



Group Value in the Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings: Case Studies from Merchant City, Glasgow

Xiaohan Lu

To cite this article: Xiaohan Lu (01 May 2025): Group Value in the Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings: Case Studies from Merchant City, Glasgow, The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice, DOI: [10.1080/17567505.2025.2492928](https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2025.2492928)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2025.2492928>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 01 May 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Group Value in the Adaptive Reuse of Historic Buildings: Case Studies from Merchant City, Glasgow

Xiaohan Lu

Mackintosh School of Architecture, Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow, UK

ABSTRACT

Several properties in the Merchant City are not qualified as listed buildings but are designated shortly after restoration. This controversial phenomenon reflects legislation issues of listed buildings on the one hand and restoration issues with built heritage on the other. An investigation incorporating the review of existing preservation policies, archival research, and detailed case studies, complemented by on-site inspections, has led to the identification of a key concept: 'Group Value.' Researchers notice the growing limitation of the listed system or preservation policies, yet few have analysed this phenomenon in specific cases with historical context. This paper will elaborate on the formation of the concept of 'group value' and provide a theoretical lens for understanding the crisis and opportunities of 'group value' in the adaptation of historic buildings.

KEYWORDS

Group value; listed building; preservation policies; urban conservation; adaptive reuse

Introduction

Group value as a criterion for listed building designation could be found in the England official document.

The extent to which the exterior of the building contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part, generally known as group value. The Secretary of State will take this into account particularly where buildings comprise an important architectural or historic unity or a fine example of planning (e.g. squares, terraces or model villages) or where there is a historical functional relationship between the buildings. Sometimes group value will be achieved through a co-location of diverse buildings of different types and dates.¹

The relevant regulation in Scotland appears in the primary legislation for architectural preservation, Planning (Listing Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, with an indirect explanation.

In considering whether to include a building in a list compiled or approved under this section, [F2Historic Environment Scotland] may take into account not only the building itself but also —(a)any respect in which its exterior contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part.²

CONTACT Xiaohan Lu  X.Lu2@student.gsa.ac.uk

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

The designation of listed buildings adheres to a central principle that considers the surroundings of historical buildings as integral components of heritage.³ This notion is not only reflected in Scotland's preservation policies but also deeply interwoven with the conservation movement and urban planning theory across European countries. The term 'group value' is commonly regarded as an essential 'code' within the mechanism of listed building consent administered by planning authorities. This term is integral in assessing the collective significance of buildings that contribute to the historical or architectural character of an area. While planning authorities use this term operationally, this paper also aims to evaluate the relevance and application of this value in contemporary society from an academic perspective. Furthermore, the terminology encapsulates practical issues in conservation-related urban planning that need addressing, such as the balance between preserving historical integrity and accommodating modern urban needs.

This research adopts an integrated approach, utilising both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, to investigate the notion of group value. It elucidates the theoretical underpinnings of this concept, situating them within the broader context of historical developments. The study further illustrates these principles through an in-depth case study analysis. The selection of Ingram Square and the Italian Centre satisfied all the criteria that express how the physical restoration is attached to group value and embodies the paradoxical situation of the notion.⁴ Both sites situated in the historical core of Glasgow, inherit the topographical legacy of the industrial era while integrating new developments through regeneration initiatives dating back to the 1980s. This investigation examines the relationships that exist between inner-city revitalisation, the adaptation of urban built heritage, and the critique of heritage values within contemporary conservation policies. Ultimately, the paper seeks to advance the discourse on group value by exploring the challenges and opportunities this concept presents for urban development and the conservation of built heritage, thereby extending the theory of built heritage adaptation.

