



The importance of place and authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation</i>
Manuscript ID	IJBPA-01-2020-0005.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Place, Genius loci, Authenticity, Adaptive reuse, Heritage buildings, Heritage values

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The importance of place and authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings

Abstract

Purpose – In adaptive reuse, the importance of place referred as ‘genius loci’, whereas authenticity refers to the design, materials, setting and workmanship of a building or place. Genius loci and authenticity are crucial evolving interconnected concepts; however, the concepts are usually studied separately and; consequently, overlooked in adaptive reuse practice. This paper provides precise definitions and an holistic understanding of these terms, and discusses complications related to the understanding of the concepts in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.

Design/Methodology/approach – Content analysis is an acknowledged way of analysing information related to a subject area and allows researchers to provide provide new insights and knowledge in a particular area. This paper applies a critical content analysis of published works related to genius loci and authenticity over time.

Findings – The findings show the inter-relationship of genius loci and authenticity, and how these concepts can be considered in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, in theory and in practice. Consequently, a checklist is proposed, to enable all interested parties engaged with adaptive reuse of heritage buildings to identify and preserve genius loci and authenticity.

Originality/value – Identity and values of heritage buildings are argued to be the strongest reasons for adaptation. Amongst a wide range of values associated with the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, place and authenticity are perceived to be the most confusing terms and concepts. Whilst place and authenticity are defined by many authors, their meaning and usage are subjective, which is a challenge in recognising and preserving the values they embody. This study contributes to the greater understanding of these concepts, their meanings and application in adaptive reuse.

Keywords – place, genius loci, authenticity, adaptive reuse, heritage buildings, heritage values.

Paper type – Viewpoint

Introduction

Changing the uses and functions of buildings has occurred throughout history; however, adaptive reuse as a theory and practice has been formalised only recently; since the 1970s (Plevoets, 2014). Converting existing buildings to new functions is not new, in the past, structurally sound buildings have been changed to fit new functions or changed requirements with little concern and questioning (Cunnington, 1988). In most cases, interventions were carried out on a needs-based way with little conscious consideration for preserving heritage (Plevoets, 2014).

Adaptive reuse comprises a wide range of activities, from maintaining a heritage building because of its specific features and values to changing the function of the building, either wholly or partially, for other uses (Conejos et al., 2013; Douglas, 2006; Plevoets, 2014; Wilkinson et al., 2014; Yazdani Mehr et al., 2017). Some authors (Aplin, 2002; Bridgwood & Lennie, 2013; Douglas, 2006) asserted all changes to a heritage building must be reversible, focusing on the preservation of the cultural values. Therefore, prior to any adaptation work on a heritage building, all its heritage values and authentic features must be identified.

1
2
3 Adaptation of heritage buildings requires an understanding of the identity and values
4 assigned to them (N. ICOMOS, 1994). However, as heritage buildings may have a series
5 of values for different people or groups (ICOMOS, 2013), there can be challenges and
6 even conflicts in adaptation. Jokilehto (2008b) believed that one of the most important
7 reasons behind adaptation is the attached identity and values of heritage buildings.
8 Heritage enhances a sense of community well-being (Taçon & Baker, 2019), thus needs
9 to be preserved. Significantly, the Venice Charter (1964, p. 1) stated that heritage
10 buildings must be delivered to future generations in “the full richness of their
11 authenticity”, implying little or no change to the former, original state. Authenticity is
12 defined as “the essential qualifying factor concerning values” (N. ICOMOS, 1994, p. 47),
13 which indicates that compliance with authenticity is critical and requires that all tangible
14 and intangible values are considered in adaptive reuse.
15
16

17
18 Genius loci gives identity to a place and thus, not only distinguishes different places
19 (Kepczynska-Walczak & Walczak, 2013), but also gives meaning and importance to them
20 because it is related to events or actions, tangible or intangible values. For example, a
21 prison might not be architecturally important; however, if it housed an important prisoner,
22 such as Nelson Mandela, it becomes historically significant, and thus possesses genius
23 loci. As such, it is both genius loci and authenticity that make places unique. However,
24 dilemmas can arise with regards to these concepts and their relationship in the adaptive
25 reuse of heritage buildings.
26
27

28 According to Kepczynska-Walczak and Walczak (2013), genius loci has been overlooked
29 in scientific analysis and is a difficult concept to define due to its abstract character and
30 internal complexity. Bold et al (2017) noted a difficulty in the adaptation of heritage
31 buildings is authenticity. Authenticity is a complex phenomenon by Del Río Carrasco
32 (2008), which needs to be defined theoretically and applied practically. Bold et al (2017)
33 believed that authenticity is an evolving concept and its’ meaning is becoming diluted.
34 Authenticity is what Gallie (1955) called an essentially contested concept, whereby
35 different individuals apply a variety of meanings or interpretations for a key term or
36 concept.
37
38

39 These notions indicate that although genius loci and authenticity are important in the
40 adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, their effect or perceived importance, as well as their
41 relationship may be reduced in practice, due to lack of knowledge and understanding.
42 Thus, this paper answers the following research questions:
43
44

- 45 1. What are the precise definitions of genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive
46 reuse of heritage buildings?
47
- 48 2. What is the relationship between genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse
49 of heritage buildings?
50

51 In acknowledgement of the complex nature of genius loci and authenticity, this paper
52 provides an holistic review of these terms to ascertain how genius loci and authenticity
53 can be preserved in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Furthermore, a checklist is
54 proposed, enabling stakeholders to identify and preserve genius loci and authenticity in
55 the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

The research design comprised a document and content analysis. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is a qualitative research method which studies and analyses documents. Bowen (2009, p. 27) stated, “document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge”. Bailey (2008) defined document analysis as a research method that analyses important information related to the subject of study. Content analysis is a method of document analysis.

Content analysis is a research method which provides replicable and valid interferences from information with the aim of providing new insights, knowledge, representation of factis, and a useful guide to action (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

A comprehensive range of documents including books, journal papers, reports and conference proceedings were analysed in the review. The selection of sources was made on the basis of relevant discussions related to place and authenticity in adaptive reuse (Holden, 2011, 2012; ICOMOS, 2008; Norberg Schulz, 1980; Plevoets, 2014; The UNESCO World Heritage, 2017), and provided a sound basis for an in-depth analysis of the concepts. Data was collected through searching certain words including ‘genius loci’, ‘sense of place’, ‘spirit of place’, and ‘authenticity’ that were specifically applied in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. The content analysis approach helped and enabled the researcher to extract important information from a wide range of data in relation to genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. The collected data was then analysed based on the adoption and development of the concepts in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, and how various researchers have interpreted these concepts in theory and practice over time. The concepts were presented on a chronological basis in each table, demonstrating various interpretations as well as the evolution of the concepts over time.

The importance of place (genius loci) in adaptive reuse

Genius loci is the concept of spirit of place which originated in the Roman belief that buildings, towns, and landscapes have a kind of guardian spirit which shaped their character (Petzet, 2008; Relph, 2007). Kepczynska-Walczak & Walczak (2013) placed it much later, stating that the concept of genius loci was first used in 18th century English landscape design. Although the historical notion of genius loci has remained to the present time, its sense has evolved over time from the natural world to the artificial world. Petzet (2008) defined genius loci as an actual spirit that is responsible for significant places and covers both tangible and intangible values. His statement is derived from the Roman belief that considered genius loci as a spirit of a place which protects that place. Norberg-Schulz (1980), a Norwegian architect and theorist, presented the concept of genius loci as a key architectural consideration. Norberg Schulz (1980) defined genius loci as a feature which goes beyond the spirit of a place, and is connected to a place and visualised in its architecture.

