

ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY GATE DESIGNS

Üniversite Giriş Kapılarının Tasarımlarının İncelenmesi

Asts. Prof. Emine TARAKCI EREN

Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Fine Arts, Department of Interior Architecture and Environmental Design, Afyonkarahisar/TURKEY

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5595-9505>

ABSTRACT

Campuses and campus open spaces have been studied frequently; however, campus entrances have never been studied before. All academic studies conducted on gates and entrances are in architecture and interior design disciplines. Thus, the present study is significant since it was the first landscape architecture study on entrance spaces.

The entrances and the gates of 30 universities in Turkey were analyzed in the present study. The analyses revealed that 26 university entrance gates were symmetrical, 13.3% were asymmetrical, 22 were straight, 10 were protrusive, 10 were recessed, 3 included a lintel, and 8 included arched gates. The presence of decorations on the gates was examined and it was determined that 76.6% of 23 gates were covered with decorations. There was a security unit at all university gates. Five had turnstiles for pedestrian entrance. Twenty-three had controlled vehicle entry. There were 27 botanical landscape elements. Only three had no botanical elements. The analysis of whether there was a water element that would add aesthetic value to the entrance design such as an ornamental pool, artificial pond or artificial waterfall demonstrated that there was a waterfall only in Karadeniz Technical University entrance. In other words, 3.3% of the university gates had a water element. Lighting elements were included in all universities.

Key Words: Entrance space, gate, design, landscape architecture, university campus.

ÖZET

Kampüs ve kampüs açık mekânları farklı çalışmalarda sıklıkla çalışılmış ancak giriş mekânları daha önce hiç çalışılmamıştır. Kapı ve girişlerle ilgili yapılan akademik çalışmaların hepsi mimarlık ve iç mimarlık meslek disiplinlerindedir. Dolayısıyla peyzaj mimarlığı alanında giriş mekânları ile ilgili makale, bildiri, kitap ya da tez yapılmamış olması sebebiyle bu araştırmanın yapılmasının önemi artmıştır.

Türkiye’de bulunan 30 üniversiteye ait giriş mekânı ve kapısı çalışma kapsamında değerlendirilmeye alınmıştır. Yapılan değerlendirmeler sonucunda 26 üniversite giriş kapısının simetrik bir yapı sergilediği, %13,3 si ise asimetrik yapı gösterdiği, 22 tanesi düz yani 10 tanesi çıkıntılı, 10 tanesi de girintili olduğu, 3 tanesi lentolu giriş, 8 tanesi ise kemerli kapı şeklindedir. Kapıların üzerlerinde süslemelerin olup olmadığı incelenmiş ve sonuçta 23 tanesinde %76,6 oranında bir takım süslemelerin olduğu belirlenmiştir. Tüm üniversite girişlerinde güvenlik birimi vardır. Beş tanesinde yaya girişleri için turnikeler vardır. Kontrollü araç girişi ise 23 tanesinde vardır. Toplam 27 tanesinde bitkisel peyzaj elemanı vardır. Sadece üç tanesinde hiçbir şekilde bitkisel eleman yoktur. Su elemanı yani bir süs havuzu, yapay gölet veya yapay şelale gibi giriş tasarımlarına estetik değer katacak bir su ögesi varlığının olup olmadığı incelendiğinde sadece Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi giriş tasarımında şelale olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Yani üniversitelerin %3,3’ünde su ögesi bulunur. Tüm üniversitelerin hepsinde aydınlatma elemanlarına yer verilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Giriş Mekânı, Kapı, Tasarım, Peyzaj Mimarlığı, Üniversite Kampüsü

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of the entrance has developed in parallel with the concept of space. For the entrance to exist, first a space should be defined. Considering that it is not possible to enter a space without an entrance, one of the first requirements and ideas in architectural construction has been the door and the entrance space. The doors and entrances have a strong architectural significance in the building and are virtually the business cards of buildings and indispensable architectural elements. The first act in a building is the entrance to the building (Bayram, 2004).

The structure of the entrance differs based on the nature of the building or the open space. Thus, doors/gates and entrances are an important element of identification. They create the first ideas about the building or the open space. Buildings or open spaces constructed for a certain purpose, reflect their functions from the outside before the entrance, employing certain architectural elements or structural

and botanical landscape elements. Gates or entrances should invite and welcome people to a building or an open space.