Historical Background and Architectural Conservation Movement

Figuratively, group value represents a 'by-product' that has emerged from the historic confrontation within the architectural conservation movement. This movement has a storied history that can be traced back to its early motivations, centred around preserving individual buildings with significant architectural or historical importance.⁵ The field expanded in two primary directions as it developed. Firstly, the movement extended its reach vertically, shifting from basic preservation to encompassing the intrinsic qualities of heritage. This broader scope emphasises maintaining not only the structural integrity but also the historical transformations, original layers, and any elements that convey the building's ongoing narrative, thereby preserving its complete historical essence. Secondly, the movement also expanded horizontally, broadening the concept and boundaries of heritage itself. Early efforts in architectural conservation focused on individual buildings of specific historical or architectural merit. Over time, this focus expanded to include broader cultural landscapes and complexes, adopting a more inclusive perspective of heritage that extends beyond isolated structures.

Historically, architectural conservation debates and practices before the 20th century were primarily concerned with individual buildings, relying heavily on archaeological and

architectural expertise. The shift towards what is now known as ‘scientific restoration’ introduced a more methodological and interdisciplinary approach, moving away from a binary view of preservation versus destruction towards a scientifically informed methodology.⁶ The divergence of the conservation movement beyond the Villoet stylistic restoration and Ruskin-Morris conservation starts interweaving with other disciplines, such as urban planning theory, modern architecture movement, etc.⁷ This interdisciplinary engagement results in a shift of paradigms as one domain interacts with another. When planning-based conservation ideas conflict with the authenticity of individual built heritage conservation, a paradoxical situation involving the concept of group value arises.

Values in Heritage Management

Before discussing cases that illustrate the concept of group value, it is essential to acknowledge the theoretical advancements that have shaped this notion. Foremost among these is the systematic evaluation of monuments’ values by Alois Riegl, particularly in his seminal conservation text, ‘The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin’ (1903).⁸ The insight of this context is he combed through the criteria of heritage values and introduced the monument’s value in the present-day (*Gegenwartswerte*) vision. He advocated for an interpretation of monuments not only based on objective heritage criteria but also through the perceptions of contemporary observers. This approach redefined heritage terminology and influenced the methodologies of heritage restoration, particularly in how values are assessed under diverse circumstances.

Group value is not a term explicitly used by Alois Riegl nor is it included in any of his texts from that period. Accordingly, group value represents a distinct category within Alois Riegl’s framework of heritage values. It neither aligns with the recollection values (age value, historical value, and intended commemorative value) nor the present-day values (use value, art value, newness value, and relative art value). Instead, group value integrates the concept of static value within dynamic physical interventions, characteristically reflecting a postmodern approach linked with legislative management in heritage conservation.

However, Riegl did explore the interrelationships between individual parts and the collective whole, which are crucial in determining the heritage value of an area. In the same year that he published his seminal work on heritage value, Riegl’s recommendations for the conservation of Diocletian’s Palace in Split on the Dalmatian coast illustrate this approach.⁹ His analysis assessed the contributions of individual buildings to the overarching value of the site, taking into account a broad spectrum of heritage values. Notably, Riegl supported the demolition of certain buildings that represented only ‘age value,’ highlighting his readiness to prioritise the collective significance over individual components. This aspect of Riegl’s work reflects a form of comparative thinking integral to heritage value assessments.

From a contemporary societal view, Gibson and Pendlebury’s interpretation of built heritage value further emphasises its relative nature. They contend that value is not intrinsic to the fabric, object, or environment itself; instead, these entities are imbued with meanings that are culturally and historically specific, with such significances being externally imposed. Consequently, the attributed value is dependent on the prevailing value frameworks that are characteristic of the specific time and place.¹⁰ Therefore, the

concept of group value emerges from the evaluation of the interrelationships among multiple values of individual historic buildings within a group, considered within a contemporary context. It should be noted that while it is essential to formulate contemporary values concerning the historic environment, this does not necessitate compromising the ethics of preserving values related to historicity.

