"You're are own your own, so be yourself."

"A reflective essay on research methods in the Heritage & Architecture department"

Anthony van Pelt

4160754

*Abstract-*The field of architecture is a very subjective matter. Every professor and tutor has its own methods to deal with and schematize our problems in designing. But how do you engage in a conversation about reuse possibilities if every teacher has its own method and "truth"? The purpose of this paper is opening a discourse on handling and finding your own way in all the methods of adaptive reuse. To find out which method is the most fitting for me and helps me in expressing myself and taking a stand against my tutors. I will look into different existing research methods and will write down the most noticeable aspects of them. After that I will reflect on them in comparison with my own experience.

In the end do the different authors of all these methods make us believe that analysis is the most important aspect and that every decision should be based on the outcome of the analysis. I would say that it doesn't really matter which method is used by a student, as long as the student is capable of relating every decision he has made to the analysis. The student should use and investigate not only the aspects the tutor wants him to do, but he should also use his personal fascination as inspiration for the analysis. If a decision is based on a solid analysis, he is capable to defend himself in a discussion with the tutor.

Keywords – *architecture, architectural teaching, building, cultural, decision-making, heritage, reuse, values*

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the start of my studies here at the faculty of architecture, I've met a lot of different teachers. Each with their own methods and ways of designing. I've knew from the beginning that this here, architecture, is actually very subjective matter. In a world of ego's and STARchitects of the future, everybody knows it best. The same thing is happening in my current graduation study of Heritage & Architecture. Even more than in other fields of architecture, dealing with the existing context is extremely important, but how do you engage in a conversation about reuse possibilities if every teacher has its own method and "truth"?

So the purpose of this paper is opening a discourse on handling and finding your own way in all the methods of adaptive reuse. To find out which method is the most fitting for me and helps me in expressing myself and taking a stand against or with my tutors. So that I can deliver a more solid ground of my position towards all these different methods. Like what is most important and do I always have to keep in mind, and what are my own experiences and views on this subject so far. This will result in a better view to be close to myself in a world full of better knowing tutors.

This paper is not about the reason why people should be reusing, but it's focussed on the how, just like it is in my studio. Because everybody knows that different conservation methods, such as preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction or adaptation to new functions can be applied to buildings which no longer serve their original use. But depending on their relative importance in history, physical condition or proposed use a different method or outcome is needed (Elsorady, 2014). And that's what this paper is about.

First in chapter three I will take a look into existing research methods. After that I will reflect on this in combination with my own experiences over the years and come to my conclusion in chapter four. I end this paper with a reference list in chapter five.

II. METHODOLOGY

I will start with a literature overview. Which means that I will be looking into different existing methods. Some close to home, like our "own" professors and some international methods. Also into some of my own experience, I encountered during my current project. I won't be looking too far back in history, the start of the whole discourse, on which it's all founded. People like Riegl (Riegl, 1903), Ruskin(Ruskin, 1849) and Brandt (Brand, 1994) are the basis for the modern discourse on heritage preservation but won't be covered in this report. I will than summarize this and mention the most noticeable facts of them. On which I than will reflect on in the second part of this paper.

III. RESULTS

How to deal with our heritage and monuments is quite a recent question or topic in architectural history. Discussions about this subject has been started during the 1960s and 1970s due to the growing concern of the environment (Mısırlısoy & Günçe, 2016). So this means, the discourse on this subject is also quite recent and architects are still searching for the right terminology for this debate. Just saying that you have to treat our heritage with respect is not enough anymore. Respect has become a meaningless word in these case (Provoost & Vanstiphout, 1995). But since sustainability and reusing has become a more and more normal and obvious, the discourse on how to deal with reuse has become livid.

III.I broad diversity in available methods

There is already a lot debated and published about difference methods on how to approach and reuse heritage. A quick look into international publish methods will result in a long list of possible approaches. There is the adaptSTAR model (Conejos, Langston, & Smith, 2013), the Multi-AttributeValue Theory (MAVT) (Ferretti, Bottero, & Mondini, 2014), the ANP-based approach (Wang & Zeng, 2010), a Holistic model (Mısırlısoy & Günçe, 2016) and the Fuzzy Multiple Criteria Decision-making (FMCDM) (Chen, Yoo, & Hwang, 2017). And that is just the beginning but I won't go in anymore specifics about these ones. But also here at the department of Heritage and Architecture is a lot published on the subject by our own professors. There is Hielkje Zijlstra with her ABCD in Time method (Zijlstra, 2009), Job Roos about redevelopment in practice (Roos, 2007) and Marieke Kuipers with her research about the architectural memory (Kuipers, 2010).

