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Abstract
Reusing pre-existing buildings for new functions and thereby ensuring the transfer of cultural knowledge and experiences to future generations contributes significantly to cultural sustainability by enhancing the city’s cultural life and the value of certain city areas. When reusing buildings the social aspect of the functions that will be assigned to these buildings that no longer serve their original function need to be considered as well, since such aspects form the basis of socio-cultural sustainability. The aim of this study was to evaluate various examples of domestic architecture at the Konya city center that no longer serve their original functions, within the context of socio-cultural sustainability. The common characteristics of these buildings, which are currently being reused as cafés or as the offices of the Conservation Board and the Chamber of Architects in Konya, is that they are all examples of authentic domestic architecture that are registered for preservation and are located in the city center. The contribution of these examples of domestic architecture to socio-cultural sustainability was analyzed by administering a questionnaire to university students and then evaluating the questionnaire results with descriptive statistics.
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INTRODUCTION
In a world where change is both constant and inevitable, it is important to ensure the preservation of historical areas and buildings, and to adapt such buildings to present-day functions within the context of preservation practices in order to ensure their continuity. Buildings considered to be part of cultural heritage often undergo functional and physical changes over time with regards to their status and appearance (Aydın et al., 2007). In case these buildings become unable to fulfill their original function over time, or in case their relevant function becomes inapplicable in the present-day setting, it becomes necessary to perform spatial changes within their structure. To ensure that cultural properties, cultural heritages, and historical, cultural, and aesthetic values are preserved, and to ensure that they continue to form a cultural link between the past and the future, it is important to consider their potential modern use and functions (Yaldız, 2013). In this context, reuse is an important aspect of preservation, and involves the reintegration of a historical structure into daily life through a new function. Using buildings outside of their original intended purpose, and benefiting from these buildings by providing them with new functions through which they can service society, contributes to the interaction between individuals, the buildings and society. However, it is also necessary to find the proper balance between the preservation of a cultural property and the change of its functions.

The concepts of preservation and adaptation for reuse involve a process of continuity, sustainability, and dynamism for a cultural property. Sustainability is defined as “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987). Sustainability is a dynamic process that encompasses the concepts of time, continuity, preservation, and adaptation to change (Shediac-Rizkallah and
Bone, 1998; Teutonico and Matero, 2003; Sarp, 2007; Yaldız, 2010). Sustainability in architecture, on the other hand, is a system that examines the economic use and the reuse-related activities of buildings, as well as their relation with the people and the environment. The architectural principles of sustainability are based on creating products/buildings that are compatible with the ‘region, culture and context,’ with the preservation of resources, and with the designing of livable environments. In this context, for historical areas those have developed their own authentic characteristics over time, it is necessary to ensure the continuity of their creative past, and to establish a relationship between the past and the present. According to the DEH (2004) from Australia and to Cantacuzino (1989), adaptation to reuse is considered as “a component of sustainable development,” and the new function of a historical building is described as one of the inputs for ensuring its sustainability. Reuse aims to extend the useful life period of a building, and acts as a component for ensuring both sustainability and preservation (Aydın et al., 2009). Although reuse represents one of the most appropriate and efficient approaches for utilizing cultural properties while simultaneously preserving them, the main focus of this preservation approach should not be sustainability of the new function itself, but rather the sustainability of the building that constitutes a cultural property. Preserving buildings without demolishing them not only allows sustainability in terms of energy-saving and material-saving, but also provides many social and economic benefits to society (Yung et al., 2012). The preservation and the re-adaptation for the use of cultural heritage is an important part of cultural policies, as well as an effective means for promoting public interests and strengthening the sense of cultural identity (Cercleux et al., 2012). Preservation can also be viewed as a policy for ensuring cultural continuity that serves as a reference for social life.

