

Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings to Promote Social Values: The Case Study of Bagamoyo District in Tanzania

Ruhonyora Kenneth and Charles Lucian

School of Earth Sciences, Real Estate, Business Studies and Informatics (SERBI),
Ardhi University (ARU)

P.O. Box 351761, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Email: kennethruhonyora93@gmail.com and charleslucian@gmail.com

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.9.08.2019.p9210

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.08.2019.p9210>

ABSTRACT:

A growing body of opinion suggests that historic buildings promote different values to communities through adaptive reuse. The government of Tanzania has allowed historic buildings in Bagamoyo to be reused to promote sustainability in the community. This paper examines how adaptive reuse of historic buildings helps to promote social values the society cherishes and seeks to promote. The data were collected using a survey research designed to allow respondents to express their own understanding of how adaptive reuse of historic buildings impacts on promoting different values attached to historic buildings especially social values. The findings indicate that adaptive reuse helps to promote social values which are social interaction, change of attitude, change in lifestyle, and change in behavior of the society. Although these social values have been acquired differently by each way of adaptive reuse, restoration seems to be important in promoting change in attitude towards preservation and conservation so as to promote economic values. However, generally from relative score algorithm through average mean of their scores if both ways are combined, they show that adaptive reuse is better to promote social values above cultural values by 1.04 but below economic values by 0.94. Regression analysis indicates that most key players are interested to adopt these historic buildings when there is a chance to promote social values which will help them to also generate economic values and increase more profit and acceptance of their project in the society.

Keywords: *Adaptive Reuse, Historic Buildings, Historic Building Values, Relative Score Algorithm*

I. INTRODUCTION

Historic buildings have become an important element as iconic to the city and need to be conserved [1]. Adaptive reuse is the process that retains as much as possible of the original building while upgrading the performance to suit modern standards and changing user requirements [2].

Adaptive reuse of historic buildings has been an important strategy to preserve historic buildings which acts as a symbol of heritage and as an effective strategy to improve the sustainability of existing buildings [2-6].

Adaptation has been seen as a way to improve social values as well as economic values in many countries [7]. Consequently, it is asserted as a strategy to promote sustainability but it's remarkable to see to what extent it will be able to improve social values because many investors and developers are interested in economic values to gain profit from adaptation and reuse of historic buildings rather than social values [8].

Adapted building will not completely match a new building in terms of performance, although the shortfall should be balanced against the gains in social value. The life expectancy of an existing building may also be less than a new alternative

despite any improvements that adaptation may inject [9]. Old buildings also express the continuity of human society as they are symbolic of their permanence, and as expressive of the deep roots of society as a late Graeme Shankland, an architect and planner, once said that “a city without old buildings is like a man without a memory [10].

Social values have become difficult to capture because a myriad of investors prefer more economic values in case of location, site, special character and neighborhood factors which mostly influence economic benefit and avoid diminished of potential market due to intense competitive pressure from other investors [8, 11].

For example in developed countries, in the case of Ontario, Canada, older buildings are important aesthetic, cultural and economic resources but in many jurisdictions hundreds of historic buildings have been demolished because developers and bankers argued that the cost of adapting them for new uses is too high but this is the only way for investors to make a reasonable profit from the use of the land [11]. In Tanzania adaptive reuse of historical building is argued to improve preservation in an effort to prevent undue deterioration of heritage features. Many historical buildings in Bagamoyo have experienced rapid deterioration of building materials caused by lack of maintenance, climatic condition, ageing of materials, use of incorrect or faulty materials for repair, poor workmanship and inherent structural design defects [12]. Barriers and challenges of adaptive reuse have allowed a good number of historic buildings in Bagamoyo to fall into a state of disrepair and dereliction [13]. However, the adaptive reuse of a few old buildings in the same area like Old Post Office has proved to be an important component in the revitalization of the neighborhood. Though modifications have been done, but the dynamic heritage features through which the buildings have passed can still be observed [14]. Although social values are essential parts to the community, most key players tend to ignore social values when preserving the dynamic heritage features of historic buildings.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Adaptive reuse is a conversion of a building to undertake modified change (Douglas, 2006). Adaptive reuse is like giving the buildings the second life when they may be previously underutilized [15, 16]. Changing building from underutilization to different purpose has become necessary to preserve heritage buildings [15]. When done well, adaptive reuse can restore and maintain the heritage preservation and restoration of historic buildings which actually increase their historic and cultural values [9]. However, many investors decide to demolish heritage building rather than preserve them based on their economic values with little regard for other values, sustainability and their historical importance to the community [17]. Adaptive reuse and the conservation of heritage buildings play a critical role for obtaining significant economic, cultural and social benefits to the communities [11, 18 - 21]. Adaptive reuse doesn't just concern about economic values, but it also provides social and environmental to the community [15]. Therefore having a large number of vacant or derelict buildings has negative impact to the society and provides an environment for crime and other antisocial behaviors [17].