International Charters and National Heritage Concept

Alois Riegl's essay was primarily motivated by his desire to articulate strategies for managing the ever-growing antiquities after he was appointed to the Austrian Monuments Commission.¹¹ The value system proposed by Riegl significantly influenced the legislative framework, promoting the concept of universal heritage value. This idea was synchronously integrated into international preservation policies, which increasingly focused on expanding the boundaries of heritage conservation, thereby facilitating the development of group value. For instance, the Athens Charter¹² of 1931 advocated for the restoration of historic monuments to include their surroundings; this concept was further elaborated and expanded by the Venice Charter of 1964.

The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event.¹³

The expansion and unification of built heritage boundaries have drawn critiques from scholars, touching on issues from material authenticity to agency, politics, and ethics. Miles Glendinning notes that the concept of national heritage spreads in individual properties and influences the assessment of the relativity of heritage values by national authorities.¹⁴ Critically, ossification tends to occur when value systems rigidify into legislative guidelines or management methodologies. Much of the criticism directed at value-based legislation points to inherent limitations, particularly the subjectivity of stakeholders and potential biases within the managing authorities tasked with evaluation.¹⁵ Although economic and social values are widely recognised as benefits of built heritage, the prevailing approach and decision-making process from various sectors often subsumes built heritage within cultural heritage without sufficiently addressing the material conditions in terms of sustainable lifespan. This method results in distinctive patterns in conservation or adaptation processes, where structures are often modified, become obsolete, and ultimately remain preserved in a state of arrested decay.¹⁶

The expansion of protection also raises the question of which parts or spaces truly qualify as 'heritage.' This issue related to heritage authenticity has been further explored in international heritage documents. The NARA Document on Authenticity, which builds upon the Venice Charter, asserted a form of cultural relativism. This document extends the criteria for assessing heritage authenticity to include technique, location, spirit, and tradition, thus moving beyond the earlier charter's focus primarily on materiality.¹⁷ The document proposed the concept of 'progressive authenticities', suggesting that the historical modifications that sites undergo over time can be considered authentic. As David Lowenthal noted, 'Authenticity is in practice never absolute, always relative.'¹⁸ Put another way, the dynamic processes that are taking place in places of built heritage pose a challenge to the conventional definitions and standards of authenticity.

Legislative Approaches of Group Value in Glasgow

The development of group value legislation in Glasgow has progressively been shaped by strengthening national policies on built heritage preservation. Beyond the initial listing system, the 1967 Civic Amenities Act introduced the concept of conservation areas, defined as ‘areas of special architectural or historical interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.’¹⁹ This policy evolution signifies a shift from a focus on individual monuments to a broader, planning-based approach to conservation, aiming to manage changes strategically at the master plan level. However, the implementation of this preservation framework has attracted criticism for eliciting confrontational viewpoints and lacking practical ‘user-friendliness.’²⁰

Group value emerges as a practical response to the escalating crisis in values amidst the rapid expansion of the urban fabric requiring preservation. This concept transitions from focusing solely on individual buildings to encompassing adjacent spaces, from groups of historic buildings to entire urban blocks or inner city areas. The aim is to legitimise buildings that may lack individual historical or aesthetic value but are crucial due to their contributions to a significant historical environment or because they represent unique memories, specific architectural styles, or historical narratives, thereby supporting the integrative protection of the entire historic environment. Hence, from the conservation-based planning aspect, group value bridges the gap between the rationalisation of conservation and the conceptualisation of place.

Planning-Based Conservation and Conservation-Based Planning, Assemblage Theory

Whether planning-based conservation or conservation-based planning, both could be summarised in the assemblage theory, which gathers various dimensions of the assemblage with the materiality of buildings and places that constitute the practice of conservation planning.²¹ Pendlebury pointed out the conservation-planning assemblage seeks to establish value-based and dynamic norms that remain flexible in dealing with heritage conservation. The idea represented the status of built heritage in the current agenda of urban development and articulated the theoretical foundation of preservation policy in the United Kingdom. Still, within the assemblage conservation theory, protecting integrity beyond individual buildings while considering the impact of external factors often clashes with the foundational goal of preserving heritage authenticity.

