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Abstract

Churches, with their architectural form, spires, towers, location and size, have long been a dominant force in the Australian landscape. This is particularly true of Adelaide, a place that, since the late nineteenth century, has been described as the ‘City of Churches’. Churches contribute to creating local identity and are often integral to the distinctive atmosphere of a place. These significant buildings represent not only particular aspects of religious heritage, but also wider constructions of social value.

But what becomes of a church when it is no longer used as a church? What happens to the landscape around it; the building’s relationship to the landscape; and to the construction of a community’s cultural heritage? How does the value of the building change with a change in use? Do we (or should we) care more about Christian church conversions than other iconic buildings with social value, such as pubs, stately homes and industrial sites?

This thesis explores the relationship between place and space with reference to the adaptive reuse of churches in Adelaide, South Australia. It examines how the significance of a building and its landmark status changes when its use shifts from a sacred to a secular place. As such, this research develops a nuanced understanding of the use and reuse of Catholic and non-Conformist religious structures in Adelaide, including North Adelaide, and the south-western suburbs of Adelaide. The research comprises questionnaire surveys (n=160), in-depth interviews (n=7) and exterior and interior architectural descriptions (n=5). These investigations address the connections between church structures and social values, and in particular, churches that have been commercially adapted, from buildings that welcome the community and provide service without return, to ones that become consumption driven and profit motivated.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The adaptive reuse of a built structure arises when its original function and use becomes obsolete, yet its structural integrity enables it to be reworked (Choi and Simons 2010; Department for Environment and Heritage 2004). This concept has historical precedents: sturdy and well constructed footings are commonly reused and structures that took time and effort to build are often changed to meet new demands. This process allows the past to exist in the present (McConnell 1997).

In urban development incentives, the reuse of a building works to create a sense of place whilst also assisting in the building of a diverse community (Bullen 2010:218; Cantell 2005:3; Choi et al. 2010; Steinberg 1996). Reuse within the environmental sphere, on the other hand, contributes to a reduction in the use of new construction materials, ultimately promoting conservation of the environment (Lichfield 1988:29). And finally, reuse within the heritage and conservation arena recycles that which is old, in the present, to remind us of the past (Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage 2004; Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992).

Adaptive reuse is not site specific. Defence estates (e.g. Doak 1999; Van Driesche and Lane 2002), government buildings (Abbotts et al. 2003), military bases (Tunbridge 2010) and industrial buildings have all shown that adaptive reuse can be successful in economic, environmental and heritage/conservation spheres. Redundant church buildings, in particular, have been effectively adapted and reused in many parts of the world, linked to a global down-turn in membership of religious organisations and an increasing move away from the Church. With this shift away from religion there has been a corresponding decrease in the need for places of worship. As a result, the
Adaptive reuse of these spaces has become more and more common (Davies 1997:25).

Adelaide has also witnessed this shifting in faith. Founded in 1843 with no state aid for religion, South Australia attracted non-Conformist European settlers who wanted to be free of major concerns that plagued other Australian colonies, including established religion (Jenkin 2008:74; Whitelock 1977). Religious tolerance in South Australia was extended to all religions and resulted in widespread religious competiveness and the convergence of many different religious faiths within the colony. With varying faiths came different church architectural styles and methods of construction. Adelaide, during the late 19th century witnessed a church construction boom. As noted by R.E.N. Twopeny in the early 1880s, ‘[churches in Adelaide] at any rate, bear a very small proportion to the public-houses, against which I think they may be fairly pitted’ (cited in Hilliard 1980:3).

A combined qualitative and quantitative approach to adaptive reuse will develop a nuanced understanding of the recycling of church structures. Do we (or should we) care more about Christian church conversions than other iconic buildings with social values, such as pubs, stately homes or industrial sites? This thesis will specifically address the relationship between social value and church structures that have been commercially adapted. Commercial reuse takes the idea of church values to the extreme: from a building that welcomes the community and provides service without return, to one that is profit motivated; the built environment becomes consumption driven and moves from prophet to profit.
1.2 Research Aims

This thesis aims to investigate the process of church adaptive reuse and how the reuse of a church building reflects the process of modernisation and changing identity in Adelaide, South Australia. To do this, the following questions were asked:

1. Does the significance of a building and its landmark status change after reuse?
2. How do Catholic and non-Conformist denominations view the act of adaptive reuse? Are they different?
3. Do form and typology (aesthetics/ornateness) influence a building’s potential for adaptive reuse? If so, how, and if not, why?

1.3 Summary of Chapters

Chapter Two provides a review of literature concerning the use of ‘place’ within the cultural heritage management arena and the processes of adaptive reuse, in particular of redundant church buildings. Chapter Three presents an historical overview of religion in Australia and concentrates on the changing role of religion since the first fleet arrived in 1788. More specifically, this chapter discusses changing religious faith in Adelaide, a city long since known as ‘The City of Churches’. Chapter Four describes the qualitative and quantitative methods used within the course of the research, including questionnaire and interview processes and the collection data on of architectural features. Chapter Five presents the results and finally, Chapter Six discusses these results within the context of the original research aims.
Chapter Two: The Power of Place

The power of place will be a remarkable one (Aristotle, cited in Casey 2003:13)

2.1 Introduction

Our built heritage reminds us of the past and links us to events that have shaped ourselves and our environment. Yet, the world goes beyond the physical form. At a fundamental level, connections between people and places bring forth meaning and importance. These social values are hard to define; they are imbedded into the fabric of buildings and places experienced by the people who use those spaces.