III.II reusing heritage

There is already a lot debated and published about difference methods on how to approach and reuse heritage. According to Job Roos, "a successful intervention gives an old building or ensemble a new impulse, without touching its soul or spoiling its ambience" (Roos, 2007). Mısırlısoy & Günçe are defining a good transformation in almost the same words when they say "a successful adaptation is one that respects the existing building and its historic context and add a contemporary layer to the heritage building rather than destroying its character" (Mısırlısoy & Günçe, 2016).
Every author or reuse architect has their own method with their own focus points on the subject, but there are some general subjects everybody agrees on that are of importance.
Generally speaking, is reuse about two main topics. Finding the existing architectural and historic qualities and finding a fitting new use. This means that analysing is the most important concern for architectural reuse (Elsorady, 2014).

III.III general thoughts in the available methods

But what is it that needs to be found by doing analysis? Some say that the most important thing in dealing with heritage is finding an appropriate function within the existing context. The right function is crucial in preserving the significance of a building (Mısırlısoy & Günçe, 2016). It's crucial for succeeding, when there's no good match between the new function and existing shape, the transformation won't be a success (Elsorady, 2014). A thorough analysis should rule out misfits in choosing a new function. This will lead to a decision based on analytic and scientific methods and not a random decision.

Another topic that is mentioned multiple times in reusing methods is the phrase 'value'. They are talking about finding and identifying the values a building has. For instance the symbolic value (Elsorady, 2014), the historic value (Roos, 2007), architectural values (Zijlstra, 2009) or just it's positive values (Chen et al., 2017). It's about the exploitation of these values and using them as a source of inspiration by designing (Zijlstra, 2009). But about what these values actually contain is the literature quite vague.

The cultural identity or significance as another frequently used term. A transformation should not affect the identity or as Job Roos called it, the soul of a building (Roos, 2007). This means also

analysing the project in a tangible and intangible way (Kuipers, 2010). The impact of the building in its social context or its contribution to the local community and economy is an aspect of the building's character as well (Chen et al., 2017). Most methodology in adaptive reuse decision-making is focussed on the physical and functional parts of the building, but the social and cultural elements of heritage are mentioned as well.

The last main topic in the methodology is the subject of preserving. Part of the goal of all of these methods is finding out what needs to be preserved. What is essential for the character of a building and thus needs to be kept in place? But what happens next is up to the designer. Using contrast or harmony are traditionally the well-known options. But this has almost become a cliché according to Job Roos, there are so many more options to go for (Roos, 2007).

The same Job Roos has even more to say on the topic of methodology for adaptive reuse. He mentions that just analysing is not enough. Having all the facts is not everything it is important to gain a certain feeling for the whole package of the building. For the physical facts and the social and cultural elements related to the building. And speaking of the physical parts of the building, an architect is in his view never the most important person. The architect is just a co-author who builds forward on the works of his predecessor. A transformation should serve both the past and the future without either being subservient to the other (Roos, 2007).

IV. DISCUSSION

Last chapter was about all these different methods of adaptive reuse and what they have in common. They all have their own focus points and ways of working, but how does this relate to the practice of teaching and learning here at the TU Delft. I do have some experience now in my graduation studio in which I work with different tutors and each of them has their own way in approaching the assignment. This means that as a student, you are surrounded by different views and you have to find your own way right through it. A student has to be aware and critical towards all the input delivered by his tutors and professors. But also critic relative to the current cultural context or architectural theory. These subject are not fixed facts, but they are up for change over time (Fraser, 2005). This means that a student always has to be ready to defend his own statements and views against the tutors.

IV.I transformation definition

Let's start with the definition of a successful transformation. Both of the previously mentioned explanation have in common that it is important to leave the existing character in place. There is in this field of architecture not much room for new input in this subject. Old and new characters should be balanced, but in the reality of this faculty is the old character the most important and the starting point of your design.