Group values here serve as a cohesive force within this assemblage perspective, enhancing the unity of heritage preservation and fostering intangible connections among objects. Nonetheless, the concept of group value raises critical issues regarding ambiguity in the discourse on preservation and restoration. These theoretical uncertainties often manifest as stark paradoxes in built heritage practices. There is often a divergence between the conceptualisation of practices and their actual implementation, and the notion of value-based authenticity may not consistently align with value-based legislation. This misalignment is further exemplified by the differences between the signifier and the signified within the framework of group value.

Group Value in Heritage Conservation

Alongside legislative development, the selected cases also shared a contextual background. By the 1980s, Glasgow urgently needed to transform and re-conceptualise its former heavy industrial centre. This regeneration strategy aligns with the conservation-planning concept previously discussed. Drawing on experiences from earlier comprehensive redevelopments, transportation reorganisation, and slum clearance, revitalising the inner city became a pivotal aspect of urban regeneration. The physical renovation of Merchant City in the 1980s relied heavily on intervention by the public sector since the city (district) council owned nearly half of the vacant properties.²² The adaptive reuse of existing Victorian industrial heritage sites has been identified as a key strategy for the revitalisation of the area and the attraction of new residents. Within this framework, the contested concept of group value becomes apparent, influencing both the processes of restoration and the designation of buildings.

Ingram Square

Ingram Square is a typical case that could manifest the concept of group value. It stands out as one of the most significant regeneration projects within Merchant City, where the block-based transformation of historic warehouses demonstrates an innovative approach to adapting a collection of built heritage within the urban landscape. Additionally, this project represented the first instance of establishing a novel partnership model between the public sector (District Council, Scottish Development Agency) and the private sector.²³ The whole project was operated by Yarmadillo Ltd, a company established by Kantel Ltd, SDA (Scottish Development Agency) and District Council (City Council). The design part was taken by Elder & Cannon Architects, including both the restoration of existing structures and the addition of new buildings.

The site originally encompassed 14 structures, including three former warehouses and a department store, along with several vacant lots. Among these, the most notable is the Baronial-style Houndsditch warehouse, situated at the corner of Brunswick and Ingram Street (Figure 1). This building is a prominent landmark for the site, occupying nearly one-third of the block. The warehouse was designed by John Baird and Robert William Billings. John Baird was charged with the plan to rebuild behind the façade, and R.W. Billing was explicitly responsible for the facade.²⁴ Another significant feature is the warehouse on Brunswick Street (known as 104 Brunswick Street), also designed by R.W. Billings, which displays architectural details similar to the façade of the Houndsditch building.²⁵

The adaptation process was threefold: refurbishing the existing host structure, inserting new buildings enclosing the courtyard, and redeveloping the semi-public space. The construction process is organised into eight distinct phases, with each progressing independently.²⁷ In addition to adapting existing structures like the Houndsditch and Nova buildings, four new buildings designed by Elder & Cannon have been placed to fill gaps and enclose the block.²⁸ The reconstruction approaches the block as a unified whole, establishing new circulation paths and introducing a new courtyard within the existing block. This intervention not only integrates the new design vocabulary into the original site but also reconfigures the spatial relationships into a 'concentric ring' arrangement.



Figure 1. The façade was designed by Robert William Billings.²⁶



Figure 2. Private courtyard newly established for exclusive use by tenement residents.

This approach effectively opens up the previously enclosed inner block, creating more flexible pathways that improve airflow and lighting (Figure 2).

The tension between restoration and preservation manifests at each stage of the design process, creating a discontinuity between approaches that treat the site as an integrated block and those that aim to preserve the diverse values of individual historic

buildings. Observations from the site reveal that the architect deliberately distinguishes between the 'old' and 'new' through distinct choices in materials, forms, and tones. For instance, the grey-yellow bricks of new constructions are visually distinct from the dull red brick of the Nova building and the polished ashlar of historic warehouses (Figure 3). This delineation by the architect and planner establishes clear boundaries for each building's exterior, while the interiors are more connected through a reorganised layout and the arrangement of new semi-public spaces. Although the block-level restoration introduces beneficial new semi-public spaces and fosters closer relationships among individual buildings, it often comes at the cost of sacrificing layers of the past that merit careful preservation.