Most authors consider one aspect of genius loci; which is spirit of place. According to the Dictionary of Architecture and Building Construction (2008, p. 336), genius loci means spirit or sense of a place, which is “a characteristic feature, identifying emotion etc. of a particular natural or built environment”. This definition implies genius loci involves both spirit and sense of a place. Markeviciene (2008) and Harney (2017) believed that genius

1
2
3 loci implies not only the physical and symbolic values of a place, but it also encompasses
4 both, sense and spirit, of place. Although it seems sense of place has been used by some
5 theorists synonymously with spirit of place, Holden (2012) distinguished between these
6 two terms by expressing that spirit of place is outside us, whilst sense of place is inside
7 us and can be provoked by a landscape. Therefore, genius loci is considered as both spirit
8 and feeling, and can be considered as an important driver for the adaptive reuse of heritage
9 buildings.
10

11
12 Buildings are part of a place, and thus are important elements in presenting the sense and
13 spirit of a place. For Wuisang (2014), architecture, landscape, and natural environment
14 create a place, and thus all of these elements play an important role in the definition and
15 preservation of genius loci. Holden (2012) considered spirit of place for both natural
16 environment and human-made places. As such, genius loci can apply to either buildings
17 or their surrounding environment and landscape. Holden (2012) further noted that the
18 feature of spirit of place is not constructed, but already exists in the place. However,
19 changes to a place can result in the creation of a new spirit of place, such as the Tower of
20 London that was once a prison where unpleasant events occurred, whereas at another
21 point in its history it was a royal palace where pleasant events happened. This example
22 shows how the spirit of a place, can and does, change over time. In sum, spirit of place is
23 somewhat connected to the lived experience and the historical knowledge of a place, thus
24 can be subjectively made.
25
26

27
28 Although Markeviciene (2008) described genius loci as an intangible feature, ICOMOS
29 (2008) and Plevoets (2014) used genius loci interchangeably with spirit of place, stating
30 that spirit of place is a combination of all tangible and intangible values, which
31 contributes to a unique feature for each building and goes beyond individual values. The
32 adaptive reuse of the Pena Palace is an example to the definition of genius loci as a spirit
33 of place. Although the palace has been converted to the museum, the adaptive reuse of
34 different spaces through the combination of different objects, architectural decorations,
35 furniture, as well as natural light and view resulted in the preservation of the spirit of the
36 place (Figure 1).
37
38

39
40 Figure 1.

41
42 Plevoets (2014) claimed that an imitative adaptation, which can result in an exact
43 imitation of the original aspects of a building (stylistic restoration), may ignore the
44 architectural, social, functional, and even genius loci features of the building. Stylistic
45 restoration is destructive in terms of delivering genius loci, since a meaningful adaptation
46 must consider all tangible and intangible features of a building as mentioned by different
47 theorists (Boito & Birignani, 2009; Jokilehto, 2007; Ruskin, 1907). Burman (2008) noted,
48 in the 1877 declaration of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB),
49 restoration was considered to be an unacceptable practice which ignored the genius loci
50 of a heritage building. According to the declaration, "spirit which is given only by the
51 hand and eye of the workman, never can be recalled. And as for direct and simple copying,
52 it is palpably impossible" (Burman, 2008, p. 60). This statement declares that a restorer
53 using individual notions in the restoration of a heritage building, cannot deliver the
54 original sense and spirit of the place.
55
56

57
58 For an understanding of the genius loci, architects, designers, and conservators not only
59 should have the skill of revealing, reading and constructing this unique quality they
60 should have an emotional involvement with the building (Harney, 2017; Plevoets, 2014).

Holden (2012, p. 253) stated that “through sensitive design a strong sense of meaningful place can be created”. Thereby, it can be concluded that through a sensitive adaptation process, the genius loci of an existing building may be preserved. However, the complex nature of genius loci presents difficulties in its preservation. Russell et al (2011) stated that a sense of place has conflicting features, which are not only the continuous connection of the present generation to the past, but also the changes in the perceptions of future generations. According to the ICOMOS (2008), the challenge of preserving the spirit of place is due to a lack of educational programmes and appropriate legal protection. Therefore, the ICOMOS (2008) considered communication as a best tool for preserving spirit of place. In summary, Table 1 illustrates the different perspectives highlighted in the literature related to place, or genius loci, over time.

Table 1.

Table 1 shows, although authors mainly focused on spirit of place as an aspect of genius loci, sense of place is also connected to buildings and presents an important feature of a building, which needs to be preserved.

Authenticity in adaptive reuse

The term authenticity, related to heritage properties was firstly introduced in the Venice Charter 1964, but without any theoretical explanation. Thirteen years later, in 1977, the Operational Guidelines of UNESCO first mentioned the test of authenticity under four categories of design, materials, setting and workmanship (Falser, 2010). According to Article 9 of the Operational Guidelines, “authenticity does not limit consideration to original form and structure, but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic and historical values” (UNESCO, 1977). This statement shows that authenticity goes beyond the original form and structure of a heritage building, and all the adaptation works carried out on the building over time contribute to its authenticity. In 1994, authenticity was exclusively addressed in the Nara Conference which was established by ICOMOS. According to the Nara Document, the adaptation of cultural heritage depends on the heritage values which play an important role in the assessment of authenticity (Plevoets, 2014; Ward, 2015).

Authenticity is considered as a quality anybody has and is defined as being original, true, sincere, genuine and having authority (Jokilehto, 2007; Sekler, 2008). In 2008, English Heritage defined authenticity as those features which reflect and embody the cultural heritage values of a place (Nezhad et al., 2015). Although authenticity has been defined over time, it can easily be misinterpreted since there are different ideas and concepts associated with it (Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Jokilehto, 2008a; Labadi, 2010) in terms of design, form, materials, setting, techniques, tangible and intangible values and workmanship. Karsten (2017) considered form, substance, and time as important factors in the preservation of authenticity. As such, the preservation of authenticity can be challenging when carrying out adaptive reuse on heritage buildings. Bridgwood and Lennie (2013) believed that it is difficult to define authenticity since a component may not be original, but can be authentic due to the introduction of its period when it was constructed. This statement shows the original time of construction of a heritage building contributes to its authenticity. Jokilehto (2007) believed that in the conservation of a heritage building, putting an emphasis on the documentary evidence of the first construction, ignoring the effect of time, and underestimating the later changes to the

1
2
3 building led to loss of authenticity. Therefore, it can be concluded that all traces of past
4 works carried out to a heritage building contribute to its authenticity.
5

6 Recently, UNESCO World Heritage (2017) defined eight features which contribute to the
7 authenticity of a heritage place including: 1) form and design, 2) use and function, 3)
8 location and setting, 4) traditions, techniques, and management system, 5) materials and
9 substance, 6) language, and other forms of intangible heritage, 7) spirit and feeling, and
10 8); other internal and external factors. These features show that authenticity covers both
11 tangible and intangible values of a heritage building. Accordingly, authenticity is not a
12 value in a heritage building, whilst different features and values of the building must be
13 authentic in order to convey authenticity. Many authors stated that based on these features
14 authenticity can take different forms, and all different forms of authenticity need to be
15 addressed in different ways by different experts (Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Dezzi
16 Bardeschi, 2008; Macchi, 2008; Sekler, 2008). According to Jokilehto (2007), the
17 UNESCO list of authentic features covers the historical, aesthetic, social, and physical
18 aspects of a heritage place. As such, the authenticity of a heritage place can be measured
19 based on different factors, and each factor is solely a representative of authenticity.
20
21
22

23 Stylistic restoration of heritage buildings, in order to restore them to their original state,
24 results in the partial loss of authenticity by ignoring past adaptation works. Both
25 transferring and rebuilding heritage buildings result in loss of authenticity in terms of
26 context and setting (Machat, 2010; Schädler-Saub, 2008). Plevoets (2014) believed
27 successful adaptive reuse can be achieved when contemporary interventions are perfectly
28 merged with the authentic values of a heritage building.
29

30
31 Conversely, Ward (2015, p. 44) stated that; “allowing contemporary interventions to be
32 free to express current values without being fearful of interfering with the past” is needed.
33 This statement shows that contemporary adaptations can be distinguished from the
34 original components of a building, and can add value to heritage buildings. Contemporary
35 adaptations become part of the history of a heritage building over time, and thus
36 contribute to the authenticity of the place. Thus, all remaining parts of a heritage building
37 can convey its authenticity, regardless of its originality or stylistic restoration.
38
39

40 Bold et al (2017) claimed that authenticity is a questionable and mutual value which may
41 include various features and qualities. This statement highlights the complexities of
42 preservation of authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Table 2 summarises
43 the different perspectives related to authenticity. As shown in Table 2, authenticity
44 embodies different features, qualities, and values both tangible and intangible.
45
46