The constantly interacting components of ecological, socio-cultural, and economic sustainability both support and complement each other (Blowers, 1997; Reboratti, 1999; Sachs, 1997). The concept of cultural continuity/sustainability, which is considered as a sub-component of continuity, is defined as the ability of a social identity to change and adapt to present-day conditions without losing touch with its essence and origins. Cultural continuity is achieved by controlling the pace and nature of change. Culture is a mechanism, which, by constantly undergoing changes, allows both individuals and society to also adapt to the changes in the world they live. The culture of present-day societies harbors the accumulated knowledge and experience of the past (Kuban, 2000). In architecture, the concept of cultural continuity refers to each generation’s task and responsibility in contributing to the cultural values and indicators it acquired from previous generations (often through interactions with other cultures) (Yaldız, 2010), and to effectively transfer these cultural values and indicators to future generations (Cebeci et al., 2002). In this context, culture represents the spatial and physical traces of past experiences. The creation, understanding, and continuity of cultural properties depend on common experiences. Cultural properties are thus the physical representations of our knowledge and memories regarding the physical world. The accumulated knowledge that is embodied by these buildings reflects not only the main characteristics of a society’s structure and organization, but also reflects many features of social identity (Asiliskender, 2005). In sum, the structures that are defined as cultural properties are much more than empty spaces enclosed by walls; they are locations that reflect the culture, traditions, customs, knowledge, and the collective consciousness and experiences of a society. Moreover, they represent areas that both witness and bear the marks of everyday life. In addition to allowing individuals to establish a link to the past, cultural properties also contribute significantly to the character of a location, illustrate important historical events, and reflect the historical identity of a location or area. With the historical marks and traces they constantly bear, cultural properties also ensure the continuity between the past, present, and future (Yaldız, 2010). With respect to the sustainable reuse of these structures, the concept of “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” is an essential aspect.
that must be considered. Reusing cultural properties that are part of a city’s historical fabric by assigning them new functions can be viewed as an extension of policies that aim to ensure cultural continuity and to preserve features/structures that serve as references for social life (Korumaz, 2006; Pereira et al., 2004).

Reuse also constitutes a part of cultural continuity not only through the protection of architectural heritage, but also by serving as an example for new preservation-related activities and practices (Arabacıoğlu et al., 2007). When considered within the context of sustainability, reuse significantly contributes to the social and cultural sustainability of a building through the new functions it assigns, while also supporting the continuity of the functions in question (Aydın and Okuyucu, 2009). Preserving and ensuring the continuation of a structure’s original spatial characteristics and value through a new function has a significant effect on social and cultural sustainability, and allows the preservation of historical values for future generations. Cultural properties serve as a bridge between the past and the present, and between the old and the new. They are the means for ensuring cultural continuity, as well as instruments for ensuring the transfer of culture to future generations (Tapan, 2007; Aydin and Okuyucu, 2009).

From a socio-cultural perspective, a new function allows a historical building: (1) to contribute to the city, environment, and urban fabric; (2) to benefit society through the activities it fulfills and the social needs it satisfies; and (3) to become once again usable and inhabitable. The criteria for evaluating socio-cultural sustainability in reused historical buildings are provided in Table 1. Within the context of the study, we have focused on social and cultural components. Based on the views of study participants who were knowledgeable about the city and the relevant historical buildings, the present study evaluated the preservation, the authenticity, and the symbolic significance of the cultural properties being reused with different functions, as well as importance that was being accorded to the historical and cultural significance of such structures. In this context, it is important that the changes introduced to a structure through new uses and functions contribute positively to its historical significance and architectural integrity.

Table 1. The components of sustainability (Aydin and Okuyucu, 2009; Aydin, 2010; Yaldız, 2013)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Cultural Components</th>
<th>Components belonged to the new function and buildings adaptation to reuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original function of the building should not be forgotten</td>
<td>Visual completeness with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New function of the building should be known</td>
<td>Accessibility and parking lot for the new function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building become a reference point by new function</td>
<td>Visual contribution with its new function to the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expression of the building’s architectural history and art value</td>
<td>The harmony between new function of the building and its environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of the building’s cultural values</td>
<td>It’s quality to attract attention in the fabric it is placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of the building’s originality values</td>
<td>Being saved from the ruin appearance/preventing visual pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of the building’s aesthetical values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New function should agree with the social and cultural structure of the city</td>
<td>The relationship between the requirements of new function and existing spatial organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of the building’s socio-cultural value</td>
<td>The spatial character of the new function (width, length, height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the publicity to the city</td>
<td>Action flow and space organization of new function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, cultural and economical benefits it provides to.</td>
<td>Spatial characteristics of the original building (plan scheme, width, length, height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New function supports the user activities and social life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual contribution with its new function to the environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The harmony between new function and environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s quality to attract attention in the fabric it is placed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being saved from the ruin appearance, preventing visual pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The study is focused on the evaluation of the social and cultural sustainability components.
Methods