Doors or entrance spaces provide the connection between the interior and exterior, and they belong to both sections. They provide a holistic approach to the indoor and outdoor spaces and considered an integral part of both. The entrances or doors reflect the identity of the space they are located to the outer space, creating a whole.

As the doors/gates and entrances lead us to the indoors while we are outside, they serve as an exit while we are inside. Here, the doors and entrances change their based on their avtion identity. The architectural element that provides this indispensable relationship between interiors and exteriors are the doors and entrances (Bayram, 2004).

1.1. Door/Gate and Entrance Design

Doors possess a volume within themselves and this volume includes a height, width, depth, form and surface. Furthermore, doors, which are sometimes perceived as a plane on the building or in the open space, also create a volume along with the entrance. In addition, the relationship between the building or open space and the entrance could be analyzed at various levels (Özgen, 2014, Bayram 2004).

The placement of the entrance in the space could be symmetrical or asymmetrical. The location of the entrance determines the form of the approach path and the order of the actions within the space based on the form of the entrance space. Entrance could be emphasized visually through various methods such as keeping it low, narrow, wide, or deep, cyclical, or using ornamentations or decorative elements (Ching, 2002).

The entrances could be analyzed in three groups:

1. Straight entrances ensure continuity without breaking from the wall surface.
2. Protruding entrances protrude from the wall surface. These entrances highlight the entrance, emphasize the point of arrival, and provide protection.
3. Recessed entrances, which are recessed from the wall surface, form almost a pocket. These entrances include a section of the exterior to the building and provide protection.

Decisions could be made by reviewing at the dimensions of the entrance spaces and other elements around them. The size and dimensions would differ based on the function of the space. In other words, if it is the door or entrance space of a house, the size would be different than that of an open space. However, in general, the door or entrance of a space depends on the size of the space and number of occupants.



















Material choices, on the other hand, are affected by features such as the function of the space, the economic conditions, the location, and geographical conditions.

Campus and campus open spaces have been frequently discussed in different studies (Yılmaz, 2015; Düzenli, 2010; Düzenli et al., 2019; Düzenli et al., 2017a; Düzenli et al., 2017b; Düzenli et al., 2018; Çelik et al., 2018; Taşçıoğlu et al., 2019; Kuyrukçu, 2012; Pouya et al., 2019); however, the entrance spaces have never been studied before. All academic studies on doors and entrances were conducted in architecture and interior design disciplines. Thus, the significance of the present study is obvious due to the absence of articles, papers, books or theses on entrance spaces in landscape architecture.

2. MATERIAL and METHODS

The entrances and gates of 30 Turkish universities were analyzed in the present study. Accordingly, the symmetrical or asymmetrical, protruding or recessed, arched university entrances were analyzed based on the presence of a lintel, ornamentation, the presence of a security unit, controlled pedestrian or vehicle entrance, botanical landscape elements, water elements and lighting. The percentages of the presence of these features were calculated.

Table 1. The university gates and included in the study and the codes assigned to these

1 (URL1, 2020)	2 (URL2, 2020)	3 (URL3, 2020)
		
KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY	İNÖNÜ UNIVERSITY	MERSİN UNIVERSITY
4 (URL4, 2020)	5 (URL5, 2020)	6 (URL6, 2020)
		
AFYON KOCATEPE UNIVERSITY	ERCIYES UNIVERSITY	KAFKAS UNIVERSITY
7 (URL7, 2020)	8 (URL8, 2020)	9 (URL9, 2020)
		
ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY	AKSARAY UNIVERSITY	SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
10 (URL10, 2020)	11 (URL11, 2020)	12 (URL12, 2020)
		
TRAKYA UNIVERSITY	YOZGAT BOZOK UNIVERSITY	BARTIN UNIVERSITY
13 (URL13, 2020)	14 (URL14, 2020)	15 (URL15, 2020)
		
FIRAT UNIVERSITY	AĞRI İBRAHİM ÇEÇEN UNIVERSITY	DİCLE UNIVERSITY
16 (URL16, 2020)	17 (URL17, 2020)	18 (URL18, 2020)
		