47 Table 2.
48

49 **Relationship between genius loci and authenticity**

50
51 There are conflicts and convergence in the concepts of place (genius loci) and authenticity
52 which are now discussed and evaluated. Genius loci has a close relationship with
53 authenticity (Jive´n & Larkham, 2003; Norberg Schulz, 1980). Genius loci was first used
54 in 1994, in which spirit and feeling of a place were considered as one of the sources of
55 authenticity (Plevoets, 2014). Consideration of genius loci includes the sense and the
56 spirit of place, Holden (2012, p. 258) defined authenticity in relation to a place and stated
57 that “a place can be attractive to people and have a distinctive sense of place because it
58 has a unique human-made identity, activity and vitality that is authentic to the location”.
59
60

1
2
3 This statement implies the authenticity of location as a way of conveying the sense of
4 place. Harney (2017) claimed that a spirit of place can be conveyed by true authenticity.
5 Therefore, authentic features of a heritage building can provoke the spirit of place. These
6 statements further imply that authenticity and genius loci are frequently correlated, and
7 reveals that authenticity includes a range of values which must be preserved to convey
8 the genius loci correctly.
9

10
11 According to Plevoets (2014), in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, all values must be
12 understood and preserved, in order not to threaten the authenticity of the building.
13 However, sense of place is a sensitive feature which can easily be threatened especially
14 in terms of functional change, notwithstanding all authentic features of a heritage building
15 are preserved. Karsten (2017) asserted that authentic features of a heritage building
16 cannot be preserved unchanged, due to the time and functional changes which impact on
17 the original authenticity of the building. As such, genius loci and authenticity cannot be
18 considered as isolated phenomena since they belong to buildings and their surrounding
19 environment which change over time.
20
21

22
23 Considering Holden's (2012) definition and distinguishing between spirit of place and
24 sense of place, it is concluded that the preservation of authentic features and values of a
25 heritage building results in the preservation of spirit of place, while sense of place as an
26 inside feeling is not directly connected to authenticity. However, the preservation of all
27 authentic features and heritage values of a building may indirectly contribute to the
28 preservation of a sense of place.
29

30
31 Based on the different definitions and perspectives to place (genius loci) and authenticity,
32 Table 3 provides a checklist of questions to preserve the genius loci and authenticity of a
33 building.
34

35 Table 3.

36
37 This checklist enables individuals to know and acknowledge different conditions and
38 values of heritage buildings over time, and can be applied by all those involved in
39 adaptive reuse projects. In this way, the checklist contributes to knowledge and practice.
40

41 Conclusion

42
43 This paper presents precise definitions and a critical content analysis of the concepts of
44 genius loci and authenticity in respect of adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Genius loci
45 and authenticity are frequently seen as separate concepts in adaptive reuse. This paper
46 has addressed two research questions related to the definition, comprehension, and
47 application of genius loci and authenticity, which play important roles in the adaptive
48 reuse of heritage buildings.
49

50
51 Following an extensive literature review and analysis in response to the first research
52 question; it became apparent that genius loci was defined and interpreted as both sense of
53 place and spirit of place, which is attached to buildings and their landscape. Authenticity
54 is described as being original and representing specific characteristics of a heritage
55 building. Genius loci and authenticity cover all tangible and intangible values of a
56 heritage building. Thus, different features and qualities in a heritage building may indicate
57 the genius loci and authenticity, introducing some level of complexity in their
58 preservation. Authentic features in terms of design, building form, workmanship, context,
59
60

1
2
3 setting, and structure contribute to the genius loci. However, the preservation of authentic
4 features and values of heritage buildings may just result in the preservation of the spirit
5 of place. Russell et al (2011) stated that a sense of place has meaning and significance
6 individually. Graham et al (2009) acknowledge that people are a crucial indicator of a
7 sense of place. These statement imply the concept of a sense of place is subjective and
8 individuals may have different feelings related to a place, which leads to different
9 interpretations. Accordingly, the sense of place differs between communities,
10 individuals, and cultures, and thus its preservation in the adaptive reuse of heritage
11 buildings is challenging anf needs community involvement and communication.
12 However, according to ICOMOS (ICOMOS, 2008), spirit of place may change over time
13 and from one culture to another. Petzet (2008, p. 6) stated that “the spirit of place is
14 transmitted by living peoplw in their every-day experience and therefore depends entirely
15 on them for its survival”. This statement confirms the role of community in the
16 identification and preservation of a spirit of place in the adaptive reuse of heritage
17 buildings. This, the preservation of a spirit of place needs the involvement of
18 governments, stakeholders, multidisciplinary expers, and local communities due to its
19 complex and multiform nature.
20
21
22

23
24 The second research question explored the nature of the relationship between genius locu
25 and authenticity. Although, these concepts are usually studies separately, have been
26 shown to be interconnected. Genius loci and authenticity have broad interpretations
27 which makes their preservation challenging. This paper provided a comprehensive
28 explanation related to these important concepts. However, there are ongoing debates
29 regarding to genius loci and authenticity in practice. One group of experts believes that
30 original features and values of heritage buildings are representative of authenticity and
31 genius loci (Burman, 2008; Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Karsten, 2017). Whereas others
32 believe that all adaptation works carried out to heritage buildings over time add to the
33 authenticity and genius loci, and thus need to be preserved (Bridgwood & Lennie, 2013;
34 Jokilehto, 2007; Machat, 2010; Petzet, 2008; Plevoets, 2014; Ward, 2015). For Del Río
35 Carrasco (2008) the preservation of authenticity requires different factors to be
36 considered; however, the historical basis of a heritage buildings must be respected as well.
37 This statement shows the importance of originality and historicity in the preservation of
38 authenticity and genius loci. This study revealed that all listed authentic features by the
39 UNESCO World Heritage either directly, or indirectly, contribute to the sense and spirit
40 of place. Thus, the preservation of authenticity and genius loci in the adaptive reuse of a
41 heritage building needs expert knowledge and skills and close involvement with, and
42 understanding of, the project. It is the responsibility of experts to know about authentic
43 features, qualities, and values of a heritage building in order to preserve and convey both
44 authenticity and genius loci. However, sense of place needs more research and
45 community involvement due to its subjective character.
46
47
48
49

50 As result of this research, an outcome is a checklist, to assist individuals in identifying
51 and preserving all authentic features and heritage values of a building, contributing to the
52 preservation of authenticity and genius loci in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.
53 The checklist could serve as a tool for practitioners, industry and society in identifying
54 all features and heritage values in the quest to preserve genius loci and authenticity. The
55 application of the proposed checklist in practice will strengthen its validity and may result
56 in its further development.
57
58
59
60

References

- Aplin, G. (2002). *Heritage: Identification, conservation, and management*: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, K. (2008). *Methods of social research*: Simon and Schuster.
- Boito, C., & Birignani, C. (2009). Restoration in architecture: First dialogue. *Future Anterior*, 6(1), 68-83.
- Bold, J., Larkham, P., & Pickard, R. (2017). *Authentic Reconstruction: Authenticity, Architecture and the Built Heritage*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Bridgwood, B., & Lennie, L. (2013). *History, performance and conservation*: Taylor & Francis.
- Burman, P. (2008). *Ruskin's Children: John Ruskin (1819-1900), the Good Steward, and His Influence Today*. Paper presented at the Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of conservation.
- Conejos, S., Langston, C., & Smith, J. (2013). AdaptSTAR model: A climate-friendly strategy to promote built environment sustainability. *Habitat international*, 37, 95-103.
- Cunnington, P. (1988). *Change of use*: Alphabooks/a. &c. Black.
- Davies, N., & Jokiniemi, E. (2008). *Dictionary of architecture and building construction*: Routledge.
- Del Río Carrasco, J. M. (2008). Values of heritage in the religious and cultural tradition of Christianity: the concept of authenticity. In *Values and criteria in heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1023): Polistampa.
- Dezzi Bardeschi, M. (2008). The Discriminating Value of the Authenticity in the Debate on the Restoration: Before and after Nara. In *Values and criteria in heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1004): Polistampa.
- Douglas, J. (2006). *Building adaptation*: Routledge.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Falser, M. (2010). *From Venice 1964 to Nara 1994-changing concepts of authenticity?*: Polistampa.
- Gallie, W. B. (1955). *Essentially contested concepts*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Aristotelian society.
- Graham, H., Mason, R., & Newman, A. (2009). Historic Environment, Sense of Place and Social Capital. *Report commissioned by English Heritage*.
- Harney, M. (2017). Genius loci restored: the challenge of adaptive re-use. In *Conservation/Adaptation: Keeping alive the spirit of the place: Adaptive re-use of heritage with symbolic values* (pp. 151-162): European Association for Architectural Education.
- Holden, G. (2011). *Sense of Place and Urbanity: Challenges and Interventions at the Gold Coast*. Paper presented at the 4th Healthy Cities: Making Cities Liveable Conference.
- Holden, G. (2012). *Authentic Experience and Minor Place-Making*. Paper presented at the Designing Place: International Urban Design Conference, Nottingham.
- ICOMOS. (2008). Quebec Declaration of the Preservation of the Spirit of Place. *International Journal of Cultural Property, Quebec, Canada*.

