

REUSE OF FARM BUILDINGS

ÅSNE VESAAS

Masters of Science

Cultural Heritage Studies

September 2006

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science, Cultural Heritage Studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to
Dr. Ian Baxter
Dag Aanderaa
Gunn Marit Sandsdalen
Steinar Sørli and Yngve Brakstad
Øystein and Nina Rudi

ABSTRACT

The changes in Norwegian agriculture results in a lot of abandoned farm buildings. These buildings are an important part of our cultural heritage and rural settlement, and we should do our best to preserve them. Buildings out of use decay very fast, and preserving and maintaining them cost a lot of money. We should therefore see the buildings as a resource, but be aware of the implications of reuse. The research question ‘How can old farm buildings be used as a resource, and what are the implications of reuse?’ have therefore been the point of departure for this project. In this research there has been used literature from both Norway and United Kingdom about reusing old buildings, the importance of our cultural heritage and cultural relics, what resources the buildings on a farm are and how we should preserve our heritage and buildings. The research has been accomplished by qualitative method. Four case studies with an interview on each farm have been done, in addition to a small desk based international comparison. Case studies are a good way to get privileged information from key players in the field and you have the ability to generalize. The analyse chapter presents and discuss the findings from the interviews. This shows that farm buildings can be used as a resource in cultural, economic and social ways. The implications differ from building to building, however in all instances you should consider historical, technical, economic and social issues. The whole theme about abandoned farm buildings is more developed in United Kingdom compared to Norway. They have policies for reuse of farm buildings in special, while in Norway this just gets affected by other laws and regulations. We have to accept that there will always be changes, but we need some guidelines to manage the changes in the best possible way.

I DECLARE THAT THIS DISSERTATION IS SUBSTANTIALLY MY OWN WORK. WHERE REFERENCE HAS BEEN MADE TO THE WORK OF OTHERS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THAT HAS BEEN USED HAS BEEN DULY ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE TEXT AND THE BIBLIOGRAPHY. THE LENGTH OF THIS DISSERTATION, EXCLUDING BIBLIOGRAPHY AND APPENDICES, DOES NOT EXCEED 15,000 WORDS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Cultural heritage	10
2.2 Old buildings as a resource	11
2.3 Implications of reuse	15
3. METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 The methods used	20
3.2 Case studies and data	21
3.3 Why the data are valuable	22
3.4 Disadvantages and shortcomings	23
4. ANALYSE	24
4.1 Old farm buildings as a resource	24
4.2 The implications of reusing farm buildings	30
4.3 Policy and laws in Norway and United Kingdom	34
5. CONCLUSIONS	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	40
APPENDIX	44

1. INTRODUCTION

This research will deal with the topic reusing of farm buildings, on a general level. This is to give an idea of what resources we are surrounded by, how to use them, and what the implications of reuse are. This study does not look at specific practical issues, as these will vary from building to building and are too complex for this study. However, some issues are mentioned, but these are relatively vague, as the researcher is neither a carpenter, an architect nor an engineer. The research will have more focus on the heritage part of reuse and the practical issues will only be discussed briefly. The work is done from a Norwegian perspective.

Norwegian agriculture is changing. Farms, especially the small ones, do not have the ability to keep up with the traditional farming and are being shut down. The reorganisation in the running of farms to more specialised production has changed the need of buildings. Houses lose their function and after a while they fall into decay or get demolished. The number of farm buildings in Norway is reduced the last 50 years, and the number of usable buildings is close connected to the number of active farms (Aarstrand and Johnsen, 1994). In 1949 it was 213000 farms in Norway, in 2005 it was 53227 (Statistic Norway, 2005). A lot of the houses lost their function many years ago, because now people buy everything they need. Earlier farmers made the tools themselves and used small houses to preserve and store the food they made themselves; it was a more diverse activity. This has resulted in varied types of buildings that can be used for various purposes. Today these houses are mainly cultural relics, but they can all be used as a resource serving new activities. The buildings are also an important part of the cultural landscape, which is changing as well because of the modifying in the agriculture. If we want to maintain the landscape we have today, we need people living on the farms, and therefore, in many cases, a new way of using the farms and their buildings. Many of the old buildings can be seen as cultural relics, but it will cost a lot of money to preserve a lot of empty buildings, therefore the best way to preserve them is to use them. Based on this, the research question for this study will be: *How can old farm buildings be used as a resource, and what are the implications of reuse?* 'Old farm buildings' is a relatively wide and vague concept. In this context it basically includes all kind of farm buildings, no matter what age. They are just old in the sense that they are not used for their original purpose.

The Norwegian government has made a report called 'Live with cultural relics'. The researcher will use the term cultural relics as it is used there and in the 'Cultural Relics Law'. 'Cultural relics are all traces from human activity in our physical environment, hereby localities that are connected to historical action, beliefs or traditions.' (Ministry of the Environment 2005:7). Cultural relics are also irreplaceable sources for knowledge and experiences. They are non-renewable resources and if they get damaged or removed they are lost forever. To get a sustainable development it is important that society make its decision from a long perspective. In rural areas it is important to create a sustainable use of cultural relics and cultural landscape to avoid that these fall apart. Today's generation is obliged to manage the cultural relics with respect for the ones who lived before us, and with consideration for those who come after us (Ministry of the Environment, 2005). Our cultural heritage is a resource in the development of our society with potential for social, cultural and economical values. Knowledge about cultural history and cultural heritage is important for the understanding of the places' and areas' qualities and possibilities, and an important element in local business development. The uniqueness of a place is something that can be used as worthiness in development of economy and society. It is about understand and communicate the cultural heritage in developments plans, from superior plans and visions to concrete actions (Directorate for Nature Management, 2005).

Normally the values are best and easiest taken care of when original use can be maintained. However, when earlier use is not rewarding any more because of economy, technology or other kind of development, new functions can preserve important historical values and special environments can be maintained (Directorate for Cultural Heritage, 2005). From the organisation Norwegian Heritage started up in the beginning of the 90's the concept 'preservation through utilisation' has been used often, meaning preservation of the past, for the future, by means of a living present (Norwegian Heritage, 2004). The focus has changed slightly the last few years, from the need of preservation to emphasise on the use and utility. It is important to preserve the heritage for future generations, but the question "why are we preserving?" is asked frequently. With a lot of different social interests, it becomes clear that taking care of the cultural heritage is not always a first priority. It can be hard to argue the case of investing money into the heritage sector instead of the health or school sector, the use of the heritage must therefore be in focus. The modifying of the agriculture changes the requirements for settlement in rural areas and a lot of cultural relics gets affected because of this change. Because of this development it is of no use to talk about preservation if there is

no foundation for living in these areas. People have to live there and other people need to come visit. It is therefore important that people and their use of the cultural heritage is in focus. The public can never finance or make any use of empty shells (Lunde, 2004).

Older buildings have historical and esthetical qualities which they have gained through a long life, and which can easily disappear if they are reused. As far as possible preserving should be integer to the rebuild process. Reuse and rebuild have economical, environmental, functional, technical and preserving consequences. These are all close related to each other and must be evaluated together if the result is going to be good. With new use of older buildings you have to face the existing situation and make use of the buildings potential to find acceptable and sufficient solutions (Hansen, 2002). There are many reasons why it is important to preserve the built heritage. It is a unique resource to knowledge about the country's past, and particular knowledge about technical processes in house building. Buildings can have a symbolic value for the local area and give the inhabitants a sort of historical identity. It is also important to preserve the built heritage as part of the attempt to achieve a sustainable development and reduce the consumption of material resources and pollution. Studies show that if you maintain old buildings instead of tear them down and build new, it can reduce pollution, waste and use of energy (Directorate for Cultural Heritage, 2006). To tear a house down or let it decay before it is mature is a waste of resources (Aarstrand & Johnsen, 1994) and these resources should therefore be used as far as possible.

A large part of Norway's built heritage is within the agriculture. The farms and farm buildings are an important part of the culture and the landscape. But in most reuse cases it is a question about money, because even if you have the buildings you would need to invest some to make them what you and your prospective public would like them to be and it have to be financially viable. However, this study will focus more on making people aware of the resources they have around them and issues you have to consider when you have decided to go through with a reuse project. The study will try to give farmers some guidelines and collaborated standing points of what they should think about if they consider reuse. To give them an understanding of the importance of the cultural heritage, and the potential development in it, make it viable as an environmental and economical resource. It is also an issue both local and national government should be aware of. The number of redundant farm buildings will probably continue to increase. What is the best way to take care of these cultural relics, the culture the farms represent and the landscape they are surrounded by? This is not an easy question to

answer, but hopefully a part of it will be answered in this report. In addition a small comparison with what is going on in the UK on the same field will be done.

The first chapter will discuss literature on the field, including the theoretical aspects about how old farm buildings can be used as a resource and what the implications of reuse are. The next chapter will discuss the methodology used, which is a mix of case study, interview and literature analysis. There will be used four case studies with interviews; the case studies are all reuse projects done in Norway. Two of them are from Telemark County, while the two other ones are one from the western part and one from the eastern part of Norway. All these are in some way involved in the arrangement or tourism business. However, it is important to remember that old farm buildings can also be used for offices, production localities, kinder gardens, workshops etc. The third chapter is applying the findings from the case studies and the documents and literature read, to the research question. In addition, a brief comparison on the issue will be done between Norway and United Kingdom.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will start defining cultural heritage and the role and uses of heritage. Further it will go on to discuss how old buildings can be used as a resource and then the implications of reuse. Buildings as a resource and implications of reuse will in many cases be two sides of the same incidence. Even so, the researcher will here try to hold these issues separate. Reuse of farm buildings is not a topic there is a lot of literature or research on, however reuse in general are more covered and can be applied to a certain extent. Literature about heritage and cultural relics as a resource will also be used. In this review there will be used literature from Norway and some from the United Kingdom.