The concepts of place and space are explored in this chapter, with particular focus on how they contribute to the assessment of cultural significance and, in particular, social value. This requires an examination of the heritage industry; enabling the connection between place and our built heritage to be drawn out and discussed in relation to the adaptive reuse of churches. The literature also charts the concept of adaptive reuse, and analyses it in the context of a shift in focus for church buildings from places of sacred form to spaces of secular function.

2.2 Place, Preservation and Significance

2.2.1 Space and Place Making

The concepts of space and place have long been discussed and debated by social scientists—including geographers, historians, archaeologists and others—and have complex historical and philological philosophical underpinnings. Tuan states that space and place are basic components of the lived world (Tuan 1977:3), Sauer notes that the facts of geography are place facts (Sauer and Leighly 1963:321), and Relph suggests
that, without a thorough understanding of place we are unable to describe its importance (Relph 1981). Pred goes as far to argue that ‘settled places and regions, however arbitrarily defined, are the essence of human (geographical) inquiry’ (Pred 1984:279).

Although space is more abstract than place, they each require the other for definition (Tuan 1977:6). Space is more neutral, but place is embedded with meaning—in essence space is external and objective, whilst place is internal and subjective.

The Oxford English Dictionary states that the word ‘space’ has two meanings: the first refers to time or duration and the second to area or extension. In classical Latin, spatium, space means a ‘course or track, expanse of ground, area, space occupied by something, expanse in which the universe is situated, intervening space, gap, interval, space available for a purpose … ’ (Oxford English Dictionary 2010). Massey suggests that ‘space’ is simply a container that ‘things’ are put into. Once this space is altered, by the act of putting into or layering with experience and subsequent memory, then place is made (Massey 2005:231).

Following on from Massey’s definition, place is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as ‘extended use: to put into, or cause to be in, a particular state, situation, or relation to other things’ (Oxford English Dictionary 2010). Canter also suggests that perceptions of place have three constituents and, somewhat like Relph, notes these as being the physical components, the activities that occurred there and the individual’s thoughts, meanings and understandings about the place (Canter, cited in Thwaites 2001:246). Consequently, Harrison and Dourish (1996:2) imply that place is created when meaning is added to space (place = space + meaning): such that ‘what begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value’.
The process by which a place becomes endowed with value lies at the core of the shift from space to place. Our relationships with place ensure that meanings are transplanted into a dwelling, an area, or a geographical space. It is through these lived relationships with place that people start to associate with these areas and buildings; it is through experiences that spaces gain meaning and significance (Basso 1996: 54). This meaning, this significance, and the subsequent notion of place, can be fleeting; it can go by unnoticed. Yet, it can also become so strong that a site becomes an integral part of everyday life. It, in turn, can come to define who we are. When place becomes part of an experience or a relationship, with it comes awareness and, as Basso suggests, a ‘complex attachment to the physical world’ (Basso 1996:55).

In order to find and experience place, you need to ‘belong to it and identify with it; the more profoundly inside a place a person feels, the stronger they identify with that place (Relph 1976:49). Relph refers to this as ‘insideness’ and explains it as the feeling that one gets in certain kinds of place, such as sacred, gendered or co-modified places. With these types of places people tend to form deeper levels of attachment, involvement and concern (Seamon and Sowers 2008:46). Sheldrake notes that sacred places, for example churches, burials and shrines, are the physical containers for the living Body of Christ. These containers are seen as utopian places and attempt to portray, evoke and invoke a peaceful ‘oneness’ between Creator and creation (Sheldrake 2001:61). They provide a place for human beings to reflect on deeper issues of meaning, understanding and direction.

The creation of place is particularly important when considering the built environment. If place can gather ‘experiences’ (Casey 1996, 2003) then what happens to these experiences when a place is abandoned or demolished? And then again, what happens to these experiences when a place is adapted for another use? Do past experiences and their level of significance transfer from old to new?
2.2.2 The Roots of Modern Preservation

The modern preservation movement developed out of an interest in ruins and the decaying past. It has its roots in the Romantic Movement, which developed in Europe during the 17th century (Lynch 1972:29; Maertz 2008:42; Vinas 2005:3) and spawned a particular classical ideal of high culture, including ‘The Grand Tour’ as a means to experience this ideal by travelling to far off lands and marvelling at ancient buildings (Vinas 2005:2). Developing from this intense travelling period, philosophers, poets and academics began interlaying the feelings evoked by the objects and places with the historical and mythical knowledge about them, thereby beginning to develop a romanticised sense of place and identity (Cantacuzino and Brandt 1980: 20; Vinas 2005:1).

In the 19th century the rise of nationalism encouraged greater public access to culture and invested the histories of cultures with particular meanings. People began to realise the importance of heritage in the creation of self, a catalyst that enabled national monuments to become symbols of national identity (Vinas 2005:3).

