

READING THE OLD TEXTILE FACTORY COMPLEX OF ANTALYA IN TERMS OF URBAN MEMORY AND CURRENT SPATIAL EXPERIENCE

KEMAL REHA KAVAS¹

ABSTRACT

Antalya, which is situated in the Mediterranean region of Turkey, has become an internationally recognized center of tourism since the 1980s. In Antalya, which is associated mainly with the sectors of tourism and agriculture today, there has been public investments in industry between the 1960s and 1980s. The textile factory, which has given its name to the “Dokuma” (weaving) district where it was established, is a representative of this period’s industrial heritage in urban space. The factory, which was active between the early 1960s and 2000s, consists of a large complex of buildings with divergent functions and this complex is an important element influencing the urban scale. During its almost 40 years of performance, it established a continuous institutional culture. The factory became an active cultural agent shaping urban space because it has become the initiator of a large urban district which did not exist before. The deep imprints of the factory in the urban memory can still be felt. After a controversial process, in 2015 preservation and re-functioning was considered officially. In consequence, the green areas were opened to public use for recreational purposes. The re-functioning of the buildings is a continuing process which has not been implemented yet. Therefore regarding the old factory complex, current spatial experience of the citizens is a matter of discussion and this experience is underlined principally by recreational function. This study reveals the relation between urban memory and current spatial experience in the specific context of the factory and proposes solutions for possible discrepancies.

Keywords: Textile, Factory, Urban Memory, Antalya.

1. INTRODUCTION

The province of Antalya is situated at the southwest of Turkey. With a long Mediterranean coast, Antalya is famous for its historical, natural and cultural values. The findings of the Karain Cave, which is situated 27 km northwest of the city centre, indicate that the region was populated by human beings at least 50 000 years ago (Kıvrın and Uysal 1992, 26). Strabo states that the name of the city comes from Attalus Philadelphus (220-138 BC), King of

¹ Assoc.Prof. Dr. Akdeniz University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Architecture, ANTALYA.
This work was supported by The Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit of Akdeniz University. Project Number: 2017.05.0161.007)

Pergamon and the founder of the city (Strabo 1924). In historical progress, this name was transformed into Adalia, and finally to Antalya (Texier 2002, 705). In history, Antalya has been an important port of the eastern Mediterranean (Mansel 1956, 10) and an important administrative, religious and commercial center during the Roman and Byzantine period. The city was conquered by the Anatolian Seljuks in 1207 (Turan 1993, 284) and the development of the coastal trade reinforced the economic power of the Anatolian Seljuk State (Cahen 1994, 69). Ottoman authority in the city was consolidated eminently in 1427 (Moğol 1997, 52-53). 15th century onwards, the region where Antalya is situated has been called “Teke Province” (Yılmaz 2002, 9).

The city walls, which have been dominant urban elements determining the city form during history, retained their physical consistency until the mid-1930s, however during this decade the city walls were destroyed rapidly (Çimrin 2002, 381). The destruction of the city walls is also the commencement of the rapid urbanization extending out of the historical urban territory. This development, which parallels the urbanization process of Turkey during the Republican period, can be understood better by analyzing the size of the city between 1950 and 1960. In 1950, the size of the city was 270 hectares and population was 27 515, while in 1960, the urban size was 690 hectares and population was 50 908 (ATSO 2015, 1-2). The statistics indicate that within a decade, there had been approximately 250 % increase in urban size and 80 % increase in population.

Like in other cities of Turkey, starting from the 1960s, there has been state investments in industry for responding the need for employment and production. For the mechanized processing of the increasing cotton production in Antalya plateau and for decreasing unemployment, Antbirlik (The Union of Agricultural Cooperatives specialized in Cotton and Citrus Fruits in Antalya) was established in 1952. Thereafter, Antalya Cotton Textile Industry Company was founded in 1955 as a branch of Sümerbank (ATSO 2015, 2). Sümerbank was a state investment established in 1933 as a bank and a textile industry company. The construction of the textile factory of Antalya started in 1956, the factory was activated in 1961, and after 42 years of performance, was closed in 2003. The factory had a significant influence on the social and economic structure of the city. The district, where the weaving factory was built, was named as “dokuma” (weaving in Turkish). This nomenclature indicates the extent of this socioeconomic influence as well as the deep imprint of the factory in urban memory.

2. THE OLD TEXTILE FACTORY COMPLEX OF ANTALYA IN URBAN MEMORY

2.1. A Short Chronology of the Factory Complex:

Chronological information concerning the foundation and performance of the textile factory complex can be found in the archives of the Antalya Chamber of Industry and Commerce (ATSO). There is also comprehensive information in the report of the “Dokuma (Weaving Factory) Project Commission” which was established in 2015 by the Kepez Municipality in order to load new functions into the old complex (Dokuma Project Report 2015).