2.1 Cultural heritage

Our cultural heritage is our collective memory of earlier generations' society and way of living. There will always be traces from human beings in our surroundings. These traces can be monuments, sites, buildings and the landscape. The memories can mean something different for us today than for those who created them. The cultural relics and landscapes can show us both continuity and change trough the times, and is important for our understanding and interpretation of the past. It can also help us understand the present and contribute to the shaping of the future (Directorate for Cultural Heritage, 2005). Aplin (2002) defines cultural heritage as results from human processes and activities. It reflects both productive or material activities, and non-material activities and values, such as social, religious, artistic, traditional, and iconic values. Cultural heritage can be moveable heritage, immovable heritage and non-material heritage. Heritage is that part of the past which we select in the present for contemporary purposes and choose to hand on to future generations (Ashworth & Graham, 2005). Individuals and societies can in a number of ways use the heritage. First of all it can give us a clearer understanding of our identity. Heritage helps us in both the temporal and spatial sense to locate our present lives both geographically and historically. It also helps us to locate ourselves socially by binding communities and nations together, giving a sense of group identity to both insiders and outsiders (Aplin, 2002). Further, heritage is a source for knowledge about the past, both practical and theoretical. It can tell us about the historical development of both our physical surroundings and humans' relations to each other and the nature. This knowledge can be helpful in promoting an environmental friendly and sustainable development. Cultural relics and cultural environments can also enhance our experiences when we are walking in the nature or in cities. It is not easy to put an economic value on these

qualities, however we can argue that it has a positive affect on people's health (Directorate for Cultural Heritage, 2005). The built heritage can also be used as a physical resource. If we preserve and use our built environment it can contribute to less waste, energy use and pollution. The knowledge about heritage is negotiated. Questions such as why a particular interpretation of the heritage is promoted, whose interests are advanced or retarded, and in what kind of milieu it was conceived and communicated, can be seen as political concerns (Graham et al. 2000). Finally, heritage has an economical role – in two ways. First the economic cost involved in preserving our heritage, and the benefits are, as mentioned before, not always clearly identifiable in economic terms. Second the heritage industry in terms of heritage tourism. Heritage can sometimes become a growth industry in declining localities (Aplin, 2002). Heritage is the most important single resource for international tourism (Graham et al. 2000). Even though heritage can contribute to an economic growth in tourism, it does not mean that the growth is entirely positive. There will always be the issue of over-use and what is left of the heritage for future generations. As Graham et al. (2000:22) put it; sustainability is about 'values and right over resources, the primacy of the economic over the cultural (and vice-versa), public and private and, finally, about individual profit and communal rights.' Lowenthal (1985) says that the past supplies benefits, entails burdens and competition between the old and the new. 'Tension and conflict are thus inherent qualities of heritage, whatever its form.' (Graham et al. 2000:22). The rest of this chapter will discuss buildings as a specific part of our heritage and reuse of this heritage.

2.2 Old buildings as a resource

Preservation of historic properties is often seen as a heavy burden on the owners. There is certainly some truth in this, because the buildings are often unsuited for modern use, and they are often more expensive to maintain compared with new buildings. This is why it is important to use their potential connected to experiences of the historic and cultural values, use their resources widely (Boro, 2005). Buildings that are made of high quality and have been taken care of can last for hundred of years, especially in areas with a dry and stabile climate. Not all houses that are seen as redundant today are technically worn out. To demolish a house or let it decay before it is mature is a waste of resources. Having said that, to what extent it is possible to use this resource depends on how suitable the houses are for other purposes and next what income this can provide (Aarstrand & Johnsen, 1994).

Sustainable development

Buildings make about 40% of Norway's real fortune. How we manage these resources is crucial for the burden on our environment. When we preserve and use the existing built environment and constructions, this contributes to less waste, energy use and pollution. In a longer perspective it will therefore be more profitable to preserve more of the existing buildings compared with demolish and build new (Directorate for Nature Management, 2005). Despite this, not much is done researching the sustainable reuse of farm buildings, however there are done some research on buildings in general. A research done by the heritage council in Dublin shows that '...re-use of buildings minimises the depletion of non-renewable resources and is therefore essential to sustainable development.' (Dublin City Heritage Office, 2004:4). It is worth mentioning though, that this research was done by studying differences and similarities between existing buildings and their hypothetical replacements. Although only five case studies were used in this case, desktop research were done to find similar more comprehensive studies, which concurred with the findings of this study. Further, the scope of saving energy by using the existing fabric of our built environment is an important aspect in a world facing energy crisis. Reuse of buildings contributes to the achievement of sustainable development targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Drivers Jonas et al. n.d.). When it comes to the economic aspect, the study from Dublin shows that only where intervention levels are extremely high does a new-build alternative cost less than the reuse option. The researcher will come back to the economic aspect in the 'implications' part. For all that, both the economic and environmental aspects are something that has to be evaluated in each case.

Time effective

Highfield (1987) argue that if there is not too much physical and structural work that have to be done in the rehabilitation process, the 'new' building will be available in a much shorter time than a completely new construction. Time can also be saved during the contract design and planning permission process, which normally takes longer time for new development than rehabilitation and even for change of use of existing buildings. This will in turn give economic advantages in terms of reducing the effects of inflation of building costs, reduction of the cost of providing finance for the scheme, and the owner can start earning revenue at an earlier date. For all that, if reuse of a building actually gets available in a shorter time depends on a lot of different factors, such as the age and rarity of the building. First class planning, detailed condition assessment and documentation, use of experts who appreciate all the ins and outs of the building's construction, appearance and qualities must be considered. Also a

good dialogue with the authorities at the earliest possible stage is important regarding the requirements concerning preservation work (Boro, 2005). Considering all these factors it is not sure that reuse is time-effective in all occasions.

A cultural resource

As a cultural relic, buildings also give us knowledge of our history, the way people lived and what kind of techniques and material they used. What was created from earlier generations give us knowledge about what they knew technically and artistically, and how the life on a farm was organised (Miljølære, nd.). Historical properties are a source for knowledge about the past. The buildings can tell us something about the living conditions, social conditions, the working life, business structure, phases in the building traditions, architectural history and technical development (Grytli, 2002). Many of the older timber buildings in Norway are preserved. Next after Japan, Norway is the country with most buildings from medieval times. Despite this the built heritage that is preserved is just a small part of the buildings that once existed. The buildings that are preserved therefore often represent good knowledge about material and good handwork. This is a knowledge that to a large extent is gone, but with the right preservation and people this can be brought back to more people. To what extent a building is represented gives an indication of how good examples they are of the environment they represent. It is often difficult to evaluate what is typical and representative for our own time period. It can also be difficult to appreciate objects from our own time as cultural relics. This can be the case for reuse of more 'modern' buildings, which might not be taken care of the way they should (Ringdal, 2003).

Uniqueness

There are also more subjective and intangible values connected to buildings. They can be a resource for experiences connected to identity, symbols, aesthetic, architecture, or for the cultural environment as a whole (Grytli, 2002). You have to see the house as a unique possibility for those who wish to live or work in an old house, not as a house with shortages (Boro, 2005). Uniqueness can give the commodities and the services added value that makes them requested in the market (Ministry of the Environment, 2005). Today's management of cultural relics is still building on national values and ideas about national identity, but are drifting away from national unity and harmony towards a historical, cultural and material diversity. The archaeologist Britt Solli, is one who has argued for the need of such new thinking. She claims that the paradigm of identity, which dominates the management of

cultural relics, should be rejected. In stead it should be replaced by a paradigm of differential and amazement. ‘This paradigm will contain values in terms of affiliation and identity, but not identity to our ancestors, but to prior people and landscape, to prior anthropological and ecological diversity.’ (Solli 1996:88, in Lønning & Haugsevje 2002:23). Instead of focusing on what binds us together as a nation, cultural relics can be a resource for wonder and amazement; something that make us different and unique. The president of The European Rural University has written that ‘The differences between regions, localities and villages, generations and social groups are mainly cultural; instead of aiming to remove them, or standing by while they become eroded, would it not be more constructive to emphasise and promote them? Cultural development should no longer be considered as an optional extra, but rather a motor for economic and social development’ (Kayser, 1994 in Lønning & Haugsevje 2002:23).

Tourism

Furthermore cultural relics can be used as part of tourism. They can enhance the quality in businesses and therefore stimulate to new activity and business development (Directorate for Nature Management, 2005). Heritage tourism has taken its place as a significant sector and become big business. The mass market is splitting and products are being developed to meet this market, heritage is such a product. However, heritage is a typical middle-class interest for those attractions where you can find research data. This has implications for how products are presented and what the content is. The heritage part of the tourism sector will depend on the leisure budgets and preferences of the middle classes of the developed world. It is therefore a challenge to find product-types that may appeal to other social classes. It is presumed that tourists are seeking the twin benefits of an authentic and learning experience. However, more research needs to be done to address the benefits tourists are seeking when visiting attractions, and benefits perceived from tourism in general (Prentice, 1994).

Older properties form a part of the overall historical framework in which we function from day to day, and they add diversity to the built environment. With its many forms, features, materials and techniques, the architectural heritage is a rich and tangible one. Each building speaks in its own way to us of the people who designed and built them, who lived or worked in them, giving us insight to the past and contributing to our sense of local, regional and national identity. The individual building’s cultural history therefore constitutes a potential

asset for everyone. Making something of this potential depends on people being willing to do so, backed up by the right kind of expertise (Boro, 2005).

2.3 Implications of reuse

When considering reuse a lot of issues will always be raised, some are easy to solve while others need some more thought through. In addition what is seen as a challenge might depend on the person who sees it. However, implications of reuse can basically be divided into two main categories; tangible and intangible (Hansen, 2002), these two categories will also to a certain extent have common issues. The researcher will start by discussing the intangible.

Understand the building

The first step is to understand the building itself, get to know both the technical and historical assets of the building. 'The starting point of any successful philosophy of creative re-use is to understand that re-use must work with the building and not against it.' (Latham 2000:77).

Further Latham (2000) argue that reuse loses meaning and purpose if too much is changed and that there is not much to retain if too much of the original is lost. Some might disagree in this, but from a heritage perspective some of the most important arguments for preserving a building is the building's capability to tell a story.

Tell the building's story

When reusing buildings it is important to tell about the building's previous functions. If the building's history can be interpreted it can make the building more exciting and personal for future users (Grytli, 2002). Interpretation can take form in many different ways, although most techniques are associated with demonstration or participation. Demonstration communicates to the audience, while participation communicates with the audience.