- 1
2
3 ICOMOS. (2013). *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of*
4 *Cultural Significance 2013*: Australia ICOMOS Incorporated.
- 5 ICOMOS, N. (1994). The Nara document on authenticity. *ICOMOS*.
- 6 Jive' n, G., & Larkham, P. J. (2003). Sense of place, authenticity and character: a
7 commentary. *Journal of urban design*, 8(1), 67-81.
- 8 Jokilehto, J. (2007). *History of architectural conservation*: Routledge.
- 9 Jokilehto, J. (2008a). Aesthetics in the World Heritage context. In *Values and criteria in*
10 *heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1010): Polistampa.
- 11 Jokilehto, J. (2008b). *The Idea of Conservation: an Overview*. Paper presented at the
12 Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in
13 memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference
14 of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the
15 philosophy of conservation.
- 16 Karsten, I. A. (2017). Reconstruction of Historic Monuments in Poland after the Second
17 World War—the Case of Warsaw. *Authentic Reconstruction: Authenticity,*
18 *Architecture and the Built Heritage*, 47.
- 19 Kepczynska-Walczak, A., & Walczak, B. M. (2013). *Visualising «genius loci» of built*
20 *heritage*. Paper presented at the Envisioning Architecture: Design, Evaluation,
21 Communication, Proceedings of the 11th conference of the European
22 Architectural Envisioning Association, Rome: Edizioni Nuova Cultura.
- 23 Labadi, S. (2010). World Heritage, authenticity and post-authenticity: international and
24 national perspectives. In *Heritage and globalisation* (pp. 80-98): Routledge.
- 25 Macchi, G. (2008). Authenticity of structural conception. In *Values and criteria in*
26 *heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1010): Polistampa.
- 27 Machat, C. (2010). *The vernacular between theory and practice*. Paper presented at the
28 Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in
29 memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference
30 of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the
31 philosophy of conservation.
- 32 Markeviciene, J. (2008). *Genius loci and Homo Faber: A heritage-making dilemma*.
33 Paper presented at the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly and International
34 Symposium: 'Finding the spirit of place – between the tangible and the
35 intangible', Quebec, Canada. <http://openarchive.icomos.org/85/>
- 36 Nezhad, S. F., Eshrati, P., & Eshrati, D. (2015). A definition of authenticity concept in
37 conservation of cultural landscapes. *International Journal of Architectural*
38 *Research: ArchNet-IJAR*, 9(1), 93-107.
- 39 Norberg Schulz, C. (1980). *Genius loci: towards a phenomenology of architecture*
40 (Trad. de l'ital.).
- 41 Petzet, M. (2008). *Genius loci—the Spirit of Monuments and Sites*.
- 42 Plevvoets, B. (2014). *Retail-Reuse: an interior view on adaptive reuse of buildings*. Ph.
43 D. Hasselt, Belgium: Hasselt University Press,
- 44 Relph, E. (2007). *Spirit of Place and Sense of Place in Virtual Reality [interaktyvus]*.
45 *Techne: Research in Philosophy and Technology*.
- 46 Ruskin, J. (1907). *Seven Lamps of Architecture*. In: JM Dent and sons, London.
- 47 Russell, H., Smith, A., & Leverton, P. (2011). *Sustaining Cultural Identity and a Sense*
48 *of Place: New Wine in Old Bottles or Old Wine in New Bottles?* In: College of
49 Estate Management Reading.
- 50 Schädler-Saub, U. (2008). *Teoria e metodologia del restauro: Italian Contributions to*
51 *Conservation in Theory and Practice*. Paper presented at the Conservation and
52 preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of conservation.
- Sekler, E. (2008). *In Praise of Principles*. Paper presented at the Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of conservation.
- Taçon, P. S., & Baker, S. J. H. (2019). New and Emerging Challenges to Heritage and Well-Being: A Critical Review. 2(2), 1300-1315.
- The UNESCO World Heritage, G. (2017). Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. *Paris*.
- UNESCO. (1977). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of the world heritage convention*: UNESCO.
- Venice Charter, R. (1964). International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites. *Venice, Italy*.
- Ward, S. (2015). *Authenticating Adaptation*. Carleton University Ottawa,
- Wilkinson, S., Remøy, H., & Langston, C. (2014). *Sustainable building adaptation: innovations in decision-making*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wuisang, C. (2014). Defining Genius Loci and Qualifying Cultural Landscape of the Minahasa Ethnic Community in the North Sulwaesi. *Indonesia (PhD, University of Adelaide)*.
- Yazdani Mehr, S., Holden, G., & Skates, H. (2017). Adding More by Using Less: Adaptive Reuse of Woolstores. *SBE16 Sydney: International High-Performance Built Environments Conference, 180*.

The importance of place and authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings

Abstract

Purpose – In adaptive reuse, the importance of place referred as ‘genius loci’, whereas authenticity refers to the design, materials, setting and workmanship of a building or place. Genius loci and authenticity are crucial evolving interconnected concepts; however, the concepts are usually studied separately and; consequently, overlooked in adaptive reuse practice. This paper provides precise definitions and an holistic understanding of these terms, and discusses complications related to the understanding of the concepts in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.

Design/Methodology/approach – Content analysis is an acknowledged way of analysing information related to a subject area and allows researchers to provide provide new insights and knowledge in a particular area. This paper applies a critical content analysis of published works related to genius loci and authenticity over time.

Findings – The findings show the inter-relationship of genius loci and authenticity, and how these concepts can be considered in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, in theory and in practice. Consequently, a checklist is proposed, to enable all interested parties engaged with adaptive reuse of heritage buildings to identify and preserve genius loci and authenticity.

Originality/value – Identity and values of heritage buildings are argued to be the strongest reasons for adaptation. Amongst a wide range of values associated with the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, place and authenticity are perceived to be the most confusing terms and concepts. Whilst place and authenticity are defined by many authors, their meaning and usage are subjective, which is a challenge in recognising and preserving the values they embody. This study contributes to the greater understanding of these concepts, their meanings and application in adaptive reuse.

Keywords – place, genius loci, authenticity, adaptive reuse, heritage buildings, heritage values.

Paper type – Viewpoint

Introduction

Changing the uses and functions of buildings has occurred throughout history; however, adaptive reuse as a theory and practice has been formalised only recently; since the 1970s (Plevoets, 2014). Converting existing buildings to new functions is not new, in the past, structurally sound buildings have been changed to fit new functions or changed requirements with little concern and questioning (Cunnington, 1988). In most cases, interventions were carried out on a needs-based way with little conscious consideration for preserving heritage (Plevoets, 2014).

Adaptive reuse comprises a wide range of activities, from maintaining a heritage building because of its specific features and values to changing the function of the building, either wholly or partially, for other uses (Conejos et al., 2013; Douglas, 2006; Plevoets, 2014; Wilkinson et al., 2014; Yazdani Mehr et al., 2017). Some authors (Aplin, 2002; Bridgwood & Lennie, 2013; Douglas, 2006) asserted all changes to a heritage building must be reversible, focusing on the preservation of the cultural values. Therefore, prior to any adaptation work on a heritage building, all its heritage values and authentic features must be identified.

