DOI: 10.38027/ICCAUA2022EN0151

Architectural Projects Prepared Through National or International Design Project Competitions on Archaeological Sites as Contemporary Additions

*** Ahu Sönmez** [1], Prof. Dr. **Mine Tanaç Zeren** [2]
Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Architecture, Izmir, Turkey [1]
Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Architecture, Izmir, Turkey [2]
E-mail [1]*: ahu.snmz@gmail.com, E-mail* [2]*: mine.tanac@deu.edu.tr*

Abstract
Cultural heritage is the most important factor in the formation of urban identities. The construction of new buildings in archaeological heritage areas as well as in the historical environment maintains its currency as a subject that continues to be discussed within the context of conservation. Regarding the protection and presentation of archaeological heritage sites, the need for articulation of service structures such as visitor centers, museums, sales units, WC volumes, experience/activity areas and excavation houses within the protected areas arises over time and defined by the regulations and declarations accordingly regarding the construction of new buildings in the historical environment and archaeological heritage areas. The aim of the study is to examine the building principles, design criteria and conservation approaches of the contemporary constructions/annexes designed through national or international design competitions in archaeological sites regarding the national and international conservation policy.
Keywords: Preservation of Archaeological Sites, Contemporary Additions to Historical Environment, Design Competitions in Historical Environment.

1. Introduction

thousands of years of history of the countries have provided the formation of heritage values at different scales.
The archaeological heritage is a universal value, and its preservation should not be left to chance. It is a universal feature to transfer the archaeological values that have reached the present day to the future and to increase the awareness of conservation. The construction of new buildings in archaeological heritage areas as well as in the historical environment maintains its currency as a subject that continues to be discussed within the context of conservation. Accordingly, regulations and declarations regarding the construction of new buildings in the historical environment and archaeological heritage areas have been published, and the legislation has been stretched according to today's conditions.
Regarding the protection and presentation of archaeological heritage sites, the need for articulation of service structures such as visitor centers, museums, sales units, WC volumes, experience/activity areas and excavation houses within the protected areas arises over time.
Within or around the protected areas over time regarding the protection and presentation of archaeological heritage sites; there is a need for articulation of service structures such as Museums/Archaeoparks, Visitor Centres, Travel Routes/Walking Paths, Protective Roofs, Sales Units, Cafes/Recreation Areas, WC Volumes, Experience/Activity Areas, Security, Entrance and Reception Areas, Excavation Houses.
The study aims to examine the building principles, design criteria, and conservation approaches of the contemporary constructions/annexes designed through national or international design competitions in archaeological sites regarding the national and international conservation policy.

2. Material and Methods

Today, archaeological relics are exhibited in situ, and an integrated conservation model is preferred.
Within the scope of the "Recommendation on International Principles to be Applied in Archaeological Excavations" published by UNESCO in 1956, it has been suggested to the member states that archaeological excavations be subject to permission, training activities should be carried out to respect the archaeological relics, and the supervision of the restoration works to be carried out in the archaeological relics.
Archaeological excavations were mentioned in Article 15 of the "Venice Charter" published in 1964, and it was emphasized that archaeological excavations should be carried out according to the decisions and scientific standards defined by international principles. The importance of preserving archaeological relics was mentioned. In addition, reconstruction was not considered appropriate, and the anastylosis method was accepted. (ICOMOS, 1964).
In the " European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage ", which was issued by the Council of Europe in 1969 but revised in 1992, a roadmap for planning was drawn for excavations in archaeological sites.

In the "Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage" published by ICOMOS in 1990, it was stated that the archaeological heritage constitutes the basic document of human activities in the past and is the material heritage obtained by archaeological methods. At the same time, it has been stated that it includes all kinds of relics including places, abandoned structures, soil, and underwater sites that reflect all kinds of traces and activities of human existence, and all movable cultural material in connection with them (ICOMOS, 1990).
Within the scope of the " The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites" published by ICOMOS in 2008, the issues related to the adoption of the concept of heritage by the society were emphasized. Community adoption of the archaeological heritage has formed the main task of archaeologists and relevant conservation experts.
“Settlements and ruins from past civilizations constitute our historical environment. Many details about the social and economic structure, philosophy of life and aesthetic sensitivity of past civilizations are hidden in these circles” (Ahunbay, 2017).
In the method of the study, primarily a literature review was carried out. After the literature review, contemporary structures/additions obtained through national or international architectural project competitions in archaeological sites in various countries were selected within the scope of the study. Even if the competition project has been concluded, buildings that have not been completed and are not open to visitors are excluded from the scope. Structures built outside the archaeological site or protected area are also excluded.
Within the scope of the study, architectural competition projects were examined under two headings as structures built in archaeological areas located at the periphery or outside of the urban fabric and structures built in archaeological areas within the urban fabric. Architectural structures include Museums and Visitor Centers. Protection roofs, excursion platforms, open space arrangements and experimental archaeology areas are excluded from the scope. Two structures from Turkey, one from Greece and one from Croatia were included in the study for analysis. Two examples are structures built in archaeological areas located at the periphery or outside of the urban fabric and two examples are structures built in archaeological areas within the urban fabric.