Interpretation can be either verbal or non verbal, but the verbal is generally considered to be far more powerful. One way of structure the interpretive content is using four components; theme, concept, message and technique (Hall & McArthur, 1996). Another thing to bear in mind is interpretation by whom and for whom. Who are telling the story and who are they telling it to (Aplin, 2002). To get the interpretation right and to get to know the building you will have to turn to evidence from the past, published reports and written history, as well as study the physical building itself (Latham, 2000). On the contrary, you have to be careful so you do not over-interpret or over-present. It can go wrong if the interpretation of earlier use is

imposed upon inadequately understanding, too much local pride or the ownership of the interpreter (Baker, 1999).

Identity

The building can also represent the identity of the people who are living on the farm, additionally it can be a part of the identity to the wider community. Aplin (2002) states that all forms of heritage can help define and maintain a sense of identity. It can help locate ourselves in the world and in the society, past and present. Without such a context our personal lives are diminished. Dorais and Searles in Ashworth and Graham defined cultural identity ‘...as a way of representing one’s relation to nature, society and the supernatural.’ (Ashworth & Graham 2005:108). The question you have to ask though is how the buildings in an area can represent the inhabitants, and what they feel is their identity, whether it is how the buildings were used hundred of years ago or if it is of a more modern character. Lotham (2000) is stating that buildings’ uses do not need to remain static to maintain the sense of identity for local people. Additionally it is not only the use of the buildings that can represent the owners’ and the area’s identity, the architecture and layout of the buildings can just as well represent people’s identity. The building traditions can tell us something about social conditions. If there have been social differences between people and if there have been stable or unstable conditions. There are often regional differences in building traditions because of climate, topography, material and access to resources, or local esthetical preferences. Christensen (1995) has a definition on good building tradition as something that shall represent the good and common. It is not a flat mass culture neither individualistic architectural marks. New buildings can be good building traditions first when they suit the area they are in, in other words, adjustment to climate, nature and existing buildings. Good building traditions mean that it is made good use of energy, material, transport and economic resources. It is important to know about the building traditions in an area before you start on a reuse project.

Buildings and the landscape

The cultural landscape will also have some affect on reuse of farm buildings. Buildings on a farm are a big part of the landscape, and they have often been there for hundred of years. For a lot of people the cultural landscape is first and foremost a landscape that is inhabited today, often with houses that tell you something about the area’s building traditions. This settlement contributes to emphasize the cultural landscape’s character. The shape of the area within the houses and the farms’ location in the landscape can also tell us something about where in the

country we are (Frislid, 1990). Buildings are often placed in the landscape for a physical or aesthetical reason. The development of the cultural landscape needs a conscious engagement to the qualities in the landscape. The landscape should not be visually polluted with bad placed buildings, and this is also important to consider when it comes to reuse (Våge, 1991). The landscape can be seen as an important part of our cultural heritage, a place for recreation and biological diversity. The result of the changes in the agriculture is big changes also in the rural landscape; it loses both distinctiveness and qualities. It does not necessarily have to be any point in preserving the landscape only because it used to be like that. But we should be aware of the consequences for both human beings and nature. In many ways the landscape has changed from being a production landscape to become an adventure landscape. The landscape is also a big part of the tourism product, but with the changes that are happening in an increased tempo this product foundation is about to disappear. The society needs to figure out what we shall do about it and who should be responsible. It is difficult for the farmers to take the whole responsibility anymore (Hjukse, 2004). Despite all that, if the farms and the buildings get a new life it might be easier to uphold the landscape and prevent reforestation.

Economy

The more tangible implications are just as important, because after all reuse is often based on the buildings functionality and its ability to pay back what you invest in it. You have to evaluate if reuse is economically justifiable compared to build a new house. What is the most profitable is not easy to answer, but if the building is in a usable condition, have sufficient space for the purpose and not too many functional disadvantages; it is normally most profitable to reuse. However, it is more difficult to calculate the costs on reuse than on a new building, because unforeseen issues can come up during the process (Aarstrand & Johnsen, 1994). Today it is argued from many instances that reuse has economical advantages, but as mentioned before there are not many studies done on reuse of farm buildings in specific. The study from Dublin shows that only where intervention levels are extremely high does a new-build alternative cost less than the reuse option (Dublin City Heritage Office, 2004). A big part of the economic question is the building's possibility to redeem today's regulation about energy, indoor climate and fire (Nesje, 2002). Other important factors that determine whether reuse is viable or not is expected income, estimated cost of development and cost of finance, which again depend upon many different factors. There is little point in reuse old buildings if the costs are going to be higher than those of constructing a new building, unless there are environmental benefits or buildings with architectural and historic interests (Highfield, 1987).

To decide whether a building is of special historical or architectural interest can in some cases be very difficult, as it often depends on people's subjective opinions.

Technical

The technical challenges are a big part of the process. Despite that, the researcher will not go into further detail on this, as this is more for workmen and engineers to do. However, to mention a few, you have to consider the areas shape, the height of the floors, the construction systems, facades, windows, staircases and infrastructure (Hansen, 2002). With new use of older buildings there will always be an adjustment between requirements to functionality and the building's possibilities to fulfil these requirements. It should be a goal that the projects that are being started should remain or strengthen the building's qualities over time. Good or acceptable solutions mean compliance between requirements, possibilities, frames and goals. You have to discuss and analyse what you need to succeed with the project, and what kind of elements that are critical or extensive. The development of a project lies in the cross line between the requirements from those who are going to use the building and the building's possibilities to meet those requirements (Hansen, 2002).

Access

You also have to make sure that your product is accessible to your users, both physical and psychological. When reusing old buildings it can be a big challenge to meet the needs of people with physical disabilities. Often the solutions to make buildings more accessible for this group are relatively unfortunate solutions. It is a difficult task and you will need good architectural planning (Grytli, 2002). The accessibility also depends on the location, and the location will influence what kind of use that will suit the building. In some instances it is important that it is close to other facilities and people, while in another setting it might be the nature and the isolation that is the asset.

Laws

Finally you have to be aware of the laws you have to follow when reusing an old building. There are many laws, regulations and instructions that you have to use in a case like this. The most important law will be the law of planning and buildings. This law intends to look after requirement to usefulness of buildings as well as heritage and esthetical values in the built environment (Thyholt, et al. 2002). It is the municipalities that have the responsibility for practising this law, they administer cultural relics and cultural environments through the law

about planning and buildings. In addition it exist a law about cultural relics that also must be considered in many cases of reuse (Directorate for Nature Management, 2005). In accordance to the law about planning and buildings, permission from other authorities must be granted if issues affect other laws that you have to apply for. In a reuse connection this can be from health authorities, fire authorities, pollution authorities or preservation authorities (Thyholt et al. 2002).

3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter it will be explained what kind of research methods that have been used, and why these methods have been used. Further a description on how the data were obtained and why the respective case studies were chosen. Next the reason why these data are valuable will be explained and finally some of the shortcomings and disadvantages that were experienced during the study.

3.1 The methods used

This research was done by qualitative methods. The researcher found this most appropriate seeing that qualitative research is more concerned with words rather than numbers, which in this case is more important (Bryman, 2001). Moreover the research question was not very suitable for a quantitative method. Four case studies with an interview for each case have been used. The four case studies were four farms in different parts of Norway. In addition, some international comparisons have been done, but this is more a small-scale desk based research.

One of the advantages with case studies is that you have the ability to generalize. Although each case is in some respect unique, it is also a single example of a broader class of things. When doing case studies you also have the ability to use a variety of sources, a variety of types of data and a variety of research methods. Whatever is appropriate can be used to investigate the relationships and processes of interest. The fact that this is a small-scale research project also makes the case study approach reasonable; you can focus on just a few cases. At the same time this is some of the difficulties and disadvantages with case studies in relation to the credibility of generalizations and the perceiving of production of soft data, because the study is restricted to just a few cases (Denscombe, 2003). Punch in Silverman explain a case study like this; ‘The basic idea is that one case (or perhaps a small number of cases) will be studied in detail, using whatever methods seem appropriate. While there may be a variety of specific purposes and research questions, the general objective is to develop as full an understanding of that case as possible.’ (Silverman 2005:126). A case study can normally study things in detail. It is a greater opportunity to discover things that might not have been apparent through more superficial research. The most common justification for the selection of particular cases is that it is typical. The findings from the case study are therefore

likely to appeal elsewhere and the findings can be generalized to the whole class of things (Denscombe, 2003).

The interviews are a good way to get privileged information from key players in the field. You can gain valuable insight based on the depth of the information gathered and the wisdom of your interviewee. Interviews require only simple equipment and it is a flexible way of collecting data. On the contrary, interviews can be time consuming and difficult to analyse. What people say they do, what they say they prefer and what they say they think cannot automatically be assumed to reflect the truth. What they chose to say can also be affected by the identity of the researcher. The impact of the researcher and of the context means that consistency and objectivity is hard to achieve, and has an adverse effect on the reliability (Denscombe, 2003). Semi-structured interviews have been used. This allows the researcher to have a clear list of issues to be addressed, but at the same time being flexible with the order of the topics and let the interviewee speak more widely on the issues raised by the researcher. However, semi-structured interviews produce data that are not pre-coded and have relatively open format, which can make them difficult to analyse (Denscombe, 2003). Case studies and interviews are suitable to get first hand information about issues related to reuse from someone who have actually been through the process. This can be more valuable than just reading and analysing theoretical information about reuse. It will also provide helpful information about how these people have made use of the resources they have available.