Although it's problematic to determine the values [22] of adaptive reuse of historic buildings numerous investors and developers still make their decision about adaptive reuse with consideration of higher profitability and high rate of return on their capital investment asset while important issues associated with the environment and social values are given less priority. In particular the adaptive reuse has been identified as a process that can significantly improve the financial, environmental and social performance of existing building assets [15]. The process of adaptive reuse can be used as a strategy to change the need of owners and occupiers and the community in general [4, 9].

Sustainable development through adaptive reuse raises the importance of building stock as economic, social and cultural capital that should not be wasted [15, 23]. However adaptive reuse is often perceived by some as expensive and sometimes requiring substantial and costly refurbishment [15, 24]. Regardless of the cost adaptive reuse of the building has a major role to play in sustainable

development of community both socially, economically and environmentally [25]. [8, 18, 21] adopt the views that few of the out-dated features of historic buildings will ever match current sustainability standards which means building owners see no socio-cultural, physical and economic value benefits of embracing adaptive reuse of historic building and this leads to diminished potential market of the adaptive reuse of old buildings.

In the case of developed countries [26] confirms that Australia heritage buildings form an integral part of Australia social capital. Within Australia conserving heritage buildings provides significant economic, cultural and social benefit [9]. Heritage buildings provide a valuable glimpse of the past and therefore should be conserved for future generations [25]. The strategy that promotes environmental, social, cultural and economic sustainability of buildings of historical significance to be adapted and reused rather than demolishing them has become a very relevant topic in developed countries [3; 17].

Adaptive reuse when applied to heritage buildings not only retains the building, but conserves the efforts, skill and dedication of the original builders [6, 17]. The outcomes of adaptive reuse should include improvement in the material and resource efficiency (environmental sustainability), cost reductions (economic sustainability) and retention (social sustainability) [27]. Adaptive reuse also needs to conserve the heritage value of prestigious, monumental or historical significant values of buildings [23]. The practical outcome of adaptive reuse and the conceptual values of conservation support the reuse of heritage buildings as a sustainability strategy [28, 22 and 29].

Adaptive reuse not only involves the preservation and restoration but also conservation [30] that aims to safeguard the quality of values of the resources [31]. Conservation and preservation share a concern about adaptive reuse. While conservation is associated with the protection of material, historical and design integrity of historic buildings through carefully planned interventions, preservation refers to the set of activities aimed to prolong the usable life of historic properties with little changes to the

original state [32, 33]. The preservation often talks about “value” of historic properties: the social values, the cultural values, aesthetic values, urban context value, architectural value, historic value, and the value of a sense of place. But one of the strongest arguments for preservation ought to be that; a historic building has multiple layers of values to its community [34]. The desire to preserve must ultimately be a rational economic and commercial choice and not just a consequence of legal and land use planning controls [31]. Historic buildings are part of the real estate market (economically) and as such they need to be left alone to adjust their prices to profitability in a free market economy; such argument ignores the social needs of the community and positive externalities from historic preservation [35].

Even in fast developing countries like Malaysia, many historic buildings have not been well conserved, thus most of them are in poor condition [36]. Likewise in developing countries like Tanzania most historic buildings are in poor condition and others are beyond repairs [12, 30]. To address the problem adaptive reuse is seen as an important strategy to reduce demolition waste and extend the useful life of the building, encourage reuse of the embodied energy and also provide significant environmental, social and economic benefit to the community [37]. The study by [38] indicates that indeed adaptive reuse is slow in developing countries but can offer economic, social and cultural benefits to their environment and is one approach to sustainability.

It is the fact that adaptation is affected by owners’ more interests in economic values more than social values [39]. The owners of historic buildings, mostly demand for economically viable adaptation to gain more return on investment for adaptive reuse of historic buildings [40, 41]. The owners and developers need to change their mind when making decisions because adaptive reuse can be used as a strategy to achieve both economic values and social values to the community, even though the process can be costly expensive for developers and owners due to heritage and conservation requirements [4, 9 and 22].

Adaptive reuse helps to conserve the architectural, social, cultural and historic values [2]. Historic buildings have an important role to play in stimulating economic growth supporting local communities and accounting for social values [42]. The sense of the past and promotion of the harmony of individual and social life in the areas concerned are realized by conservation [43]. Adaptation of historic value will help to improve both cultural and economic values associated with cultural heritage [44].