3. Contemporary Annexes in Historic Environment and Archaeological Heritage Sites

The concept of contemporary annex has emerged to ensure that these structures or areas can be transformed into living spaces again due to the loss of their functionality as a result of the inability of historical buildings or historical areas to keep up with today's conditions and requirements (Zeren, 2010).
According to Zeren, two concepts form the basis of the design criteria of the contemporary building. These are style and proportion. One of the basic principles of the new building, which will be built in a historical texture or an archaeological heritage site, is to respect the characteristics of the area where the building will be built in terms of scale and proportion. The new building should also connect with its surroundings (Zeren, 2010).
Michael Davies has proposed five different approaches to the design of new buildings in the historical environment: Emulation Approach, Traditionalist Approach, Arrogant Approach, Current Approach, and Implicit Approach. In the Greater Philadelphia Conservation Agreement published in 2007, four different approach models were envisaged for the design of new buildings in the historical environment: Authentic Copying, Discovery in a Style, Abstract Reference and Intentional Contrast (Pasin, Varinlioğlu, 2018).
For the features of the new building to be built in a historical texture or an archaeological heritage site, Zeren has adopted four different approaches: Imitation of Style, Emulation of the Traditional, Respectful Approach and Contrary Approach (Zeren, 2010).
Contemporary annexes built in archaeological sites are produced by the competition method today. While the project work of contemporary buildings to be built in archaeological sites is usually given directly to architectural offices, the creation and announcement of architectural projects through competitions has recently been on the agenda in terms of the emergence of different ideas and approaches.
Kolumba Museum, Archaeological Pavilion and St Antony Industrial Archaeological Park from Germany, Villa Romana La Olmeda and Cartagena Archaeological Park Cover from Spain are some examples of architectural projects prepared through national or international design project competitions on archaeological sites as contemporary additions which are outside the scope of the study.
When the historical process of architectural competitions in the world is examined, it is possible to see its development over time. In the 20th century, architectural project competitions became universal and the power of the competitions in the architectural environment increased. Architectural project competitions have increased in importance over time, as they form the focus of tourism in the national and international sense, as well as stating the importance of the place and period in which they are held (Eraydın, Arslan, 2021).

4. Conservation of Archaeological Sites and Their Relationship with The Urban Fabric

Archaeological sites can be located within the urban fabric as well as outside the urban fabric. This situation leads to the emergence of various potentials and threats in the protection, exhibition, and transfer of archaeological sites to future generations.

Situations such as dense urbanization, property problems, expropriation costs, the boundaries of the archaeological area, and the characteristics of the emerging movable/immovable cultural assets cause uncertain and various difficulties during the construction of contemporary annexes on archaeological sites in the urban fabric. In this case, it emerges as a result of making a solution together with archaeological relics for the structures needed for the protection and transfer to the future of archaeological sites located in dense and complex areas within the urban fabric. Therefore, these structures are often built on archaeological relics. Due to this situation, which also forces the designer, different conservation problems and discussions come into question.

Contemporary annexes such as museums or visitor centers to be built on archaeological sites located outside the urban fabric can be built outside the archaeological site, not on the archaeological relics, due to the sparse construction and wide usage areas around the archaeological site. These structures are sometimes built on the periphery of the archaeological site and sometimes at a certain distance. In this case, the archaeological relics are not damaged. After the information that needs to be given to the visitors is conveyed, the archaeological site is experienced. These areas can also be considered as buffer zones.

Structures built on archaeological relics bring along various conservation problems. It is of great importance that experts from different professions and disciplines meticulously carry out the design and construction process together. The coexistence of the relics and the building cannot be ensured in the structures built in a different place from the archaeological relics. Thus, the situation of being detached from the context of the information to be transferred may occur. The purpose of the contemporary annexes is for the visitors to obtain information from the relevant unit and to visit and experience the area with that information. Since these structures are built in an area far from archaeological relics, some visitors choose between the archaeological site and the museum/visitor center structure. The decrease in the number of people visiting the archaeological site and the museum/visitor center together may cause the building to not serve its purpose.

Table 1. Archaeological Sites and Their Relationship with The Urban Fabric

Archaeological Sites and Their Relationship with The Urban Fabric		
Location	*Oppurtunities*	*Threats*
In The Urban Fabric	● Increasing awareness of the Archaeological site by area users ● Easy for visitor access ● Contributing to city life during tourism activities	● Difficult to control and protect the archaeological site ● Urbanization and zoning activities ● Intensive construction and wrong planning ● Infrastructure works
Outside The Urban Fabric	● Not to be exposed to the wrong consequences of urbanization ● The sparse nature of development activities	● Difficult to control and protect the archaeological site ● Reduction in the number of visitors

5. Examples of Contemporary Annexes in Archaeological Sites

Within or around the protected areas over time regarding the protection and presentation of archaeological heritage sites; there is a need for articulation of service structures such as:

- Museums/Archaeoparks,
- Visitor Centers,
- Travel Routes/Walking Paths,
- Protective Roofs,
- Sales Units,
- Cafes/Recreation Areas,
- WC Volumes,
- Experience/Activity Areas,
- Security,
- Entrance and Reception Areas,
- Excavation Houses.