3.2 Case studies and data

The case studies were approached in the first instance by e-mail, three of them responded quickly and were positive, while the fourth one did not give any reply, so another case had to be found. This place was also approached by e-mail and the response was positive. Each of the farms were visited to see the places and to do the interviews. It was useful to see the farms, how they had done the practical solutions, and to meet the people behind the ideas and solutions to get a more holistic view rather than just do the interview by phone or e-mail. Three of the farms used as cases in this research, the researcher was aware of from the start, the fourth one was discovered on a website for cultural landscape. The reason for choosing these four case studies was that they represent much of the same business and have been successful in their work. They are all inviting visitors or tourists to their farms, offering experiences in a farm milieu. The first farm visited is well developed and is used as an example in many instances, and something ministers also refer to. The next one was chosen

because they did something a bit more untraditional with offering an opera weekend, in addition to have a nice web site. The third was chosen because it is not very far from the researcher's base and they are relatively big and successful in this context. As mentioned before the fourth one was chosen when one of the intended farms did not reply. This farm is also relatively near the researcher's base.

A list of questions was prepared for the interviews, but these were not followed strictly but used more as a guide (see appendix). All the interviews got taped on a regular tape recorder. Taping the interviews was found more efficient compared to writing down the answers. Then you can concentrate on the conversation and you do not have to worry about not getting everything written down. The interviews got transcribed few days after the visits. They were not transcribed word by word, but more or less everything got included. It would have been very time consuming to do it word by word from just a tape recorder, and in a study like this it is not the exactly way of saying things that is important, it is more the content of the interview as a whole.

3.3 Why the data are valuable

There are many examples of reuse of old farm buildings, some successful some less successful. The aim was to get ideas and thoughts about reuse on a general basis, and then apply the findings to the research question, with some international comparisons. The challenge is to make generalizations from the case studies, however it is also up to the reader to make some generalizations (Denscombe, 2003). By doing interviews on four different farms you get a more holistic view, and at the same time viewpoints from different persons and angels. A study like this is not about finding the truth, it is an attempt on finding some of the answers to a difficult and complex question. And as mentioned before, the data is based on privileged information (Denscombe, 2003). You get first hand information from people in the field, instead of reading it in a book or an article, which have been written and therefore biased of previous researchers. It is important to remember that physically the buildings themselves are different, and this will naturally affect the solutions. However, on the background that all farms have some common preferences the researcher would argue that generalization can be done. Likewise the study can be seen as valid because the case studies represent the phenomena to which the research refers (Silverman, 2005). The farms all have buildings that are not used in an agricultural context any more, and have been converted to new purposes. The case studies represent the truth in each of the different cases. The

researcher would also argue that the research is reliable, even though social qualitative research can almost never be hundred percent reliable; the answers would probably not be exactly the same if done at a different occasion or by a different interviewer. For all that in a case like this the broad picture would be the same and therefore also the conclusions.

3.4 Disadvantages and shortcomings

When you are dealing with people you never know what the result is going to be. People respond differently and it can also depend on the person they are going to talk to. In this case most of the respondents were easy to talk with, while others did not have that much to say. It did not seem like any of the respondents had any problem with the interviewer, however some of them might have answered a bit different if it was a professional who had done the interviews. None of the interviewees had any contradictions about using the tape, however some might become more formal and it seemed like they relaxed a bit more when the tape was turned off. The contact person on the fourth farm had not received the message about the time of the meeting, but she still said yes to do the interview on very short notice. Because of this the researcher would not take too much of the interviewee's time, and did not ask to have a look at the whole farm. It also turned out that this farm did not actually use the barn very much at the time. They had put most of the arrangement dead until they found a proper concept. Another shortcoming was that the researcher planned to investigate the concept about reuse as an environmental friendly solution, but this seemed to be something that was not much of an issue in these four cases.

4. ANALYSE

Farm buildings are a wide range of types of buildings, both in character, architecture, earlier use and age of the building. This will affect the way the building can be used as a resource and the implications of reuse. The farms visited in this research were all from different time ages and they all had buildings from different times on the farms. As a result the ideas and solutions varied slightly. Despite this, they had some common opinions and visions, and agreed that their buildings were part of our cultural heritage. The interviews have been read through thoroughly to find commonalities with each other and the theory written in the literature chapter. The observations done at each of the four case studies have also been considered and interpreted. In addition, comparisons from both Norwegian and international reports have been done.

4.1 Old farm buildings as a resource

The cultural heritage

The fact that the buildings have been used for some agricultural activity gives them a special dimension and atmosphere that you can not create elsewhere. All the interviewees saw the history of the buildings and the farm as a resource. Stories can be traced back and the buildings contribute to give the experience they offer authenticity. One of the interviewees specified that you should take care of the stories that exist. Some also clearly said that they saw the buildings as part of the culture on the farm and in the area, a part of the history and the landscape. But it was specified that if it is going to be a resource you have to do something with it. Some of the interviewees also said that their intention for preserving and reuse the buildings was to preserve the cultural heritage, while for others this was something that followed from the projects they were working on, but still something they considered important. This shows that buildings as cultural relics are important for people, especially those who live in close relation to them. It is often something they have inherited from their parents or relatives and they have certain memories connected to the buildings and the farm. One of the interviewees remembered visiting his aunt every summer and taking part in the life on the farm, which were all good memories to him. This can be an important part of their identity and something they want to preserve, but with their own touch on it. The globe is becoming more and more alike. The infrastructure help culture and trends travel faster and influence each other. For some people this can be frustrating and most of us need something that we can relate to and feel that is a part of our identity. A farm is clearly a part of the

identity of the people or family who lives there. They have certain memories and feelings connected to the farm and houses, and feel that this is a part of their heritage and somewhere they belong. Further the farms and houses can be a part of the community's identity. The building-traditions bind the area together and make it unique, it is therefore important that the changes made connected to reuse is not too big, or differ too much from the original. Most people who are reusing their buildings are aware of this and see it as important to preserve the building traditions in their area. Some are more concerned about it than others and want to do as little changes as possible. They want to preserve the old as much as possible and sometimes find it a bit difficult to unite the old with the new. However, most of the farmers visited did not see this as any problem. The preserving of the buildings is also appreciated by the community around. Some of the interviewees had got feedback from neighbours that they appreciated to see lights again on the farm. For the people in the community and the neighbours it can be enlightening to see that an old house can come to live again, and that something new is happening in the neighbourhood. Many seemed to appreciate the changes just as much as the preservation. However, one of the interviewees had experienced some difficulties with the neighbours in the beginning. They were afraid it was going to be too much traffic and people. But recently this has changed. A new generation have come, who all are positive to the activity on this old farm. The attitudes also changed when they started create jobs for people in the area. Despite this, some experience that even though people in the neighbourhood seems to be positive, it does not always shows in practice. Some of the activities might be new and scary, while in other instances it is difficult to know why the neighbours do not use the new offers.

Tourism and uniqueness

Old buildings are a big resource when it comes to tourism, both as attractions and as accommodation. As one of the interviewees said, there are values in the old farm buildings that are not easy to put a price on and it is a dimension that you can not create when building a new house. This is something that actually is important for people, something they appreciate and ask about. Further he said that if you do not use the history, origin and originality of what you have got, you will loose compared to those with a lot of money who can build big and nice new houses. All the farms visited were in some way involved in the tourism industry. For some of them the old buildings were the foundation for the whole business. One of the farms has developed to become a place were groups can come to have dinner, conferences, weddings etc. Individuals can also come there for bed and breakfast. The farm was bought for

private use, but it has developed to be more commercial. The tourists who come here get to see a typical old farm in this region, where the houses are old but some of the interior is relatively modern and functional. Another farm has been transformed to a place where they arrange an opera weekend and have exhibitions. The old barn which they have done very few changes in creates a very special atmosphere for both the actors and the public. They also use the house for accommodation, where the visitors can experience a house from the 1890's. In addition, they cooperate with an artist centre in the region and would like to develop this further by offering work studios and accommodation for artists. The two other farms are still active farms. One of them uses the barn as a gallery and location for parties. In addition they have made a pub in the basement. They have not done any big changes in the barn, so it is not difficult to see what kind of building this has been. They also offer accommodation in some of the other houses on the farm. The last farm uses basically the barn and the shed for cultural arrangement like concerts, festivals, theatres, shows and pub. They all try to offer the visitors an authentic experience and something that they could not have got in a regular locality. Uniqueness is something that attracts visitors and is a big resource in that connection. This supports Solli's (1996 in Lønning & Haugsevje, 2002) paradigm about differential and amazement; cultural relics can be a resource for wonder and amazement, something that makes us different and unique. This uniqueness can bind local groups together while separating them from the rest of the nation. If you take this a bit further and apply it to cultural arrangements, the buildings can be the frame that makes such experiences unique. There are many examples on this, and one of the farms visited is connected to a project that offers arrangements on different farms, which are focusing on different things, but at the same time it is a common concept that binds them together but separates them from other regions. If you go even further and look on the international market, these localities and specialities will be even more unique. All the farms are trying to promote what makes them unique, whether it is a very special barn, special arrangement, a special pub or the landscape around. Old buildings can be used as a resource in many ways in tourism if farms work together and cooperate. Tourists rarely visit a place for one attraction only, the area must have more to offer. For some visitors it can be important that they get a whole package when visiting a new place, including activities, experiences, food and landscape. If one farm offers the beds, the next might offer activities or food. Or the food might come from the neighbour, but is served in the barn on another farm. This is something one of the farms has been working together with other farms to develop in one of the traditional regions in Norway. Tourists are also looking for authentic experiences and to learn something (Prentice, 1994). It is as good as

impossible to make an experience hundred percent authentic, if you think about authenticity as something that should be just like it was hundred years ago. But it is something that the hosts on the farms are concerned about and try to be conscious about. They are fully aware that this is not possible, but it might not be of any point to be stuck in the middle age too much either, after all we are in 2006. Even so, they feel that it is important not to give the visitors an impression of the buildings and the farm being something different than it actually is. It is also important for the hosts on the farms that are still active, that the visitors see that this is a farm, and not a museum. The researcher will come back to the theme about interpretation later. Heritage tourists and visitors to farms like this, seems to be middle aged or elderly people. It is difficult to say anything about why this is so, but one of the reasons might be that elder people have more references and memories about farms, they might have lived on one the mselves. It can also be that elder people appreciate the peace and quite that often is connected with staying on a farm. Young people tend to ask for more activities and action. Some have managed to catch this group by offering arrangements and activities that interest young people, but there are still potential for attracting more of this group. After all young people are also interested in culture, despite that cultural heritage might not be very popular yet.