The restoration process from its inception embraced a vision of unification, aiming to elevate the diverse values of each building onto a common platform, despite the unique evidential, historical, aesthetic, and communal values inherent to each historic structure.²⁹ The intervention goes beyond simply establishing a physical connection among the individual historic buildings on the site; it also considers the unity of the site's historical significance and its overall development.

In this case, group value refers to the description of the interconnectedness among the multiple values of individual buildings following restoration, and further, it embodies the intangible impacts arising from the physical connections established on the site by designers or planners. It is noteworthy that the situation at Ingram Square markedly differs from that of palace complexes (such as Diocletian's Palace in Split) or other groups of buildings initially constructed with an intrinsic connection that extends beyond mere topographical settings.

The designation of buildings as listed within Ingram Square clearly highlights the impact of group value and reflects the city's conservation-planning vision. Almost all the buildings in Ingram Square are listed.³⁰ Besides two historical warehouses with Billing's facade being issued before the redevelopment in 1970, the rest were issued after or during the restoration.³¹ Moreover, except for the warehouses at the corner of Ingram and Candleriggs Street, which are in relatively poor condition, all other buildings fall under Category B, the same classification as the Billing warehouses. It may seem questionable that all these buildings on the site are assigned the same level of value. Nevertheless, this uniform listing highlights a strategic decision to preserve the block as



Figure 3. Newly constructed corner building attached with another Billing's façade.

an integrated whole. In this context, group value acts as a crucial factor that elevates buildings that might not individually qualify for listing.

Italian Centre

The adaptation of the Italian Centre is another representative case that illustrates the crisis and opportunities of the group value concept. The host structure was constructed between 1823 and 1840 to serve as warehouses, commercial and domestic buildings. [4] The building group was mainly around 3–4 stories with polished ashlar façades and remained consistent in classic style with richly detailed motifs, including bands, pilastered cornices, 4-pane glazing, pediments, etc (Figure 4). Half the side that faces Ingram Street was designed by William Brun, a highly regarded Scottish architect, marked as one of the leaders of Edinburgh neoclassicism.³² Before reunification, these properties were mainly owned by the City Council (Glasgow District Council). Similar to Ingram Square, the redevelopment of this project also represents the model in that the private sector cooperates with the public sector. The conversion is led by the development company-Classical House and financially supported by the Scottish Development Agency (SDA). Page & Park is appointed as architects in charge of the design part.

The most distinctive manipulation of this project is reforming the courtyard, the intervention referred to as subtraction, removing the partially existing host structure to open up the courtyard. The new courtyard is composed of three principal elements: firstly, a sunroom designed in a half-octagon shape, complemented by 'L'-shaped walkways affixed to the inner walls, which introduce additional complexity and enrich the semi-public characteristics of the space. Secondly, the incorporation of an exposed metal balcony structure, paired with textile-like installations on the freshly painted walls, adds a layer of textural interest. Lastly, an ensemble of sculptures and a strategically placed fountain with accompanying staircases create an interactive design that serves not only decorative and metaphorical purposes but also engages viewers and directs movement within the space (Figure 5). The



Figure 4. Refurbished façade with the sculptures on the roof.



Figure 5. Courtyard.

architectural additions are integrated with the preserved elements of the existing structure. Externally, the original textural details at the ground and upper levels have been removed, creating a clean, unified facade. Damaged architectural features, such as pediments, string courses, and window frames, have been replaced.³³ The renovated elevation harmonises with the preserved staircases and cross walls. The entire roof is newly built; one side is reformed with new elements to offer extra space, and the other is constructed with a new storey to balance the height's overall rhyme.³⁴

The assemblage approach is clearly present in this restoration, with significant changes to spatial identity. The group value is fully integrated into the original value system before being absorbed into the newly restored unit. As a result, there is uncertainty regarding the changes in historical, aesthetic, and other values as the project progresses. This integration process sacrifices the authentic connections between individual components and the overall structure. Specifically, the intervention makes it challenging to differentiate between the old and new elements. This difficulty is symptomatic of the blurred boundaries between historicity and modernity, which are manifested in both the spatial configurations and the material choices. The confrontation and discontinuity of interior and exterior are more dramatic in this case compared with Ingram Square.