The Industry of Cotton Textile of Antalya stock company was founded in 1955 by the members of the Turkish parliament representing Antalya, representatives of Sümerbank, Ziraat (Agriculture) Bank, İş (Business) Bank, Turkish Bank of Commerce and native merchants. Company stocks were shared by Antbirlik, Sümerbank, Agriculture Bank, Business Bank, Turkish Commerce Bank and individual investors and companies of Antalya. The construction of the factory complex started in 1956.

The factory was activated in 1961. In order to provide electricity for the textile factory complex, the Kepez power plant started working at the same year (ATSO 2015, 2). In its

regular performance, the weaving capacity of the factory was 6,5 million meters of cloth per year. The aim of the factory was to satisfy the need for poplin, thin cotton cloth, by the use of which shirts, trousers, pajamas and handkerchief could be produced. Amongst the important products of the factory were uniforms for the Turkish Armed Forces. Within the framework of the urban context in the early 1960s, the factory complex was out of the city center therefore “the construction cooperative of the textile workers” was founded in order to meet the need for the accommodation of the employees (ATSO 2015, 3). The company realized capital improvement in 1959, 1962, 1990 and 2002. In 1971, the yarn-dyeing establishments were renewed and a confection workshop was founded.

The numbers of workers were 1.765 in 1965, 1.025 in 1985, 320 in 1998. The numbers of officers were 73 in 1985 and 49 in 1998. Through its almost 40 years of performance, the factory was integrated to its urban environment and gave its name to its district. In 2003, the factory was closed for making loss. In 2005, the factory was handed over to the Municipality of Kepez. In 2005 the Sümer Holding, in 2006 ATSO transferred their stocks to the Municipality of Kepez (ATSO 2015, 2-5).

2.2. The Significance of the Factory Complex in terms of Urban Memory

The textile factory complex of Antalya is a significant constituent of urban memory. The factory complex comprises building with various functions (**Figure 1**). These functions, which are related with work, accommodation and leisure, makes it possible to understand the urban significance of the factory complex in its historical context. Since the building complex represents the Republican industrialization processes in urban scale, in 2005, it was registered as a cultural heritage by the regional council of historic monuments and sites.

The main factory building is the most characteristic element of the complex (**Figure 2**). Here, through successive steps, the raw material is transformed into finished product. The closed area of the main factory building is 16.733 m². The building has a reinforced concrete frame structural system. The dimensions of the longitudinal structural module is 11,8 m. x 6 m. (Dokuma Project Report 2015). The roof of the main factory building is constituted by the rhythmic repetition of the reinforced concrete folded plate structure spanning 6 meters. The form of the roof is related with the specific orientation of the building. When the site plan of the factory complex is analyzed, it can be observed that the main building is perfectly oriented according to the cardinal directions. Due to this fact, the main building has an angular position with respect to the boundaries of its site and other buildings of the complex. This precise orientation of the building and the form of the roof makes it possible to let only northern light into the interior space (**Figure 3**). The scattered character of northern light prevents sharp contrasts of light and shadow. The space is designed precisely in order to avoid work accidents.

Seen in this framework, the main building is a perfect example where function, orientation, structural system and site plan are in harmony and where the character of a period is embodied. The main building is the illustration of precision, discipline and high quality standards.

The other buildings of the factory complex are placed around the main building. On the northern corner of the site there are guesthouse, education hall, dining hall for the workers and officers. In the western section which fits into the main entrance axis, there are security control building, administration building and day-care center for the children. In the south, there are housing units, which is separated from chemical depot and maintenance workshops by the use of a wide green area. In the east, there is a mosque, a repair shop, water tank, heating plant and electricity plant.

In contrast to the initial understanding of the term “factory complex”, the weaving factory of Antalya is not only a space for working, it comprises several functions related with various dimensions of life.

Several examples exhibit the significance of the above mentioned spaces for the urban memory of Antalya. The education hall, which is a constituent of the factory complex, was the stage for periodic educational facilities of Sümerbank, the founding public investment of the factory. The textile factory of Antalya was one branch of Sümerbank, which had similar investments in other Turkish cities such as Adana, Denizli, Nazilli (Aydın), Merinos (Bursa), Kayseri etc. In certain periods, there were educational meetings for the workers and officers of these factories. The objectives of these meetings were to improve the knowledge and skills of the employees of different branches and guarantee a certain overall quality standard in all of the Anatolian branches. Therefore the textile factory of Antalya was the stage of professional and industrial contact at the inter-city level. In addition the factory complex has been the embodiment of an institutional culture which introduced a new life style to the city. Thousands of workers and officers, who were employed by the company learned, experienced and shared these ideals for several decades and transmitted their professional culture to next generations. This institutional culture, which played an important role in urban memory of Antalya, had been multidimensional. In 1961, the Textile Company established a sports club with the departments of football, basketball and volleyball. The official football club of the city of Antalya was established in 1966. This fact indicates that the sport club of the textile company was one of the first professional attempts for disseminating sport facilities in the city.