Buildings and the landscape

Reuse of farm buildings can also be seen as a resource to maintain the cultural landscape. In older times all the farms had animals, often several types. The animals contributed to prevent reforestring around the houses and to keep it more open in the forest as well. Today this has become a problem. If we reuse old buildings and farms the chances that the cultural landscape will be maintained is bigger. Farm owners see the landscape as an important part of the farm. They spend time and money to uphold it, and in some cases they try to bring it back to what it used to look like some years ago. One of the farms had sheep in the beginning, but they have not had that for some years and notice the difference. They are considering getting some sheep again. One of the other farms is also considering getting some sheep that could grass there in the summertime, and which they might could use in a food concept as well. At this farm they also have created a typical 1890s garden. It had been a garden there before and the house needed one again. They have also planted some apple trees with old sorts from the 19th century. A third farm spent quite some time to open up the landscape around the farm again when they took over, and they need the animals there to maintain it like that. The fourth farm also spends some time each spring and autumn with machines to keep it open. This shows that

they take responsibility for the landscape and their surroundings, even though they might not get much cash back for it. If it had not been any activity on these farms it would not have looked as nice as it does today. All of them also see the buildings as part of the landscape and the landscape as a resource. One of the farms is typically placed in the landscape in this respective region, because of the steep hills, and the buildings as well are placed in relation to each other. The landscape has often been formed by the agriculture in the area through years with farming, it is therefore naturally that the buildings are a part of it. The landscape it self can also be a resource together with the farm. Most people appreciate the silence that often is available on places like these, and enjoy being close to the nature. At one of the farms they have a big mountain very close, which the owners did not like at once, they thought it blocked for the view. But a lot of visitors have said that what a great mountain to have so close, so the owners have changed their mind and now see it as a resource. At one of the other farms they make the visitors park 150 metres away from the farm so they have to walk the last part. Then the visitors will have time to look around a little, walk with fields on both sides towards the farm, they see the shape of the farm, the cultural landscape the farm is surrounded by, what is growing on the field and the river down in the valley. The landscape and the view is often a big resource for recreation, and the people who are coming are often looking for this peace and quite and beautiful landscapes.

Built resource

Farm buildings can also tell us something about the material and techniques they used in previous times, which often were solid and sustainable. Old houses can therefore be a resource for those who want to copy such houses. Among craftsmen it is often a lack of knowledge about old techniques. At one of the farms they wanted to repair the chimney on one of the houses, and they wanted it to be done with the traditional technique it was built originally. But they had to struggle for a while to find craftsmen who were capable to do this job. In a reuse project it could therefore be an idea to cooperate with craftsmen who want to learn such techniques, and make a course part of the reuse project. This was something they had thought about on this farm, but it was just an idea so far. One of the other farms has been used as a good example on reuse, a good example for 'preservation through utilisation'. This place can therefore be seen as a resource for others who are dealing with some of the same business. This farm has also been part of a project about building new houses on listed and preserved farms. They were going to build functional and modern farm buildings, it was not supposed to look old, but it should be in harmony with the old. A lot of barns that are

available today are from the 60s and 70s, and might not be seen as cultural relics or important to preserve. However, they are a part of our heritage and a part of the history on a farm and should be taken care of. But some of these buildings will not always be as aesthetically nice as many of the older buildings, so it will be a discussion how important it is to take care of these. For all that, as one of the interviewees said, it does not have to be from the middle age to be interesting for people.

Time and cost effective

If a reuse project is time and cost effective depends on a lot of different factors. In most cases the fact that the house is already there makes it possible to get started even though it might not be the final product. One of the interviewees said that for them it had been a resource to get started without too many investments. You do not necessarily have to do so many changes in a barn to make it usable as a small concert venue. For two of the respondents it started more or less by an accident. They gathered some friends and invited to concert in the barn, and they realised that this worked pretty well and was something they wanted to do more. Probably none of them had started their businesses if they did not have the buildings available. Having available space is a resource when you want to start some kind of business. A reuse project can often continue and develop through years. It depends on the business, how the business goes and how many houses on the farm that are included. One of the farms has continuously had restoration or building projects on the farm from 1977 to 1996. You do not necessarily have to invest very much to begin with, and if you can save time you often save some money as well. It has not been an option for any of the farmers to build new houses for their business, for most of them it has been more economic to use the old houses compared to build a new one. However, this is something that has to be evaluated in every single case. In most of these cases the businesses did not require too much work done on the buildings, but they are also mostly used in the summertime so isolation of the houses is not that necessary. The farm that had most old houses and that are used through the whole year they have done much more work on the buildings. This is because of the state the buildings were in and because of their new function. In some cases it can be more economic to build a new house, but then you do not have the historical value any more and the extra dimension this can give to a business.

4.2 The implications of reusing farm buildings

Suitability

The first step in any reuse project is to be aware of what kind of building you are dealing with. You should know all the ins and out of the building to find the best solutions. You have to consider how suitable the building or buildings are for different purposes, or what the best alternative for your building is. For most people it depends on the income the building can provide after the change. The reasons why the farms visited decided to change the use of their buildings vary a little. Some of them saw the potential in the houses and saw it as a resource. One of the owners saw the barn and figured that this could be a nice place to have parties like weddings etc. Another found reuse the best way to conserve the barn and prevent it from decay. A part of it functions very well as a gallery with high ceilings and much light, this place can also be used for dancing. Another part is converted to a dining room and the basement which is a bit smaller and darker with stone walls, is made into a pub. As mentioned earlier for two of the others it started more or less as a coincidence. They arranged a small concert just for fun, but figured it worked well and that this was something they wanted to develop. Norwegian barns are often not isolated and will therefore mostly be suitable during the summer. But this will of course depend on how much changes you are willing to do or can do. At one of the farms they have to do something more with the barn in relation to water, toilets, isolation etc, if they want to develop the business further, but this is something they have not decided yet. If the house is listed or preserved you should contact professionals like the Ministry of Cultural Heritage for advice. Anyhow you have to contact the municipality if you want to do any big changes with the façade on the house, and you also have to apply for change of use of the building (Vinje Municipality, 2003). Most of the farms visited have done the changes step by step, this can be wise both economically and to avoid complications and unforeseen difficulties. They are all aware of that they are dealing with some special buildings, and therefore spend time on finding the best solutions and what can be done and should not be done. At one of the farms they discussed if it was right to build a hearth in a farm house, it does not actually belong there, but it turned out to be a positive action. For all that, as one of the interviewees said, if you have an old empty barn, it is not sure that you should make it into a concert venue or party hall just because others have succeeded. It is not as easy as copy someone else who is doing the right thing. Bad copies exist everywhere, but they are rarely as good as the original. It is also an advantage if you have some previous knowledge about the business you want to start. This can obviously prevent possible pitfalls.

Economy

The reason why farmers choose to reuse their buildings is normally not because it is more economic than building a new one, even though it often can be. It is more because they have an empty building which they want to use, and often because they need some extra income in addition to what they get from the farming, or instead of the farming. How much a project will cost is often the do or die for the whole thing, and no matter how much you want to start a project you have to evaluate the costs and generate the incomes. It can be wise to start in a small scale and then develop the project step by step. If you for example have many available houses, take one at the time, unless you have a lot of money. This is what one of the farms visited has done, as mentioned before they started the first change in 1977 and did the last one in 1996. One of the other farms has also developed the business year by year and they always have to evaluate that what they do is financially viable. It is always a good idea to discuss the plans with different people, and to seek advice from professionals. However, a lot of consultancy can cost a lot of money. But it does not always have to be a consultant. One of the interviewees said that they had got a lot of free and good advice from friends, neighbours, visitors etc. Most of the respondents are, or have been, dependent on some kind of economic support. One of the farms applied for support to finish the buildings. This was not a problem, they got what they asked for and actually they got more. This was probably because what they were doing created jobs, and it was therefore unfortunate that the place was unfinished for too long time. Those who are offering cultural arrangement also need some support, otherwise they could easily loose thousands in just one night. As one of the farmers said you must remember that a lot of cultural institutions which offer arrangement is 90% financed by the state and only 10% is from ticket sale. The Government find the activities on these farms very interesting and it is just as they have said in one of their reports; 'The Government want that the cultural heritage should get an increased importance as cultural, social and economical resource.' and they want to 'help arrange that listed and preserved buildings can be used in a new way.' (Ministry of the Environment). Some of the farmers found this true, they had experienced that they got support when they wanted to start their project. But it can be difficult when you loose this support, because it is often something you get only in the beginning and not when you start running it. The technical solutions will vary widely from building to building. And this is something that will affect the costs. First of all you have to make sure that the building is appropriate for the new use and then you have to considerate health and safety regulations. As one of the interviewees said, it is not as easy as just filling an old farm building with people. This is something you have to spend money on and take care

of. Then it is a lot of options on how you can solve the layout of the new interior and exterior. If the building will require a lot of maintenance you should be careful. Having said that, the fact that it is an old, and maybe slanting building, can give the experience added value, which can make it worth using anyway. If the building is listed, there might be some more restrictions and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage should be contacted. Another important issue is access for people with physical disabilities. This is something all the farmers have been concerned about and thought about. For some of them it has not been a big problem since most of the doors are wide and the entrances are not very difficult to access with a wheelchair. Others had to make more technical solutions with ramps and special entrances. The last farm did not have any wheel chair access so far to the second floor in the barn, and they did not know if it was possible to do this, without ruin too much of the building. Normally people only have to be a bit more manageable and it is sometimes a bit more complicated and must be more arranged, and the hosts have experienced that his is something those with physical disabilities mostly understand and accept. However, in some cases it is almost impossible to get full access for those with disabilities. Building elevators for wheelchairs or ramps may destroy these old rare buildings or make it too expensive.