Adaptation of heritage buildings requires an understanding of the identity and values assigned to them (N. ICOMOS, 1994). However, as heritage buildings may have a series of values for different people or groups (ICOMOS, 2013), there can be challenges and even conflicts in adaptation. Jokilehto (2008b) believed that one of the most important reasons behind adaptation is the attached identity and values of heritage buildings. **Heritage enhances a sense of community well-being (Taçon & Baker, 2019), thus needs to be preserved.** Significantly, the Venice Charter (1964, p. 1) stated that heritage buildings must be delivered to future generations in “the full richness of their authenticity”, implying little or no change to the former, original state. Authenticity is defined as “the essential qualifying factor concerning values” (N. ICOMOS, 1994, p. 47), **which indicates that compliance with authenticity is critical and requires that all tangible and intangible values are considered in adaptive reuse.**

Genius loci gives identity to a place and thus, not only distinguishes different places (Kepczynska-Walczak & Walczak, 2013), but also gives meaning and importance to them because it is related to events or actions, tangible or intangible values. For example, a prison might not be architecturally important; however, if it housed an important prisoner, such as Nelson Mandela, it becomes historically significant, and thus possesses genius loci. As such, it is both genius loci and authenticity that make places unique. However, dilemmas can arise with regards to these concepts and **their relationship** in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.

According to Kepczynska-Walczak and Walczak (2013), genius loci has been overlooked in scientific analysis and is a difficult concept to define due to its abstract character and internal complexity. Bold et al (2017) noted a difficulty in the adaptation of heritage buildings is authenticity. Authenticity is a complex phenomenon by Del Río Carrasco (2008), which needs to be defined theoretically and applied practically. Bold et al (2017) believed that authenticity is an evolving concept and its’ meaning is becoming diluted. Authenticity is what Gallie (1955) called an essentially contested concept, whereby different individuals apply a variety of meanings or interpretations for a key term or concept.

These notions indicate that although genius loci and authenticity are important in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, their effect or perceived importance, **as well as their relationship** may be reduced in practice, due to lack of knowledge and understanding. Thus, this paper answers the following research questions:

1. **What are the precise definitions of genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings?**
2. **What is the relationship between genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings?**

In acknowledgement of the complex nature of genius loci and authenticity, this paper provides an holistic review of these terms to ascertain how genius loci and authenticity can be preserved in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. **Furthermore, a checklist is proposed, enabling stakeholders to identify and preserve genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.**

Methodology

The research design comprised a document and content analysis. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is a qualitative research method which studies and analyses documents. Bowen (2009, p. 27) stated, “document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge”. Bailey (2008) defined document analysis as a research method that analyses important information related to the subject of study. Content analysis is a method of document analysis.

Content analysis is a research method which provides replicable and valid interferences from information with the aim of providing new insights, knowledge, representation of factis, and a useful guide to action (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

A comprehensive range of documents including books, journal papers, reports and conference proceedings were analysed in the review. The selection of sources was made on the basis of relevant discussions related to place and authenticity in adaptive reuse (Holden, 2011, 2012; ICOMOS, 2008; Norberg Schulz, 1980; Plevoets, 2014; The UNESCO World Heritage, 2017), and provided a sound basis for an in-depth analysis of the concepts.

Data was collected through searching certain words including ‘genius loci’, ‘sense of place’, ‘spirit of place’, and ‘authenticity’ that were specifically applied in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. The content analysis approach helped and enabled the researcher to extract important information from a wide range of data in relation to genius loci and authenticity in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. The collected data was then analysed based on the adoption and development of the concepts in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, and how various researchers have interpreted these concepts in theory and practice over time. The concepts were presented on a chronological basis in each table, demonstrating various interpretations as well as the evolution of the concepts over time.

The importance of place (genius loci) in adaptive reuse

Genius loci is the concept of spirit of place which originated in the Roman belief that buildings, towns, and landscapes have a kind of guardian spirit which shaped their character (Petzet, 2008; Relph, 2007). Kepczynska-Walczak & Walczak (2013) placed it much later, stating that the concept of genius loci was first used in 18th century English landscape design. Although the historical notion of genius loci has remained to the present time, its sense has evolved over time from the natural world to the artificial world. Petzet (2008) defined genius loci as an actual spirit that is responsible for significant places and covers both tangible and intangible values. His statement is derived from the Roman belief that considered genius loci as a spirit of a place which protects that place. Norberg-Schulz (1980), a Norwegian architect and theorist, presented the concept of genius loci as a key architectural consideration. Norberg Schulz (1980) defined genius loci as a feature which goes beyond the spirit of a place, and is connected to a place and visualised in its architecture.

Most authors consider one aspect of genius loci; which is spirit of place. According to the Dictionary of Architecture and Building Construction (2008, p. 336), genius loci means spirit or sense of a place, which is “a characteristic feature, identifying emotion etc. of a

particular natural or built environment". This definition implies genius loci involves both spirit and sense of a place. Markeviciene (2008) and Harney (2017) believed that genius loci implies not only the physical and symbolic values of a place, but it also encompasses both, sense and spirit, of place. Although it seems sense of place has been used by some theorists synonymously with spirit of place, Holden (2012) distinguished between these two terms by expressing that spirit of place is outside us, whilst sense of place is inside us and can be provoked by a landscape. Therefore, genius loci is considered as both spirit and feeling, and can be considered as an important driver for the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.

Buildings are part of a place, and thus are important elements in presenting the sense and spirit of a place. For Wuisang (2014), architecture, landscape, and natural environment create a place, and thus all of these elements play an important role in the definition and preservation of genius loci. Holden (2012) considered spirit of place for both natural environment and human-made places. As such, genius loci can apply to either buildings or their surrounding environment and landscape. Holden (2012) further noted that the feature of spirit of place is not constructed, but already exists in the place. However, changes to a place can result in the creation of a new spirit of place, such as the Tower of London that was once a prison where unpleasant events occurred, whereas at another point in its history it was a royal palace where pleasant events happened. This example shows how the spirit of a place, can and does, change over time. In sum, spirit of place is somewhat connected to the lived experience and the historical knowledge of a place, thus can be subjectively made.

Although Markeviciene (2008) described genius loci as an intangible feature, ICOMOS (2008) and Plevoets (2014) used genius loci interchangeably with spirit of place, stating that spirit of place is a combination of all tangible and intangible values, which contributes to a unique feature for each building and goes beyond individual values. The adaptive reuse of the Pena Palace is an example to the definition of genius loci as a spirit of place. Although the palace has been converted to the museum, the adaptive reuse of different spaces through the combination of different objects, architectural decorations, furniture, as well as natural light and view resulted in the preservation of the spirit of the place (Figure 1).

Figure 1.

Plevoets (2014) claimed that an imitative adaptation, which can result in an exact imitation of the original aspects of a building (stylistic restoration), may ignore the architectural, social, functional, and even genius loci features of the building. Stylistic restoration is destructive in terms of delivering genius loci, since a meaningful adaptation must consider all tangible and intangible features of a building as mentioned by different theorists (Boito & Birignani, 2009; Jokilehto, 2007; Ruskin, 1907). Burman (2008) noted, in the 1877 declaration of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), restoration was considered to be an unacceptable practice which ignored the genius loci of a heritage building. According to the declaration, "spirit which is given only by the hand and eye of the workman, never can be recalled. And as for direct and simple copying, it is palpably impossible" (Burman, 2008, p. 60). This statement declares that a restorer using individual notions in the restoration of a heritage building, cannot deliver the original sense and spirit of the place.

1
2
3 For an understanding of the genius loci, architects, designers, and conservators not only
4 should have the skill of revealing, reading and constructing this unique quality they
5 should have an emotional involvement with the building (Harney, 2017; Plevoets, 2014).
6 Holden (2012, p. 253) stated that “through sensitive design a strong sense of meaningful
7 place can be created”. Thereby, it can be concluded that through a sensitive adaptation
8 process, the genius loci of an existing building may be preserved. However, the complex
9 nature of genius loci presents difficulties in its preservation. Russell et al (2011) stated
10 that a sense of place has conflicting features, which are not only the continuous
11 connection of the present generation to the past, but also the changes in the perceptions
12 of future generations. According to the ICOMOS (2008), the challenge of preserving the
13 spirit of place is due to a lack of educational programmes and appropriate legal protection.
14 Therefore, the ICOMOS (2008) considered communication as a best tool for preserving
15 spirit of place. In summary, Table 1 illustrates the different perspectives highlighted in
16 the literature related to place, or genius loci, over time.
17
18
19

20
21 Table 1.