The methodology of the study relies on the evaluation within the context of social and cultural sustainability of domestic architecture that were no longer used according to their initial functions. This field study was performed on six cases of domestic architecture that are located around the Alaeddin Hill in Konya city center. The Alaeddin Hill has an important influence on the overall structure and organization of the city. These cases are selected due to their location at the city center, and they are well known and commonly used. To assess the selected components of social and cultural sustainability, a 31-item questionnaire was administered to third and fourth year students enrolled in the Selcuk University Department of Architecture during the 2013-2014 academic years. The questionnaires are administered to architecture students would provide more informative and relevant results regarding the study problem. In addition, since most of these students resided near the city center, most of them were familiar with the relevant domestic architecture. The questionnaire was designed based on the Likert-Style. When evaluating the questionnaire, scores were taken into consideration, and the intervals shown in Table 2. The methods used during the study included interviews and the documenting of photographs. Other techniques for collecting results were employed as well.

Table 2. Gap widths of quintet likert scale (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Score range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4.21-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.41-4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2.61-3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.81-2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula: Gap width=series width/number of the group
It is determined as Gap width=4/5= 0.8

The socio-cultural components assessed were organized under eight different categories with further sub-components (see Table 3). The score of the sub-components for each building was accepted as the score for the main component. Based on the scores provided by the participants for each one of the main sub-components, the applicable mean and standard deviation values were determined by using descriptive statistical analyses. In addition, scores received for their respective socio-cultural components, comments and interpretation reached regarding the buildings’ socio-cultural characteristics. During the study, a score above 2.60 was considered to indicate a favorable opinion among the study participants.
Table 3. Socio-cultural sustainability components handled in the study (Source: Authors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main components</th>
<th>Sub-components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A. The cognoscibility of the building’s original-new function** | The building is known with its old function  
The building is known with its new function  
The new function of the building made the old function to be forgotten |
| **B. The relationship between the actual function and context** | There is a harmony between the new function of the building and the functions of the context  
The building enriches the environment with its new function |
| **C. Building-environment relationship** | There is a visual completeness between the building and its near environment  
The building has a disturbing appearance in the fabric where it is placed  
The building is a distinctive building within its environment  
The building is saved from its old ruin appearance with new function and repair  
The change of buildings’ appearance provides a true image in the process of new function |
| **D. The relationship between the location of the building and new function** | The location of the building in the city make it easier to make use of the new function  
The location of the building is easy from the point of transportation  
The building has a positive relationship with the order in its environment |
| **E. The increase of the cognoscibility and symbolic value with the new function** | It is a place to show the visitors came to the city  
It provides contribution to the publicity of the city  
It is the symbol of the area where it is placed with the new function  
It is a reference/definition/identification vehicle in the environment with the new function |
| **F. The value of new function from the point of architecture culture and conservation** | The usage of the building with its new function is respectful to its past  
The building has traces belonged to the past  
The image of the building is sensed as a historical building |
| **G. The adaptation of the new function to the building** | New usage of the building makes the building livable  
Given function fulfills the people’s requirements  
Given function brings mobility  
New function brings social and cultural space to the city  
Given function is appropriate for the society |
| **H. Usage value increases with the new function** | Preference reason for the building to be used is that it is a historical building  
New usage of the building leaves positive effects on the users  
The building joins to the daily life with the new function |

**Field Study**

The examples of domestic architecture that were selected for this study were located around the Alaeddin Hill, which is an important structural element of the Konya city center. The common characteristics of these buildings, which are currently being reused as cafés or as the offices of the Conservation Board and the Chamber of Architects in Konya, is that they are all examples of original domestic architecture that are registered for conservation and are located at the city center.
This study evaluated the perceptions regarding both the physical environment and the original identity of the selected examples of domestic architecture. Within the context of this evaluation, the following sub-components of socio-cultural sustainability were assessed for these buildings: the level awareness concerning their original function; the level of awareness concerning their new function; their functional compatibility with their environment; their role as a noteworthy structures or symbols in their area; their contribution to the city’s publicity; the liveliness they add to their environment; their role as a reference point; their ability to meet the city’s needs; the compatibility of their new functions with the city’s social and cultural fabric; the preservation of the building’s cultural, aesthetic, and economic value; elimination of the building’s neglected/ruined appearance; prevention of visual pollution; forming a new image according to the building’s new function; and the social, cultural, and economic benefits these buildings provide to their users.