Tell the building's story

One of the farmers found it easy and felt that the building itself told how the changes should be done, it felt kind of obvious. Some of the other interviewees were really interested in cultural heritage and they had spent quite some time finding the right colours and material for the old house they wanted to refurbish and use as accommodation for visitors. They also wanted to recreate the old kitchen as it was in the 1890s. They found it very important to spend some time and to get to know the buildings. Some take this more seriously than others, but it also depends on the buildings you have got. At one of the farms most of the houses were relatively new, which often means that there is not as much history, material and techniques to preserve. In one way a new building is often not as complex as a really old one. That does not mean that a new one is not as important, but it can make the reuse process a bit easier. How the reuse is solved often depends on the owners' background and interests, but it has also changed during the times. One of the interviewees told that he did not see the compatibility with the old and the new as any problem, but they have got better on preserving the old and tell the buildings' stories compared to what they did in the beginning. Through his studies he saw the value of preserving the old, but at the same time they did not have the economy to use professionals on everything, and a lot resulted in the cheapest solution in the beginning. One

of the farmers is conscious about not giving the buildings a look and shape that gives the impression of being something else than they actually are, they do not want it to be something completely different from its origin. The respondents want to tell the story of the buildings, and they want visitors to see and feel that they are in for example an old barn. The way the hosts choose to interpret the buildings vary a little, but most of them give the visitors a verbal version of the buildings history. This seems to be the most effective way to do it, and the easiest way to give the visitors as much information as possible. One of the hosts gives all the groups visiting a historical informal lecture about the buildings and the farm. There are not any farming activities on this farm today, and some of the houses have gone through relatively big changes. On the other farms there are more elements left like old machinery and cow stalls. Here the hosts also normally tell the visitors stories from the farm. However, not all the visitors are the same, and therefore the hosts might focus on slightly different things for each group. For many visitors it seems important that they meet the hosts, and get the stories from them. The reason for this might be that the whole experience gets more authentic, it is not only a guide who gets paid to be friendly and tell stories. The interpretation part is a difficult one, and can be solved in a lot of different ways. But it is something that should be thought through; what do we want to tell, to who are we telling it, and how should we do it. This is also important if you want to represent an areas identity. Even if this is something the owners are aware of and considerate or not, most of them do in some way represent the areas identity by preserving and telling about the farm and buildings.

Identity

The question about how to represent the area and the people on the farm's identity is also a difficult one. Everybody has their own identity, but it can be hard to describe. And even if identity is something everybody has, it is not an issue most people walk around and think about. For people dealing with reuse their identity might be presented even though it is not something they think consciously about. What they choose to fill their buildings with and how they choose to use them, can tell you something about their identity. When some of the owners present opera in their old buildings it tells you that this is something they are interested in. It can also tell you that these people are representing something more than just the old farming culture and traditions from this area. They want to preserve the heritage by taking care of the buildings, but they fill it with something more modern, which also represents them. They also want to take care of the food traditions from the area, but with their own touch on it. They want to make the food they serve from scratch, with clean,

traditional raw material, but with a new twist. If you go a bit further and want to represent the area or community's identity you need to be aware of what that identity is. Whether it is the colour of the houses, the shape or layout of the houses, the landscape the buildings are surrounded by etc. People and communities' identities do not necessarily have to go back hundred of years. Our heritage is a big part of our identity, but this is changing, and it is just as important to present our own identity as our ancestors. The challenge will therefore be to figure out what is part of our identity, how much of it do we want to present and what is the best way to do it.

4.3 Policy and laws in Norway and United Kingdom

To a certain extent the situation for old farm buildings is the same in UK as in Norway. Traditional farm buildings are a big part of the historic structure in the countryside in UK, but they are not immune from the accelerating pace of change. The large scale dereliction of buildings and poorly informed or ill-conceived conversion of buildings could damage important and irreplaceable historic assets. Rapid and large scale changes to the farm building stock could also here seriously harm the quality of the landscape and impair the appeal for locals and visitors. The quality of the landscape is now increasingly recognised as a major contributor to regional economies. It is therefore important that the policy framework for these buildings recognises and balance their multifunctional role as historic, scenic and economic assets. Policy decisions should be based on the best possible information (Trow, 2002).

The Historic Environment Review Executive Committee and Regional Historic Environment Forums have made a national report about the state of England's historic environment. Historic features that have survived many previous episodes of change over the centuries are now threatened. In order to understand and manage these changes, you need to be able to measure and monitor change in the countryside. This has been recognised and gave a commitment to publish an indicator of change in countryside quality, taking into account attributes as biodiversity, tranquillity, heritage and the character of the landscape. Despite the acknowledged importance of the historic farm building stock and the pressure on it, there is a lack of information on its size, condition, character and course of change. To address this lack of information there were undertaken a major research project to assess the state of the resource. The aims of the project were to provide baseline data on the character and

management of listed agricultural buildings in rural areas and the threats to these. In addition there were undertaken a desk based photographic survey project to create a database for supporting long-term monitoring of the building stock (Heritage Counts, 2005). This shows that historical and redundant farm buildings, and the reuse of these, is taken seriously by both the Government and big heritage organisations in England. In Scotland as well this is a known issue. A report commissioned by the Scottish Executive, Central Research Unit, aims to provide guidance on the conversion of redundant farm buildings, illustrating best practise, identifying the key problems and making recommendations for their resolution (Scottish Executive, 2006). Even though the results in this report are the view of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Department or Scottish Ministers, you can find the report on the Government's websites. The Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department also support policies which encourage farm diversification including that of finding new uses for their redundant buildings. However, some instances would argue that in England the insensitive conversion of agricultural buildings has resulted in the need for urgent new planning guidance and procedures. It is important that the work must be carried out to high standards, both in terms of design and construction, and be properly controlled (Scottish Executive, 2006). Additionally a project called North Sea Rural project; Reuse of redundant farm buildings, which is based in Norfolk, started in 2004. The project aims to gather information about the supply and demand for redundant farm buildings as suitable business accommodation. The partners in the project will use this information to look for common themes and obstacles and will draw in all interested parties. The project will end July 2007 and will provide a model of best practise for reusing buildings of cultural importance in order to support the rural economy and maintain rural life. They will also publish case studies of successful reuse of farm buildings (Norfolk County Council, 2006).

The researcher has not been able to find this much projects and policies connected to the Government in Norway. At this point it seems like reusing farm buildings is a bigger issue in UK than in Norway. However, it should be mentioned that conversion into residential use remains the most popular option in UK (Scottish Executive, 2006), while this is not such a big theme in Norway, here the farm buildings are mostly converted into business purposes. Even so, reuse will be affected by plans and laws in Norway as well. One of the most important ones is the law of planning and buildings, which is supposed to regulate also the esthetical and historical. This law also includes regulations about change of use of the buildings. If the buildings are listed there will be even more restrictions, and the law about cultural relics will

be used. For all that there are no policies for reuse of farm buildings in special (pers.com.). None of the farms visited have any listed buildings and they have not had any big problems with the authorities. At one of the farms there have been talking about listing the buildings, but the owners have had good contact with the cultural authorities in the county, so they do not actually see the need for it. The authorities have agreed with the owner that 'preservation through utilisation' is the right thing to do. It is the municipality who administer the laws, but they have not had any objections. However, recently they had some difficulties about convert the stable into a guest room. The municipality used the law about fire safety. The problem was that the stable was too close to the other buildings, if the barn had been bigger and had the stable included it would not have been any problem. Despite this, it now seems to be sorted. At one of the other farms they have also been careful about follow the law about planning and building, and have not had any trouble doing this. They feel that the authorities have been helpful and easy to cooperate with, also when it comes to the Food Safety Authority and other authorities.

5. CONCLUSIONS

There are, and will probably never be, any right or wrong answer to this research question. It depends on people's individual opinions. Some are of the meaning that if it is a very old and rare building it should just be preserved. For others old buildings are old buildings and it is better to build new houses. Further, when it comes to the technical, functional and aesthetical solutions it will vary what people think are the best thing to do. Despite all that some conclusions can be drawn.

Because of the change in Norwegian agriculture to bigger and more mechanical units a lot of farm buildings are unused. If this trend continues we will be witnesses to a lot of abandoned farm buildings in the near future. This will affect the cultural landscape and rural settlement. To avoid that even more decay it is vital that we see these buildings as a resource and focus on 'preservation through utilisation'. The buildings are a resource in cultural, economical, environmental and social terms. An old farm building contains an architectural and cultural heritage that are valuable in both tangible and intangible ways. They can give us a sense of local, regional and national identity, and be an important asset for old building techniques. Finding a new use for these old buildings can be used to supplement depressed farm incomes and generate a considerable social and economic boost to rural communities. Well planned and reasoned projects can enhance the range of facilities available in such areas. It can help preventing that people are moving from rural areas, and maybe make new inhabitants interested in moving to the countryside. Old farm buildings can also be a big resource for tourism and recreation purposes. Further reusing houses can help promote a sustainable development. This is a theme that could be focused more on, after all, the world today spend quite lot energy. It is therefore important that the authorities are encouraging this kind of projects and are more in favour of reuse redundant buildings instead of building new ones. The government should encourage people who are looking for places to run their businesses to use old houses, but this would need arrangements and some special benefits like economical support. Obviously this would depend on the suitability of the building, both technical and cultural. Conversely it is important that the authorities do not forget that when they are building public houses, this can be directly in competition with a business in an old farm building which they actually have supported. Reusing old farm buildings can also help maintaining the cultural landscape, which is important for both recreational and biological

reasons. As researcher Haukeland said, we need a system where the small farms can be profitable, because the farms create many public goods (Midtgarden, 10.08.06).

The next step is to figure out what the best solutions are, for the building, those who are going to use it and for the society and environment around. What we all can agree on is that it is wise to make good plans and be aware of the laws and regulations that will affect the project. A good plan is often necessary to get loan and subsidy as well. Further, it can be a good basic rule that the building shall not give the impression of being something else than it actually is; a part of a farm. The fact that the buildings have been used for agricultural activities can also give the new use an extra dimension and added value that visitors experience as unique and authentic. In this sense it is also important to consider the local building traditions, so the changes that are made do not differ too much from these. However, it is perfectly manageable to use new elements and more modern solutions in the reuse process as well. It can be wise to use old documentation to figure out if there have been done any changes before and at the same time document the new changes. Additionally, thorough economical calculations must be done.