Museums are important facilities by transferring the knowledge of all kinds of heritage (Hussein, 2017). Therefore, museums and visitor centers play a significant role in the protection and presentation of archaeological heritage sites.

Within the scope of the study, museum/visitor centers were examined under two headings: **structures built in archaeological areas located at the periphery or outside of the urban fabric** and **structures built in archaeological areas within the urban fabric**.

Table 2. Archaeological Sites and Contemporary Annexes in terms of their Location

Archaeological Sites and Contemporary Annexes in terms of their Location	
↙	↘
Structures Built in Archaeological Areas Located at the Periphery or Outside of the Urban Fabric	*Structures Built in Archaeological Areas Within the Urban Fabric*

5.1 Structures Built in Archaeological Areas Located at The Periphery or Outside of The Urban Fabric

5.1.1 Yeşilova Mound Visitor Center

Figure 1. Yeşilova Mound Visitor Center, İzmir/Turkey (Cemal Emden)

Table 3. Imprint Information

Yeşilova Mound Visitor Center	
Location	Izmir, Turkey
Type Of Competition	National Architectural Project Competition
Year Of Competition	2010
İnstitution That Opened the Competition	Izmir Bornova Municipality, Turkey
Winners	Studio Evren Başbuğ Architects + SCRA Architects
Commissioning Date	2014

A free-participation, one-stage, national architectural project competition has been announced by the Izmir Bornova Municipality for the visitor center of the Yeşilova Mound archaeological site located in the Bornova district of Izmir. The architectural competition was held in 2010. The partnership of Studio Evren Başbuğ Architects and SCRA Architects won the first prize in the competition. The visitor center was opened in 2014.

The visitor center is built on the 3rd degree archaeological site, which is next to the 1st degree archaeological site where the archaeological excavations are still carried on.

Yeşilova Mound Visitor Center is an example of archaeological site outside the urban fabric. It is located in an area where the residential texture is not dense. The parcels adjacent to the 1st-degree archaeological site were expropriated by the relevant municipality and declared as a 3rd degree archaeological site.

As a result of the excavations carried out since 2005 in the Bornova district of İzmir province, it has been revealed that Yeşilova Mound is one of the oldest known settlements in the Aegean Region. The said area, together with Yassıtepe Mound and İpeklikuyu Mound, constitutes the prehistoric settlement area of İzmir (Derin, 2010).

The Visitor Center is a steel structure made of H-frames resting on a concrete basement. Steel frames are sheathed externally with modern materials (glass fiber reinforced concrete panels and multilayer polycarbonate sheets). The building has two floors. Activity and meeting rooms are located on the ground floor, while exhibition spaces are located on the upper floor. The excavation house is located inside the Visitor Center. It is the area where the delegation of the excavation team carries out the recording, restoration, photography, and publication works related to the excavation. Special study rooms for the technical team are located on the mezzanine floor of the building. The works of the excavation team can be watched by the visitors, and the workshop and exhibition areas can be visited. The building has three different functions. These are divided into museum, archaeological lalboratories and general services. When the interior architectural setup of the building is examined, a ramp consisting of keywords is used to reach the upper level, information about the archaeological heritage area is obtained in different exhibition areas, and then the building takes the visitors into the open air. The works carried out in the archaeological site can be observed from this open area. The works carried out in the archaeological site can be observed from the large exhibition space on the upper level. A fire tower/torch was designed to refer to the image of fire, which is important for life in İzmir. In addition, the excavation house located on the ground floor of the building opens to the courtyard at the back, and the works carried out in the excavation house can be observed by the visitors.

Yeşilova Visitor Center hosts experimental archeology applications that have been frequently encountered in recent years. Within the framework of a program called "Time Travel", students from different age groups visit the archaeological heritage site. In the "Time Travel" program, which was initiated as an international project, a Neolithic village integrated with the archaeological site was created. It is an important program that strengthens cultural identity (Derin, 2010).

Considering the criteria for designing new structures in archaeological sites, it can be said that Yeşilova Visitor Center is quite different from the Neolithic Period archaeological heritage area in terms of texture, color, and material, and even dominates the archaeological heritage site. On the other hand, the visitor center has been deemed worthy of many awards.

When the competition specifications are examined, the national and international policy decisions such as the Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Assets, Venice Charter or Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage regulations and laws on the archaeological site are not included in the specification of the competition. Information on the history and characteristics of the archaeological site is given in the specification. Detailed drawings are also included in the specification.

As the surrounding of the archaeological site does not have a dense urban texture and the excavations are continuing, the visitor center was built on a separate parcel on the border of the 1st-degree archaeological site. As a result of the visitor center being built next to the archaeological finds rather than on top of it, the archeological relics were not damaged within the scope of the project, which provided visual communication between the visitors and the archaeological site.

Although it did not damage the archaeological relics, when the scale and material of the building are evaluated, it can be said that it far surpasses the archaeological finds and has become a symbol in the area. It has been observed that visitors come to the site even just to visit the building.

The archaeological site is a major reference for both the architectural organization and the design of indoor and outdoor spaces. This strengthens the bond that the building has established with the archaeological site and ensures that it continues to exist in a qualified and appropriate way.

