there are about 31,000 men compared to 9,600 women in the township. “Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi, 2010” T.C. Başbakanlık Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/adrnsdagitapp/adrns.zul. (“Address Based Population Registration System, 2010,” Turkish Statistical Institute.)
The Foça peninsula is a series of bays along the Aegean Sea. A considerable amount of the town’s territory has different degrees of designations due to its urban, natural and archaeological significance. The traditional city center is located between two of these bays, Büyük Deniz (Big Sea) on the south and Küçük Deniz (Small Sea) on the north. Its traditional and contemporary residential fabric, administrative buildings and commercial uses are located mostly around Küçük Deniz whereas vacation homes are situated around Büyük Deniz and further north from Küçük Deniz on both sides of the road that leads to
Yenifoça. Touristic facilities are distributed around the town. The traditional residential architecture of the area shows the following characteristics: attached one- or two-story stone masonry buildings with rough or cut stone as basic construction material and lime mortar as the binding material.69

In the past, Foça has had an agricultural- and fishing-based economy. However, that changed during the last decades of the 20th century, and tourism became the primary income source of the town. Agricultural lands diminished with tourism, but agriculture, however, is still an important component of the town’s economy. Olive is the dominant product and vineyards are encouraged to revive black Foça grapes (an ancient wine grape variety), and the area’s wine-making tradition.

In ancient times, Phokaia was the farthest northern of the Ionian cities and has a history dating back to the 11th century BCE. Starting from 1913, excavations revealed remains of an ancient city that included the Temple of Athena, a theater and a steel workshop.70 The area was continuously occupied through Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman times. The city was a major trade port under the control of Italian city states and later, became an important base for Ottoman navy forces. Commercial activities slowed down but the area remained on economic scene because of agriculture and fishing.71

---

exchange of Orthodox and Muslim populations in the early 20th century changed the structure of the town like many others in Anatolia; however, the economy remained the same, depending on trade, agriculture and fishing.\textsuperscript{72} Shortly before the Second World War, Foça and its immediate area was declared a prohibited military service area which affected the agricultural and commercial scene of the period, and consequently resulted in its population decreasing to as low as 2,000 inhabitants.\textsuperscript{73} This prohibition was lifted in 1952 and the town started to adjust and transform.

The first archaeological excavations in Foça were carried out in 1913 by Felix Sartiaux and became systematic in 1953 under the supervision of Ekrem Akurgal who worked on site until 1974. Excavations stopped for another 15 years but resumed in 1989 with Ömer Özyiğit as the director and still continue today. Foça is not well-known for its archaeological heritage despite its significance which is due especially to its Ionian past and the Athena Temple. There is need for a larger support for excavations and an on-site museum for exhibiting artifacts from the excavation. There are no museums in Foça today; therefore, many pieces were sent to the İzmir Archaeology Museum. Also, a large part of the ancient city is buried under the current settlement, which is an earlier layer of built heritage.

\textsuperscript{73} Çetin, 6.
Starting from the 1960s, national tourism policies of the state had a significant effect on Foça. The town was selected for one of the largest investments of its period; a holiday village was constructed in 1967, one of the first such to be built in Turkey. Operated by a French company, Foça Club Med was a business-tenant of the Turkish Retirement Fund.\textsuperscript{74} The village accepted only foreign tourists and attracted great attention, introducing new concepts to Turkish tourism. Moreover, Club Med acted as a driving force for tourism in Foça.\textsuperscript{75}

The earliest preservation activities of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century were initiated by several state agencies in 1977 and involved 204 single building designations as well as some master plan studies. The final plan proposal was approved in 1980 and set boundaries of designated archaeological and natural sites. However, many traditional buildings were demolished and new, higher buildings were raised within three years in order to avoid the construction limitations that would come with the plan. During the 1980s, the town encountered a major tourism wave because of its proximity to İzmir and Manisa which made it a popular destination for vacation homes and weekend trips. Tourism and development pressure caused changes in the initial plan decision, and boundaries of the designated sites changed three times, ultimately encouraging new constructions and resulting in the loss of historical fabric.\textsuperscript{76} In 1988, new residential and tourism areas

\textsuperscript{74} Turkish Retirement Fund built and owned a number of tourism facilities in metropolitan areas and some coastal settlements. Their aim was to provide federal support for early tourism investments. The Fund realized these constructions with easements provided through Law for the Encouragement of Tourism.

\textsuperscript{75} The village was taken over and privatized in 2005, and it has been unoccupied since. \textit{Foça}, 409; Sinan Doğan, “Foça’daki Fransız Tatil Köyü Kasım’da Satılıyor;” \textit{Yeni Asr}, October 5, 2010, http://yeniasir.com.tr/KentHaberleri/2010/10/05/fransiz_tatil_koyu_kasimda_satiliyor.

\textsuperscript{76} Erdem, 23-28.
were proposed as a revision to the 1980 plan in order to meet the increasing demand for vacation homes and tourist facilities, and maximum building height for new constructions was increased from 6.5 meters to 9.5 meters.77

In 1990, Foça and its environs were declared as a “Special Environment Protection Area (SEPA)” by the Council of Ministers to protect the natural and historical assets of the region, especially Mediterranean monk seals (Monachus monachus), one of
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77 Erdem, 24-25.
the most endangered seal species. The concept of the Special Environment Protection Area was introduced in order to “preserve and secure biodiversity, natural and related cultural values of land and water areas which have national and international ecological significance and are susceptible to environmental pollution and decay.” Another wave of new constructions occurred before the approval of this decision. In 1991, a new revision master plan that took SEPA into consideration was prepared; the main objectives of the plan were the preservation of Foça’s natural structure, continuation of archaeological and historical urban values, and management of urban development while preserving the town’s characteristics, controlling the construction of vacation homes and providing a compatible tourism approach.

Figure 25. Aerial view of Foça showing Küçük Deniz to the left with traditional town center extending to the central peninsula, and Büyük Deniz to the right with vacation homes rising on the hills. Source: http://www.foca.bel.tr/foca/images/fotogal/fotogal_12.html.