Heritage-related literature and cultural ideals spread across Europe during this time, yet it was England that fully embraced the cultural milieu through the Arts and Crafts Movement. This movement flourished between 1880-1910 with the publication of works by such prolific writers and public speakers as John Ruskin and William Morris (Vinas 2005:4). Ruskin, a prominent and well respected figure noted for his passionate support and appreciation of the virtues and values of ancient buildings, argued that nothing should disturb the past, not even those who try to rebuild damaged buildings (Vinas 2005:5). Concurrently, Morris and Lethaby founded the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) with the manifesto of ‘Repair not restore’ (Latham 2000:7). They argued that such buildings should stand as a ‘promise to the
virgin land ... the worms and the trees ... that they [the buildings] will represent the highest and most intelligent kinds of happiness’ (De Bottan 2006: 267). This movement gave a particular kind of meaning to heritage conservation and fostered certain core Western values, for example pristineness and authenticity, which still underlie the concept of heritage today.

Given the particular meaning invested in the concepts of culture and heritage as a result of the Romantic and Arts and Crafts Movements, settler countries in the New World were seen as devoid of culture in comparison to Europe. Consequently, preservation in Australia was only introduced to protect cultural places by federal and state governments in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The development of heritage legislation arose in relation to the rapid expansion of Australian cities threatening the ‘integrity of many urban landscapes, prompting widespread public outcry and government response’ (Colley 1996:144).

During this period, volunteer organisations such as The National Trust enabled communities and non-government groups to contribute to the growing awareness of heritage issues in Australia. These ‘grass root’ groups were the first to recognise the importance of local places, such as the inner city workers cottages in Sydney. To the government, these areas were slums, but to the residents they were homes to which they had a deep sense of attachment (Taylor 1996:46). Developments in heritage management since the 1980s have produced increasingly sophisticated understandings of the range of heritage values that attach to a place (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992), including teasing out frameworks within which social values can be measured and assessed alongside more traditional scientific and historical values (see, for example, Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003; Johnston 1994), the deeper spiritual nature of attachment (Byrne and Nugent 2004, Read 2003), and thus the creation of place.
2.2.3 *Significance and Social Value*

Significance and social value are concerned with people’s attachment to place. Places embody meanings that are important to people or a community. Such meanings are in addition to the ‘physical-ness’ of a building or space, they are experienced by ‘insiders’ (a particular group or community) and can only be recognised by them (Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003:153). Methods involved in defining social value depend on how a community (insider) is characterised. Johnston suggests that there are three ways to distinguish a community: geographically e.g. state, local area or neighbourhood; socially, e.g. through ethnicity or shared values; or self-defined (Johnston 1994:19) (see Figure 2.1).

![Figure 2.1 – Defining a community](image)

Social significance embraces the qualities for which a place has become the focus of spiritual, political or cultural sentiment (Byrne, Brayshaw and Ireland 2003:7). As such, the assessment of social significance requires the involvement of community groups and those who engaged with the place, whether in tangible or intangible ways. Clark further notes that buildings are places layered with memories (Clark 2007:68). For
buildings, these memories are collective as well as individual, thereby indicating that
the building has social significance for a community, albeit variably defined.

The term ‘significance’ did not appear in the heritage literature until the 1970s (Emerick
2001:279) and came in response to the realisation that archaeological material could
present not just archaeological facts and figures, but also layers of significance and
meaning. Emerick further notes that it was not until the 1980s and 1990s that the terms
‘significance’ and ‘value’ became common in the heritage and archaeological arenas.
The use of these two terms highlighted the increased awareness of heritage issues
and encouraged an understanding that places of value enrich people’s lives and are of
benefit to future generations (Emerick 2001:280).

Within Australia, the term has a comparable history. In 1977, the Burra Charter,
developed by Australia ICOMOS (the International Council on Monuments and Sites)
(henceforth called ‘the Charter’), recognised the importance of connections between
place and community, stating that not only can a place have historic value, but it can
also have cultural significance and become a symbol of identity and aspiration
(Australian Government, Productivity Commission 2006; Clark 2007; Marquis-Kyle and
Walker 1992). The Burra Charter states:

... places of cultural significance enrich people’s lives, often providing a deep
and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past
and to living experiences. They are historical records that are important as
tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural
significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are
and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are
irreplaceable and precious (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992: 11).

In addition, the Burra Charter states that places can, and in most cases are, associated
with various levels of cultural significance; cultural significance is defined by aesthetic,
historic, scientific and social or spiritual criteria, with one or more of these contributing to a collective sense of place (Colley 1996:142).

The Charter defines cultural heritage in terms of both tangible assets, such as historic places, sites and built environments, and intangible assets, such as personal stories and memories. The intangible aspects of place are often hard to define and consequently in many ways hard to protect. Irrespective of their physical appearance, or materiality, places of intangible social significance, as the Burra Charter suggests, are places that give the past, the present and the future meaning.

In a similar manner, Read discusses spiritual attachment to place in *Returning to Nothing* (1996) and *Haunted Earth* (2003). Although not explicitly dealing with the context of adaptive reuse, Read refers to the term ‘inspired sites’ to connote the ways in which places are ‘inspired’ by people’s stories of the past and the present. In such a way, Read presents the idea of significance, and our need to cling to the memories of a particular place. He argues that ‘the meaningful events in our lives are inseparable from the places in which they occur’ (Read 1995:43).