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data presented in this paper were collected using a survey research designed to allow

respondents to express their own understanding of the impact of adaptive reuse of historic buildings on promoting different values attached to historic buildings especially social values. The questions were open ended revolving around the process of adaptive reuse to promote values of historic buildings i.e. social values, cultural values and economic values. Thereafter the responses were classified on a five level “categorical” scale based on interpretative approach. Indeed the values were categorized to be on a “Likert” scale, in such a way that the values attached to them were so different to reflect a continuum of the same phenomenon. Table 1 explains the codification of survey responses from individual.

Table 1: Codification of Survey Responses

| S/No. | Interpretative Code | Responses | | |
|-------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | | Social Values | Economic Values | Cultural Values |
| 1. | Very Bad | Social interaction, attitudes, behaviours, technical knowledge (skills) | Use: space value, aesthetic value, environmental value, tourism, architectural value Non use: Historic legacy, uniqueness value | Cultural beliefs, stories, customs, intergeneration values |
| 2. | Bad | Social interaction, attitudes, behaviours, technical skills | Space value, aesthetic value, architectural value, environmental value | Cultural beliefs, stories, customs, intergeneration values, |
| 3. | Normal | Social interaction, attitudes, behaviours, technical knowledge | space value, aesthetic value, architectural value uniqueness value | Cultural beliefs, stories, customs, intergeneration values, |
| 4. | Good | Social interaction, attitudes, behaviours, technical skills, actions | Space value, aesthetic value, environmental value, tourism, architectural value, uniqueness value | Cultural beliefs, stories, customs, intergeneration values, |
| 5. | Very Good | Social interaction, attitudes, behaviours, technical knowledge (skills) | space value, aesthetic value, architectural value, Historic legacy | Cultural beliefs, stories, customs, intergeneration values, |

IV. DATA COLLECTION

Data collected was mainly primary data collected directly from first hand experience. The data was collected from key players of adaptive reuse which are both investors and developers from both private owned and government owned, and individuals around those historic buildings with purposive

sampling technique to select the required responded to ensure objectivity of the study is made [45].

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Relative score algorithm and Pearson’s correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the degree of relationship among variables. Relative score

algorithm was used to determine which way of adaptive reuse is better than another way where the value with the highest score of 1 was considered the best on that way. Pearson’s correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between dependent variable and independent variables whereby +1 means strong relationship and -1 means weak relationship and 0 means there is no relation between adaptive reuse and that factor.

Relative score algorithm results encompassing ways of adaptive reuse which has an influence on different values associated with historic buildings are shown in Table 2. The best score is 1 representing the best way of adaptive reuse though generally the average mean of the relative score was calculated to show which values are best performed with the both ways of adaptive reuse. The scores under 1 have been below the relative score, but they also seem good in different ways among the three ways of adaptive reuse.

VI. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Table 2: Relative score algorithm; ways of adaptive reuse

| Adaptive reuse | Values | Values | Mean Score | Ranks | Relative score | Ranking | Overall Rank | Average mean |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|-------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| Preservation | Cultural Values | stories | 2.07 | 5 | 0.84 | 3 | 7 | 2.34 |
| Preservation | Cultural Values | symbolic value | 2.38 | 8 | 0.96 | 5 | 13 | |
| Preservation | Cultural Values | local meaning value | 2.57 | 13 | 1.04 | 7 | 19 | 2.59 |
| Conservation | Economic Values | Uniqueness value | 1.54 | 1 | 0.62 | 1 | 1 | |
| Restoration | Economic Values | aesthetic value | 1.92 | 3 | 0.78 | 1 | 1 | 2.42 |
| Preservation | Economic Values | integeneration value | 1.98 | 4 | 0.80 | 2 | 4 | |
| Preservation | Economic Values | architectural values | 2.14 | 6 | 0.87 | 4 | 10 | 2.42 |
| Restoration | Economic Values | tourism | 2.38 | 7 | 0.96 | 2 | 4 | |
| Conservation | Economic Values | Recreation | 2.43 | 9 | 0.98 | 2 | 4 | 2.42 |
| Preservation | Economic Values | historic legacy | 2.46 | 11 | 1.00 | 6 | 16 | |
| Conservation | Economic Values | aesthetic value | 2.48 | 12 | 1.00 | 3 | 7 | 2.42 |
| Restoration | Economic Values | space value | 2.84 | 16 | 1.15 | 4 | 10 | |
| Restoration | Economic Values | economic value | 2.87 | 17 | 1.16 | 5 | 13 | 2.42 |
| Preservation | Economic Values | Environmental value | 3.00 | 18 | 1.22 | 9 | 20 | |
| Preservation | Economic Values | Income level | 3.08 | 19 | 1.25 | 10 | 21 | 2.42 |
| Conservation | Economic Values | Environmental value | 3.16 | 20 | 1.28 | 5 | 13 | |
| Conservation | Economic Values | Income level | 3.23 | 21 | 1.31 | 6 | 16 | 2.42 |
| Restoration | Economic Values | Environmental value | 3.31 | 22 | 1.34 | 6 | 16 | |
| Preservation | social Values | customs | 1.84 | 2 | 0.74 | 1 | 1 | 2.42 |
| Restoration | social Values | Attitude | 2.46 | 10 | 1.00 | 3 | 7 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------|------|----|------|---|----|------|
| Conservation | social Values | Action | 2.66 | 14 | 1.08 | 4 | 10 | |
| Preservation | social Values | Attitude | 2.75 | 15 | 1.11 | | | 1.04 |
| | | | 2.47 | | | | | 0.94 |