Erdem, 25.
The dominant tourists of the town are domestic tourists who have vacation homes in the area and who come for weekends or day trips for recreational purposes. The summer population of the town doubles the official population with seasonal tourists. This increase, caused by tourists, home owners and weekenders, pushes the limits of the municipal budget which is made for a permanent population of 40,000 inhabitants.

Under-occupied vacation homes also constitute a great problem for Foça because of their yearly municipal service needs. The first-degree archaeological site covering a significant amount of the city center causes infrastructural difficulties due to restricted construction activities.

Foça still receives high number of foreign tourists but this number has been decreasing since Club Med closed in 2005. Due to privatization decisions of many national investors, the holiday village was also declared for sale among other tourism facilities, and the tenant moved out of the property reluctantly. The holiday village went on sale first in 2006, and then again in November 2010. However, no bids were placed and the so-called “French Holiday Village” was left derelict. European tour operators took Foça off their lists a few years ago due to lack of large scale tourist facilities for which they were looking. Foça turned in to a popular town for older residents of metropolitan regions who settle here after their retirements, and today they constitute a considerable part of the population.
Club Med was the initiative force for the town’s tourism development but this development was largely limited to vacation homes and weekenders rather than large-scale tourist facilities. Surveys by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism point out that there are 35 touristic accommodation facilities of different scales in the area (hotel, motel or guest houses). The town does not have a busy and crowded image like Bodrum or Çeşme; it is largely known for being a quiet, peaceful summer resort. According to Gümüş and Özüpekeç, there are three major components affecting Foça’s tourism potential:

1. Well preserved coastline compared to southern seaside towns of Çeşme or Kuşadası, despite vacation homes and tourist facilities. (Being a designated natural site and Special Environment Protection Area also adds to this quality.)
2. Being a habitat to the Mediterranean monk seal.
3. Cultural heritage of Foça and its proximity to complementary settlements with similar historic and cultural significance (such as Bergama/Pergamon, Ayvalık, Assos or Kaz Dağları/Mount Ida).

Foça is preferred by tourist groups who seek these qualities. The main commercial street of Foça (Reha Midilli Caddesi) runs from Büyük Deniz to Küçük Deniz where the peninsula connects to the mainland. Commercial activities are not limited to this street and expand to neighboring ones as well. The number of commercial activities catering to tourists (gift shops, restaurants or bars) has increased and these businesses become denser towards summer.
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82 Foça, 407.
Foça is a natural port because of its geographical features. There is a landing pier on the eastern shore of Büyük Deniz but the town does not have international customs which limits the number of foreign visitors and its accessibility by sea. There are proposals for constructing a marina in Yenifoça (22 km to the north of Foça) as part of a series of investments along the Aegean coast.\textsuperscript{83} Local businessmen complain about a short tourism season of three months, inadequate number of beds in tourism facilities, existence of military areas and not having a preservation or tourism plan which keeps investors away from Foça.\textsuperscript{84} Military bases in the area provide a financial dynamism to local commerce but also limit physical development since they cover a large section of the town.

The conflicts between designation and tourism development are very apparent in the town center. Many public and/or private institutions state the role of designations in preserving natural and cultural significance of the town but also list them as weaknesses for economic growth.\textsuperscript{85} Another issue is a limited construction area and increasing real estate prices. Old stone houses are becoming very popular following recent successful and award-winning architectural conservation projects in the town. (There were many houses within the vicinity of the study area with signs saying “For Sale” during January 2011.) However, property prices are too high to be purchased by locals, so a number of them are being sold to people from metropolitan cities that prefer Foça for its serenity.

\textsuperscript{84} “FOGIAD Başkanı Taner Acar, 'Foça Turizmde Küme Düştü.’” Bergama Haber.Net, October 25, 2010.
\textsuperscript{85} İzmir Chamber of Commerce lists first degree archaeological and natural designated sites as number one obstacle for tourism.
The director of Phokaia Archaeological Project has spoken out in the past about its battle with illegal and/or “legalized” constructions on the first-degree designated archaeological site. According to its official definition, construction is not allowed in the first degree archaeological sites except for mandatory infrastructural work and service areas for visitors such as walking routes, parking lot, public toilets, ticket offices, etc. A newspaper article from 2006 suggests that problems derive from lack of communication between authorities. In September 2006, the local preservation council of İzmir, under the cognizance of the Foça Municipality and the Directorate of the İzmir Archaeological Museum, issued building permits for a new house within the boundaries of the third-degree archaeological site without any sondages. As a reaction, Phokaia excavations’ director Ömer Özyiğit conducted an “operation dawn” with his team and found five sarcophagi in two hours, which presented evidence for an ancient necropolis. After a four-month investigation, the preservation council upgraded the archaeological site designation to the first-degree, and cancelled the building permit. This is not the only case that has come up in the past few years, but a more recent one that summarizes the seriousness of the problem. High land values, limited construction area and tourism pressure, carelessness toward heritage and lack of cooperation between institutions still threaten the archaeological remains of Foça.

Large-scale administration, preservation and planning of Foça is under the control of many public stakeholders on a local and national scale, including Foça Municipality, İzmir Metropolitan Municipality, Environmental Protection Agency for Special Areas (for SEPA), Ministry of Culture and Tourism (for designated buildings and sites) and the Ministry of National Defense (for military areas). All these institutions are not working in a well-managed way today, as evidenced in the 2006 case described above regarding building permits and the archaeological excavation. Coordination and cooperation between these institutions is crucial in order to have a comprehensive plan for the town’s future.