Besides all these factors, the textile factory is imprinted powerfully to the urban memory through the name of its district. This district which was at the margins of the city center as of 1960s, was named after the weaving company. Today the district is called “Dokuma”, which means “weaving” in Turkish.

3. THE CURRENT SPATIAL EXPERIENCE OF THE COMPLEX

The factory complex performed almost 40 years between 1960s and 2000s. The place of the factory complex in urban memory consolidated during these decades. After being closed in 2003, the factory was handed over to the Municipality of Kepez in 2005. A decade between 2005 and 2015 passed for coming up with a consistent plan for use. After a controversial process concerning these decisions, in 2015 the Municipality of Kepez established a commission to formulate the outlines for the preservation and rehabilitation of the site through re-functioning. The members of the commission were representatives of the political parties, professional chambers and universities. The commission analyzed the universal principles for preserving industrial heritage and successful examples of preservation. In consequence, a strategy of restoration and preservation is proposed.

The universal principles for such objectives are voiced by two essential texts declared by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites): the first one is the “Venice Charter” (International Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964) (http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf) and the second one is the “Dublin Principles,” which stands for the Joint ICOMOS – TICCIH The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage) Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes (2011). (https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/GA2011_ICOMOS_TICCIH_joint_principles_EN_FR_final_20120110.pdf)

The Venice Charter (1964) puts forward the universal principles for restoration and conservation. According to the first article of the Venice Charter, “the concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time.” In this framework, the commission established by the municipality has regarded the weaving factory and its whole complex as the representative of a characteristic stage of development in social, economic, urban and architectural history of Antalya. The 4th article of the Venice Charter asserts that conservation should be “maintained on a permanent basis” and 5th article argues that conservation is “always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose” as long as this new use does not change the “lay-out or decoration of the building.” (Erder, 2007, s. 241).

The Dublin Principles (2011) define industrial heritage as “sites, structures, complexes, areas and landscapes as well as the related machinery, objects or documents that provide evidence of past or ongoing industrial processes of production, the extraction of raw materials, their transformation into goods, and the related energy and transport infrastructures”. The 10th article of the same text argues that “appropriate original or alternative and adaptive use is the most frequent way and often the most sustainable way of ensuring the conservation of industrial heritage sites or structures” however “new uses should respect significant material, components and patterns of circulation and activity. Specialist skills are necessary to ensure that the heritage significance is taken into account and respected in managing the sustainable use of these industrial heritage sites and structures.”

The final report of the Dokuma (Textile Factory) Project Commission is submitted to the municipality in April 2015. The implementation process of this proposal is continuing. The current spatial experience is an outcome of this report’s proposals. By referring to the above mentioned universal principles for the restoration and conservation of the industrial heritage, the report asserts that the textile factory complex of Antalya should be preserved in an integral manner together with all of its buildings and landscape elements. No new building should be constructed. Without violating the spatial character of the site, the open spaces should be opened to the public for recreational facilities. This is an important proposal for the life quality of the citizens because around the Dokuma district green areas, public parks and recreational facilities are quite limited. In addition, the existing buildings should be repaired and restored in accordance with their original architectural features. The critical point is the maintenance of the roofs because the buildings, especially the main factory building, have an enormous roof area and the roofs are damaged seriously. In order to sustain and preserve the physical quality of buildings the first precaution to take should be the maintenance of the roofs (Dokuma Project Report 2015).

Besides these objectives concerning the recreational use of open spaces and physical maintenance of the buildings, the new functional content of the existing buildings are discussed by the report. Since the original function of the factory complex cannot be continued new functions should be proposed in accordance with the 5th article of the Venice Charter. The report argues that the factory complex should be reviewed through the functions related with education, culture, sports and recreation. In this framework the proposed functions are a textile museum, scientific center encompassing education, implementation and experience, kindergarten, art workshops, restaurants, city library, conference halls and accommodation units, sport center etc. It may be observed that the spatial quality of the existing buildings and open areas are compatible with these functions and there is no need for constructing new

buildings. If the existing buildings can be loaded with these functions in accordance with the Venice Charter – Article 5, preservation of the industrial heritage can be realized through reuse.

Today, most of the proposals of the report are not implemented yet. However, the green spaces around the main factory building is opened to public as a recreational space. As a result of this decision, the current experience of the site is realized mainly through open space. As long as the characteristics of the site is preserved this use is very positive for the quality of urban life however for preserving the essential characteristics of the site, the proposals for the buildings should be implemented as soon as possible. Especially the proposed museum of weaving is a critical component of the new layout since the historical character of the site and spirit of the place is underlined by the activity and industry of weaving.