22 Table 1 shows, although authors mainly focused on spirit of place as an aspect of genius
23 loci, sense of place is also connected to buildings and presents an important feature of a
24 building, which needs to be preserved.
25
26

27 **Authenticity in adaptive reuse**

28
29 The term authenticity, related to heritage properties was firstly introduced in the Venice
30 Charter 1964, but without any theoretical explanation. Thirteen years later, in 1977, the
31 Operational Guidelines of UNESCO first mentioned the test of authenticity under four
32 categories of design, materials, setting and workmanship (Falser, 2010). According to
33 Article 9 of the Operational Guidelines, “authenticity does not limit consideration to
34 original form and structure, but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over
35 the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic and historical values” (UNESCO,
36 1977). This statement shows that authenticity goes beyond the original form and structure
37 of a heritage building, and all the adaptation works carried out on the building over time
38 contribute to its authenticity. In 1994, authenticity was exclusively addressed in the Nara
39 Conference which was established by ICOMOS. According to the Nara Document, the
40 adaptation of cultural heritage depends on the heritage values which play an important
41 role in the assessment of authenticity (Plevoets, 2014; Ward, 2015).
42
43
44

45 Authenticity is considered as a quality anybody has and is defined as being original, true,
46 sincere, genuine and having authority (Jokilehto, 2007; Sekler, 2008). In 2008, English
47 Heritage defined authenticity as those features which reflect and embody the cultural
48 heritage values of a place (Nezhad et al., 2015). Although authenticity has been defined
49 over time, it can easily be misinterpreted since there are different ideas and concepts
50 associated with it (Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Jokilehto, 2008a; Labadi, 2010) in terms of
51 design, form, materials, setting, techniques, tangible and intangible values and
52 workmanship. Karsten (2017) considered form, substance, and time as important factors
53 in the preservation of authenticity. As such, the preservation of authenticity can be
54 challenging when carrying out adaptive reuse on heritage buildings. Bridgwood and
55 Lennie (2013) believed that it is difficult to define authenticity since a component may
56 not be original, but can be authentic due to the introduction of its period when it was
57 constructed. **This statement shows the original time of construction of a heritage building
58 contributes to its authenticity.** Jokilehto (2007) believed that in the conservation of a
59
60

1
2
3 heritage building, putting an emphasis on the documentary evidence of the first
4 construction, ignoring the effect of time, and underestimating the later changes to the
5 building led to loss of authenticity. Therefore, it can be concluded that all traces of past
6 works carried out to a heritage building contribute to its authenticity.
7

8
9 Recently, UNESCO World Heritage (2017) defined eight features which contribute to the
10 authenticity of a heritage place including: 1) form and design, 2) use and function, 3)
11 location and setting, 4) traditions, techniques, and management system, 5) materials and
12 substance, 6) language, and other forms of intangible heritage, 7) spirit and feeling, and
13 8); other internal and external factors. These features show that authenticity covers both
14 tangible and intangible values of a heritage building. Accordingly, authenticity is not a
15 value in a heritage building, whilst different features and values of the building must be
16 authentic in order to convey authenticity. Many authors stated that based on these features
17 authenticity can take different forms, and all different forms of authenticity need to be
18 addressed in different ways by different experts (Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Dezzi
19 Bardeschi, 2008; Macchi, 2008; Sekler, 2008). According to Jokilehto (2007), the
20 UNESCO list of authentic features covers the historical, aesthetic, social, and physical
21 aspects of a heritage place. As such, the authenticity of a heritage place can be measured
22 based on different factors, and each factor is solely a representative of authenticity.
23
24
25

26 Stylistic restoration of heritage buildings, in order to restore them to their original state,
27 results in the partial loss of authenticity by ignoring past adaptation works. Both
28 transferring and rebuilding heritage buildings result in loss of authenticity in terms of
29 context and setting (Machat, 2010; Schädler-Saub, 2008). Plevoets (2014) believed
30 successful adaptive reuse can be achieved when contemporary interventions are perfectly
31 merged with the authentic values of a heritage building.
32

33
34 Conversely, Ward (2015, p. 44) stated that; “allowing contemporary interventions to be
35 free to express current values without being fearful of interfering with the past” is needed.
36 This statement shows that contemporary adaptations can be distinguished from the
37 original components of a building, and can add value to heritage buildings. Contemporary
38 adaptations become part of the history of a heritage building over time, and thus
39 contribute to the authenticity of the place. Thus, all remaining parts of a heritage building
40 can convey its authenticity, regardless of its originality or stylistic restoration.
41

42
43 Bold et al (2017) claimed that authenticity is a questionable and mutual value which may
44 include various features and qualities. This statement highlights the complexities of
45 preservation of authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Table 2 summarises
46 the different perspectives related to authenticity. As shown in Table 2, authenticity
47 embodies different features, qualities, and values both tangible and intangible.
48
49

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Table 2.

Relationship between genius loci and authenticity

There are conflicts and convergence in the concepts of place (genius loci) and authenticity which are now discussed and evaluated. Genius loci has a close relationship with authenticity (Jive´n & Larkham, 2003; Norberg Schulz, 1980). Genius loci was first used in 1994, in which spirit and feeling of a place were considered as one of the sources of authenticity (Plevoets, 2014). Consideration of genius loci includes the sense and the spirit of place, Holden (2012, p. 258) defined authenticity in relation to a place and stated

1
2
3 that “a place can be attractive to people and have a distinctive sense of place because it
4 has a unique human-made identity, activity and vitality that is authentic to the location”.
5 This statement implies the authenticity of location as a way of conveying the sense of
6 place. Harney (2017) claimed that a spirit of place can be conveyed by true authenticity.
7 Therefore, authentic features of a heritage building can provoke the spirit of place. These
8 statements further imply that authenticity and genius loci are frequently correlated, and
9 reveals that authenticity includes a range of values which must be preserved to convey
10 the genius loci correctly.
11
12

13 According to Plevoets (2014), in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, all values must be
14 understood and preserved, in order not to threaten the authenticity of the building.
15 However, sense of place is a sensitive feature which can easily be threatened especially
16 in terms of functional change, notwithstanding all authentic features of a heritage building
17 are preserved. Karsten (2017) asserted that authentic features of a heritage building
18 cannot be preserved unchanged, due to the time and functional changes which impact on
19 the original authenticity of the building. As such, genius loci and authenticity cannot be
20 considered as isolated phenomena since they belong to buildings and their surrounding
21 environment which change over time.
22
23

24 Considering Holden’s (2012) definition and distinguishing between spirit of place and
25 sense of place, it is concluded that the preservation of authentic features and values of a
26 heritage building results in the preservation of spirit of place, while sense of place as an
27 inside feeling is not directly connected to authenticity. However, the preservation of all
28 authentic features and heritage values of a building may indirectly contribute to the
29 preservation of a sense of place.
30
31

32 Based on the different definitions and perspectives to place (genius loci) and authenticity,
33 Table 3 provides a checklist of questions to preserve the genius loci and authenticity of a
34 building.
35
36

37 Table 3.
38

39 This checklist enables individuals to know and acknowledge different conditions and
40 values of heritage buildings over time, and can be applied by all those involved in
41 adaptive reuse projects. In this way, the checklist contributes to knowledge and practice.
42
43

44 Conclusion

45
46 This paper presents precise definitions and a critical content analysis of the concepts of
47 genius loci and authenticity in respect of adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. Genius loci
48 and authenticity are frequently seen as separate concepts in adaptive reuse. This paper
49 has addressed two research questions related to the definition, comprehension, and
50 application of genius loci and authenticity, which play important roles in the adaptive
51 reuse of heritage buildings.
52
53

54 Following an extensive literature review and analysis in response to the first research
55 question; it became apparent that genius loci was defined and interpreted as both sense of
56 place and spirit of place, which is attached to buildings and their landscape. Authenticity
57 is described as being original and representing specific characteristics of a heritage
58 building. Genius loci and authenticity cover all tangible and intangible values of a
59 heritage building. Thus, different features and qualities in a heritage building may indicate
60