**Current Status, January 2011**

A field survey of the commercial center of Foça was performed in January 2011 to understand the town’s physical fabric and changes in the market related to tourism. Reha Midilli Caddesi and part of Aşklar Caddesi were selected as the target area of the historic commercial corridor. In total, 52 properties were surveyed on both sides of the street, starting from the bus station, stretching to the end of the peninsula on the western coast of Küçük Deniz and to 175th Street on the eastern coast, forming a Y shape. The survey area shows different characteristics on the northern and southern sections: the former has recent concrete structures, almost all of which are used as cafes or restaurants; the latter shows more diversity in terms of building stock, integrity and uses.
Survey results of the area show that among 52 buildings, only 14 show traditional characteristics, whereas the rest are recent, modern-day structures. The construction outbreaks of the late 1970s and early 1990s caused loss of fabric and emergence of concrete buildings as replacements of old ones. New buildings are mostly three stories high and have larger footprints, but the width of the street reduces the overwhelming effect. The remaining traditional buildings are visible on the southern portion of the survey area. Also, the remaining fabric can still be seen through street intersections which frequently remind visitors of the area’s character.

Figure 26. Building integrity in the study area as of January 2011. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; plan from İzmir Metropolitan Municipality; data collected through field survey by the author, January 2011.
The scene outside the boundaries of the designated urban site represents a very different town development, one that is full of three-story high apartment buildings. These were built in the 1990s as the town expanded toward its edges on the designated archaeological and urban sites. Today, a dense residential area surrounds the commercial and administrative hub while slightly scattered vacation houses are situated to the south of Büyük Deniz and the coast of Küçük Deniz to the further north.
The commercial nature of the area has been preserved through current building uses. The northern section around Küçük Deniz is solely commercial, with restaurants and cafes, whereas the southern section of Reha Midilli Caddesi consists mainly of commercial and mixed uses (commercial on the ground floor and residential on the upper) in addition to three residential buildings. Tourist-oriented retail is not dominant in Foça, there are only four shops but their windows and outside counters are filled with typical gifts of Foça/Phokaia magnets, mugs, and ashtrays or imported products. Since fishing is still one
of the main income sources of the town, restaurants around Küçük Deniz are famous for their seafood dishes, salads and *mezes*. They serve a variety of Aegean and local cuisine to both inhabitants and visitors.

Figure 29. Building use in the study area as of January 2011. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; plan from İzmir Metropolitan Municipality; data collected through field survey by the author, January 2011.

Although Reha Midilli Caddesi is the main commercial axis, the commercial hub of Foça is not limited to the survey area. The neighboring streets, especially to the east of the survey area, also accommodate stores, places to eat, offices and even a supermarket. This is more of a transition area between commercial and residential zones with mixed uses.
There is a current, small-scale transformation happening in the residential area which includes adaptive reuse of old stone houses as art galleries, stylish cafes and boutique hotels. This change is similar to that of Alaçatı in Çeşme, which is a smaller town that has become filled with over-priced, luxurious small hotels and restaurants within the last few years.

Figure 30. Above, fish restaurants along Küçük Deniz serving local cuisine of the area; below, a shop front selling standard tourist gifts. Source: Author, 2011.
Although high property rates are mentioned by many sources, vacancy is not a problem in the survey area. There are only three partially and one completely vacant buildings among 52, a very small number when compared to the vacancy ratio in Çeşme. The commercial center still serves the needs of Foça’s residents and is frequently used by locals of all ages. There are many cafes and restaurants used by people for gathering purposes (both tourists and locals) in addition to stores that serve the permanent population (stationery shops, children’s clothing stores or bakeries).
For the last decades, Foça has been in need of a comprehensive preservation and tourism plan but has not yet received it. There have been revisions to old plans, survey studies and analyses by various groups, but these were only attempts or temporary solutions. The first phase of a recent planning study regarding preservation and development in third-degree designated sites was approved in 2008 but the necessity for a long-delayed complete plan has been proclaimed by locals.89

89 Foça, 418.
Economically, tourism development changed the structure of the settlement; tourism became the main source of income while fishing and agriculture started to decline. The effects of tourism on the landscape and traditional fabric were slowed down by different types and degrees of designations but some demolition of history could not be avoided in the process. Designations have long been seen as obstacles to development by local government and the public for a period but this has started to change in recent years. Despite some instances that have arisen from pressure for new construction, both Foça and İzmir municipalities support conservation activities, archaeological research, and provide funds for both.

Currently, Foça is still closer to the coexistence stage, the first stage in the culture, community and visitor relationship continuum as defined by Peter T. Newby: “Tourism does not dominate the economy and the ongoing pattern continues with the urban environment.” Club Med triggered the tourism investments with its establishment in 1967, and Foça moved forward in the tourism industry. However, it never became as popular as Çeşme or Bodrum; north of İzmir has typically had a more peaceful and quiet tourist profile that prefers similar, small-scale settlements. SEPA and first-degree designations within the town boundaries have also added to this introverted development pattern, and have effectively saved the traditional center of Foça from overdevelopment.

---

90 Newby, 208.
Foça attracts tourists not only for its beaches but also for its natural resources. It is well known for the Mediterranean monk seals which draw visitors to its bay. Its well-preserved traditional residential fabric also attracts a wealthier group who buys and restores these houses. Having natural and cultural heritage as a part of its product definition has recently increased public awareness of Foça. However, the town has undergone an extreme change from the 1980s to the 2000s. Physical transformation of the commercial area also occurred during this period. Historic buildings were demolished and three-story reinforced concrete ones built in a short time, changing the topography completely. Although their proportions are questionable, vacation homes on the outskirts of the town do not dominate the landscape. The commercial hub continues to serve local needs and it is used equally by inhabitants and visitors.

Foça still functions as a living town with a vigorous commercial center and stable population, but the historic character of the main commercial axes has been lost. The residential fabric is in a better state but houses are changing hands, so locals are losing control of their own heritage. Foça wants to take center stage in the tourism scene again and revive its tourism-based economy. However, it cannot handle any more destruction and needs to keep its distinct, well-preserved structure. Future plans of building a marina and getting in touch with international tour operators should not be realized before a preservation plan is completed and zoning decisions are finalized. Since these plans generally deal only with the physical environment, a long-term vision for tourism should be set for sustainable, healthy development and progress.
5. ŞİRİNCE

Şirince is a late discovery for the tourism sector, a factor which helped to preserve its local characteristics to a degree. The village is located relatively close to the İzmir metropolitan area, Selçuk’s district center and major tourist attractions of the region. Its traditional architecture is well-preserved despite the absence of a preservation plan and increasing commercial uses. The original lifestyle of a farming village is still visible, evidenced by fields and orchards surrounding the village and byproducts sold by villagers. The local cuisine and wines of Şirince are among the most promoted aspects of the village and can be tasted in restaurants. Relics of the previous Christian Greek population are visible in two monumental churches as well as in the details of many of the town’s historic houses. This architecture reminds visitors of the history and cultural changes in the area. The historic association of Şirince with the well-known Ephesus is another significant aspect of the town’s interest, but has not been sufficiently interpreted.