5.1.2 Troy Museum

Figure 2. Troy Museum, Çanakkale/Turkey (Emre Dörter)

Table 4. Imprint Information

Troy Museum	
Location	Tevfikiye, Çanakkale, Turkey
Type Of Competition	Free-Participation, One-Stage, National Architectural Project Competition
Year Of Competition	2011
İnstitution That Opened the Competition	Ministry of Culture and Tourism
Winners	Yalın Architecture
Commissioning Date	2018

A free-participation, one-stage, national architectural project competition was announced in 2011 by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism to preserve and exhibit the archaeological artifacts excavated from the Troy Archaeological Site. Another purpose of the museum is to make the region and Çanakkale a center of attraction and to develop the area socially and economically. 132 projects were submitted to the competition. The results of the competition were announced in the same year. Yalın Architecture won the competition. The Troy Museum was opened in 2018.

Troy Ancient City is known as an important trade settlement. It has a deep-rooted history with Homer's Iliad and Trojan legends (Büyük, Can, 2021). The Ancient City of Troy was included in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1998. An area of 13350 hectares, including the borders of the ancient city, before being included in the UNESCO World Heritage List, has been declared as a Historical National Park. Tevfikiye village, where the Troy Museum is located, is located within the boundaries of the Historical National Park. (World Heritage Sites of Turkey, 2009). The project area is located on the periphery of the 1st-degree archaeological site boundary, within the 3rd-degree archaeological site. National Park refers to natural parts with national and international rare natural and cultural resource values (National Parks Law, 1983). The fact that the ancient city of Troy is a world heritage has enabled the conservation and planning processes to be carried out in and around the archaeological site to be evaluated in an international framework. The fact that it hosted the Trojan War, and many civilizations is an element that makes the area a historical national park (Salcan, Tokay, 2017).

The construction area of the museum is 11.000 m². The museum structure includes exhibition areas, storage units, administrative units, and social areas. Landscape work was carried out around the museum, which consists of 4 floors, with a texture like the fields around it (Yıldız Kuyrukçu, 2021). The ground floor of the museum is reached by descending the ramp. The ground floor is completely underground but can receive natural light through ceiling openings. In the exhibition located on the ground floor, the layers of the Ancient City of Troy are explained, and brief information about the excavations is conveyed with the small artifacts unearthed during the excavation. On the first floor, a chronological description of the Troy region belonging to the Bronze Age is carried out. On the second floor, there are narratives about the Archaic Period and the Trojan War epic. Various statues, sarcophagi and marble works are on display. On the third floor, information about the Ottoman period is explained through pottery, stone, and coins. Since the 19th century, information on the history of excavations is conveyed. A separate exhibition area is also included for lost heritage (Yıldız Kuyrukçu, 2021).

When the architectural features of the museum are examined, it is observed that the building has a very plain language. Keeping the ground floor under the ground and covering it with landscaping reduced the apparent height of the museum and enabled it to have a scale closer to the human scale. When the location of the museum is examined, it is seen that the surrounding area is quite open, there is no dense construction around it, and there are usually fields around it. It is stated that the fields usually form a regular grid system in the form of a square, this arrangement is an example of the landscaping around the museum, and thus the museum establishes a strong bond with its context. For the façade, a color tone was chosen inspired by the color of the terracotta products obtained during the excavations, and rusted metal material was used to strengthen the connection between the past and the future. All materials were chosen naturally in the museum, and no covering material was used on the structure. In terms of lighting, natural light was used, and studies were carried out to prevent deterioration of works from lighting (Yıldız Kuyrukçu, 2021). It can be said that the building is compatible with the region as the museum is compatible with the topography, use of natural lighting, compatible with the surrounding texture, a simple form language, the material is tactile and its scale is compatible with the environment and human scale (Yıldız Kuyrukçu, Alkan, 2019).

The construction of the museum building on the third-degree archaeological site, outside of the first-degree archaeological site where there are no archaeological relics, prevented the destruction of the archaeological area, which shows the value of universal cultural heritage. In addition, the visit of the visitors to the area after getting information from the museum structure will help strengthen the awareness of conservation and their knowledge of the area.

Within the project specifications, the map of the excavation area, the conservation plan and the explanation report, the decisions of the Conservation Board and the Principal Decision on the Protection and Use Conditions of Archaeological Sites No. 658 were given. However, within the specification, there is no clear and explanatory text regarding which national or international conservation laws/regulations the competitors should submit projects (Troy Museum Architectural Project Competition Specification, 2011). Although the museum structure is related to an area on the UNESCO World Heritage list, ICOMOS regulations are not included in the competition specifications. In addition, UNESCO or related institutions did not become any stakeholders during the project process.

5.2 Structures Built in Archaeological Areas Within the Urban Fabric

5.2.1 The New Acropolis Museum

Figure 3. Acropolis Museum, Athens/Greece (Nikos Daniilidis)

Table 5. Imprint Information

The New Acropolis Museum	
Location	Athens, Greece
Type Of Competition	International / By invitation (4th one)
Year Of Competition	2000 (before that in 1976,1979,1989)
İnstitution That Opened the Competition	OANMA (Organisation for the construction of the New Acropolis Museum)
Winners	Bernard Tschumi and Michael Photiadis
Commissioning Date	2009

The New Acropolis Museum is an archaeological museum in Athens, Greece. Acropolis was included in the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1987 (Report of The World Heritage Committee,1987). The museum is within the buffer zone area approved by UNESCO, which also specifies the boundaries of protection (2009).