**Description of the Selected Examples of Domestic Architecture**

The selected examples of domestic architecture that were evaluated within the context of social and cultural sustainability had been were built towards the end of the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century. These buildings, which are all registered for conservation, are currently being used for purposes other than their original functions. The specific location of the examples of domestic architecture was an important factor for their selection for this study. The examples located in the city center are distributed in an area through which many public transportation vehicles are routes pass. The fact that these examples were also located near pedestrian areas also contributed to the level of awareness and knowledge among the public regarding these buildings. The fact that this area was also one of commercial, social, and cultural activity also affected the level of awareness/knowledge concerning these buildings. Table 4 briefly provides information regarding the history, the function, and the architectural characteristics of the buildings selected for this study.
Table 4. Introduction of the domestic architecture cases (Sources: Authors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>(Dr. Nevzat Özkal House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building is built as a dwelling in the second half of 19th century. The dwelling is bought by a doctor in 1958 and used as both a dwelling and an office. The building is registered in 1991 and Chamber of Architects of Turkey Konya Branch took its ownership in 1999. The building is restored and it has been used as Chamber of Architects branch building since 2000. The building composed of basement, ground floor and first floor has middle sofa “karnıyarık” plan scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>(Old Konya House I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building, with the other domestic architecture example adjacent to it, is built as a dwelling in the first half of 19th century. The building is registered with the other dwelling next to it having the same scheme and façade characteristics in 1991. In time the surrounding area of this dwelling became dense trade areas and it has been used as a shoe store in the ground floor and a narghile saloon in the upper floor. There is no restoration project prepared for the building. It had simple repairs in different time intervals. The building composed of basement, ground floor and first floor has middle sofa “karnıyarık” plan scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>(Old Konya House II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building, with the other domestic architecture example adjacent to it, is built as a dwelling in the first half of 19th century. The building is registered with the other dwelling next to it having the same scheme and façade characteristics in 1991. In time the surrounding area of this dwelling became dense trade areas and it has been used as a restaurant. There is no restoration project prepared for the building. It had simple repairs in different time intervals. The building composed of basement, ground floor and first floor has middle sofa “karnıyarık” plan scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 4</th>
<th>(Arapoğlu Kosti House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is known that the building is constructed as a dwelling in late 19th century by Maruni Araboğlu Kosti who immigrated to Anatolia. In 1892 it was used as a school of French and then it was used as a dwelling again until 1970. After that the building is used as a city building of a political party and later as a cram school. The building is registered in 1991 and it has been used as a restaurant, then a narghile saloon and later a café since 1999. The building composed of basement, ground floor, first floor and an attic space has middle sofa “karnıyarık” plan scheme. The building is placed in corner parcel and has two entrances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The building with the unknown definite construction date is said to be built as a dwelling in late 19th or early 20th century. The building is nationalized in 1990; its repair was started in 1991 and completed in 1996. After the repair the building was used as Republic of Turkey Ministry o Culture and Tourism Konya Directorate of Culture Entities Conservation Region Board.

After the fire happened in December 2009 in the archive section in the basement, the building could not be used for a while; it continued to be used as a board building after the repair.

The building composed of basement, ground floor, first floor and an attic space has middle sofa “karnıyarık” plan scheme. It is one of the best examples in stone craftsmanship.

The building is thought to be built in early 20th century and was registered in 1989. It was used as a narghile salon and a cafe for a while, and then new arrangements related to new functions were applied in the building. Today the building has a public function as a cafe and a place of little trade sales.

The building composed of basement, ground floor and an attic space has a plan scheme with inner sofa. The building is one of the best examples in stone craftsmanship.

The Evaluation Domestic Architecture Examples from a Socio-Cultural Perspective

When the examples of domestic architecture were evaluated according to the mean scores of the socio-cultural components, the results shown in Table 5 were obtained. These scores were determined with the aid of sub-components that constitute the main components. The results obtained for the nine socio-cultural characteristics that were selected within the context of this study are discussed below.

A. ‘The cognoscibility of the building’s original – new function’ was determined as $\bar{x} \geq 2.60$ for all of the buildings. When the sub-components constituting component A were analyzed separately for each one of the buildings, it was determined that the score of the responses regarding the level awareness on the original function and name of these buildings mostly corresponded to “Agree” and “Strongly Agree.” These scores indicated that the current function of these buildings did not cause the study participants to forget these buildings’ past and original functions.