History and Development

Şirince (meaning pleasant in Turkish) is located approximately 80 km southeast of the metropolitan center of İzmir in the Aegean region. It is an inland, hillside village under the jurisdiction of Selçuk Municipality. The village can be reached from Selçuk by a winding road of eight kilometers. Şirince Creek runs from south to north, dividing the village into two. According to the 2010 census, the population of the village is 534.91 The

80
The economy of the village depends on agriculture, especially on olive and grape cultivation, and recently has been supported by tourism.

The only access to Şirince is via a road from Selçuk by private vehicle or half-hourly bus service; however, Selçuk is easily accessible by land (connected to nearby settlements by highways), air (İzmir International Airport is 55 km away) and sea (20 km to Kuşadası Port and 75 km to İzmir Harbor). Şirince is located in a valley defined by Şirince Creek and the developed area is limited by two ridges on the west and east banks of the creek.

Figure 33. Location of Şirince in relation to Selçuk, Kuşadası and İzmir. Source: Edited from Google Maps, 2011.

---

tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/adnksdagitapp/adnks.zul. (“Address Based Population Registration System, 2010,” Turkish Statistical Institute.)
Residential buildings are constructed parallel to contour lines, forming a bowl shape that positions the village squares and commercial center at the core. The village is surrounded by agricultural lands where villagers grow mainly olives, grapes and peaches. Şirince is not a densely built settlement, but density noticeably increases around monumental buildings and commercial area. The road coming from Selçuk enters the village and

92 “Conservation Project for Şirince-Izmir” (studio report, METU, 2008), 44.
makes a loop in the eastern square: this is the main vehicular axis within the village. The main pedestrian axis is almost perpendicular to the vehicular one; it starts at the eastern village square, moves west through the traditional commercial area and heads to St. John the Baptist Church. Dense commercial uses developed around these two main axes. The pedestrian axis includes the traditional commercial center on the east, part of which has managed to survive though it is hard to observe the traditional fabric because of invasive retail activities. The rest of the commercial activity occurs in the form of re-used traditional houses or new constructions used as shops, cafes, restaurants or timber stalls inserted along wider streets and squares.

Figure 35. Houses that are built parallel to contour lines encircle the village mosque, adjacent commercial area and two village squares at the core. Source: METU Şirince Studio Report, 2008.
The earliest known document revealing information on Şirince dates to 1583 in which its former name, Çirkince (meaning unpleasant in Turkish), was used. It was a Christian town, probably founded by former residents of Ephesus. It was mentioned as a sub-district of Selçuk (then known as Ayasuluk). The population of Şirince increased in the mid-18th century with immigration, initiating the construction of the St. John the Baptist Church and a school. The town showed significant economic growth with the help of carborundum mining and agriculture, mainly fig cultivation, and was mentioned as the administrative center of the area in 1911. Travelers of the time also refer to 19th century-Şirince as a vital and wealthy town. There are archaeological remains found in and around the village (remains of a Hellenistic building, reused marble urns and buildings blocks, relief tablets, etc.) that might refer to earlier periods of settlement but that has not been confirmed due to missing archaeological studies.

The decline of the Ottoman Empire and the Independence War of Turkey had an effect on Şirince, like many other surrounding settlements. During the first two decades of the 20th century, the Christian population of Şirince started to leave the village because of ongoing tension between Greece and Turkey. Subsequently, the remaining population was forced to leave after 1923’s population exchange treaty; the Turkish population arrived from the Balkans during the late 1920s. First generations struggled to adapt to this new

93 “Conservation Project for Şirince-Izmir” (studio report, METU, 2008), 25.
environment, lifestyle and architecture. Many families moved to Selçuk or İzmir to look for other opportunities. A comparison of two images from 1900 and 1965 shows former boundaries of the settlement that extended from northwest to east, encircling the current village. Şirince shrank from a wealthy town to a small village within a few decades.

The earliest legal preservation actions for Şirince were the designation of two churches, St. John the Baptist and St. Demetrios, as well as the old school building in 1978; two houses were also designated the following year. The village was surveyed by a team from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 1982; after this, a report and a development plan...
proposal for the area were published. This survey led to the designation of Şirince as an urban site in 1984, followed by 88 single building designations. In 1997, the boundaries of the urban site expanded to its current state and a large area surrounding the village was designated as a third-degree natural site. Throughout these designation phases, the village did not have any plans regarding conservation decisions or development areas. Inhabitants of Şirince continued repairing their homes and building new ones in order to keep living in the village. Finally, 18 years after urban designation in 2002, a preservation and development plan was issued approved in 2004, but received great reaction and was fought by villagers. The new plan proposed demolition of many recent constructions, so villagers raised their objections to local and national government and received attention from written and visual media. The plan has been approved and cancelled many times during recent years due to lawsuits. In March 2011, the Minister of Culture and Tourism unofficially announced that they plan to declare Şirince a “Culture and Tourism Preservation and Development Region,” which will authorize the Ministry as the only planning body and decision maker.