In Norway it does not exist any policy or laws about reusing farm buildings in special. Converting old buildings will first of all be affected by the law of planning and buildings, then other laws depending on the building and the new use. If the number of abandoned buildings continues to increase and more and more get converted, it could be an idea to develop a policy that gives certain guidelines to avoid bad solutions for both safety reasons and for esthetical reasons. It would not have been easy to outline such policy because it depends on a lot of different factors, which all affect on different levels. The functional, technical and economic issues affect first of all the people directly involved in the business. While the value of the cultural relics, the buildings' appearance and impact on social relations affect both the directly involved and the society around.

The whole theme about abandoned farm buildings and the reuse of these could have been spent a lot more time researching. In this research more farms could have been visited, more comparisons with UK or other countries could have been done and more conversations with local and national authorities could be done. Further, not much research is done on how important these old farm buildings are, how many traditional farm buildings survive, how many are derelict, and what historic, social and economic criteria should be used to determine

whether conservation or conversion is the most appropriate for a farm building (Trow, 2002). For all that, it will be interesting to see the results from the North Sea Rural project; Reuse of redundant farm buildings.

There will always be changes and these are hard to avoid, the challenge is to control the changes, not avoid them. Finally, as Grytli (2002) said, the challenge is to make the changes positive both esthetical and historical for the building and the environment, so that our descendants appreciate what we did and not regret it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aarstrand, K. and Johnsen, S. (1994) *Verdier under tak. Bygninger på gårdsbruk – en ressurs for næringsutvikling* (Values under roof. Buildings on farms – a resource for business development) Norway: Statens Landbruksbank/NLH-Fagtjenesten.

Aplin, G. (2002) *Heritage Identification, Conservation and management*, South Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Ashworth, G.J. and Graham, B. (2005) *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Baker, D. (1999) "Introduction. Context for collaboration and conflict" in Chitty, G. and Baker, D. (Ed.) *Managing Historic Sites and Buildings. Reconciling Presentation and Preservation* (1999), London: Routledge.

Boro, M. (2005) "Ressurssterke gamle hus" in Pauldan Muller, C. og Gundhus, G. (Ed.) *Kulturminner en ressurs i tiden* (2005) (Resourceful old houses. In Cultural heritage: an asset for all ages) Oslo: NIKU.

Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Christensen, A.L. (1995) *Den norske byggeskikken. Hus og bolig på landsbygda fra middelalder til vår egen tid* (The Norwegian built tradition. Houses in the country side from medieval times to our own) Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Denscombe, M. (2003) *The Good Research Guide for small-scale social research project* (2nd edition), England: Open University Press.

Directorate for Cultural Heritage (2004) *Det er gode grunner for å bevare* (There are good reasons to preserve) Online. Available from <http://www.riksantikvaren.no/./?module=Articles;action=Article.publicOpen;ID=2535> Accessed 27 May 2006.

Directorate for Cultural Heritage (2005) *Alle tiders kulturminner – Riksantikvarens vernestrategi. Hvorfor verner vi?* (Cultural memories – The Directorate for Cultural Heritage's preservation strategy. Why are we preserving?) Online. Available from http://www.riksantikvaren.no/Norsk/Om_Riksantikvaren/Vernestrategi/?module=Articles;action=Article.publicShow;ID=2831 Accessed 29 May 2006.

Directorate for Cultural Heritage (2005) *Kulturarven i lokalmiljøet* (The cultural heritage in the local society) Online. Available from <http://www.riksantikvaren.no/?module=Files;action=File.getFile;ID=5699> Accessed 23 May 2006.

Directorate for Nature Management (2005) *Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer* (Cultural relics and cultural environments) Online. Available from <http://www.dirnat.no/wbch3.exe?p=2689> Accessed 30 May 2006.

- Drivers Jonas, English Heritage, Ricks and BPF (n.d.) *Heritage Works. The use of historic buildings in re-generation. A toolkit of good practice*. Online. Available from http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Heritage_Works.pdf Accessed 01 June 2006.
- Dublin City Heritage Office (2004) *Built to last. The Sustainable Reuse of Buildings*. Online. Available from http://www.dublincity.ie/shaping_the_city/heritage/the_heritage_office.asp Accessed 01 June 2006.
- Frislid, R. (1990) *Norske kulturlandskap* (2nd edition) (Norwegian cultural landscapes) Oslo: Landbruksforlaget.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E. (2000) *A Geography of Heritage. Power, Culture and Economy*, London: Arnold Hodder Headline Group.
- Grytli, E. (2002) *Ny bruk av eldre bygninger. Delrapport: Vernehensyn ved ny bruk* (New use of older buildings. Report: Protectional implications for new use) Trondheim: SINTEF Bygg og miljø.
- Grytli, E. (2002) *Ny bruk av verneverdige bygninger* (New use of protected buildings) Online. Available from http://www.gjenbrukshus.no/ny_bruk_av_eldre_bygninger.htm Accessed 23 May 2006.
- Hall, C.M. and McArthur, S. (1996) *Heritage Management in Australia and New Zealand. The Human Dimension*, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, G.K. (2002) *Ny bruk av eldre bygg – eksempler og erfaringer* (New use of older buildings – examples and experiences) Online. Available from http://www.gjenbrukshus.no/ny_bruk_av_eldre_bygninger.htm Accessed 23 May 2006.
- Hansen, G.K. (2002) *Ny bruk av eldre bygg – tilpasningsevne og funksjonalitet* (New use of older buildings – tilpasningsevne and functionality) Online. Available from http://www.gjenbrukshus.no/ny_bruk_av_eldre_bygninger.htm Accessed 23 May 2006.
- Heritage Counts (2005) *The State of England's Historic Environment*, England: Colourhouse.
- Highfield, D. (1987) *Rehabilitation and Re-use of Old Buildings*, Great Britain: University Press, Cambridge.
- Hjukse, A.V. (2004) *Norske bygder gror igjen* (Norwegian rural areas are reforesting) Online. Available from http://www.forskning.no/Artikler/2004/mai/1084430279.32/artikkel_print Accessed 27 May 2006.
- Latham, D. (2000) *Creative Re-use of Buildings. Volume I*, UK: Donhead Publishing Ltd. Shaftesbury.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985) *The past is a foreign country*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Lunde, Ø. (2004) *Vern gjennom bruk* (Preservation through utilisation) Online. Available from <http://www.kulturarv.no/kulturarven/index.aspx?artikkel=1191> Accessed 26 May 2006.

Lønning, D.J. and Haugsevje, Å.W. (2002) *Kulturminne og kulturmiljø som grunnlag for verdiskaping. Kva kan kulturøkonomien bidra med?* (Cultural relics and cultural environments as foundation for business development. What can the cultural economy contribute with?) Bø: Telemark Research Institute

Midtgarden, I.J. (2006) *Ein tredjedel ynskjer gjerne å bu på landet* (One third would like to live on the countryside) Online. Available from <http://www.vtb.no/vis.php?id=2922> Accessed 10 August 2006.

Miljølære, (nd.) *Det er framsynt aa se bakover* (It is a force to look backwards) Online. Available from <http://www.miljolare.no/tema/kulturminner/artikler/se-bakover.php> Accessed 31 May 2006.

Ministry of the Environment (2005) *Rapport nr 16 (2004-2005) Leve med kulturminner* (Report nr 16 (2004-2005) Live with cultural relics) Aurskog: PDC Tangen.

Nesje, A. (2002) *Investering i eksiterende bygninger – en lønnsom satsning?* (Investment in old buildings – a profitable commitment?) Online. Available from http://www.gjenbrukshus.no/ny_bruk_av_eldre_bygninger.htm Accessed 23 May 2006.

Norfolk County Council (2006) *North Sea Rural project: Re-use of redundant farm buildings*. Online. Available from http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=NCC007378&ssSourceNodeId=&ssTargetNodeId=3102 Accessed 06 June, 2006.

Norwegian Heritage (2004) *Norwegian Heritage*. Online. Available from <http://www.kulturarv.no/index.aspx?article=24853&mid=24853> Accessed 28 May 2006.

Prentice, R. (1994) "Heritage. A key sector in the 'new' tourism" in Corsane, N. (Ed.) *Heritage, Museums and Galleries. An Introductory Reader* (2005), Abingdon: Routledge.

Ringdal, S. (2003) *Bygningsarven – hva kan den fortelle* (The built heritage – what can it tell) Online. Available from <http://www.niku.no/archive/niku/prosjekter/treitiden/3%20Gen%20info-side/Bygningsarven%web.doc> Accessed 25 May 2006.

Scottish Executive (2006) *The Conversion of Redundant farm Steadings to Other Uses*. Online. Available from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/kd01/orange/crfs-03.asp> Accessed 28 July 2006.

Statistic Norway (2005) *Jordbruksbedrifter* (Agricultural Businesses) Online. Available from http://statbank.ssb.no/statistikkbanken/Default_FR.asp?Productid=10.04&PXSid=0&nvl=true&PLanguage=0&tilside=selecttable/MenuSelP.asp&SubjectCode=10 Accessed 21 August 2006.

Trow, S. (2002) *Abandon, repair, convert? Finding a future for historic farm buildings*. Online. Available from <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.00100200500800e> Accessed 25 May 2006.

Tyholt, M., Grytli, E., Nesje, A. and Denstad, D. (2002) *Ny bruk av eldre bygninger. Delrapport 3: Lovverk og offentlige bestemmelser ved ny bruk av eldre bygninger* (New use of older buildings. Report 3: Lovverk and offentlige bestemmelser with new use of older buildings) Trondheim: SINTEF Bygg og miljø

Vinje Municipality (2003) *Kva må du søkje om og kva må du melde?* (What do you have to apply for and what do you have to give notice about?) Online. Available from <http://www.vinje.kommune.no/default.asp?uid=967&CID=58> Accessed 11 August 2006.

Våge, J. (1991) *Bygninger i landskapet* (Buildings in the landscape) Ås: The Agricultural University of Norway.