DUMLUPINAR UNIVERSITY	EGE UNIVERSITY	KARABÜK UNIVERSITY
19 (URL19, 2020)	20 (URL20, 2020)	21 (URL21, 2020)



GAZİ OSMAN PAŞA UNIVERSITY
22 (URL22, 2020)



CUMHURİYET UNIVERSITY
23 (URL23, 2020)



ONDOKUZ MAYIS UNIVERSITY
24 (URL24, 2020)



RECEP TAYYİP ERDOĞAN U.
25 (URL25, 2020)



ABANT İZZET BAYSAL
UNIVERSITY
26 (URL26, 2020)



KİLİS 7 ARALIK UNIVERSITY
27 (URL27, 2020)



ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
28 (URL28, 2020)



AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY
29 (URL29, 2020)



HACI BEKTAŞ VELİ UNIVERSITY
30 (URL30, 2020)



BAYBURT UNIVERSITY



İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY



ERZURUM TEKNİK
UNIVERSITY

3. RESULTS

Initially, the symmetry of the university entrance structures was investigated. Thus, it was determined that 4 entrance structures out of 30 universities were not symmetrical and the remaining 26 university entrance structures were symmetrical. Accordingly, 86.6% of all structures were symmetrical and 13.3% were asymmetrical. In another analysis conducted based on three categories as straight, recessed and protruded gate structures, it was determined that 22 were straight (73.3%), 10 were protruding (33.3%), and 10 were recessed (33.3%). The analysis based on the support type (arched or linteled) revealed that 3 were linteled (10%) and 8 were arched (26.6%). The analysis based on the presence of ornaments on the entrance structures demonstrated that 23 were ornamented (76.6%). These ornaments did not include engravements like those found on the entrances of historical buildings, but engraved university name, emblems and other features. There was a security unit at all university entrances. Five included turnstiles for pedestrian access. Thus the pedestrian entrance was controlled. Others did not have turnstiles. In other words, the university entrances with controlled pedestrian entrance were 16.6%. Twenty-three included controlled vehicle entrance. In other words, 76.6% included a controlled vehicle entry facility. The presence of plants or landscape design elements in the entrance areas was investigated. While certain universities had designs that included groundcover plants, shrubs and trees, others only included groundcover plants. Certain entrances had

only one plant or few plants. All were considered as the presence of landscape elements and included in the analysis. Thus, 27 entrances had botanical landscape elements. Only three had no botanical elements. In other words, 90% of the university entrances included in the study included vegetation. The analysis of the presence of a water element that would add aesthetic value to the entrance design such as an ornamental pool, artificial pond or artificial waterfall, it was determined that there was only one structure with waterfall in entrance design (Karadeniz Technical University). In other words, 3.3% of the universities had a water element at the entrance. Lighting elements were included in all university entrances analyzed in the present study (Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Study findings

Entrance features codes	Entrance Feature	%	Count
EF1	Symmetrical structure	%86,6	26
EF2	Asymmetrical structure	%13,3	4
EF3	Straight entrance	%73,3	22
EF4	Protruded entrance	%33,3	10
EF5	Recessed entrance	%33,3	10
EF6	Linteled structure	%10	3
EF7	Arched structure	%26,6	8
EF8	Ornamented	%76,6	23
EF9	Security unit	%100	30
EF10	Controlled pedestrian access	%16,6	5
EF11	Controlled vehicle access	%76,6	23
EF12	Botanical elements	%90	27
EF13	Water element	%3,3	1
EF14	Lighting	%100	30

Table3. Study findings

EF	University code (Table 1)																													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
EF1	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	√	√
EF2	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	√	x	√	x	x	x
EF3	x	x	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	x
EF4	x	√	x	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	x	√	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	√
EF5	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	√	√
EF6	x	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x
EF7	x	x	√	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x
EF8	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x
EF9	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
EF10	x	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x
EF11	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	x
EF12	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x
EF13	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
EF14	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Bayram (2003) investigated the design and construction of the building doors and entrance spaces in Beyoğlu district in Istanbul in a thesis. The findings of the study demonstrated that the doors were an important primary element employed for symmetry and balance in the building entrances and the facade. In more than half of the public buildings, the positions of the exterior and certain garden gates were symmetrical on the facade. On the other hand, only 27% of the residential buildings had symmetrical doors (Bayram, 2003). In the present study, although the entrances to open spaces were investigated, symmetrical designs were still more dominant.