96 There are not any definitions for designations of rural areas in the Law, so urban designations are used for settlements of different scales from villages to cities.
97 There are 148 traditional buildings and 137 new buildings in the village (Uyar, 38).
98 Cultural and Tourism Preservation and Development Regions: The regions having a high potential for tourism development, and/or having intensive historical and cultural importance, that are to be evaluated for the purpose of preservation, utilization, sectoral development and planned improvement. Boundaries of these regions are determined and declared by the Council of Ministers upon the proposal of the Ministry (Law for the Encouragement of Tourism, No: 2634, Article 3b, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 1982); Newsletter of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Press and Public Relations Consultation, http://basin. kultur.gov.tr/belge/1-92214/kultur-ve-turizm-bakani-ertugrul-gunay-tarihi-sirince-k-.html, last updated on March 03, 2011.
Figure 37. Natural and urban sites in and around Şirince district center under different levels of protection by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Source: Aerial view from Google Maps, 2011; data from METU Şirince Studio Report, 2008.
Figure 38. Above, view of the surrounding landscape under legal protection; below, St. John the Baptist Church among traditional houses, one of the designated monuments and a major tourist attraction in the village. Source: http://www.nisanyan.com; author, 2007.
Şirince is located in an area with high tourism potential (major nearby attractions and seaside resorts are Ephesus, Selçuk, Pamucak and Kuşadası) which makes the village a part of active tourist routes. Tourism is first mentioned in the report of the 1982 proposal created by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism; the main goal of the plan was the preservation of historic fabric and its use for tourism purposes. However, Şirince was not a tourist attraction then; it was only visited by a few curious travelers. There was not even a paved road until 1986.99 The village became a popular destination in the 1990s after the discovery of its well-preserved traditional fabric and lifestyle. It is preferred for day trips from İzmir and nearby settlements. Tour operators also noticed the village and Şirince became an additional stop in their bus trips covering Western Anatolia.

Şirince’s proximity to Ephesus, Selçuk and Kuşadası, three very popular destinations for domestic and international tourists, made it an ideal place to visit. Visitors see Ephesus as an example of Turkey’s archaeological heritage; they go to Selçuk to see artifacts and layers of different civilizations from the Greek to Ottoman Empires, Kuşadası for its sea-sand-sun and Şirince for its traditional architecture and village life, a nice sampler of the promoted image of Turkey. There are usually two types of international tourists: the ones who are part of package tours visiting major attractions of Western and Central Anatolia and the tourists carried by buses from their cruise ships docked at Kuşadası Port.

Tourist flow changed the diversity of building and land use in the village. Restaurants, gift shops and guest houses appeared; villagers started to sell local crafts as well as

homemade food, wine and olive oil in these places or in front of their houses. Moreover, the inhabitants of Şirince realized the significance of their homes, preservation awareness raised and maintenance and repairs started on traditional houses. All this interest in Şirince also brought out-of-town investors who acquired old houses and started to live here or converted them into boutique hotels or restaurants.

Within a few years, major paths in the village were filled up with tourist retail.\(^\text{100}\) Home-produced wine, a trademark of Şirince, turned into fabricated wine. Many shops on the main street sell not local goods but imported or mass produced ones, such as imitation brand-name clothing (a shop named Flipper Sport sells Tommy Hilfiger or Polo t-shirts for 5 Euros), Indian textiles, low-quality jewelry or Pinocchio dolls together with supposed “Turkish” goods like apple tea, spice sets or painted ceramics. Stalls on the streets still present a variety of local products; *tarhana* (a homemade dry soup-mix) and pasta, dried herbs, knitted wool socks and gloves are the most favored ones but they also sell textiles brought from other parts of Turkey. There are numerous cafés and restaurants in the village which typically serve local food cooked by villagers (with exceptions such as a café which claims to be “The Village Coffee House” but serves cappuccino and macchiato instead of Turkish coffee). Signs started to appear in two languages, Turkish and English, and sometimes prices are quoted in both Turkish Lira and Euro. Within this area, there are only three shops catering to villagers: a butcher shop, a grocery,

---

100 There are 19 buildings with gastronomic uses, 28 touristic shops (12 of which are wine shops), and approximately 40 stalls in the village according to a survey performed by METU in September 2007 (“Conservation Project for Şirince-Izmir,” 53).
and a *kahvehane* (traditional coffee house). Şirince’s traditional commercial center expanded and today, especially in the western part of the village, is something of an open market. It is reminiscent of the bazaar in Kuşadası, with similar items on stalls, but with a significant difference: one can still catch a glimpse of local life. One can see large glass jars filled with green olives sitting next to typical gift sets or a man slowly passing through tourists and gift shops on his mule.

![Figure 39. Above, a view from the traditional commercial center with shops selling clothing; below, a typical stall selling homemade local food and crafts of the village women. Source: https://picasaweb.google.com/lh/photo/IJ5pIEo2Fw1ij5-onh8Z4A; author, 2011.](Image)
Commercial uses are mostly situated along pedestrian and vehicular axes but hotels and guest houses are scattered. Domestic tourists, who have visited the village more than once in the past, complain about its changes and overwhelming retail scene. People from İzmir and İstanbul bought houses and farms in Şirince, which has resulted in extremely high prices for a small village and it has become difficult for villagers to purchase property.¹⁰¹ This is a crucial problem as there are a limited number of properties and construction permits are not available due to planning issues.

Tourism has not changed the physical structure of the town radically; there are concrete constructions that do not fit with the traditional buildings but heights and footprints usually follow the existing pattern. On the other hand, the urban morphology in terms of land use and social structure has changed substantially. Typically, Şirince had a village square defined by a mosque, a commercial hub in the middle of the settlement, residential use wrapping this core on three sides and agricultural lands around the built fabric. Agricultural lands have remained intact but as stated above, commercial uses dispersed all over the village and blended with residential uses. In addition, the number of mixed used buildings increased along the main axes.¹⁰² The two village squares lost their traditional character: the eastern square, defined by the coffee house, has a heavy traffic flow and has become a stop for tour buses with an adjoining parking lot, and the western square with the mosque is more like a commercial hub loaded with tourist shops rather than a gathering space.