Indeed, Table 2 results clearly explain the relationship between the values of historic buildings and ways of adaptive reuse. It seems that restoration is the best way among the other ways to promote one of the social value which is changing the attitude of the individual about the process of adaptive reuse through restoration of historic buildings, and conservation is the best way to promote one of economic value which is aesthetic value of the building to ensure that the building looks nearly as it was during the construction or appears better whereas preservation helps to protect the historic legacy of a building.

But coming to the overall performance of both ways to understand which values the adaptive reuse protects above the other ways, the average mean of relative score was calculated and then the comparison was made for both social values,

economic values and cultural values. For social value the average mean of a relative score was 2.42, the average mean of a relative score for economic values was 2.59 and the average mean of a relative score for cultural value became 2.34 which by interpretation, both ways promote social values above cultural value by an average mean of 1.04 but below economic value by 0.94. This indicates that the adaptive reuse ways help to promote social values in the society, though, according to the individual’s response it’s below economic values and above cultural value.

Correlation was calculated to show the relationship between adaptive reuse and historic building values on how key players (investors and developers) of adaptive reuse are mostly interested in adaptive reuse and understand which values are mostly important to them as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Definition of variables.

| Variable | Description of variables |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Adaptive Reuse | Adaptive reuse |
| A.V | Aesthetic value |
| Unique | Uniqueness value |
| Inco.V | Income level |
| So.I(actions) | Social interaction |
| Envi.Value | Environmental Value |
| Recre.va | Recreation value |
| Eco.V | Economic value |
| Tourism.A | Tourism attraction value |
| Space.V | Space value |
| Attitude | Attitude |
| Symbolic | Symbolic value |
| Stories | Stories value |
| Historic.L | Historic Legacy value |
| Loc.Meang | Local meaning |
| Intege.V | Intergeneration value |
| Customs | Customs |
| ARC | Architectural value |

Table 4 shows that the correlation between the values range from -1 to +1 whereby -1 is perfectly

negative linear relation and + 1 is perfectly positive linear relation and 0 means there is no linear

relation. However, upon computation most values exhibited both positive and negative linear relationships with adaptive reuse. The Table 4 shows that adaptive reuse has a strong positive relation in promoting economic value by 0.88 and also has a strong positive relation with aesthetic value by 0.63. Social interaction has a strong positive relation to adaptive reuse where most ways of adaptive reuse help in promoting social interactions and highly positive correlation with attitude by 0.85. However, it seems to have a low negative relation with recreation value and tourism

attraction by -0.08 and -0.10 respectively. Other values also have negative correlation which are as follows: symbolic (-0.10), stories (-0.09) historic legacy (-0.06) and customs (-0.02). Key players of adaptive reuse are mostly likely to be involved in adaptive reuse because it's likely to promote social values in the society which is mostly important because as the society accepts the activity and also helps to promote social values, many individuals will be interested to accept the activity and this will increase their profit.

Table 4: Relationship between adaptive reuse of historic buildings and values associated with historic buildings