1
2
3 the genius loci and authenticity, introducing some level of complexity in their
4 preservation. Authentic features in terms of design, building form, workmanship, context,
5 setting, and structure contribute to the genius loci. However, the preservation of authentic
6 features and values of heritage buildings may just result in the preservation of the spirit
7 of place. Russell et al (2011) stated that a sense of place has meaning and significance
8 individually. Graham et al (2009) acknowledged that people are a crucial indicator of a
9 sense of place. These statements imply the concept of a sense of place is subjective and
10 individuals may have different feelings related to a place, which leads to different
11 interpretations. Accordingly, the sense of place differs between communities,
12 individuals, and cultures, and thus its preservation in the adaptive reuse of heritage
13 buildings is challenging and needs community involvement and communication.
14 However, according to ICOMOS (2008), spirit of place may change over time and from
15 one culture to another. Petzet (2008, p. 6) stated that “the spirit of place is transmitted by
16 living people in their every-day experience and therefore depends entirely on them for
17 its survival”. This statement confirms the role of community in the identification and
18 preservation of a spirit of place in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. This, the
19 preservation of a spirit of place needs the involvement of governments, stakeholders,
20 multidisciplinary experts, and local communities due to its complex and multiform nature.
21
22
23
24

25 The second research question explored the nature of the relationship between genius loci
26 and authenticity. Although, these concepts are usually studied separately, have been
27 shown to be interconnected. Genius loci and authenticity have broad interpretations
28 which makes their preservation challenging. This paper provided a comprehensive
29 explanation related to these important concepts. However, there are ongoing debates
30 regarding to genius loci and authenticity in practice. One group of experts believes that
31 original features and values of heritage buildings are representative of authenticity and
32 genius loci (Burman, 2008; Del Río Carrasco, 2008; Karsten, 2017). Whereas others
33 believe that all adaptation works carried out to heritage buildings over time add to the
34 authenticity and genius loci, and thus need to be preserved (Bridgwood & Lennie, 2013;
35 Jokilehto, 2007; Machat, 2010; Petzet, 2008; Plevoets, 2014; Ward, 2015). For Del Río
36 Carrasco (2008) the preservation of authenticity requires different factors to be
37 considered; however, the historical basis of a heritage building must be respected as well.
38 This statement shows the importance of originality and historicity in the preservation of
39 authenticity and genius loci. This study revealed that all listed authentic features by the
40 UNESCO World Heritage either directly, or indirectly, contribute to the sense and spirit
41 of place. Thus, the preservation of authenticity and genius loci in the adaptive reuse of a
42 heritage building needs expert knowledge and skills and close involvement with, and
43 understanding of, the project. It is the responsibility of experts to know about authentic
44 features, qualities, and values of a heritage building in order to preserve and convey both
45 authenticity and genius loci. However, sense of place needs more research and
46 community involvement due to its subjective character.
47
48
49
50

51 As result of this research, an outcome is a checklist, to assist individuals in identifying
52 and preserving all authentic features and heritage values of a building, contributing to the
53 preservation of authenticity and genius loci in the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.
54 The checklist could serve as a tool for practitioners, industry and society in identifying
55 all features and heritage values in the quest to preserve genius loci and authenticity. The
56 application of the proposed checklist in practice will strengthen its validity and may result
57 in its further development.
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3 Aplin, G. (2002). *Heritage: Identification, conservation, and management*: Oxford
4 University Press.
- 5 Bailey, K. (2008). *Methods of social research*: Simon and Schuster.
- 6 Boito, C., & Birignani, C. (2009). Restoration in architecture: First dialogue. *Future*
7 *Anterior*, 6(1), 68-83.
- 8 Bold, J., Larkham, P., & Pickard, R. (2017). *Authentic Reconstruction: Authenticity,*
9 *Architecture and the Built Heritage*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- 10 Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative*
11 *research journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- 12 Bridgwood, B., & Lennie, L. (2013). *History, performance and conservation*: Taylor &
13 Francis.
- 14 Burman, P. (2008). *Ruskin's Children: John Ruskin (1819-1900), the Good Steward,*
15 *and His Influence Today*. Paper presented at the Conservation and preservation:
16 interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905):
17 proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS International
18 scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of conservation.
- 19 Conejos, S., Langston, C., & Smith, J. (2013). AdaptSTAR model: A climate-friendly
20 strategy to promote built environment sustainability. *Habitat international*, 37,
21 95-103.
- 22 Cunningham, P. (1988). *Change of use*: Alphabooks/a. &c. Black.
- 23 Davies, N., & Jokiniemi, E. (2008). *Dictionary of architecture and building*
24 *construction*: Routledge.
- 25 Del Río Carrasco, J. M. (2008). Values of heritage in the religious and cultural tradition
26 of Christianity: the concept of authenticity. In *Values and criteria in heritage*
27 *conservation* (pp. 1000-1023): Polistampa.
- 28 Dezzi Bardeschi, M. (2008). The Discriminating Value of the Authenticity in the
29 Debate on the Restoration: Before and after Nara. In *Values and criteria in*
30 *heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1004): Polistampa.
- 31 Douglas, J. (2006). *Building adaptation*: Routledge.
- 32 Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of*
33 *advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- 34 Falser, M. (2010). *From Venice 1964 to Nara 1994-changing concepts of authenticity?* :
35 Polistampa.
- 36 Gallie, W. B. (1955). *Essentially contested concepts*. Paper presented at the Proceedings
37 of the Aristotelian society.
- 38 Graham, H., Mason, R., & Newman, A. (2009). Historic Environment, Sense of Place
39 and Social Capital. *Report commissioned by English Heritage*.
- 40 Harney, M. (2017). Genius loci restored: the challenge of adaptive re-use. In
41 *Conservation/Adaptation: Keeping alive the spirit of the place: Adaptive re-use*
42 *of heritage with symbolic values* (pp. 151-162): European Association for
43 Architectural Education.
- 44 Holden, G. (2011). *Sense of Place and Urbanity: Challenges and Interventions at the*
45 *Gold Coast*. Paper presented at the 4th Healthy Cities: Making Cities Liveable
46 Conference.
- 47 Holden, G. (2012). *Authentic Experience and Minor Place-Making*. Paper presented at
48 the Designing Place: International Urban Design Conference, Nottingham.
- 49 ICOMOS. (2008). Quebec Declaration of the Preservation of the Spirit of Place.
50 *International Journal of Cultural Property, Quebec, Canada*.
- 51 ICOMOS. (2013). *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of*
52 *Cultural Significance 2013*: Australia ICOMOS Incorporated.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 ICOMOS, N. (1994). The Nara document on authenticity. *ICOMOS*.
- 4 Jive' n, G., & Larkham, P. J. (2003). Sense of place, authenticity and character: a
5 commentary. *Journal of urban design*, 8(1), 67-81.
- 6 Jokilehto, J. (2007). *History of architectural conservation*: Routledge.
- 7 Jokilehto, J. (2008a). Aesthetics in the World Heritage context. In *Values and criteria in*
8 *heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1010): Polistampa.
- 9 Jokilehto, J. (2008b). *The Idea of Conservation: an Overview*. Paper presented at the
10 Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in
11 memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference
12 of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the
13 philosophy of conservation.
- 14 Karsten, I. A. (2017). Reconstruction of Historic Monuments in Poland after the Second
15 World War—the Case of Warsaw. *Authentic Reconstruction: Authenticity,*
16 *Architecture and the Built Heritage*, 47.
- 17 Kepczynska-Walczak, A., & Walczak, B. M. (2013). *Visualising «genius loci» of built*
18 *heritage*. Paper presented at the Envisioning Architecture: Design, Evaluation,
19 Communication, Proceedings of the 11th conference of the European
20 Architectural Envisioning Association, Rome: Edizioni Nuova Cultura.
- 21 Labadi, S. (2010). World Heritage, authenticity and post-authenticity: international and
22 national perspectives. In *Heritage and globalisation* (pp. 80-98): Routledge.
- 23 Macchi, G. (2008). Authenticity of structural conception. In *Values and criteria in*
24 *heritage conservation* (pp. 1000-1010): Polistampa.
- 25 Machat, C. (2010). *The vernacular between theory and practice*. Paper presented at the
26 Conservation and preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in
27 memoriam Alois Riegl (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference
28 of the ICOMOS International scientific committee for the theory and the
29 philosophy of conservation.
- 30 Markeviciene, J. (2008). *Genius loci and Homo Faber: A heritage-making dilemma*.
31 Paper presented at the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly and International
32 Symposium: 'Finding the spirit of place – between the tangible and the
33 intangible', Quebec, Canada. <http://openarchive.icomos.org/85/>
- 34 Nezhad, S. F., Eshrati, P., & Eshrati, D. (2015). A definition of authenticity concept in
35 conservation of cultural landscapes. *International Journal of Architectural*
36 *Research: ArchNet-IJAR*, 9(1), 93-107.
- 37 Norberg Schulz, C. (1980). *Genius loci: towards a phenomenology of architecture*
38 (Trad. de l'ital.).
- 39 Petzet, M. (2008). *Genius loci—the Spirit of Monuments and Sites*.
- 40 Plevoets, B. (2014). *Retail-Reuse: an interior view on adaptive reuse of buildings*. Ph.
41 D. Hasselt, Belgium: Hasselt University Press,
- 42 Relph, E. (2007). *Spirit of Place and Sense of Place in Virtual Reality [interaktyvus]*.
43 *Techne: Research in Philosophy and Technology*.
- 44 Ruskin, J. (1907). *Seven Lamps of Architecture*. In: JM Dent and sons, London.
- 45 Russell, H., Smith, A., & Leverton, P. (2011). *Sustaining Cultural Identity and a Sense*
46 *of Place: New Wine in Old Bottles or Old Wine in New Bottles?* In: College of
47 Estate Management Reading.
- 48 Schädler-Saub, U. (2008). *Teoria e metodologia del restauro: Italian Contributions to*
49 *Conservation in Theory and Practice*. Paper presented at the Conservation and
50 preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl
51 (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of
4 conservation.