¹⁰² “Conservation Project for Şirince-Izmir” (studio report, METU, 2008), 46.
Tourism in Şirince emerged as a new hope for locals to stay in their villages rather than migrating to the town or city and a new income source to support earnings from agriculture. A quiet farming village became busy with cars, buses and tourists and filled

with retailers. The lack of a preservation and development plan resulted in the loss of some of the architectural fabric and the emergence of concrete structures within the village. Additionally, although there is still a strong farming practice, agriculture is losing its share in the economy and traditional production techniques have been neglected for the last few years. Outsiders purchasing property in the village radically increased the prices and impacted the internal real estate market. During recent planning and demolition discussions, all governmental stakeholders (Selçuk Municipality, Selçuk District Governorship, İzmir Governorship and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism) supported demolition decisions but none proposed anything regarding the direction of tourism development in the village. Only the Minister mentioned his personal view about the over-commercialization of Şirince and his plan to declare Şirince a “Culture and Tourism Preservation and Development Region.” Although this legal status indicates preservation, in most of the previously declared preservation and development regions, the Ministry focused on expansion through tourism investments instead of a comprehensive planning approach regarding preservation as promised.

Current Status, October 2007 and January 2011

A field survey of the traditional commercial center of Şirince was performed in January 2011 to understand the changes related to tourism. Since the commercial area has expanded notably, the whole village was analyzed with the help of the studio project carried out by the graduate students of the Middle East Technical University in 2007-08. The traditional commercial center is the main street that extends between village squares,
and all properties on both sides of this short street are used for commercial purposes. Among 16 properties on the street, there are two cafes and a restaurant, and the remaining are shops selling a wide range of products, none of which are produced in or specific to Şirince. Two coffee houses, one in the eastern village square and the other on the main street, serve both locals and tourists.

The traditional commercial center is the most degenerated area. It is almost impossible to observe the buildings and fabric because of facades covered with extra stalls and merchandise, mostly clothing, leather bags, imported textiles and jewelry. The street is covered with reed, corrugated metal and PVC sheets which creates the impression of a partially enclosed shopping center. This partial roof also obstructs views of the upper floors of the buildings. The ground floors are already wrapped in signage, banners and products, so there is no way to view the urban space or observe the architecture on this street.

Tourist-oriented retail continues to the west along the main pedestrian route that connects the western square to St. John the Baptist Church. Ground floors of the houses around the square are used as shops, similar to those on the main street. From this point onward, stalls become the dominant commercial element in the landscape. Located on one or both sides of the street, these are very basic wood structures that do not follow a specific design. Some of them have storage units, some have awnings, some are covered with textile but they are all very simple, rough constructions. All stalls are open from spring to
fall but many of them were open even in January, despite fewer tourists. They are owned by villagers who sell local crafts and food. Lately, they have started to include a variety of textiles and clothing from other parts of the country.

Except two coffee houses, a grocery store and a butcher, all commercial activities in the village are tourist-oriented. Other than the traditional commercial center, touristic retail, cafes and restaurants are concentrated on the western part of Şirince Creek. This part

Figure 41.  Above, stalls in the western village square during high-season; below, most of the stalls are closed during the low tourist season if it is during the week and if there are not any tours coming. Source: http://www.nisanyan.com; author, 2011.
of the village stands out because both churches are located in this neighborhood, and it offers well-known panoramic views of the village and landscape. Visitors usually start their tour from the eastern square, walk through the main street, climb up to the church and walk down. Sometimes, they walk north through the village to see the Church of St. Demetrios, but this is not a very common route as this church is deserted and in poor condition.

The majority of the touristic accommodation facilities are also located in the western neighborhood but there has recently been a slight shift toward the east, which is quieter. Very few tourists visit the residential area across the Creek, so this section has not yet been invaded by stalls.

Overall, the built fabric of the village is highly intact. There are new buildings, especially along the commercial axis, but these do not dominate the general character. New constructions follow the same color palette (white and brown) as the traditional buildings. However, there are not any quality architectural examples: they either imitate the existing architecture or are poor-quality, concrete boxes. There are a handful of restored buildings in the village (annual maintenance such as plastering, painting, roof repair, etc, does not count as restoration), some of which look more like new constructions after architectural elements have been replaced or exteriors and interiors have been over-restored.
**Analysis**

Şirince was declared a historic urban site in 1984 and quickly gained recognition as a tourist destination. The 1990s were the start of changes in the social and physical structure which have since turned Şirince into an unfortunate model of itself. The traditional architecture remained despite the lack of a preservation plan and several additions, but village life quickly became affected by the introduction of tourist buses. An agriculture-based economy was supported by the tourism industry, yet the balance has started to shift towards tourism.

If we reflect on Newby’s continuum, Şirince is very close to the last phase of staging in which “culture is shaped and packaged to a recognized formula, for the benefit of the market and immediate financial gain.”\(^\text{103}\) There are other villages with similar architecture and traditional life, but Şirince’s location made it a favored destination. Its tourist success is very much tied to the tourism industry in Selçuk and Kuşadası, which are among the most visited destinations in Turkey. International tour operators are also part of this development; Şirince has been reshaped according to tips from tour guides in addition to the expectations and needs of foreign tourists. Busloads of tourists touring Anatolia or spending the day off of their cruise ships visit the village year round.

Over the last two decades, a number of bed and breakfasts (or boutique hotels as they call themselves) and cafés/restaurants have showed up in converted houses. Many of these

\(^{103}\text{Newby, 208.}\)
accommodation facilities cater to wealthier travelers with their very high room rates. A loss of distinctiveness is most visible in the commercial area; traditional commerce was replaced with tourism-related uses which invaded the village in a short time. The farming character of the village is still intact but there have been changes in cultivation and production techniques which might bring more serious problems in the future. There is also a risk of being swept up in the unplanned tourism development and neglecting the town’s traditional economic basis.