The Project by Bernard Tschumi was selected as the winning project in the fourth competition. Until the architectural projects of the building were finalized, 3 competitions were held (Paisiou, 2012).

The first architectural competition to design a new museum was held in 1976 and was limited to participants from Greece. The Ministry of Culture was the initiator of the first competition. The 1976 competition and the one in 1979 failed to produce any results because the plots of land selected for the proposed constructions were deemed unsuitable. The third competition was held in 1989, which was an international competition, a two stage ideas competition. The third competition was implemented according to International Union of Architects UIA- UNESCO) regulations (Paisiou, 2012).

3 projects were in the final, as a result, the competition was won by the Italian architects, Manfredi Nicoletti and Lucio Passarelli. Because of the archaeological relics on the site, which were discovered during foundation excavation, the work has stopped, and it was decided to cancel the competition (Paisiou, 2012).

The fourth competition was held in 2000 and it was open only to architectural practices by invitation. The competition was implemented according to national and international laws. Tschumi, in collaboration with the Greek architect Michael Photiadis won the competition (Paisiou, 2012).

During the Project, suitable locations for the foundation pillars were identified and the new plans set the building high above the ground on pillars. As the museum is built over an archaeological site, some parts of the floor use glass to let the visitors see the excavations below (Han,2021). Natural light plays a major role in the museum (Beresford, 2015). Another important feature of the museum building is the relationship with the Parthenon. The Parthenon is an important reference for the museum (Han, 2021). Acropolis Hill is a major inspiration for the interior design. visual communication has been tried to be provided throughout the building (Jakobsen, 2012).
It can be said that the Acropolis played a major role in the design of the building, and that there are traces of the heritage site from the structural system of the building to the interior design.
The building has been the target of criticism and comments from the moment it was built. Interpretations reflecting very different perspectives on the building were made. Professional critics were divided into three. For some critics the building was good inside but disappointing outside, for some critics it was an admirable building and for some critics the building was a fiasco, because of the solution to the problem of building on the archaeological site (Horáček, 2014). Also, in 2007, another controversy erupted in the site, which was about the demolition of two historic buildings in front of the museum. The two buildings had to be de-listed from the Greek Government, according to Bernard Tschumi's suggestion. One of the buildings was architecturally a Neo-Classical, the other was an Art Deco example. Protest came from INTBAU and ICOMOS against the demolition (Horáček, 2014).
The museum structure is in the center of Athens, in a location where the urban fabric is very dense. It is a universal task to transfer the archaeological relics and knowledge that have emerged in the city center and have survived to the present day. There is no possibility of the relocation of the said finds. The ruins must be preserved in situ, but in an environment where there is a dense urban texture, it was inevitable to solve the conservation action together with the archaeological relics. The museum structure can also be evaluated as a protective shelter. The museum structure, which is tried to be solved together with the archaeological relics, has brought along many discussions about the conservation process, which also has various difficulties for the designer.
Considering the location and surroundings of the museum, every point around it can be considered as potential archaeological sites. This situation, which can be described as a great value and potential, can sometimes appear as a threat in the design and construction processes. It is highly unlikely that no archaeological finds will be found in the planned location during the archaeological sounding works to be carried out to build the museum building on an area other than the archaeological finds. In addition, the 3rd project competition for the museum structure was canceled as new archaeological finds were found during the foundation excavations.
The museum is built on a parcel where the former military hospital, a small church and some apartment houses were on. Another 25 buildings were demolished to open place to the museum (Horáček, 2014).
Although the archaeological relics were affected by the construction activities during the construction of the museum structure when the resultant structure is observed, the visit of the visitors to the building together with the archaeological relics can be effective in increasing the value and awareness of the archaeological site, and in raising the awareness of conservation in the visitors.

5.2.2 Narona Archaeological Museum

Figure 4. Narona Archaeological Museum, Vid/Croatia (Boris Cvjetanovic)

Table 6. Imprint Information

Narona Archaeological Museum	
Location	Vid, Republic of Croatia
Type Of Competition	Architectural and Urban Competition
Year Of Competition	2001
İnstitution That Opened the Competition	Ministry of Culture
Winners	Radionica Arhitekture / Goran Rako
Commissioning Date	2007

The museum is in a village of Vid, in the Republic of Croatia. Narona was an ancient settlement on the eastern Adriatic coast which was also an important center during the late Roman period. The museum was built on the archaeological relics of a Roman temple from the late first century B.C. Many archaeological excavations and rescue excavations were carried out since 1877. In 2001, an architectural and urban competition was held for the Narona Museum. Radionica Arhitekture/Goran Rako won the competition. The construction of the building was financed by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia (Glučina, 2015).