| Adaptive Reuse | A.V | Unique | Inco.V | So.(actions) | Envi.Value | Recre.va | Eco.V | Tourism.A | Space.V | Attitude | Symbolic | Stories | Historic.L | Loc.Meang | Intege.V | Customs | ARC | |
|----------------|-------|--------|--------|--------------|------------|----------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|---------|------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------|------|
| Adaptive Reuse | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A.V | 0.63 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unique | -0.22 | -0.10 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inco.V | 0.17 | -0.09 | -0.10 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| So.(actions) | 0.65 | -0.04 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Envi.Value | 0.42 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recre.va | -0.08 | 0.03 | 0.61 | -0.12 | 0.21 | 0.28 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eco.V | 0.88 | -0.14 | -0.12 | 0.57 | -0.06 | 0.18 | -0.10 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tourism.A | -0.10 | 0.00 | 0.25 | -0.03 | 0.45 | 0.09 | 0.06 | -0.12 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Space.V | 0.27 | -0.06 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Attitude | 0.85 | 0.10 | 0.23 | -0.05 | 0.88 | 0.20 | 0.24 | -0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Symbolic | -0.10 | 0.19 | 0.03 | -0.12 | -0.07 | 0.09 | 0.16 | -0.15 | 0.09 | -0.10 | 0.18 | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Stories | -0.09 | -0.13 | -0.08 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.00 | -0.20 | -0.11 | 0.09 | -0.11 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Historic.L | -0.06 | -0.04 | 0.10 | -0.06 | -0.16 | -0.06 | 0.02 | -0.14 | -0.14 | -0.28 | -0.08 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Loc.Meang | 0.04 | 0.17 | -0.29 | -0.24 | 0.03 | 0.00 | -0.11 | -0.20 | 0.08 | -0.08 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | -0.11 | 1.00 | | | |
| Intege.V | 0.80 | 0.17 | -0.32 | -0.16 | -0.04 | 0.02 | -0.20 | -0.05 | -0.08 | -0.16 | -0.08 | 0.06 | 0.12 | -0.08 | 0.47 | 1.00 | | |
| Customs | -0.02 | 0.14 | -0.13 | -0.09 | -0.17 | 0.05 | -0.10 | 0.00 | -0.14 | -0.19 | 0.05 | 0.24 | -0.08 | 0.10 | -0.02 | 0.31 | 1.00 | |
| ARC | 0.22 | -0.08 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.40 | 0.22 | -0.11 | 0.29 | 0.37 | 0.68 | 0.07 | -0.20 | 0.14 | -0.33 | 0.01 | -0.05 | -0.12 | 1.00 |

Significance of adaptive reuse to promote values of historic building

The study has indicated that adaptive reuse is an effective strategy to influence many values in the society through different ways. Although the process of adaptive reuse influences a myriad of social values, individuals in the society have shown the impact addressed by adaptive reuse as follows (Table 5).

Social interaction

Most survey respondents (49 percent) showed that complete restoration to adaptive reuse is a very

good way to increase the social interaction in the society because individuals living near the historic buildings interact together through works associated with adaptive reuse. On the other hand only 7 percent of respondents did not agree, and believed that adaptive reuse is the worst strategy. Furthermore, most respondents expressed sincere appreciation to the government that decided in 2010 to restore old market and gave it to individuals to work at that place for their artistic activities; the move that increased the social interaction among the individuals working there and those living around the market.

Attitude

Individuals in the society believed that the process of adaptive reuse has changed their attitude over historic buildings, whereby most of the buildings were left without development and ended up in bad condition beyond repair. For example, Old Boma and Old Market were once believed to belong to the government and not for the purpose of the community, but only after the restoration of these buildings the individuals' attitudes changed and believed that these buildings can help the society through many ways by providing employment opportunities like the case in point of old market. This change of views was supported by 51 percent of the respondents who agreed that adaptation is a better method and only 7 percent explained is a bad method to promote social values because a few number of people are involved in the exercise.

Customs

Majority of people living in the area believed that, though adaptive reuse is not a very good method to change the customs of individual, but believed it is a good method to conserve historic buildings. Only 30 percent of the respondents believed adaptive reuse to be a very good method to promote customs, 56 percent agreed that it is a good method to promote customs and only 5 percent said it is the bad method to promote customs and none said it is a very bad method and this shows that adaptive reuse has an impact on promoting customs in the society though not in a very good way but in a good way anyway.

Economic values

These comprise both use and non-use values. Non-use values are the values individuals are willing to pay to obtain them though they might also benefit indirectly rather than directly [46]. These are values which are kept for the future generation where the use of today will not compromise the use of future generation [47]. The respondents had an opportunity to rate the significance of adaptive reuse on both use and non-use economic values as explained below:

Aesthetic values

This is part of economic value found in non-use values whereby many respondents in the field agreed that adaptive reuse has an impact on aesthetic value. 39 percent agreed that adaptive reuse is a good method to promote aesthetic value and only 10 percent of the respondents explained it as a bad method.

Respondents confirmed that the level of tourism has been increasing day by day and most of them gave the reason that the historic buildings are adaptively reused through different ways, such as restoration, preservation and conservation. 48 percent of the respondents agreed that the process of adaptive reuse has shown the significance of increase of tourists in the district of Bagamoyo and only 7 percent said it is a bad strategy.

Space value

Space value is the value given to the buildings after the process of adaptive reuse, whereby, according to respondents buildings which have been given space value for other activities in the case study area are Arabic tea house which is used as offices for the municipally and acts as a department of education in Bagamoyo district, Old Post Office which is now a Millennium Hotel, Old Market used as a market of arts, Mwambao primary school used as a primary school, Old Fort used as an office for management of all historic buildings, and Caravan Serai used as an office of antiquity department. 25 percent of respondents agreed adaptive reuse is a good approach to promote space value, 20 percent of them said is a bad strategy because most of the space provided is not of benefit to the individuals, except in few cases like Old Market building and Mwambao primary school which have positively benefited them. Many respondents suggested that citizens need to be given chance to invest in those buildings to promote social values instead of non-indigenous developers and investors who are only interested in making profits.