2.3 Adaptation or Adaptive Reuse?

‘Nothing is what it seems’, exclaimed Alice.
'Exactly the contrary', said the Red Queen.
'Things are all the wrong way round', continued Alice.
'Banks are restaurants, warehouses are blocks of flats, post offices are hotels, hotels are shops and shops are post offices. Everything is something else.'
'It is called adaptive reuse', replied the Mad Hatter sternly.
'But isn't adaptive reuse a tautology?' asked Alice, innocently.
'Don't get impertinent', said the Mad Hatter, crossly, adjusting his bow tie (Broadbent 2000:21).
Adaptation, or adaptive reuse, is a term derived from the history of preservation, conservation and restoration (Campbell 1996:26). The reuse, adaptation and reappropriation of buildings arises when the original function and use of a building becomes obsolete, yet the building still maintains its physical integrity, enabling it to be reworked into another function (Choi and Simons 2010; Department for Environment and Heritage 2004). Such efforts have historical precedents: sturdy and well constructed footings are commonly reused and structures that took time and effort to build are changed to meet new demands. As such, the reuse of suitable and suitably built structures, brings the past into the present, and lends character to communities (McConnell 1997).

Chin and Binjuan (2009:1) use the term ‘adaptive reuse’ to describe a process that preserves something or keeps something alive, an idea that moves beyond the historic in structures. In agreement with Mallach (2006), Chin and Binjuan suggest that the reuse of historic structures keeps the past part of the present, but the process also has at least three other advantages. Firstly, the desire to keep a working link with the historical past; namely, as a building that contains features linked to the history of a community, thereby enabling the past to be relived and revisited everyday (Mallach 2006). Secondly, there is an added economic benefit, because through reuse a building can retain its current economic value and new economic activities can generate income that recoups the cost of building restoration (Allison et al. 1996:8; Rock 1979:161). Thirdly, there is the currently popular environmental debate that the reuse of buildings reduces the use of new construction materials, ultimately promoting conservation of the environment (Lichfield 1988:29; Williams et al. 2003:94).
Miele (1996:17) further elaborates on this environmental discussion, stating that the reuse of buildings can contribute to current sustainability goals and reduce the amount of ‘embodied energy’ created through new construction\(^1\). In 2001, for example, new buildings accounted for 40% of annual energy and raw material consumption and 44% of landfill (Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage 2004; Fowler 1992; South Australian Department for Environment and Heritage 2008, Victorian Government 2006).

The literature gives many examples of successful adaptive reuse, including defence estates (e.g. Doak 1999; Van Driesche and Lane 2002), government buildings (Abbotts \textit{et al.} 2003), military bases (Tunbridge 2010) and industrial buildings (e.g. Ball 1999; Cantell 2005). Some fascinating studies have been conducted into the characteristics needed for the successful adaptation of buildings within city centres (Bullen 2007; Wang \textit{et al.} 2010). In the reuse of industrial buildings in Toronto, for example, Wilson (2010) demonstrated that the social benefits of reuse are significant. Not only does the reuse of an older building contribute to creating a sense of place, it can also assist in bringing together a diverse community. The new use attracts new people who, in turn, value the building in new ways.

Growth in environmental awareness has led to the creation of policy strategies with regards to the development of American and European inner city land during the 1970s and 1980s. This has increased the number of buildings being reused and adapted.

\(^1\) Bullen and Love (2010: 215) state that embodied energy is ‘the energy required to extract, process and manufacture, and transport a product. It is considered over a material’s life cycle from extraction to installation … [which] lead[s] to green house gases that cause climate change’.
(Bullen et al. in press; Cantell 2005:3; Choi et al. 2010; Steinberg 1996). Cantell (2005:2) provides examples of such reuse in New York City, citing the practice of local governments rehabilitating vacant and disused buildings to fulfil development and affordable housing schemes; he argues that the reuse of buildings offers an attractive alternative to the current consumption-orientated ‘throw away’ society.

The reuse of buildings moves beyond environmental and economically focused processes. Reuse can lead to long term benefits for the people who value the building, either as a commercial development or as a private residence (Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage 2004). Highfield (1987) discusses the value of reuse and puts forward possible new uses for old structures, including retail spaces, offices, guest houses, warehouses, hotels, health centres, and museums. Further examples are presented by Tiesdell et al. (1996:69), who point out that adaptively reused structures should ideally fall within, and relate to, three groups of activities: cultural tourism, housing and commerce/industry.

Chin and Binjuan (2009) note the distinction between the ideas of adaptive reuse within the heritage sphere and within the real estate community. Their work studies the reuse of Singapore’s Chinatown through the examination of changing notions of authenticity. Authenticity as a concept is rooted in the values attributed to heritage and understanding these heritage values is dependant, in part, on the degree to which information is understood to be creditable or truthful (UNESCO 2008; van Balen 2008:40). Interestingly, Chin and Binjuan suggest that the authenticity and significance of a reused structure/area are based on our senses (the use of colours and ideals that appeal to those who are viewing the buildings), rather than to any absolute quality of age.
Within the construction management arena, Bullen's (2007) study found that cultural and heritage significance should be placed at the centre of all adaptive reuse projects. Consultation with community groups and local heritage organisations should be undertaken at the feasibility stage. In other words, the importance of heritage values and the significance of a building are noted by Bullen as being the key features to successful adaptive reuse.