B. ‘The relationship between the current function and the urban environment of the building’ was determined as $\bar{x} \geq 2.60$ for all of the buildings. The sub-components that constituted component B assessed the compatibility between the building and its function within its relevant urban environment. As all of the examples were located within the city center, they were all part of an active urban environment/fabric where buildings are extensively used as offices and for commercial purposes. The selected examples functionally contributed to the urban environment. With the exception of Example 1 and Example 5, all of these buildings provided recreation-, leisure-, and meeting-related services. Example 1 and Example 5, on the other hand, had semi-public functions. However, as the study participants were architecture students, they did not know all the details regarding the function of each one of the buildings.
C. ‘The relationship between the building and the environment’ referred to the compatibility and consistency between the building and its environment in terms of visual appearance. For all of the buildings, the score for this component was determined as $\overline{X} > 2.60$. Due to the time period in which they were constructed, most of the buildings had either one or two stories. On the other hand, the scores for the physical fabric surrounding the evaluated buildings at the city center varied between 3 to 5 times. For each one of the buildings, the responses of the participants to the sub-component “the repair and reuse of the building remedies their old and ruined appearance,” corresponded to “somewhat agree.” Concerning examples of domestic architecture that have fewer stories in comparison to the buildings in their surrounding and/or which are located in a very active urban framework, it is not possible to speak of a compatibility/consistency in terms of building height. Although it is a positive approach to repair and improve the appearance of these buildings, and to ensure that they continue to exist by fulfilling new functions rather than becoming idle and disused, such measures also have the effect of necessitating preservation-related urban planning approaches for the area in which these buildings are located. When the buildings selected and evaluated within the scope of this study were accorded a preservation status, this decision also had an irreversible effect on area in which these buildings located.

D. ‘The relationship between the location of the building and its new function’ had an above-average score (2.61·$\overline{X}$:3.40) for all of the buildings. The fact that all of the buildings were located at the city center made it easier for them to be accessed by pedestrians. The ease of access/transportation for these buildings had a favorable effect on their frequency of use, and also on the preference among the city inhabitants for using these buildings.

E. With respect to the increase in ‘cognoscibility and symbolic value as a result of the building’s new function,’ Example 2 and Example 4 had the highest scores (“Agree” 3.41·$\overline{X}$ > 4.20). The other examples, on the other hand, mostly received scores that corresponded to “Somewhat Agree.” Each one of the buildings was considered as symbols or points of reference in the urban area in which they were located (“Agree” 3.41·$\overline{X}$ > 4.20). The new function of these buildings not only increased their involvement in public life, but also their recognition.

F. Concerning the ‘value of the new function with respect to architectural culture and conservation’ component, Example 1 received a score of $\overline{X} = 2.10$, which corresponded to response of “Disagree.” The reason why Example 1 was considered as such by the study participants was because two of the sub-components of F, which were “the building still bears the traces of its past” and “the image of the building conveys the appearance of a historical building” sub-components, were both scored negatively by them. All of the other examples of domestic architecture were evaluated favorably in terms of the sub-components of F, with the following sub-components receiving scores that corresponded to ‘Agree:’ 1) ‘the building effectively conveys information to the public regarding its architectural culture;’ and 2) ‘the new function of the building respects the building’s past and history.’ For a cultural property, effectively preserving the traces and characteristics of the past is a positive approach in terms of preservation. In this context, the principles and procedures regarding restoration are important. Regardless of the conservation status of a building, ensuring that a building does not lose the traces and characteristics relating to its past depends heavily on avoiding, the use of present-day technologies and construction materials during the restoration process. The fact that most of the evaluated buildings preserved the traces of their past was a positive observation with respect to architecture culture and preservation.

G. ‘The adaptation of the building to its new function’ component evaluated the compatibility between the building and its function. For each one of the evaluated architectural examples, a score corresponding to “Somewhat Agree” was obtained from the study participants. Example 1 and Example 5 were used as meeting halls, and thus provided services to large numbers of
individuals. For all of the buildings, it was determined that the new functions had been determined according to practical considerations.

H. ‘The new function’s contribution to the building’s use value’ component reflected the extent to which the new function was publicly used, as well as the extent to which people preferred to use the building in question. For each one of the architectural examples, a score corresponding to “Somewhat Agree” was obtained from the study participants ($\bar{x}=2.60$). In addition, the H sub-component called ‘the level of involvement of the building’s new function in daily life’ received a score corresponding to ‘Agree’ for all of the buildings. Buildings that are registered for preservation, which bear a considerable cultural and historical value, and reflect the architectural culture of a certain period find limited public use when they are used as houses/domiciles. For this reason, repairing such buildings and allowing them to provide services to the city greatly enhances their value and continuity.