As discussed in the case of Ingram Square about the designation of list building, this project appears to have a similar controversial phenomenon- except for one historic warehouse that was listed in the 1970s before the redevelopment, the rest part of the block is listed during the stages of the redevelopment (1987).³⁵ Group value serves as the 'binding agent' after restoration, addressing the value crisis that emerges when new interventions are incorporated within historic structures. Although the transformation and intervention strategies fundamentally rely on the original structural system's prototype. Preservation efforts, however, are limited to facades and segments of the original historic fabric, with the majority of the block being newly constructed. Consequently, in terms of material authenticity, the listing designation focuses on the new unit as a whole rather than on the individual historic buildings separately.

Conclusion

The block-based adaptations adhere to a rational methodology that integrates scientific conservation principles with urban development strategies, effectively incorporating new constructions within existing historical contexts. These adaptive reuse projects have received positive assessments in public evaluations, attributed to the enhanced quality of space, economically viable approaches, contributions to area regeneration, and the revitalisation of the block's image.

Both cases illustrate the concept of group value in block-level restoration and the inherent tensions between urban development and conservation. This conflict arises within the context of inner-city regeneration, which seeks to reconceptualise and redefine urban historic spaces. In these cases, the concept of assemblage conservation is shaped by a decision-making process that incorporates various dimensions, including social, political, and economic factors. From a contemporary viewpoint, built heritage conservation is predicated on the principle that preservation extends beyond mere maintenance to encompass the revitalisation of heritage assets. However, it remains crucial to preserve the authentic boundaries of built heritage, aligning with the original goals of the conservation movement. Given that the value of heritage is inherently comparative, it is essential to discern the various values and their associated material aspects throughout each stage of the design and implementation process.

Preservation policies, particularly in historic urban quarters, have faced criticism for potentially stalling development by 'freezing' areas. The concept of group value intensifies this tension between preserving the existing historic environment and enabling future transformations. From a sustainability perspective, group value plays a beneficial role in managing urban historic environments. However, the designation of buildings based on group value often obscures the distinction between old and new structures, suggesting a need for more precise definitions and conservation strategies. Physical interventions through adaptive reuse not only transform intangible values but also influence the listed status of buildings. Buildings associated with group value frequently receive designations at the same level as the area's most historically significant structures. This raises a fundamental question: What aspects of heritage should we prioritise for preservation? The phenomenon of group value introduces inherent challenges in evaluating the historic environment.

If the preservation of historic buildings became the preservation of contemporary-historic buildings, that would only pause the opportunity from the future and dispossess the rights of next-generation planners, architects and citizens. Similarly, if individual buildings are initially constructed as a collective, it is logical to recognise this pre-restoration group value in order to secure the multiple values inherent in the historical space. However, it would be inappropriate to use group value as a corrective measure for historic or aesthetic values that have been compromised during restoration. Furthermore, interventions involving newly formed group-built heritage should consider the dynamics of development, material obsolescence, functional changes, and their impact on the authenticity of group value.

Managing change does not necessarily imply limiting it. While radical interventions may occasionally be necessary to preserve built heritage, identifying values post-restoration and understanding both the signifiers and signified elements of group value

are essential. This comprehensive evaluation helps determine how interventions affect both the intrinsic and attributed values of the heritage site, guiding more effective preservation strategies.