The reuse of space and ideas of place are discussed by Quin and Man (2008). They track the movement and change of a villa in Shanghai from private residence to café, and witness the changing use of the building. Quin and Man examine the manner in which architecture and building form influence people’s experiences within the building and thus the ‘spirit of the place’ (Quin and Man 2008: 3). The authors suggest that the social, symbolic and structural elements of a building act as a bridge between the past and the present and that, with reuse of the villa, new memories are created.

In Australia, the term ‘adaptation’ was legitimised by the Burra Charter and became a conservation practice in 1979 (Nelson 2000:45). The Burra Charter defines the term as ‘modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use’ (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992:12) and associates the term with ‘compatible reuse’—i.e. an activity that allows new use to be undertaken, but which respects the cultural significance of the place. Furthermore, the Charter stipulates that adaptation must involve no change to culturally significant fabric, be substantially reversible, and have minimal impact (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992:64).

The Charter also states that adaptation should not down-grade the place and the components that make it significant. Thus, adaptation ‘that involves a major change in use or new structures should provide benefits by maintaining or interpreting significance’ (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992:64). Projects that involve the reuse of
built heritage should respect and retain a building’s heritage significance, providing value for the future (Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage 2004:3).

The term ‘adaptive reuse’ has flourished over the past ten or so years (M. Queale 2010, pers. comm., 10 June) and, as such, these two words have firmly cemented themselves within the vocabulary of Australian architects, archaeologists, designers, cultural heritage managers, town and urban planners, and sociologists (Fleming 2009:18; Pearson and Sullivan 1995). The New South Wales (NSW) Heritage Branch states that ‘adaptive reuse plays a major role in heritage conservation practice in NSW’ (Heritage Branch, New South Wales Department of Planning, 2004).

The NSW Heritage Branch (2004) highlighted the positive and negative issues associated with adaptive reuse in the redevelopment and reuse of the Walsh Bay wharves in Sydney. They stressed, for example, the conflicting issues facing developers and those interested in the conservation of historic structures. Built between 1907 and 1922, the wharves became an important link to Sydney’s maritime past. Sitting within one of the most historic districts of Sydney, the wharves are a tribute to the timber architectural achievements of the region (Anglin 1988:75).

Anglin noted that the wharves’ structure offered a unique opportunity for development, but warned that expansion could disturb the historic nature of the structures. Further concerns were raised in regards to the intangible features. Anglin expressed concern that, with redevelopment, the preservation of ‘the patina of age, the weathered timber cladding, the sleepy fishing community and the understated, rudimentary presentation are all facets of the present condition that will quietly vanish with the redevelopment of each wharf’ (Anglin 1988:76). Anglin did not suggest that development and adaptive reuse of historic buildings was necessarily bad, but recommended that building reuse
should not be dictated by economic concerns. Reuse should follow a ‘use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, and changes which require a minimal impact’ (Anglin 1988:77).

The South Australian Department for Environment and Heritage (2003) identified adaptive reuse as a means to secure a ‘viable future for heritage assets by encouraging, where appropriate and strategic, the sensitive adaption of heritage places for new uses. The Department suggested that reuse could allow for heritage values to be recognised and successfully combined with new and exciting architectural designs. They noted, for example the adaptive reuse of the Balhannah Mine in Balhannah as a successful case study. Operating between 1869 and 1976 the site included the most intact group of 19th century mining structures in South Australia, before being used as a private slaughterhouse, implement shed and finally as a private residence after its adaptive reuse in 1990 (Department of the Environment and Heritage 2004:10).

2.4 Adaptive Reuse of Churches

The global down-turn in membership of religious organisations has decreased the need for places of worship, such as churches, church halls and associated buildings (Architect Community Projects 2007; Velthuis and Spennemann 2007). According to Cantacuzion and Brandt (1980:100), the abandonment of churches can be associated with, but is not limited to:

…..shifts in population from the country to industrial centres, some parishes may have joined with others, or dissolved entirely, and others may have been created nearer the heart of a new community. City centres have become depopulated, which means that there is no resident community around a church … and some churches, though conveniently situated, may be too large, or too expensive to maintain, and are replaced by new, smaller buildings.
Throughout Europe, in particular Holland and the United Kingdom, dioceses have felt the dilemma associated with fewer patrons and a dwindling income. They have, in turn, closed and sold sacred properties, and in some cases fully abandoned a church (Architect Community Projects 2007; Velthuis and Spennemann 2007). Australia has also witnessed a decrease in church attendance. Thompson notes that, since the First World War, new freedom and more secular values have changed religious behaviour (Thompson 1994:65). According to the Australian 2001 Census only approximately 20% of the population still attended church services at least monthly (Langmead et al. 2002; Langmead 2005). And as Langmead notes, this is often to attend individual memorial or rites-of-passage ceremonies rather than regular church worship.

As such, superfluous and redundant churches fall into two categories: those that easily fall into disrepair, are affected by vandalism and decay through misuse and abandonment, and are often eventually demolished; and those that are reused, having their function, and possibly their form, transformed.