The village is developing with the efforts of its residents and lately, with the contribution of several investors interested in the area. People are repairing their homes and building new ones without any valid regulation. The inhabitants of Şirince are not against designations at all; however, they have been waiting for a preservation and development plan for 27 years. When it finally arrived, they had already built and repaired a number of structures, some of which were declared as “illegal constructions” and listed to be demolished by the district and the municipality. Not everyone is blameless, of course; there are also people who exploited the lack of a plan and spoiled urban quality. Protests against demolition decisions are mainly conducted by the latter, not the former. The planning, decision making and implementation stages would be much easier for the village if the community could be included in the process, which would be relatively easy in a place with only 534 residents.
Şirince is a location that is seen as successful and followed as an example by many other places. There are many newspaper articles that include quotes from mayors or villagers of the Aegean region stating that they want to become “the other Şirince.” On the other hand, though, many comments can be found in newspapers or websites from people who have visited Şirince in the past and complained about the consumer-focused nature of the village.

Şirince was on the agenda of local and national administrations at the beginning of this year with the seemingly-endless saga of its preservation and development plan. This plan might be a solution to the preservation of the built fabric if all sides can reach an understanding, but it is very questionable as to whether or not it would be an answer to the larger question of Şirince’s tourism-related alteration and loss of identity.
Çeşme, Foça and Şirince are among the popular tourist destinations of Izmir area, and
are well-known in Turkey. The three settlements followed different paths in their tourism
development affected by various internal and external factors, and have reached different
phases within this development.

The tourism potential of Çeşme has been obvious to national and local administrations
and investors for several decades, but it remained a resort town for a long time. Popularity
of the Southern Aegean and Mediterranean coasts in the 1980s made settlements like
Marmaris, Bodrum, and Antalya targets for international and national tourists, and
Çeşme remained as the backyard of Izmir with vacation home complexes. When these
destinations consumed and lost their qualities, tourists and agents started to look for
new places to discover during the late 1990s, and Çeşme was there with its natural and
cultural attractions as well as its accessibility. The progression and construction pressure
(both from earlier vacation homes and recent tourism development) resulted in the loss
of formerly designated natural sites, agricultural lands, and a significant amount of urban
fabric. But still, the farming character (both agricultural production and husbandry) of the
town is effective and a part of its economic structure. In terms of physical characteristics,
the traditional built fabric of Çeşme center is mostly gone since the seaside focused
tourism development did not appreciate cultural heritage in the past. The commercial
center is the most affected area, physically and socially, with traditional buildings
replaced with concrete structures of substandard architecture, and local commerce moved out to create space for touristic retail. On the contrary, the Alaçatı district in Çeşme which became a “trendy” destination very recently, later than the town itself, stands out with its almost completely preserved architecture. (Its tourism development is very questionable and problematic since it happened in a very short time: Alaçatı is adapted to a different lifestyle, and both services and properties are extremely high-priced compared to any other destination in the area or even in Turkey.) Although the social replacement problem is still valid for Alaçatı, especially during summer months, cultural heritage is the valued aspect in the settlement, and both inhabitants and investors are aware of it.

Figure 42. Views from the commercial center of Alaçatı showing traditional architecture and new uses
Source: Author, 2011.
Foça is no different than Alaçatı in terms of architecture, historic building stock (despite extreme demolitions) and ease of access, but its encounter with tourism was in a period when constructing was more valuable than preserving. The town has been populated since antiquity, and all cultural layers add to the current characteristic of the place together with its distinctive natural setting. Foça’s encounter with tourism is different than Çeşme: the town was also within the boundaries of the tourism development area declared by the Turkish state in 1968, and it was selected for a major investment by the Turkish Retirement Fund (Club Med Holiday Village) but it reserved its tranquility during this time. There are archaeological and natural designations in Foça as well, but it is mostly military zones and the Special Environment Protection Area that are still restricting the tourism development and protecting the town’s social structure. The economy of Foça depends on tourism despite the fact that its tourism-related profit is less than many destinations in the region. Agriculture and fishing is undermined even though both have been important parts of the town’s character. Preserving most of its built heritage –despite the loss on the commercial axis– and its social character is a success for Foça, whereas losing agriculture and fishing are the failures in the town’s preservation history. Foça has started to attract more people with its architecture lately; nevertheless no one can guarantee that it will not become Çeşme or Alaçatı since there are no plans for preservation or tourism development.

Şirince is a whole different case; it is not situated on the coastal tourism development area like Çeşme or Foça, so it was never on the agenda of the state or local administrations.
Its story started with its discovery like Alaçatı, but earlier in the 1990s. Different than previous cases, the transformation was stimulated by the tour operators who discovered the village and made it a part of their Selçuk-Ephesus-Kuşadası tours. Since it is a small village with 500 people, tourism made a huge difference in the daily lives of villagers and tourism gains affected the economic structure. Means of living depend on agriculture in the village which is still very active, but is slowly shifting toward tourism. Şirince is the most commercialized among all three cases: its small Main Street was not enough for the gift shops, so the entire village became a commercial area with houses converted to shops, cafes and restaurants, hotels, in addition to stalls installed along major tourist axes. Despite all this commercialization, Şirince is a place where you can still see glimpses of the daily life, local foods and handcrafts. Built fabric and daily life are the strong aspects of the village but unplanned tourism development is a huge problem which already threatens Şirince with over commercialization.

Proximity to metropolitan areas and nearby destinations makes Çeşme, Foça and Şirince targets for domestic and international tourists and accelerates the development. The three cases have their strong suits and failures: Foça and Şirince are more successful in preserving the built fabric whereas Çeşme lost most of it in the past and has not followed an efficient preservation approach for what remains. The economies of all three towns depend largely on tourism, but agriculture, husbandry or fishing have not disappeared altogether and keep the roots in place. The commercial structure in Foça still serves the local needs of inhabitants and is actively used by them whereas Çeşme and Şirince lost
most of their original commercial centers to tourist retail. All three towns are desperately waiting for preparation and/or implementation of preservation plans. The question of tourism planning remains in the air, because neither preservation nor master plans manage tourism growth (except zoning).

The forces behind tourism development and its effects on local distinctiveness can be attributed to administration on the national and local levels as internal agents, and international tour companies as external agents. The Turkish state, particularly the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, is the most powerful agent in tourism development in the national level. The state’s mass tourism policy and incentives for tourism development, which started in the second half of the 20th century, resulted in over-urbanized coastal settlements in the southern Aegean and Mediterranean. Çeşme and Foça are among better preserved examples due to large amounts of designated sites; however, loss of traditional fabric is obvious in many other places, especially during the 1980s and 1990s.