The Narona Archaeological Museum is referred to as the first museum building in the Republic of Croatia which is an On-Site Museum. The museum opened its doors in 2007. During the time, new archaeological investigations in Narona were held and a great number of relics were found. In 2014, a legalization work was done about establishing the cultural in endangered areas. The museum is in the center of the village, under the hill. The building was built on the ruins of ancient buildings, considering the slope of the hill behind it. The ancient architectural relics are presented in situ. Also, an ancient mosaic floor is presented in situ in a room. The indoor permanent exhibition is organized on three levels. The reception and souvenir shop are located on the first level. On the second level, statues of Roman emperors are exhibited. On the third which is the last level in the museum, archaeological findings are located which were discovered during the archaeological investigations. There are also terraces which give panoramic views of Vid (Glučina, 2015). International Council of Museums made a recommendation to The Ministry of Culture, to associate the central advisory museum with its tasks (Lukic, 2011).

When the architectural design of the building is examined, it can be said that it is compatible with its surroundings in terms of building scale, and the facade material and color are chosen in harmony with the square and street where it is located. It is observed that the mound behind the architectural design was formed by foreseeing, thus stratification occurred in the building.

Reinforced concrete and exposed steel were used in the construction. Narrow plastic panels were positioned to let a diffused light in (Halaç, Abacı, Dağlı, 2021).

The museum structure was built on the finds to be preserved in situ since the archaeological relics are in the residential fabric. Topographic conditions were also considered during the design of the museum structure.

No information or document could be found that the international regulations were guiding during the design of the building.

6. Conclusions

During the formation of urban identities, cultural heritage is the most important factor. It is a universal duty to transfer the archaeological heritage values that have survived to the present day to the future and to increase the awareness of conservation.

The more information visitors can learn about archaeological heritage sites, the higher the conservation awareness and conservation value will be. Thus, there is a need for contemporary structures such as museums, visitor centers, or experimental archaeological sites.

When the structures built by the competition method are examined, it can be said that the reflections of the ideas from the archaeological remains are strong, and thus very valuable architectural structures are produced. The structures that emerged with a strong design idea by being designed together with the archaeological remains can later become important architectural works. It can be said that the buildings designed with a strong idea attract more visitors, so that visitors are more willing to access information about both the heritage site and its surroundings. Such examples are very important as they are structures that convey historical texture and conservation awareness to people. The strong architectural aspects of the buildings examined within the scope of the study can be considered as a factor that also ensures that the archaeological heritage site attracts visitors. While visiting the architecturally contemporary building, information about the archaeological heritage site is obtained through modern exhibition methods, thus strengthening the bond that visitors establish with past civilizations. Such structures must be integrated with the area to increase the value and conservation awareness of the archaeological heritage site.

The competition projects for the protection of archaeological sites, which are universal heritages, and their transfer to the future, is of great importance in the creation of original and high-value-added designs.

One of the most important steps in this process is to comply with the international regulations on protection. In some conservation processes, it is possible to carry out studies by following per under international regulations, while in some cases it cannot.

In Troy, settlement took place in a certain and limited area in the form of layers. Since the archaeological area is located outside the urban fabric and there are parcels around it that can be expropriated, the museum structure was built outside the archaeological area. This situation created an opportunity to preserve the relics in situ and to convey information about the site to the visitors before visiting the archaeological site. The fact that the layered settlement of the Ancient City of Troy was also layered within the museum structure, ensured that the museum structure formed a strong bond with its surroundings and that the building had an architectural language suitable for its context. When the materials used in the building are also examined, the bond that the building establishes between the past and the future is quite strong.

On the other hand, it has emerged that the structures such as museums and visitor centers, which are needed for the preservation and transfer to the future of archaeological sites located in a complex area and within the urban fabric, such as the Acropolis, must be solved together with the archaeological relics. This situation has brought different protection problems as well as challenging the designer. When the layout of the Acropolis Museum in the exhibition areas, the gridal system and the aspects of the building's facade are examined, it can be said that the Acropolis played a major role in the design of the building and that there are traces of the heritage area from the structural system of the building to the interior design. It can be said that this situation strengthens the bond that the visitor establishes between the museum structure and the surrounding heritage site.

The presence of the archaeological site within or outside the urban fabric brings along different potentials and threats as a conservation problem. The studies carried out in the preservation and transfer of archaeological relics to the future may therefore differ accordingly.

Considering that archaeological sites are universal cultural heritages, all kinds of conservation activities planned for these heritage sites should be carried out by authorized conservation bodies within the framework of national or international conservation laws, and interventions to the area should be carried out openly to the public, and their suggestions and opinions should be sought. In this direction, national or international architectural project competitions should be considered as very important processes that serve this purpose. Thus, all kinds of positive interventions set an example for other archaeological sites, and all kinds of negative interventions are provided with the opportunity to be overtaken promptly on time.