The reuse of religious structures, rather than their abandonment and destruction, is not an unusual phenomenon. Cantacuzion and Brandt note that England was the first country to address the problem of church redundancy, and to do so in an ‘organised manner, even though church redundancy was a problem found in all industrialised countries’ (1980:101). In 1983 England introduced new legislation, known as The Pastoral Measure 1983, which settled the future of churches closed for regular public worship. This legislation noted that:

... a church, even if not of major historic or architectural quality, may be the most significant building in its locality, a familiar and important feature of the landscape. Churches make up the most significance group of the nation’s historic buildings and the process for settling the future of redundant churches recognises the interests of both the Church of England and the wider community (The Church of England 2010).
The first churches handed over (allowing for reuse) were the church of St. Peter, Barton-on-Humber, and the neo-Gothic church of St. Mary, Studley Royal.

Simons and Choi (2010) have extensively studied the reuse of church structures. According to them church buildings maintain the features that are linked with the history of the neighbourhood and therefore are great candidates for reuse. It is the physical characteristics of the church building that hold a sense of the past and offer a unique utilisation of space. Simons and Choi point out that people gain enjoyment and satisfaction in seeing landmark buildings being reused (Simons and Choi 2010:81).

Mork (2008) further supports this claim, and states that, from a social and cultural perspective, a church building plays many roles within a community.

Mork (2008) discusses the changing patterns in religious affiliation and the closure of religious structures in the Nordic countries of Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Norway. In this work, Mork argues that reuse solutions for religious buildings are extremely expensive and that, apart from the seldom profitable outcome, the reuse of such properties should focus on preserving and maintaining cultural heritage and community values. In essence, church reuse should move beyond economic and profit values. This distinction is important, as Mork demonstrates that understanding a community’s religious, cultural and social values is the key to creating a site that benefits all (Mork 2008:62).

Discussed within the framework of landscape architecture, Duckworth (2010) presents examples of religious adaptive reuse from New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania, in the United States. This work suggests that the reuse of church structures contributes to the long standing character of the site and highlights the importance of gaining support from not just resident community groups, but also from the former parish community before undertaking any religious reuse project. In this way, the resident community has
an opportunity to develop attachment to the new place, whilst the former parish community is able to maintain a physical link to the past.

As previously noted, the study of church reuse has been undertaken within the real estate arena. Kiley (2004) highlights a growing acceptance of the process of church reuse. Kiley discusses the reuse of religious structures in Boston, in the United States, to illustrate how the location, size and architectural structure of the church influence its reuse potential. Supporting his argument, Kiley presents a variety of factors that determine the successful adaptation of religious structures, for example, and at the most general level, the inclusion of stakeholders (see Figure 2.2).

![Figure 2.2 – Range of stakeholders affected by church buildings (Kiley 2004:37).](image)

Clark makes reference to the reuse of religious structures within the wider real estate market. Unlike Kiley, Clark in *The Impact of Church Closure in Popular Australia Culture* (1996) suggests that the concept of ‘church’ will always be retained, even after sale, renovation and refurbishment. She notes that:

...former church buildings are identified as such regardless of the current use of the nature of the sale. Popular perception means that an ecclesiastically
distinct building will always be called a ‘church’. ... There is no word to describe accurately a church building that was once ceremonially dedicated to a religious purpose and then later ceased to perform that function (Clark 1996:151).

Often, it is this ecclesiastical distinctiveness that helps to create a real estate ‘genre’ for church buildings (Clark 1996:151). The real estate market stresses features that are popular and appeal to those who want something different. Advertisements noted in the course of this research declared ‘saint or sinner, this home is ideal for all lovers of historic architecture’, ‘thank heavens for this converted church ... it features stained glass windows and cathedral ceilings reminding you of the home’s origins’ (The Advertiser, May 29th, 2010), and ‘a rare and exclusive opportunity’ (The Advertiser, October 15th 2010) (also see Appendix One).

Furthermore, and of significance here, there are differences in the way churches are prepared for adaptive reuse between denominations. Catholic and Nonconformist churches undertake the processes of closure and reuse in different ways, for example the Catholic Church sees the Eucharist as the source of Christian life and believes that the bread and wine brought to the altar are transformed into the body and the blood of Christ (Mork 2008:60). Therefore, before reuse can be contemplated for a Catholic church, all items used during the performance of the Eucharist, such as the altar and the tabernacle, are removed (K O’Loughlin, pers. comm., 24 September 2010). A closing liturgy is also undertaken, this literally and symbolically brings the building’s sacred purpose to an end.

In contrast, Nonconformist belief holds that it is the congregation that is sacred and not the building. The church is considered an object used by the congregation for practical purposes, a place of ‘auditory rather than a theatre of ritual’, and as such, the buildings tend to be plain and functional (Lewis 1991: 21). In this manner, once the congregation
leaves the building, a ceremony takes place and the building is no longer held to be spiritual. Items used during religious service are moved to new premises, sold, or left for those who have purchased the space (C Aiken pers. comm., 15 May 2010).

Within the Australian context, adaptive reuse of religious structures is not uncommon. Clark makes reference to the closure and reuse of churches in South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania (Clark 1996, 2010). Having looked at ten church closures within these states, Clark notes the way in which closing liturgies and services allow members to deal with the sadness that comes with church closure.
Chapter Three: Religion, Australia and Losing Faith

...but South Australia deserves much, for apparently she is [a] hospitable home for every alien who chooses to come, and for his religion too (Twain 1897:181).