APPENDIX

Interview questions

1. How old is the farm?
2. What buildings have you reused?
3. When did you start to reuse your buildings?
4. Do you run it as a traditional farm today?
5. How do you find the combination?
6. Why did you choose to reuse your buildings?
7. Did you have to do something with the buildings anyway?
8. Did you consider more traditional farming?
9. Did you consider building new houses instead? Why? Why not?
10. Did you find it more time saving to use an old building compared to build a new one?
11. How do you see the buildings as a resource?
12. Did you find it more economic to reuse compared to build a new house?
13. Was it an environmental choice? Do you see it as more environmental friendly and sustainable to reuse the buildings?
14. Was it a cultural choice?
15. What do you see as the most important factor about reuse; environmental friendly, more economic or preserve the culture?
16. How do you consider the character of the buildings, the farm and the landscape?
17. How do you see the compatibility between old, new and future use?
18. Are you focusing on the new or old use?
19. What are the aims of the reuse?
20. How do you see the buildings as part of the area's/country's cultural heritage?
21. Why did you want to preserve the buildings?
22. What do the buildings mean to you, the family and the area?
23. What values do you feel that you have provided the buildings, the farm and the area by preserving/change the buildings?

24. What remains from the original to the next generations?
25. Is it a competition between the old and the new?
26. Is it any special qualities or knowledge that you can get from the buildings? Technical, artistically, architecturally, technical development or social life?
27. Did you consider any other use? Why this business?
28. Do you see the buildings as cultural relics? Why? Why not?
29. Does the history of the buildings get presented?
30. Have you considered who presents the story and to whom? Is it most demonstration or participation?
31. Is it something special about the buildings that get promoted? Focus on something special or unique?
32. Do you try to present the owners' or area's identity? How?
33. Have the new use given any positive affects?
34. Do you have any target group? Who? Why? What do you want to give them? Do you know what they want?
35. Did you use old pictures, documents etc. in the process? Did you take any pictures before you started?
36. Have you considered the local building traditions?
37. Have you used help from any professionals?
38. How did you evaluate the technical solutions?
39. What are your thoughts about the law about planning and buildings? Or other laws that you have been affected by?
40. Have you cooperated with the municipality? Other partners through the process?
41. Have you considered the landscape around the farm?
42. Do you see the buildings as part of the landscape? Why?
43. Do you feel that the preservation of the landscape and buildings is appreciated? Is the changes appreciated as well?
44. Any special problem or issues you want to mention?

English summaries of the interviews

Case 1

The farm is basically from 1977 with some older and some newer buildings. The father in the family who lives there now inherited the farm from his father. They are now using basically the barn and shed for culture arrangement like concerts, festivals, theatres, shows and pub. The first time they started with a new use of the older buildings was in 1998, and the last change was done this spring. Today these are the main business on the farm, with 90% of the turnover and work. In addition to the culture arrangement the production on the farm is grain and grass. If they should have continued with more traditional farming they would have needed milk quota, which you do not get, or built a modern shed for pigs. They did not actually have any plans about starting with cultural arrangement. It first started when they had some friends visiting, who all were musicians, and they decided to arrange a small concert. A few people came and they thought that this was fun, and then it all began from there. The buildings were for them a resource which helped them get started without too much investment. It has developed step by step and there is still potential for further development, it is just the fantasy and courage that can prevent it. For them it has been important that they had some previous knowledge about this business and most of all that this is something that they are very interested in. It is important to find new use for the buildings, but also important not to start just because others have been successful. There are values in the old farm buildings that are not easy to put a price on and it is a dimension that you can not create when building a new house. This is something that actually is important for people, something they appreciate and ask about. If you do not use the history, origin and originality of what you have got, you will loose compared to those with a lot of money who can build big and nice new houses. The new use shows that the buildings are alive, buildings out of use decay very fast. Even though you see your buildings as a resource it is not easy to just fill an old building with people. There are a lot of physical requirement like fire safeguard, fire exit, sign posting, capacity etc. On Rudi they have not found it very difficult to unite the old with the new, but it is something they see as important to consider. They try to be careful about giving the buildings a look and shape that give the impression of being something else than they actually are, they do not want it to be something completely different from its origin. They considered if it was right to build a hearth in a farm house, it does not actually belong there, but it turned out to be a positive action. The new dance floor made them remove some of the old cow stalls, but it is practical and good. You need to find a balance between what is practical in operation and what makes things special. It is also important for them that the area between the houses is not going to look like a park, they want people to see that it is a regular farm as well. And they do not want to use the buildings as a museum with a lot of old stuff hanging on the walls, if they put something on the wall it should belong to the building it is in. For them it seems like the visitors appreciate that they meet the hosts, the family who lives on the farm, and that they get stories from them. The stories the hosts tell depends whether the visitors comes from the area, another part of the country or are foreigners. They also see the landscape around the farm as an important part of the experience. They make visitors parking 150m from the farm so they have to walk the last part. Then visitors will have time to look around a little, walk with fields on both sides towards the farm, they see the shape of the farm, the cultural landscape the farm is surrounded by, what is growing on the field and the river down in the valley.

Case 2

The farm is from 1895. The owner took over the farm from his aunt in 1997 and started the first rehabilitation in 1998. He and his friend started working on the buildings because they were in such bad conditions that they had to do something, whether they should use them for

something or just use it as a summer place. When they started the restoration they did not have any plans about starting any business or having an open house for the public. But when the houses began to be finished they wanted to have a big party and they invited singers in to the barn, and they saw that it actually worked pretty well. They saw that this was something they liked and something they wanted to do more. This resulted in arrangement of an opera weekend, the first one in 2002. They also decided that they wanted to rent out rooms in the house to help covering the loan they have on the restoration project. They have done very little with the barn, it is more or less like it used to be so they can only use it during the summer. It is a special atmosphere there, which they want to sell as part of the whole packet, and which you can not get in a new building. They also use a part of the barn as a gallery. They work together with an artist centre in the region and want to develop accommodation and work studios for artists. Although, if they want to go further, they have to do something more with the barn in relation to water, toilets, isolation etc. but this is something they have not decided yet. The reason why they started with this is because they wanted to take care of the cultural heritage, they wanted to develop some business and to be a resource and contribute to development of the area. They see the landscape as an important part of the context and the whole experience. There are no animals on the farm so the cultural landscape is reforesting, but they hope that in the future they can have some animals there during the summers in cooperation with other farmers. The dream is that if they start living there more of the time, they can have breeds which they can use in the food concept. The food concept is more or less making food from scratch with clean, traditional raw material, but with a new twist. As a next step they want to do more with the cultural landscape. However, they have already made a typical 1890s garden. It has been a garden there before and the house needed one again. They have also planted some apple trees with old sorts from the 19th century. They see it as important to preserve most of the buildings as they were. They want to present the buildings history and the historical in the rooms. They want to preserve the material, surfaces, the rooms and the buildings, but still the rooms can get new functions and new furniture. Even so, it should be mentioned that this is an architect's view, while the other person is more nostalgic and want to create an authentic 1890s living room. But they both agree that it can be in contrast with new elements on the farm. They have spent some time on finding the right and cunning people to do craftsman jobs, like bricklayers. They see it as important to take care of the cultural history and on the same time create something new, create their own history.

Case 3

The farm is from the middle of the 1700s. Today's owner bought the farm in 1976. They started with farm holidays in 1980, later they started with groups for guiding and lunch, courses, conferences and parties. The owner is from a rectory and used to large buildings and to gather a lot of people, and his dream was to have it like that. When he first saw this place he thought that the barn could be a nice party hall. He saw the possibilities early, but did not think about tourism when they bought the farm, first of all he wanted it for private use. However, when they started with commercial use they started with family holidays, but this was something they got bored of and it did not give much income. The farm is a typical Vest-Telemark farm, where the houses lie in a row, because of the steep hills. You get the best view of the farm from above and a lot of visitors like to walk up there to watch the farm beneath them and the mountains on the other side. At first the owners did not like the big mountain Skorve, which shut a part of the view. But a lot of visitors have said that what a great mountain to have so close, so they have changed their view on this, and see it more as a resource now. In the beginning they had some sheep so they did not notice the reforesting. Now they are chopping to keep it open, but next year they will have some sheep again to

graze. They have continuously worked on the houses on the farm from 1977 to 1996, so they have worked on it over a long period of time. He has not seen the compatibility with the old and new as any problem, but they have got better on preserving the old and tell about the buildings history compared to what they did in the beginning. Through his studies he saw the value of developing and preserving the old, but at the same time they did not have the economy to use professionals on everything, and a lot resulted in the cheapest solution in the beginning. In addition it was not in the time that you should preserve everything. Today all the guests get a cultural program, where they tell about the buildings history and form, what they have been used for and the reason behind the architecture. They feel that the new works well together with the old, and the people from the county's cultural department have used this farm as a demonstration on what you can create with old buildings. At first the neighbours were sceptical to the new development in the area, they were afraid of too much people and traffic. Now it has changed, it is a new generation and they work well together with all the neighbours, now it is more acceptable to do something new, despite some envy. It also caused a break trough when they started to create jobs for people in the area.

Case 4

The farm is from early 1700. The reason why they chose to rebuild the barn started with a little dream about creating something out of it. Furthermore the barn was empty, since they have ecological kettles, which do not stay inside. To prevent that the buildings fall apart you have to do something, they chose to do something inside. If it is going to be a resource you have to do something with it. They see it as important to take care of the buildings because they are a part of the culture here, a part of the cultural landscape, a part of the history and a natural part of the farm, especially as long as they run it as a traditional farm. Now they use the barn for exhibitions and if they get any questions about arranging private parties. They have also tried to have concerts, a local pub and dancing, but these are all activities that are difficult to run, especially when they are both working full time as well as running the farm. So today it is not much activity, until they decide what direction they want to go. Even so, they also have 30 beds on the farm, which is often used when it is festivals in the area. The day Olav took over the farm the cultural landscape was very over grown, they have made a lot of effort to recreate it, and they need animals to maintain it. They want to tell the building's history, but feel that actually the building itself tells the story. The walls, the rooms and the installations can tell you what its original use was. They feel that the barn has a special soul, and it was the barn it self which decided how they were going to do it. Where it is material today instead of timber it was either a hole or something else that made them plug it. They did not want to bring in a lot of new stuff, so all the furniture and windows are all second hand.