IV.II reuse methodologies critic

But I do have some thoughts that I encountered in relation with all these subjects. As Job Roos already mentioned, the term value is very vague and tutors and students don't really know how to use them (Roos, 2007). The whole word value has a subjective feeling around it. It is often in discussions with tutors not clear how to value certain architectural qualities. This leads to misunderstandings with teachers instead of a constructive conclusion. And that will lead to my second critical note to all these methods. They all try to make the decision-making process more scientific, by putting all information in schemes and analyses. But it still has this random feeling around it. Like it is up to your convincing skills instead of architectural skills if a plan succeeds. This also raises the question if this faculty is more about teaching a craft instead of a scientific discipline. Is it really possible to defend your design choices on the analysis?

After completing the first analysis phase of my graduation studio I can say based on my experience that this studio is heavily focussed on the history part of a building. It is an important aspect in every method but this focus leads to a decrease in focus and time for other parts. The parts I would say are underexposed during my time at the studio are attention to the cultural aspects and a clear view towards future use of a building. But I know that it is impossible to grab everything together in a method or scheme. This means that the student has to stand up for himself and that he should convince the tutors and professors that his personal view on the matter is important as well. Because this will lead the student to aspects of analysis that might not be in the list or scheme but could result in an important inspiration as well.

IV.III conclusion

After investigating all these different methods, one thing becomes very clear. The field of Heritage and Architecture is mostly about analysis, and professors and tutors may think that everything can be solved if enough analysis is done. But also that a student should take the next step, use the information from the analysis as inspiration. However, every decision that has been made should be based on your analysis.

There are a lot of different systems and a student should feel free to use them all. Like ways should tutors be open to different methods because they all lead to the same goal. Finding out everything there is about the building and capture the soul of his existence.

In the end it doesn't matter how a student finds his information, as long as it is enough to give a reason to convince your tutor. It is not about finding out everything, it's about bringing your own convincing story. Be close to yourself and your own personal interest, because that is what everybody does, including the professors with all their own self written methods.

V. REFERENCE LIST

Brand, S. (1994). *How Buildings Learn. What happens after they're built.* London: Penguin.

Chen, Y., Yoo, S., & Hwang, J. (2017). Fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making assessment of urban conservation in historic districts: Case study of Wenming Historic Block in Kunming City, China. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development, 143*(1). doi:10.1061/(ASCE)UP.1943-5444.0000334

Conejos, S., Langston, C., & Smith, J. (2013). AdaptSTAR model: A climate-friendly strategy to promote built environment sustainability. *Habitat International, 37*, 95-103. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2011.12.003

Elsorady, D. A. (2014). Assessment of the compatibility of new uses for heritage buildings: The example of Alexandria National Museum, Alexandria, Egypt. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 15*(5), 511-521. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2013.10.011

Ferretti, V., Bottero, M., & Mondini, G. (2014). Decision making and cultural heritage: An application of the Multi-Attribute Value Theory for the reuse of historical buildings. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 15*(6), 644-655. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2013.12.007

Fraser, M. (2005). The cultural context of critical architecture. *The Journal of Architecture, 10*(3), 317-322. doi:10.1080/13602360500162287

Kuipers, M. (2010). *The Architectural Memory*. Delft: VSSd.

Mısırlısoy, D., & Günçe, K. (2016). Adaptive reuse strategies for heritage buildings: A holistic approach. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 26*, 91-98. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.05.017

Provoost, M., & Vanstiphout, W. (1995). *Re-Arch. Nieuwe ontwerpen voor oude gebouwen*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.

Riegl, A. (1903). *The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin*. Vienna: Braumüller.

Roos, J. (2007). *Discovering the assignment. Redevelopment in practice*. Delft: VSSD.

Ruskin, J. (1849). *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

Wang, H.-J., & Zeng, Z.-T. (2010). A multi-objective decision-making process for reuse selection of historic buildings. *Expert Systems with Applications, 37*(2), 1241-1249. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2009.06.034

Zijlstra, H. (2009). *Analysing Buildings from Context to detail in Time ABCD research method*. Amsterdam: IOS Press BV.