Acknowledgements

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

This study was produced from the thesis titled "*Additional Structure Design Criteria in Archaeological Heritage Sites: A Case Study of Metropolis Ancient City Excavation Center*" which is carried out at Dokuz Eylül University (DEU) Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Department of Architecture, Restoration Master's Program.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Accardi, A. (2012). Open-air Conservation of Ruins and the Concept of “Non-Dislocation”. *Asian Culture and History 4* (2), 109-117. https://doi.org/10.5539/ach.v4n2p109

Arslan, H. D., Orhan, Ş. B. & Dişli, G. (2020). Tarihi Çevrede Yeni Yapı Tasarımının Müze İşlevi Özelinde Değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the New Building Design in the Historical Environment in terms of Museum Function]. *Art-e Sanat Dergisi, 13* (25), 71-101. https://doi.org/10.21602/sduarte.593963

Aydeniz, N. E. (2009). Kent Arkeolojisi Kavramının Dünyadaki Gelişimi Ve Türkiyedeki Yansımaları [The Development of the Concept of Urban Archeology in the World and Its Reflections in Turkey]. *Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi, 4* (16), 2501-2524.

Beresford, James M. (2015). Museum of Light: The New Acropolis Museum and the Campaign to Repatriate the Elgin Marbles. *Architecture MPS, 7* (1) pp. 1-35. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.amps.2015v7i1.001

Büyüköztürk, E. & Oral, M. (2020). Arkeolojik Alanlarda Üst Örtü Tasarım Kriterleri [Protection Roof Design Criteria in Archaeological Sites]. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research, 7* (51), 679-691. https://doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.1806

Derin, Z. (2010). İzmir Yeşilova Höyüğü'nde Yeni Bir Eğitim Yöntemi:Zaman Yolculuğu [New Educational Methods At İzmir-Yeşilova: Time Travel]. *TÜBA-KED Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Kültür Envanteri Dergisi, 8,* 263-274.

Derin, Z. (2020) "Bornova-Yassıtepe Höyüğü 2010-2019 Yılı Çalışmaları" [Bornova-Yassıtepe Mound 2010-2019 Studies]. *Arkeoloji Dergisi*,1-42.

Derin, Z. (2020). İzmir-Yeşilova Höyüğü [İzmir-Yeşilova Mound]. *İzmir Araştırmaları Dergisi, 12,* 1-10.

Eraydın, Z., Yoncaci Arslan, P. (2021). Türkiye'de Kentsel Tasarım Yarışma Pratiği: Tanımlar, Ölçekler, Aktörler [Urban Design Competitions in Turkey: Definitions, Scales and Actors]. *idealkent, 12* (32), 155-178. https://doi.org/10.31198/idealkent.847199

Eres, Z. (2013). Arkeolojik Kazı, Koruma, Sergileme ve Toplum İlişkisi Kırklareli'nde Tarihöncesi Arkeolojik Alanlar Üzerinden Bir Deneyim [Archeological Evidence, Protection, Demonstration and Relationships Between Societies (On the Basis of The Kirklareli Monument)]. *Arkeoloji ve Sanat, 0* (144), 15 - 44. DOI: 10.5782/2218-0346.2018.21.1.110

Glučina, T. (2015). Narona Archaeological Museum – Today. Auguste, Son Epoque Et L'augusteum De Narona, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (AIBL), Université catholique de Croatie, 51-66.

Guzin Lukic, N. (28-30 April 2011). National museums in Croatia. *Building National Museums in Europe 1750-2010. Conference proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen,* Bologna.

Halaç H. H, Abacı C. S, Dağlı H (2021). Arkeolojik Kalıntılar Üzerine İnşa Edilen Müzelerin Tasarım Yaklaşımları [Design Approaches Of Museums Built On Archaeological Remains]. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 17* (35), 2225 - 2253. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.822518

Han J. (2021). Representational and Authentic: Sustainable Heritage Message through Architectural Experience in the Case of Bernard Tschumi's Acropolis Museum, Athens. *Sustainability. 13* (20). https://doi.org/10.3390/su132011369

Horácek, M. (2014). Museum of Art Versus the City as a Work of Art. *International Journal of Architectural Research, 8* (2), 47-61. https://doi.org/10.26687/archnet-ijar.v8i2.428

Hussein, N. (2017). Adaptive Reuse of the Industrial Building: A case of Energy Museum in Sanatistanbul, Turkey. *Journal of Contemporary Urban Affairs, 1* (1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.25034/1761.1(1)24-34

Jakobsen Svaneklink, A. (2012). Experience in-between architecture and context: the New Acropolis Museum, Athens. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture. Journal of Aesthetics & Culture, 4*. https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v4i0.18158

Kaderli, L. (2014). Kültürel Miras Koruma Yaklaşımlarının Tarihsel Gelişimi [Historical Development Process of Cultural Heritage Conservation Approaches]. *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Kültür Envanteri Dergisi, 12,* 29-41. https://doi.org/10.22520/tubaked.2014.0002

Kalfa, B. (2018). Affiliation of Archaeological Sites and People: Case Studies on Interpretation and Presentation Approaches. *GRID - Architecture Planning and Design Journal, 1* (1), 24-50. https://doi.org/10.37246/grid.358769

Keskin, Y., Tanaç Zeren, M. (2018). Arkeolojik Alanlarda Bir Sunum Yöntemi Olarak "Arkeoparklar" ["Archeoparks" as a Presentation Method of Archaeological Sites]. *Journal of Architectural Sciences and Applications, 3* (2), 110-124. https://doi.org/10.30785/mbud.439805

Keskin, Y. & Tanaç Zeren, M. (2022). Arkeolojik Alanlarda Mimari Düzenlemelerin ve Sunum Tekniklerinin Türkiye'deki Örnekler Üzerinden Karşılaştırmalı Değerlendirilmesi [A Comparative Evaluation of Archaeological Sites on The Architectural Arrangements and Presentation Techniques]. *Artium, 10* (1), 21-35. https://doi.org/10.51664/artium.948113

Kortanoğlu Savrum, M. (2017). Kent Uzamında Arkeoloji [Archeology in Urban Space]. *Colloquium Anatolicum, 16,* 105-119.