The Ministry and local municipalities are responsible for preparation of preservation and development plans. None of the cases have a completed and approved plan but even if they did, these plans only focus on physical fabric, and not site-specific tourism planning. Municipalities are also responsible for the implementation of the plan and providing building permits on designated sites; but as in the Foça case, their control is not always reliable due to lack of experienced staff or coordination between institutions. The creation
processes of plans have also stimulated episodes of demolition and building activities that damaged the architectural character. Although there are a small number of incentives for historic preservation, historic buildings are usually not seen as economically valuable and keeping them is seen as costly by many people who would prefer knocking them down and rebuilding concrete structures.

In terms of spatial change, commercial centers are the first and most affected areas in historic towns under tourism pressure. This is valid for all three case studies for this thesis: the main commercial axes lost their physical characteristics in all cases and their social characteristics in Çeşme and Şirince. Usually in the area with highest property rates, demolition of traditional buildings is the most common problem followed by over-restored or in contrast, neglected structures. Change of uses, users and owners is another issue in commercial areas. Local businesses move out (because they cannot pay high rents if they are tenants or they want to get higher rents if they are owners), and tourist-oriented retail dominates which only serves to tourists. The displacement of local businesses creates new centers for local uses and touristic commercial areas become deserted during low season with high vacancies. Comparison of Çeşme and Foça clearly demonstrates transformed and preserved commercial centers; the former was struggling with a high ratio of vacancies and a small number of users during January whereas the latter had a lively main street with running businesses and inhabitants of different ages on the streets.
International tour companies (and cruise ships in port cities and towns) are the external agents in the tourism development triggering transformation. Working with large numbers of tourists throughout the year, their demands and tourists’ expectations shape these places, and locals are not economically strong enough to resist their requests. Kuşadası is an important example from Turkey which exemplifies the effects of cruise tourism in a historic town. Tourism gains impressed locals in the beginning but after three decades, they are not happy with what they had given up in terms of urban qualities, and want to recover from the loss. Apparently, this case is not enough to take lessons from because many coastal towns see their futures in cruise ship and mass tourism (in a world where tourism is moving toward a small-scale growth options) without assessing both negative and positive aspects.

Tourism has been a significant driving force for economic development in towns. Its effects on physical, social and cultural environment are more obvious in historic settlements which become destinations for their established values and distinct qualities. Tourism is an industry that requires careful planning and management to preserve the local characteristics of places and minimize possible damages created by the common effect of homogenization that comes with tourism development.
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APPENDIX: Definitions of Legal Designations

Archaeological sites: Settlements and sites that hold above ground, underground, and underwater assets and cultural properties of ancient civilizations that reflect social, economic, and cultural characteristics of their periods.¹⁰⁴

- **First Degree Archaeological Site:** These sites will be preserved without any changes except scientific studies regarding their conservation. Constructions are certainly not allowed within these sites. They will be set as “designated site to be preserved” in development plans; no digging is allowed except scientific excavations. Over time, existing buildings in such areas are to be removed to new locations provided by the State. (Exceptions: Mandatory infrastructural work by public and private institutions can be allowed after evaluation of museum directorate, excavation director, and finally the associated Preservation Council. Only limited, seasonal cultivation is allowed within the existing agricultural lands. Walking routes, parking lots, public toilets, ticket offices etc. can be constructed within archaeological sites for visitors with the permission of the associated Preservation Council.)

- **Second Degree Archaeological Site:** These sites will be preserved without any changes except scientific studies regarding their conservation; however, terms of conservation and use will be decided by preservation councils. Constructions are not allowed within these sites but basic repair work can be performed on undesignated buildings in use. (The same exceptions apply.)

- **Third Degree Archaeological Site:** New arrangements and constructions can be allowed in accordance with the terms of conservation and use. Building is permitted in these areas with the approval of the Preservation Council and provided that a trial excavation is performed under supervision of the museum authorities and director of excavations.

**Urban Site:** These sites include cultural and natural elements (buildings, gardens, landscape, fabric, walls) which hold higher architectural, local, historical, aesthetic and artistic significance for their togetherness.\(^{105}\)

**Urban Archaeological Site:** Areas that include designated archaeological sites, urban fabric (see definition of urban site), and immovable cultural assets (such as mounds, tumuli, citadel, houses, mosques, churches etc.) that need to be preserved according to Article 6 of Law No. 2863.\(^{106}\)

**Natural Site:** Above ground, underground, and underwater sites of geologic, prehistoric or historic periods that need to be preserved because of their rarity or characteristics and beauty.\(^{107}\)

- **First Degree Natural Site:** Sites with universal values in terms of scientific protection that need to be preserved for the public good because of their rarity or noteworthy characteristics and beauty. Activities damaging vegetation, topography, and silhouette are certainly not allowed within these sites and they will be preserved without any changes except scientific studies regarding their conservation. (Exceptions: Mandatory infrastructural and maintenance work by public and private institutions can be allowed after evaluation of the associated Preservation Council. Recreational facilities for public use such as restaurants, kiosks, walking routes, changing booths, parking lots, public toilets etc. can be built with the permission of the associated Preservation Council.)

---
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• **Second Degree Natural Site**: While preserving and developing natural structure, building can be permitted for public good in these areas. Building activities are limited to licensed tourist facilities and restrictions regarding construction are set by the local Preservation Council while taking the topography, landscape, silhouette etc. into consideration. Existing agriculture and animal husbandry can continue within the boundaries of the designated site, and new activities can be introduced after approval of the associated Preservation Council.

• **Third Degree Natural Site**: While preserving and developing natural structure, residential uses can be permitted in these areas. Restrictions regarding construction are set by the local Preservation Council while taking the topography, landscape, silhouette etc. into consideration. Existing agriculture and animal husbandry can continue within the boundaries of the designated site, and new activities can be introduced after approval of the associated Preservation Council.
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