Environmental value

The environment around the historic buildings which undergo adaptive reuse benefits individuals through reduction of waste and reuse of materials. 38 percent of respondents believe that environment value has increased, and is in very good state, but

26 percent of them said adaptive reuse doesn't promote environment value. The case in point is of people working in Old Market building who explained that the environments are in very bad condition, because of absence of social services like toilets in the place and very poor infrastructure. Likewise, the environment condition around Old Boma is very poor because the building has been put at risk through neglect for a long time without any improvement.

Recreation purpose (non-use value)

The recreation purpose is one of the non-use values, whereby individuals are willing to pay to enjoy the view and visiting these historic buildings after adaptive reuse. Many respondents explained that they are mostly interested to visit these historic buildings after adaptive reuse. 43 percent of the respondents expressed their attraction to adaptive re-use of historic buildings like the Old Boma which is under renovation and once finished it will be the best building in Bagamoyo and majority will be attracted to visit it.

Income level

Appropriate adaptive reuse of historic building can result in generation of income. However 33 percent of the respondents believe that adaptive reuse is a very bad method in promoting income level because most of the buildings that undergo adaptive reuse do not save the individuals in the society, but rather benefit the developers and investors, together with the government. Only 32 percent of the respondents believe it's the very good method to increase their income.

Cultural values

These are values which are passed from one generation to another generation and are preserved and kept in the society; these are explained below.

Symbolic value

Many historic buildings in Bagamoyo feature a variety of symbols mostly displayed in various

forms of carving on doors and windows representing the skills and wisdom of the traditional craftsmen. Many respondents in the region of 41 percent believe that the adaptive reuse is the very good method to protect these symbols and only 7 percent of the respondents say it's the bad strategy. A particular building cited by many respondents is Caravan Serai which is meticulously conserved with historic symbols that remain as the legacy and history of the slave trade.

Historic legacy value (option value)

Adaptive reuse of historic buildings can help buildings create a distinct historic legacy, identity and character. Many respondents in Bagamoyo believe that if the historic buildings are kept in good condition they will remain a legacy to the coming generation and will be reminders of different stages of life experience they have passed through. 41 percent of the respondents believed adaptive reuse is the best strategy to promote historic legacy value and only 5 percent of the respondents believe that it is the bad strategy.

Intergeneration value

52 percent of the respondents explained that adaptive reuse is a good method, but is not a very good method because they believe that the buildings will continue to decay and in the future there will be no building left. Only 3 percent of respondents said adaptive reuse is not a good method to preserve the value.

Architectural value

Architectural value refers to the look, feel and functionality of the design of the building. 42% of the respondents agreed that adaptive reuse is the very good and good method to promote architectural design, style and material and none of the respondents said it is the bad process and this is due to the reason that historic buildings have remained for so long in the way they were left by the colonies in terms of design, style and material.

Table 5. Summary of significance of Adaptive reuse of historic buildings on values.

| VALUES | TOTAL | Very Good(%) | Good (%) | Normal (%) | Bad (%) | Very Bad (%) | TOTAL | Total Weight Score | Relative Importance Index(RII) | Rank |
|-----------------------|-------|--------------|----------|------------|---------|--------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| Attitude | 59 | 51% (30) | 10% (6) | 25% (15) | 7% (4) | 7% (4) | 100% | 235 | 0.7966 | 6 |
| Customs | 61 | 30% (18) | 56% (34) | 10% (6) | 5% (3) | 0% (0) | 100% | 250 | 0.8197 | 3 |
| Social interaction | 61 | 49% (30) | 20% (12) | 16% (10) | 8% (5) | 7% (4) | 100% | 242 | 0.7934 | 7 |
| Aesthetic value | 61 | 11% (7) | 39% (24) | 39% (24) | 10% (6) | 0% (0) | 100% | 215 | 0.7049 | 11 |
| Tourist Attraction | 61 | 48% (29) | 33% (20) | 11% (7) | 2% (1) | 7% (4) | 100% | 252 | 0.8262 | 2 |
| Space value | 61 | 23% (14) | 25% (15) | 20% (12) | 13% (8) | 20% (12) | 100% | 194 | 0.6361 | 14 |
| Uniqueness value | 61 | 11% (7) | 57% (35) | 31% (19) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 100% | 232 | 0.7607 | 10 |
| Environmental value | 61 | 38% (23) | 13% (8) | 16% (10) | 7% (4) | 26% (16) | 100% | 201 | 0.6590 | 12 |
| Recreation purpose | 61 | 43% (26) | 33% (20) | 11% (7) | 7% (4) | 7% (4) | 100% | 243 | 0.7967 | 5 |
| Symbolic value | 61 | 41% (25) | 26% (16) | 25% (15) | 2% (1) | 7% (4) | 100% | 240 | 0.7869 | 8 |
| Historic legacy | 61 | 41% (25) | 30% (18) | 15% (9) | 10% (6) | 5% (3) | 100% | 239 | 0.7836 | 9 |
| Intergeneration value | 60 | 30% (18) | 52% (31) | 10% (6) | 5% (3) | 3% (2) | 100% | 240 | 0.8000 | 4 |
| Income level | 60 | 32% (19) | 23% (14) | 12% (7) | 0% (0) | 33% (20) | 100% | 192 | 0.6400 | 13 |
| Architectural value | 59 | 42% (25) | 42% (25) | 8% (5) | 7% (4) | 0% (0) | 100% | 248 | 0.8407 | 1 |