3.1 Religion in Australia

When the first fleet came to Australia in 1788, one tenth of all the convicts were Catholic and nearly half were born in Ireland. By the 1828 census, there was a total Catholic population in the new colony of NSW of around 10,000 (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). Yet Catholicism was not the only faith brought to Australia. Travelling into Sydney Cove with the First Fleet in 1788 was a Church of England clergyman who was licensed as a chaplain to the settlement. Further European settlement brought other traditional churches to Australia, including the Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist and Society of Friends (Quaker) churches (Henry 2009; Thomson 1994:1).

In 1901, Australian society was mainly Anglo-Celtic, with 40% of the population being Anglican (Church of England), 23% Catholic, 34% other Christian and about 1% professing non-Christian religions (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2009-2010). The exception to this was the small yet influential Lutheran community of German descent. The discovery of gold during the 1850s in Victoria and New South Wales also attracted a huge wave of new settlers, in particular many Chinese Buddhists and Daoists, and Syrians/Afghans who were Muslim (Howell 2002:59; Inglis 1972:266). The impacts of WWI and WWII led to an increase in Australian migration, and an accompanying growth in the number of other religious affiliations, such as Greek and other forms of Orthodox religion.
The initial wave of post-war migration saw increasing numbers of Catholic and Protestant groups settle in Australia, while an increase in Jewish, Greek Orthodox, Turkish and other Islamic churches rose between the 1950s – 1960s (Bouma 2002:19). For example, in 1950s Melbourne, the Greek Orthodox Church grew by 3%, resulting in Melbourne becoming the world’s third largest Greek city, after Athens and Thessalonika (Breward 1993:188; Bouma 1995:286).

Table 3.1 shows the distribution of religious groups in Australia from Federation in 1901 to 2001. It demonstrates the decrease in Australians who identify themselves as Anglican, whilst showing the increasing number of people who identify with the Catholic faith and with ‘other’ religions. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) states that these increases were ‘partly the result of immigration’ (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anglican %</th>
<th>Catholic %</th>
<th>Other %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Other Religion %</th>
<th>No religion %</th>
<th>Not stated/ inadequately described %</th>
<th>Total 000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(a)2.0</td>
<td>3,773.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>(a)2.9</td>
<td>4,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(a)1.9</td>
<td>5,435.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6,629.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7,579.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8,966.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10,508.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11,599.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12,755.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13,548.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14,576.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15,602.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16,850.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17,752.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18,769.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) includes ‘object to state’

Source: ABS data. Census of Population and Housing 2004

Table 3.1 – Major Religious Affiliations since 1901
During the 1970s and 1980s there was a rise in the number of Australians who declared themselves to have ‘no religion’. Bouma suggests that this was due to the 1971 Australian census modification, which informed Australians that if they had ‘no religious [belief], [then they were to] write ‘none’ in the census (Bouma 2006: 13). The Australian census had always had a question on religious affiliation, yet answering this question had always been voluntary (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). Further to Bouma’s suggestion, the ABS also noted in 2004 that the percentage of people declaring an absence of religious affiliation ‘saw a seven-fold increase from the previous census year’ (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). In some parts of Australia the percentage of people declaring themselves to have no religious affiliation exceeded the national average; notably, in South Australia in 2006, when 24% of people in Adelaide claimed to have no affiliation, compared to the national average of 18.7%.

![Figure 3.1 – Percentage of all major Christian religious affiliates 1891-1986](image)

The above data (Figure 3.1) shows that Australia witnessed greater religious variety over the course of the 19th century, but this then drastically changed, with a drop in numbers over the 20th century. The Anglican Church felt the brunt of this change.
3.2 Adelaide: The City of Churches

In 1834 the British House of Commons passed an act to establish South Australia. The South Australia government decided that no church would be placed in a privileged position, and as a result no state aid was set aside for religion. Consequently, South Australia attracted non-Conformist European settlers wanting to be free from the major concerns that plagued the other Australian settlements at the time, namely established religion, class structure and poverty (Jenkin 2008:74; Whitelock 1977).

Religious tolerance was therefore extended to all religions and formed the basis for allowing Adelaide to become known as the ‘City of Churches’ (Hilliard 1980:2; Whitehead 1986: xiii). With each wave of new settlers into the colony, new places of worship were built, and soon spires and bell towers pierced the landscape, often side by side. Evidence of this can be seen in the construction of Australia’s first Mosque in Little Gilbert Street, Adelaide, which was built in 1888 by the descendents of Afghan cameleers (see Figure 3.1) (Sciver 2004:39).

Figure 3.2 – Adelaide Mosque. Image taken 1904
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia - #B1621746)
The traditional view that South Australia had no state religion, however, is naive. Despite the fact that settlers had the freedom to practice any religion, socially powerful religious views and tradition were strongly reinforced by Anglican distinctiveness (Hilliard 1994:11). The Anglican Church, in fact, became the de facto state church through the elevated social status accorded to its Archbishop and the strong support given to it by the gentry of the colony, many of whom switched allegiance from non-Conformist religions (Stone 2010:143).