5 Sekler, E. (2008). *In Praise of Principles*. Paper presented at the Conservation and
6 preservation: interactions between theory and practice: in memoriam Alois Riegl
7 (1858-1905): proceedings of the international conference of the ICOMOS

8 International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of
9 conservation.

10
11 Taçon, P. S., & Baker, S. J. H. (2019). New and Emerging Challenges to Heritage and
12 Well-Being: A Critical Review. 2(2), 1300-1315.

13 The UNESCO World Heritage, G. (2017). Operational Guidelines for the
14 Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. *Paris*.

15 UNESCO. (1977). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of the world heritage*
16 *convention*: UNESCO.

17
18 Venice Charter, R. (1964). International charter for the conservation and restoration of
19 monuments and sites. *Venice, Italy*.

20 Ward, S. (2015). *Authenticating Adaptation*. Carleton University Ottawa,

21 Wilkinson, S., Remøy, H., & Langston, C. (2014). *Sustainable building adaptation:*
22 *innovations in decision-making*: John Wiley & Sons.

23 Wuisang, C. (2014). Defining Genius Loci and Qualifying Cultural Landscape of the
24 Minahasa Ethnic Community in the North Sulwaesi. *Indonesia (PhD, University*
25 *of Adelaide)*.

26
27 Yazdani Mehr, S., Holden, G., & Skates, H. (2017). Adding More by Using Less:
28 Adaptive Reuse of Woolstores. *SBE16 Sydney: International High-Performance*
29 *Built Environments Conference, 180*.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Pena Palace located in Sintra, Portugal (Source: Authors, 2017).



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
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and Adaptation

Table 1. Different perspectives related to genius loci over time (Source: Authors, 2020).

Author	Genius loci	
	Spirit of place	Sense of place
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in 1877 (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is given to a place by the hand and eye of the workman and cannot be recalled. 	
Norberg Schulz (1980)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is connected to a place and visualised in its architecture. 	
ICOMOS (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is a combination of tangible and intangible elements. • Spirit of place is constructed by various social actors. • Spirit of place has multiple meanings which can change over time. • A place can have several spirits of place. 	
Petzet (Petzet, 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place which is responsible for protecting of heritage places. • Genius loci covers both tangible and intangible values. 	
Russell et al (2011)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of place needs to identify the heritage of the built environment, which exists between different generations.
Holden (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is outside us. • Spirit of place is connected to both natural environment and human-made places. • Spirit of place already exists in a place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of place is inside us and can be provoked even by a landscape.
Plevoets (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is a combination of all values including tangible and intangible, as well as intrinsic and actual. • Spirit of place is unique for each building and site, and goes beyond the individual values. • Spirit of place is connected to spirit of time. 	
Harney (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirit of place is connected to the lived experience and the historical knowledge of a place 	

Table 2. Different perspectives related to authenticity over time (Source: Authors, 2020).

Author (s)	Qualities of authenticity
Operational Guidelines of UNESCO (1977)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design • Materials • Setting • Workmanship • Authenticity includes all subsequent modifications and additions that have artistic and historical values.
Nara document (ICOMOS, 1994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All heritage values are important in the assessment of authenticity.
Jokilehto (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity means original, real, and genuine. • All past adaptation works carried out to a heritage building contribute to its authenticity.
Sekler (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity is something that can be trusted as being genuine and reliable.
Lipp (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity is a time dependent concept.
English Heritage 2008 (Nezhad et al., 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity includes all features that embody the heritage values of a place.
Del Río Carrasco (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials play an important role in presenting authenticity.
Burman (2008)	
Dezzi Bardeschi (2008)	
Karlström (2013)	
Karsten (2017)	
Bridgwood and Lennie (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every component may be authentic due to its introduction of its specific period.
Ward (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity of a building is connected to the palimpsest which remains from its intrinsic adaptations over time.
Karsten (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form, substance, and time.
UNESCO World Heritage (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form and design • Use and function • Location and setting • Traditions, techniques, and management system • Materials and substance • Language, and other forms of intangible heritage • Spirit and feeling • Other internal and external factors
Bold et al (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authenticity is a questionable and mutual value which may include various features and qualities (tangible and intangible)

Table 3. Checklist for assessment of genius loci and authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings (Source: Authors, 2020).

Questions	Yes	No	Comments
1. Are all heritage values of the building identified and documented? (e.g. social, Aesthetic, historic, scientific, experience value, use value, non-use value).			
2. Is the form and design original or representative of a specific period of time? (e.g. Art Deco, Classical, Romanesque, Islamic, Baroque).			
3. Is the building function based on its original use? Does the original use of the building represent an important function? (e.g. industrial buildings which have undergone extensive adaptive reuse and adaptation over time).			
4. Does the building represent an important historical era or event? (e.g. a prison which houses an important prisoner and becomes historically significant).			
5. Does a building belong to an important individual or organisation? (e.g. city halls which belong to local governments and communities, having a collective sense of ownership).			
6. Are the construction materials and substances original or representative of a specific period of time? (e.g. clay, stone, wood, brick, concrete, or ornaments and paintings belonging to a specific architectural style such as Art Deco).			
7. Is the building located in its original setting? Is the location of the building important? (e.g. historic buildings which are located in historic urban precinct).			
8. Does the building represent specific techniques and traditions internally and externally? (e.g. the increase height and span in a specific period).			
9. Do past adaptation works represent a specific era or function? Do these adaptation works add to the values of the building? (e.g. Tower of London which was once a prison and then reused as a royal palace and now as a tourist attraction).			

Table 3. Checklist for assessment of genius loci and authenticity in adaptive reuse of heritage buildings (Source: Authors, 2020).

Questions	Yes	No	Comments
1. Are all heritage values of the building identified and documented? (e.g. social, Aesthetic, historic, scientific, experience value, use value, non-use value)			
2. Is the form and design original or representative of a specific period of time? (e.g. Art Deco, Classical, Romanesque, Islamic, Baroque).			
3. Is the building function based on its original use? Does the original use of the building represent an important function? (e.g. industrial buildings which have undergone extensive adaptive reuse and adaptation over time).			
4. Does the building represent an important historical era or event? (e.g. a prison which houses an important prisoner and becomes historically significant).			
5. Does a building belong to an important individual or organisation? (e.g. city halls which belong to local governments and communities, having a collective sense of ownership).			
6. Are the construction materials and substances original or representative of a specific period of time? (e.g. clay, stone, wood, brick, concrete, or ornaments and paintings belonging to a specific architectural style such as Art Deco).			
7. Is the building located in its original setting? Is the location of the building important? (e.g. historic buildings which are located in historic urban precinct).			
8. Does the building represent specific techniques and traditions internally and externally? (e.g. the increase height and span in a specific period).			
9. Do past adaptation works represent a specific era or function? Do these adaptation works add to the values of the building? (e.g. Tower of London which was once a prison and then reused as a royal palace and now as a tourist attraction).			