VII. CONCLUSION

This explanatory study has managed to reveal valuable findings that are important to the key players of adaptive reuse which are investors and developers with more values to consider during making decision about adaptive reuse of historic buildings and how individuals in the society respond to the changes. The study finds that, if done properly, adaptive reuse of historic buildings can have a significant positive impact on the economic socio-cultural, and economic, values. The values which are mostly important to the individual about adaptive reuse are those that they help to promote social interaction among the society, change attitude, improve lifestyle, increase tourism attraction, increase aesthetic values as well as

architectural values. The adaptive reuse of historic buildings, however, requires a fundamental shift in how people in the local communities are tacitly involved in creative acts of adaptation.

VIII. REFERENCES

[1] RICS, 2009. *Historic building conservation*. UK: The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
 [2] Latham, D., 2000. Creative Re-Use: Working with the Building. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 5(2), pp. 7-23
 [3] Ball, R., 1999. Developers, regeneration and sustainability issues in the reuse of Vacant buildings. *Building Research and Information*, pp. 140-148.
 [4] Kohlear, N. & Hassler, U., 2002. The Building stock as a Research Asset. *Building Research and Information*, 30(4), pp. 226-236.

- [5] Douglas, J., 2006. *Building Adoption*. UK: Oxford, Elsevier Ltd
- [6] Bullen, P A (2004) Sustainable adaptive reuse of the existing building stock in Western Australia. In: Khosrowshahi, F (Ed.), *20th Annual ARCOM Conference*, 1-3 September 2004, Heriot Watt University. Association of Researchers in Construction Management, Vol. 2, 1387-97.
- [7] Carassus, J., 2004. *The Construction Sector System: An International Framework*, Netherlands: International Council for Research and Innovation in Building and Construction CIB
- [8] Bullen, P. A. & Love, P. E. D., 2011. Adaptive reuse of Heritage buildings. *Article in structural Survey*, 29(5), pp. 411-421.
- [9] Bullen, P. A. & Love, P. E., 2010. The rhetoric of adoptive reuse or reality of demolition: Views from the field. *Cities*, 27(4), pp. 215-224.
- [10] Perris, C. (2013). A "sustainable" adaptive reuse of old buildings to implement Social Housing. *Scientific Conference 2013*,
- [11] Shipley, R., Steve, U. & Parsons, M., 2006. Does Adaptive Reuse Pay? A Study of the Business of Building Renovation in Ontario, Canada. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* , pp. 505-520
- [12] Lucian, C., 2014. Engineering Properties of Building Materials In Historic Buildings in Bagamoyo (Tanzania). *International Journal of Engineering and Innovative technology (IJEIT)*, p. 15.
- [13] Lucian, C., 2010. Conservation and Maintainance of the Old Boma Building in Bagamoyo. *Conservation and Management of Historic Buildings*, pp. 1-16
- [14] Lucian, C. & Samwel, A., 2013. Tracing Sources of indigenous Knowledge on Building elements of Historic Structural. *International Journal for Management Science and Technology (IJMST)*, pp. 1-13
- [15] Bullen, P. A., 2007. Adaptive reuse and sustainability of commercial buildings. *Emerald Insight*, 25(1/2), pp. 20-31.
- [16] Dyson, K., Matthews, J. & Love, P. E., 2016. Critical success factors of adapting heritage buildings: an exploratory study. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management* , 6(1), pp. 44-57
- [17] Wilkinson, S.Reed, R., and Kimberley, J. (2009). "Using building adaptive reuse to deliver sustainability in Australia". *Structural Survey*, 27(1), pp. 46-61
- [18] Nasser, N., 2003. Planning for urban heritage places: reconciling conservation, tourism, and sustainable development. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 17(4), pp. 467-479.
- [19] Langston, C., Wong, F., Hui, E. & Shen, L., 2008. Strategic assessment of building adaptive reuse opportunities in Hong Kong. *Building and Environment*, 43(10), pp. 1709-1718
- [20] Wood, B. & Muncaster, M., 2012. Adapting from glorious past to uncertain future. *Structural Survey*, 30(3), pp. 219-231.