Table 5. The values of the dwellings used with different purposes other than the original one from the point of socio-cultural sustainability components (Source: Authors).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1 (Dr. Nevzat Özkal House)</th>
<th>Example 2 (Old Konya House I)</th>
<th>Example 3 (Old Konya House II)</th>
<th>Example 4 (Araboğu Kosti House)</th>
<th>Example 5 (Fuat Anadolu House)</th>
<th>Example 6 (M.Nebil Ergül House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The cognoscibility of the building’s original – new function</td>
<td>2.81 0.53</td>
<td>2.76 0.59</td>
<td>2.85 0.69</td>
<td>2.78 0.49</td>
<td>3.03 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The relationship between current function – urban environment</td>
<td>3.19 0.70</td>
<td>3.04 0.74</td>
<td>2.79 0.68</td>
<td>3.25 0.68</td>
<td>3.12 0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Relationship between building - environment</td>
<td>2.81 0.35</td>
<td>3.17 0.46</td>
<td>2.82 0.49</td>
<td>3.00 0.53</td>
<td>2.80 0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Relationship between the location and the new function of the building</td>
<td>2.81 0.61</td>
<td>3.12 0.73</td>
<td>2.85 0.84</td>
<td>2.99 0.71</td>
<td>2.97 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Increase in the cognoscibility and symbolic value with new function</td>
<td>3.19 0.75</td>
<td>3.61 0.74</td>
<td>3.24 0.96</td>
<td>3.62 0.87</td>
<td>3.37 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The value of the new function from the point of architecture culture and conservation</td>
<td>2.10 0.65</td>
<td>3.17 0.58</td>
<td>2.73 0.68</td>
<td>3.04 0.58</td>
<td>2.37 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Adaptation of the new function to the building</td>
<td>2.60 0.59</td>
<td>2.98 0.61</td>
<td>2.65 0.75</td>
<td>3.14 0.60</td>
<td>2.70 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Increase of the usage value with the new function</td>
<td>2.65 0.59</td>
<td>3.10 0.75</td>
<td>2.68 0.91</td>
<td>3.14 0.70</td>
<td>2.70 0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x}$ = Mean    $S$= Std. Deviation
CONCLUSION

Transferring cultural heritage and experiences from the past to future generations is an inseparable part of our modern social responsibilities, as well as being a requisite for social progress. Many historical buildings and areas are often left in disrepair and ruin due to neglect, irresponsible use, inadequate preservation policies, or their inability to meet present-day needs and demands. Leaving such historical buildings in a state of neglect gravely endangers cultural sustainability. Ensuring the continuity of a cultural property through reuse not only ensures the preservation of history, but also allows history to become something that is visible, concrete, learnable, and interesting for the public. The reuse of examples of domestic architecture that were evaluated within the context of the present study demonstrated that reuse contributed considerably to social and cultural sustainability. A general evaluation of the study results highlighted the following points:

- New functions of a public or semi-public nature for these historical buildings effectively contributed to raising the level of awareness regarding conservation.
- New functions for these buildings that focused on meeting certain social needs/requirements effectively contributed to the use value and the continuity of these buildings, while also improving the sustainability of their conservation.
- The ability to reuse and assign new functions to a building under preservation depended on the building’s location and accessibility.
- It was observed that the functions of other structures surrounding a historical building, as well as the location of the historical building within the city, had a considerable impact on the continuity of the building’s new social and cultural functions.
- Conservation must be considered as a whole, and historical buildings under preservation need to be visually compatible with their surrounding buildings.
- The height, the shape, and the function of surrounding buildings must not negatively affect the appearance and perception of buildings under conservation.
- Urban planning decisions and practices that affect the city area in which historical buildings are found can have either negative or positive effects on cultural properties.

There are numerous examples of domestic architecture across the urban and rural areas of Anatolia that reflect authentic regional characteristics, and which serve as evidence of historical richness and cultural diversity. When assigning new and alternative functions to these buildings, it is important to also consider aspects relating to social and cultural sustainability. For example, there are numerous bathhouses (or hamams) in many places of Anatolia that are not used according to their original purpose. For such buildings, it is important to consider the benefits associated with their potential alternative uses. As such, the process of adapting cultural properties to new functions, and the evaluation of how these functions would contribute to social and cultural sustainability, should take into consideration whether the selected function would satisfy social needs/demands, benefit their users, and favorably contribute to the buildings’ current environment.
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