Also, one of the few studies conducted on entrance spaces was published by Özgen (2014). In the study, the impact of the health building spatial design on occupants was investigated and the entrance design proposals were presented. The author reported that since the first effect on the occupants was evoked by the general approach and entrance of the hospital, the design of these areas should consider the occupant factor. Also, hospital entrances should be easily identified using specific colors or forms and the author emphasized that they should be easily distinguished by the users. It was stated that a space should be defined for the security unit close to the entrance area, but a sense of insecurity in the user should be avoided. However, this space should allow security officers to directly observe public spaces. In the present study, it was determined that all included university entrances included security units.

In a paper titled “Bridge and Door,” it was stated that since the door establishes a connection between the space of the individuals and everything else, it exaggerates the distinction between the inside and the outside, and since it is also openable, the closure of the door is stronger than anything else to wall out the outside, providing a sense of isolation (Simmel, 2000, Özbek, 2004).

Lefebvre (2014) described the door as a symbolic and functional object that allows access. He stated that at the entrance gate, the threshold, a step, another transition object are traditionally of ritual significance. In the present study, the entrances and gates were the transition elements that connect a campus to the urban space. The entrance gates included controlled vehicle entrances and turnstiles for pedestrians. These could be considered as a threshold at the entrance gate that Lefebvre mentioned. In other words, this element is suitable for the traditional ritual exhibited during the passage through the doors.

Aldo, another finding in our study was that the predominant presence of straight gates and equal number of protruding and recessed gates in the university entrances. The structures were generally arched doors. There were only 3 lintel gates. The gate ornaments were also investigated. It was found that the gate ornaments did not include carved ornaments or decoration observed on architectural gates.

Ertekin and Çorbacı (2010) studied landscape design at Kastamonu Karabük University in a study titled “Landscape Design in University Campuses.” In the study, they reported that the location of the entrance of this university was a dominant location in the campus, and it facilitated both pedestrian and vehicle traffic, included a label that included the name and the emblem of the university on the arch, direction signs and a security unit.

Plants and water elements, which are indispensable and the most important elements in a landscape design, in campus entrances were also investigated. Although there were quality planting designs at most university entrances, the designs investigated in 27 universities included at least one species. The analyses revealed that water elements were not used frequently like the plant elements, and only one university entrance included a water element. All university entrances included lighting elements.

5. REFERENCES

Bayram, Ş. (2004). *Kapı/Giriş Mekanı, Anlam Ve Tasarımı İçin Tipolojik Araştırma. 19. Yüzyıl Beyoğlu (Pera) Örneği* (Doctoral dissertation, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü). Lefebvre, H. (2014). *Mekânın Üretimi*. İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

Çelik, F., Gemici, R. Ö., & Mirza, E. (2018). Öğrencilerin Alaeddin Keykubad kampüsü fiziksel çevresine ilişkin güvenlik algıları. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(16), 216-247.

Ching F., D., K., 2002.. “Mimarlık (Biçim, Mekan ve Düzen)”, Çeviri: Lökçe, S., 2. Baskı, YemYayın, İstanbul,

Düzenli, T. (2010). Kampüs açık mekan olanaklarının gençlerin psikososyal yapısına bağlı olarak incelenmesi: KT Ü. Kanuni kampüsü örneği. *Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Peyzaj Mimarlığı Anabilim Dalı, Trabzon*.

Düzenli, T., Eren, E. T., & Alpak, E. M. GENÇLERİN AÇIK MEKÂN KULLANIMLARI: KTÜ KANUNİ KAMPÜSÜ ÖRNEĞİ. *Social Sciences*, 14(1), 33-45.

Düzenli, T., Mumcu, S., & Işık, B. Ö. (2017a) GENÇLERİN İHTİYAÇLARINA BAĞLI OLARAK KAMPUS AÇIK MEKAN TASARIMI. *İnönü Üniversitesi Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 6(13).