- [21] Thaler, M., 2012. Adaptive reuse of historic buildings makes economic sense. *Albany Business Review*
- [22] Bullen, P. & Love, P., 2011 a. A new future for the past: A model for adaptive reuse decision-making. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 1(1), pp. 32-44.
- [23] Bromley, R., Tallon, A. & Thomas, C., 2005. City centre regenerations through residential development: Contributing to Sustainability. *Urban Studies*, 42(13), pp. 407-427
- [24] Holyvake, K. & Watt, D., 2002. The sustainable reuse of historic urban Industrial buildings: Intern result and discussion.
- [25] Department of the Environment and Heritage, 2004. *Adaptive Reuse:Preserving our past, building our future*. Australia: Commonwealth of Australia
- [26] Stubbs, Michael, 2004. "Heritage-Sustainability: Developing a Methodology for the Sustainable Appraisal of the Historic Environment." *Planning, Practice and Research* 19:3, pp. 285-305
- [27] Cooper, I. (2001). "Post-occupancy evaluation-where are you"? *Building Research and Information*, 29(2), pp.158-163
- [28] Hamer, D., 2000. Learning from past: Historic districts and the new urbanism in the United states. *Planning Perspectives*, 15(2), pp. 107-122.
- [29] Conejos, S., Langston, C. and Smith, J. (2011) "Improving the implementation of adaptive reuse strategies for historic buildings" *Le Vie dei Mercanti S.A.V.E. HERITAGE: Safeguard of Architectural, Visual, Environmental Heritage*. Naples, Italy
- [30] Kigadye, F. S., 2011. Adaptive Reuse of Historic Building and Community Development. *ICOMOS*, pp. 412-414
- [31] Feilden, M. F., 2008. *Conservation of Historic buildings*,. 3rd ed. s.l.: Elsevier Ltd .
- [32] Rypkema, D. 1992. Rethinking economic values, In: A.J. Lee. ed. *Past Meets Future: Saving America's Historic Environment*, Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation/The Preservation Press, pp. 205-212
- [33] Rypkema, D. 2008. Heritage conservation and the local economy. *Global urban development*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1-8
- [34] Tiesdell, S., Oc, T. & Heath, T., 1996. *Revitalizing Historic buildings*. London: Butterworth and Co. Ltd
- [35] Romero, A. m., 2004. The positive externalities of historic district designation. *The park Place economist*, Volume XII
- [36] Ahmad, G.A. (2009). *Urban Conservation in Malaysia, Safeguarding Cultural Heritage*. Available at www.hbp.usm.my/conservation Accessed on 15th May, 2018.

- [37] Yung, E. & Chan, E., 2012. Implementation challenges to the adaptive reuse of heritage buildings: Towards the goals of sustainable,. *Low carbon cities Habitat International*, 36(3), pp. 352-361
- [38] Enache, M., 2014. *Branding the Danish City is Adaptive Reuse an option?*. Denmark: Aalborg University
- [39] Swallow, P., 1997. "Managing unoccupied buildings and sites. *Structural Survey*, 15(2), pp. 74-79
- [40] Arge, K., 2005. Adaptable office buildings: Theory and practice. *In Facilities*, 3(4), pp. 119-127 .
- [41] Ijla, A. and Broström, T. (2015). The Sustainable Viability of Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings: the experiences of Two World Heritage Old Cities; Bethlehem in Palestine and Visby in Sweden. *International Invention Journal of Arts and Social Sciences* (ISSN: 2408-7238) Vol. 2(4) pp. 52-66.
- [42] English Heritage, 2006. *The use of historic buildings in regeneration; A toolkit of good practice..* London: English Heritage, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors & British Property Federation.
- [43] Harun, N. Z., 2007. Problems Involved in the Conservation of Historic Settlements in Malaysia: Case Study of Kuala Selangor. *Journal Alam Bina, Jilid*, 9(3), pp. 79-88
- [44] Gražulevičiūtė, I. (2006). Cultural Heritage in the Context of Sustainable Development. *Environmental research, engineering and management*, No.3(37), pp.74-79
- [45] Kumar, R., 2011. *Research Methodology:A Step-By-Step Guide for beginners*. New Dehli: Sage.
- [46] Mason, R., 2005. *Economics and Historic preservation: A guide and Review of the Literature*. University of Pennsylvania: Brookings Institute Metropolitan Policy Program
- [47] Huxley, M., 2010. *Value Added: The economic and social contribution of cultural facilities and activities in Central NSW* , Australia : Museums & Galleries NSW.