Notes

1. Department for Culture, Media and Sport, "Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings."
2. Government of UK, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.
3. Historic Environment Scotland.
4. In this article, the terms "adaptation," "restoration," and "adaptive reuse" are used interchangeably. Each term refers to the process of modifying a building or site to serve a new purpose while retaining its historical and architectural significance. There is no specific design method prescribed inherently by any of these terms.
5. Jokilehto, *A history of architectural conservation*, 255–306.
6. *Ibid.*, 255–306.
7. Glendinning, *The Conservation Movement: A History*, 116–138.
8. Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments."
9. Ćorić, "The Alois Riegl Report Concerning Diocletian's Palace."
10. Gibson and Pendlebury, *Valuing Historic Environments*, 1–18.
11. Lamprakos, "Riegl's 'Modern Cult of Monuments' and the Problem."
12. ICOMOS, "The Athens Charter for the Restoration."
13. ICOMOS.
14. *Ibid.*, 390–414.
15. Poullos, "Moving Beyond a Values-Based Approach."
16. Urban, "From Obsolescence to Eternal Preservation."
17. ICOMOS, "The Nara Document on Authenticity."
18. Lowenthal, "Changing Criteria of Authenticity."
19. UK Public General Acts, "Civic Amenities Act 1967."
20. Larkham and Jones, "Conservation and Conservation Areas in the UK."
21. Pendlebury, "Conservation Values, the Authorised Heritage Discourse."
22. Brand, "Building the Merchant City: Some Lessons."
23. Tiesdell et al., "Revitalizing Urban Historic Quarters," 119.
24. Goold, "Dictionary of Scottish Architects."
25. Historic Environment Scotland. "102–104 Brunswick Street, Known as 104 Brunswick Street (Lb32627)."
26. All the figures were taken by the author.
27. Glasgow City Archive, *The Architects' Journal (Archive : 1929–2005, 1989)*.
28. Johnson, "Building Study," 39–48.
29. English Heritage.
30. Historic Environment Scotland, "Ingram Square Development."
31. Ingram Square buildings' records: 125–127 (ODD NOS) CANDLERIGGS, Category C, Date Added 04/09/1989; 109–123 (ODD NOS) CANDLERIGGS, Category B, Date Added 04/09/1989; 108–114 (EVEN NOS) BRUNSWICK STREET AND 87–99 (ODD NOS) CANDLERIGGS, Category B, Date Added 03/07/1985; 83C, 83D CANDLERIGGS AND 102 BRUNSWICK STREET, Category B, Date Added 24/01/2000; 102–104 BRUNSWICK STREET, KNOWN AS 104 BRUNSWICK STREET, Category B, Date Added 15/12/1970; 115–137 (ODD NOS) INGRAM STREET AND 118–128 (EVEN NOS) BRUNSWICK STREET, Category B, Date Added 15/12/1970.
32. Historic Environment Scotland. "170–176 (Even Nos) Ingram Street (Lb32746)."
33. Glasgow City Archive, "Refurbishment, Italian Centre, Glasgow," 39–42.
34. Glasgow City Archive, Cruickshank, Dan. "Glasgow renaissance," 27–30.
35. The Italian Centre buildings' record: 19 JOHN STREET AND 45–49 (ODD NOS) COCHRANE STREET, Category B, Date Added 03/07/1987; 9–17 (ODD NOS) JOHN STREET AND 47 COCHRANE STREET, Category B, Date Added 03/08/1987; 170–176 (EVEN NOS) INGRAM

STREET, Category B, Date Added 03/07/1987; 162–168 (EVEN NOS) INGRAM STREET, Category B, Date Added 21/08/1970.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Bibliography