Ntaflou, C. (29 June – 1 July & 25-26 November 2011). The New Acropolis Museum and the Dynamics of National

Museum Development in Greece. *Great Narratives of the Past. Traditions and Revisions in National Museums Conference proceedings from EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen,* Paris.

Özturan, Ö., Göküz, B. & Kaynakcı Elinç, Z. (2020). Arkeolojik Buluntuların Sergilenmesi ve Korunmasında Yeni Yaklaşımlar [New Approaches for Exhibiting and Protecting Archeological Findings]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11* (Ek (Suppl.) 1), 368-379. https://doi.org/10.29048/makufebed.824592

Paisiou, S. (2012). Four performances for the New Acropolis Museum. *Geographica Helvetica, 66* (1), 33–41. https://doi.org/10.5194/gh-66-33-2011

Pasin, B., Varinlioğlu, G. (2018). Arkeolojik Çevre Bağlamında Yeni Yapı Tasarımı [New Building Design in the Context of the Archaeological Environment]. *Yedi,* (20), 173-182. https://doi.org/10.17484/yedi.426497

Salcan, E. Tokay, Z.Hale. (2017). Troya Tarihi Milli Parkı'nda Süregelen Koruma Sorunları ve Çözüm Önerileri [Continuing Conservation Problems in Troy Historical National Park and Suggestions for Solutions]. *Tasarım Kuram, 13* (24), 148-169. https://doi.org/10.23835/tasarimkuram.539283

Tanaç Zeren, M., Uyar, O. (2010). Arkeolojik Alanlarda Koruma Çatıları Ve Gezi Platformlarının Düzenlenmesi Kriterleri [Arrangement of Protective Shelters and Walking Platforms in Archeological Sites]. *DEÜ Mühendislik Fakültesi Mühendislik Bilimleri Dergisi 12* (2), 55-64.

Tanaç Zeren, M. (2010). Tarihi Çevrede Yeni Ek ve Yeni Yapı Olgusu, Çağdaş Yaklaşım Örnekleri [New Addition and New Building in Historical Environment, Contemporary Approach Examples]. İstanbul: Yalın Yayıncılık.

Taşcı, B., Akyüz Levi, E. (2016). Kent İçi Arkeolojik Alanlarda Kalıntıların Sunumuna İlişkin Yaklaşımlar: Foça Örneği [Presentation Approaches in Urban Archaeological Areas A Case Study in Foça, İzmir]. *idealkent, 7* (19), 588-627. https://doi.org/10.37879/belleten.2018.31

UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu Somut Kültürel Miras İhtisas Komitesi, (2009). Türkiye'nin Dünya Miras Alanları, Koruma ve Yönetimde Güncel Durum [Turkey's World Heritage Sites, Current Situation in Conservation and Management]. Ankara

Yıldız Kuyrukçu, E. (2021). Bir "Yapı" Değil Bir "His" Yaratmak: Troya Müzesi Örneği [Creating a "Feel", Not a "Structure": The Case of the Museum of Troy]. *Online Journal of Art and Design 9* (3), 53-70.

Yıldız Kuyrukçu, E., Alkan, A. (2019). AHP Metoduyla Yer'e Özgü Mimari Tasarım Kriterlerinin Öncelik Sırasının Belirlenmesi [Determination of the Priority Order of Place-Specific Architectural Design Criteria by AHP Method]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 23,* 169-180. https://doi.org/10.19113/sdufenbed.531807

Yüceer, H., İpekoğlu, B. (2012). An architectural assessment method for new exterior additions to historic buildings. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 13(*4), 419-425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2011.12.002

Zeren, M. ve Uyar, O. (2010). Arkeolojik Alanlarda Koruma Çatıları Ve Gezi Platformlarının Düzenlenmesi [Arrangement of Protection Roofs and Travel Platforms in Archaeological Sites]. *Mühendislik Bilimleri Dergisi, 12*(2), 55-64.

URL - 1: https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/ilanlar/eskiilanlar/2010/06/20100622-4.htm#%C3%8702

URL - 2: https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/ilanlar/eskiilanlar/2010/09/20100927-4.htm#%C3%8704

URL - 3: https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/ilanlar/eskiilanlar/2011/01/20110124-4.htm#%C3%8701

URL - 4: https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/ilanlar/eskiilanlar/2011/06/20110601-4.htm#%C3%8705

URL - 5: https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuatmetin/1.5.2873.pdf

URL - 6: https://www.icomos.org/en/resources/charters-and-texts

URL - 7: https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/404/documents/

URL - 8: https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/404/

URL - 9: https://www.yarismo.org/img/troya_m%C3%BCzesi_sartname.pdf