Düzenli, T., Tarakçı Eren, E., Baltacı, H., & Aktürk, E. (2018). Bitkisel Peyzaj Tasarımında Renk Tercihleri: Ktü Kanuni Kampüsü Örneği. *Journal Of International Social Research*, 11(55).

Düzenli, T., Alpak, E. M., & Özbilen, A. (2017b). Effect of spatial characteristics on campus open space uses of youth: Example of KTU Kanuni Campus Gençlerin kampüs açık mekân kullanımlarına mekânsal özelliklerin etkisi: KTÜ Kanuni Kampüsü örneği. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(3), 2417-2435.

Edgü, E., & Ünlü, A. (2011). Konutlarda mekansal dizin verilerinin mekan tercihleri ile ilişkisi. *İTÜDERGİSİ/a*, 2(1).

Ertekin, M., & Çorbacı, Ö. L. (2010). Üniversite kampüslerinde peyzaj tasarımı (Karabük Üniversitesi peyzaj projesi örneği). *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 55-67.

Özgen, E. (2014). *Sağlık yapılarının genel mekan tasarımlarının kullanıcılar üzerindeki etkisi ile Hacettepe Tıp Fakültesi Hastanesi 7 no.'lu kapı girişinin düzenlenmesine bir öneri* (Master's thesis,

Özbek, M. (2004). Giriş: Kamusal Alanın Sınırları. M. Özbek, & M. Özbek (Dü.) içinde, Kamusal Alan. İstanbul: Hil Yayın Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü).

Kuyrukçu, Z. (2012). *Kampüslerde fiziksel değişim üzerine bir araştırma: Selçuk Üniversitesi Alaeddin Keykubat Kampüsü örneği* (Doctoral dissertation, Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Pouya, S., Yılmaz, B., & Ateş O. (2019). Üniversite kampüs meydanlarında peyzaj tasarımı (İnönü Üniversitesi Kampüsü, Mediko Meydanı peyzaj tasarım projesi örneği). *Akademik Ziraat Dergisi*, 8(2), 251-264.

Simmel, George. (2000). "Bridge and Door". Simmel On Culture (Selected Writings). Ed. David Frisby and Mike Featherstone. Wiltshire, The Cromwell Press.

TAŞÇIOĞLU, S., GÜNAYDIN, A. S., & YÜCEKAYA, M. Kampüs Alanlarında Meydan Tasarımı: Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Örneği. *Bartın Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(2), 246-256.

Yersel, A. (2015). *Mekan ve iktidar ilişkisi bağlamında 'makam odaları'* (Master's thesis, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi).

Yılmaz, S. (2015). Bir Kampüs Açık Mekânın Çevresel Tasarımı: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Binası. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 297-307.

URL-1, (2020) www.ktu.edu.tr

URL-2, (2020) www.inonu.edu.tr

URL-3, (2020) www.mersin.edu.tr

URL-4, (2020) www.aku.edu.tr

URL-5, (2020) www.erciyes.edu.tr

URL-6, (2020) www.kafkas.edu.tr

URL-7, (2020) www.atauni.edu.tr



- URL-8, (2020) www.aksaray.edu.tr
URL-9, (2020) www.sakarya.edu.tr
URL-10 (2020) www.trakya.edu.tr
URL-11, (2020) www.bozok.edu.tr
URL-12, (2020) www.bartın.edu.tr
URL-13, (2020) www.firat.edu.tr
URL-14, (2020) www.agri.edu.tr
URL-15, (2020) www.dicle.edu.tr
URL-16, (2020) www.dumlupınar.edu.tr
URL-17, (2020) www.ege.edu.tr
URL-18, (2020) www.karabuk.edu.tr
URL-19, (2020) www.gop.edu.tr
URL-20, (2020) www.cumhuriyet.edu.tr
URL-21, (2020) www.omü.edu.tr
URL-22, (2020) www.erdogan.edu.tr
URL-23, (2020) www.ibu.edu.tr
URL-24, (2020) www.kilis.edu.tr
URL-25, (2020) www.cu.edu.tr
URL-26, (2020) www.akdeniz.edu.tr
URL-27, (2020) www.nevsehir.edu.tr
URL-28, (2020) www.bayburt.edu.tr
URL-29, (2020) www.istanbul.edu.tr
URL-30, (2020) www.erzurum.edu.tr