4. CONCLUSION

It is seen that “industrial heritage” has emerged as a new category of “cultural heritage” in cities where former industrial spaces cannot continue to perform their functions due to several social and economic reasons (Karıptaş, Erdinç ve Dinçer 2015, 512). Since industrial buildings reflect the sociological, cultural and technological context of their periods, they are seen as significant historical heritage and proposals are developed to preserve them through reuse (Asiliskender, Yöney, Özer 2015 ve Saner 2012).

In this framework, the textile factory of Antalya, which has given its name to the “Dokuma” (weaving) district where it was established, is a representative of industrial heritage in urban space. The factory consists of a large complex of buildings with divergent functions and the factory complex is an important element which has influenced the urban scale. The factory was built in 1960s, when Antalya was a little Mediterranean town. During its almost 40 years of performance, it provided considerable employment and established a continuous institutional culture. The factory complex became an active cultural agent. It has become the initiator of a large urban district which did not even exist before. Although more than a decade has passed after it was closed, the deep imprints of the factory in the urban memory and the former employees’ sense of belonging did not disappear.

After a controversial process, in 2015 preservation and re-functioning was considered officially. In consequence, the green areas were opened to public use for recreational purposes. The re-functioning of the buildings is a continuing process which has not been implemented yet. The current spatial experience is provided by recreational function in the open space. Since urban memory associates this space with its former function, the other proposals of the mentioned project should be implemented as soon as possible. The implementation of the project’s proposals can be solutions for possible discrepancies between urban memory and current use.



Figure 1. Site plan with original functions
(Dokuma project report 2015)

1. Guesthouse, 2. Education Hall, 3. Mosque, 4. Depots, 5. Dining Hall for the Workers, 6. Dining Hal for the Officers, 7. Maintenance Workshop, 8. Water Storage, 9. Electricity Plant, 10. Construction Maintenance Workshop, 11. Atelier, 12. Depot for Chemical Material, 13. Main Factory Building, 14. Administration, 15. Security, 16. Kindergarten, 17. Housing, 18. Heating Center.



Figure 2. Main Factory Building, exterior view.
(<http://kepezdokuma.com>)



Figure 3. Main Factory Building, interior space.
(<http://kepezdokuma.com>)

REFERENCES

- Asiliskender, B., Yöney, N. and Özer, A. 2015. Modern Mimarlık Mirasının Onarımı ve Yeniden İşlevlendirilmesi: Kayseri Sümerbank Bez Fabrikası Büyük Ambar Binası. Kargir Yapılarda Koruma ve Onarım Semineri Bildiri Kitabı (2015), pp.249-276, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Varlıkları Daire Başkanlığı.
- ATSO. 2015. Şirket Kronolojisi. Dokuma Projesi Çalışma Grubu Raporu. Kepez Belediyesi, Antalya.
- Cahan, C. 1994. Osmanlıdan Önce Anadolu'da Türkler. Çev.: Y.Moran. E Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Çimrin, H. 2002. Bir Zamanlar Antalya: Tarih, Gözlem ve Anılar, I. Cilt. Antalya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası, Antalya.
- Dokuma Project Report / Dokuma Projesi Çalışma Grubu Raporu. 2015. Kepez Belediyesi, Antalya.
- Erder, C. 2007. Tarihi Çevre Bilinci. ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi, Ankara.
- Karıptaş, F.S., Erdinç, J.E. and Diñer, B.Ö. Endüstriyel Mirasın Kentlerdeki Sürdürülebilirlik Bağlamında İncelenmesi. 2nd International Sustainable Buildings Symposium (2015), pp. 512-516, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Kıvrın, F. and Uysal, M. 1992. Antalya: Bir Kentin Portresi. Fırat Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Mansel, A.M. 1956. İlk Çağda Antalya Bölgesi. İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Moğol, H. 1997. Antalya Tarihi. Mehter Yayınevi, İstanbul.

- Saner, M. Endüstri Mirası: Kavramlar, Kurumlar ve Türkiye'deki Yaklaşımlar. Planlama (2012/1-2), pp. 53-66, Şehir Plancıları Odası Yayını, İstanbul.
- Texier, C. 2002. Küçük Asya Coğrafyası, Tarihi ve Arkeolojisi. Çev.: A.Suat. Enformasyon ve Dokümantasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, Ankara.
- Turan, O. 1993. Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye. Boğaziçi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Yılmaz, L. 2002. Antalya (16. Yüzyılın Sonuna Kadar). Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara.
- http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf.
- https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/GA2011_ICOMOS_TICCIH_joint_principles_EN_FR_final_20120110.pdf.
- <http://kepezdokuma.com>