- Brand, J. "Building the Merchant City: Some Lessons in Urban Regeneration." Paterson, Lindsay. The Scottish Government Yearbook 1990. Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland, University of Edinburgh, 199–210, 1990.
- Čorić, F., and M. Špikić. "The Alois Riegl Report Concerning Diocletian's Palace of 1903." *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 42, no. 1 (2011): 387–416.
- Cruickshank, D. "Glasgow Renaissance." *The Architects' Journal (Archive: 1929-2005,1991)* 194 1991 : 27–30.
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport. "Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings." GOV.UK. November 19, 2018. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/principles-of-selection-for-listing-buildings>.
- Drury, P., A. McPherson, and E. Heritage. "Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment." 2008.
- Gibson, L., and J. R. Pendlebury, eds. *Valuing Historic Environments*. London: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2009.
- Glasgow City Archive. "Merchant Revival." *The Architects' Journal (Archive: 1929-2005)* 189 1989, no. 18 36–41, 44–49, 51.
- Glasgow City Archive. "Refurbishment, Italian Centre, Glasgow." *The Architects' Journal (Archive: 1929-2005)* 1991 : 39–42.
- Glendinning, M. *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Goold, D. "Basic Site Details." Dictionary of Scottish Architects - DSA Building/Design Report. May 2, 2024. Accessed April 25, 2024. https://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/building_full.php?id=200532.
- Heath, T., T. Oc, and S. Tiesdell. *Revitalising Historic Urban Quarters*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Historic Environment Scotland. "102-104 Brunswick Street, Known as 104 Brunswick StreetLB32627." Historic Environment Scotland. Accessed April 16, 2024. <https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/LB32627>.
- Historic Environment Scotland. "170-176 (Even Nos) Ingram STREETLB32746." Historic Environment Scotland. Accessed April 16, 2024. <https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/LB32746>.
- Historic Environment Scotland. "Designation Policy and Selection Guidance." Historic Environment Scotland. Accessed April 15, 2024. <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b>.
- Historic Environment Scotland. "Ingram Square Development (Single City Block, Bounded by Ingram Street, Brunswick Street, Wilson Street, and Candleriggs), Merchant City, Glasgow300061425." Historic Environment Scotland. Accessed April 25, 2024. <https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/decision/500003645>.
- ICOMOS. "The Venice Charter." The Venice Charter - International Council on Monuments and Sites. Accessed April 16, 2024. <https://www.icomos.org/en/participer/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/157-the-venice-charter>.
- ICOMOS. "The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments - 1931." The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments. International Council on Monuments and Sites, 1931. Accessed April 16, 2024. <https://www.icomos.org/en/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments>.

- ICOMOS. "The Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)." The NARA Document on Authenticity. International Council on Monuments and Sites, 1994. Accessed April 16, 2024. <https://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/386-the-nara-document-on-authenticity-1994>.
- Johnson, J. "Building Study: BRinging it All Back Home Ingram Square, Glasgow: Appraisal." *The Architects' Journal (Archive: 1929-2005)*, 185 1987, no. 18 39–48.
- Jokilehto, J. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Lamprakos, M. "Riegl's 'Modern Cult of Monuments' and the Problem of Value." *Change Over Time* 4, no. 2 (2014): 418–435. doi:10.1353/cot.2014.0011.
- Larkham, P. J., and A. Jones "Conservation and Conservation Areas in the UK: A Growing Problem." *Planning Practice & Research* 8, no. 2 (1993): 19–29.
- Lowenthal, D. "Changing Criteria of Authenticity." Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the Word Heritage Convention, Nara, Japan, 1995.
- Pendlebury, J. "Conservation Values, the Authorised Heritage Discourse and the Conservation-Planning Assemblage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19, no. 7 (2013): 709–727. doi:10.1080/13527258.2012.700282.
- Poulios, I. "Moving Beyond a Values-Based Approach to Heritage Conservation." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 12, no. 2 (2010): 170–185. doi:10.1179/175355210X12792909186539.
- Riegl, A. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin." *Oppositions* 25 (1982): 20–51.
- UK Public General Acts. "Civic Amenities Act 1967." Legislation.gov.uk. July 31, 1978. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1967/69>.
- UK Public General Acts. "Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997." Legislation.gov.uk. February 27, 1997. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents>.
- Urban, F. "From Obsolescence to Eternal Preservation." *Future Anterior* 3, no. 1 (2006): 24–35.