Within such a religious landscape there was also overt and covert competiveness. In 1872, English novelist Anthony Trollope wrote that the large number of churches in Adelaide could be attributed to its spirit of religious competitiveness (South Australian Memory 2010). An abundance of smaller congregations and sects produced a far greater number of religious buildings, whilst further competition within Lutheran branches saw the construction of separate churches. Two different groups of Presbyterians built their own churches in defiance of other Presbyterian groups who retained links with the Church of Scotland (Howell 2002:59).

Competitiveness between denominations, and no state aid, had several repercussions for South Australia. Firstly, most South Australian churches looked very modest in comparison to those built in other Australian colonies at the time. Interstate colonies built grand churches, though fewer in number, and they were claimed to match the splendour of the ‘temples of commerce’ (commercial buildings) (Howell 2002:60). In South Australia, the wealthy and highly ornate churches were not necessarily filled with more ‘godly’ members. Visitors to Adelaide in the late 19th century noted that congregations in the more ‘fashionable’ suburbs, for example those in North Adelaide, made potential worshipers feel unwelcome, especially if they lacked ‘smart clothes and money for the collection plate’ (Howell 2002:60).
Secondly, churches and chapels were built faster and in greater numbers by those who could manage in a society without state aid and by those who had access to capital. As a result the Anglicans and Presbyterians started to lose members to the Baptist and Methodist faiths. The heavy reliance on congregational donations resulted in larger and more decorative churches being founded in the wealthier suburbs (Hean 2006:92).

Access to building material was also highly influential in the design and look of Adelaide’s churches. Bluestone was quarried from the Adelaide Hills, from Magill to Willunga (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1993:6; Stone 2010:202) and was most frequently used in the Adelaide square mile\(^2\) and the wealthier eastern suburbs\(^3\). On the other hand, limestone became the material of choice in the western and southern suburbs\(^4\) (Department of Environment and Natural Resources 1998:7; Howell 2002:59; Piddock et al. 2009:5).

Principally because of cost, the use of brick in the early colony was limited. By the late 19\(^{th}\) century economic competiveness and the loosening of attitudes towards exposed brick enabled brick construction to increase (Bell 2008:7). By the 1880s the arrival of a Hoffman kiln meant that brick construction costs shrunk and brick usage increased. From the 1920s bricks became an established building material, yet within the

\(^2\) Adelaide’s North, South, East and West Terraces are all one mile in length (Stone 2010:53).

\(^3\) The most popular was Glen Osmond Bluestone. First quarried in 1851, it was widely used in housing and larger buildings. New Heaven, former St Paul’s, was built from Glen Osmond bluestone in 1875.

\(^4\) The southern region of South Australia is the major source of quarried limestone.
enclaves of Adelaide’s wealthy elite, the use of bluestone and sandstone was still favoured.

3.3 Structural Frames of Reference

Places of worship are special. They are layered with spiritual meaning and provide both a moral and a transcendental frame of reference during our lifetimes. As noted by Mol, they ‘can come to guarantee the moral integrity of [a] community and family life’ (Mol 1985:55). Accordingly, Christian church architecture is deeply rooted in the belief that the ‘church’ building should come to symbolise Christianity, both visually and figuratively (Clark 1996:150; Debuyst 1967:21). As religious worship in Australia has changed since settlement, so, too, has church architecture. Although religions have designed and built churches to suit their own styles of religious services, architecture has also changed in response to broader social transformations.

Christian denominations build in diverse architectural styles. Gothic was typically favoured by the Catholics, whereas the Nonconformists generally favoured the Classical style\(^5\) (Lewis 1991:20). Yet defining the manner in which any denomination uses architecture to identify itself is a difficult task (Carey 2010:6 Harris 1972:3; Lewis 1991:20). Douglas categorises the religious use of architecture as being either a simple or ornate style:

\[^5\] The Gothic architectural style evolved in Europe (starting in France). As its name suggests, it is a style defined by the pointed arch, pointed rib vaults and deep buttresses (sometimes flying). The Classical architectural style, on the other hand, follows the principles of Greek and Roman art and architecture.
‘.... the simpler church usually being associated with the Non-Conformist or reformed traditions, which reacted against the existing elaborate building styles. Their churches were consequently simpler and more domestic in character and size. The latter, on the other hand, were usually built on a grander scale’ (Douglas 2006: 162).

The Protestant churches, beginning with the Church of England but culminating in the true non-Conformist denominations, such as the Lutherans, Methodists and the various forms of Baptists, deliberately moved traditions away from the more elaborate aspects of medieval ritual and architectural style (Lewis 1991:20). Taylor further notes that the Protestant churches became plainer and less decorated because the sacred and the iconic were challenged\(^6\). In contrast, the Catholic Church continued to build on the ‘three natural laws of Catholic church construction; vertically, permanence and iconography’, in which imagery and symbolism were both emphasised and elaborate (Taylor 2007:24).

From the early nineteenth century onwards, churches in England and Europe became increasingly defined by their adherence to these traditions, and Australia followed suit. At the time when the First Fleet left England, the Romantic Movement and ‘Gothic’ style were well established (Carey 2010:15). The Church of England urged that all churches in the colonies should be built in the Gothic style:

Let, then, England’s religious architecture take root in her colonies, together with England’s church. In the new buildings, let no violence be done to the

\(^6\) The Reformation, in the sixteenth century, partly occurred in protest to the obscene wealth (and greed) of the Roman Catholic Church. Objections in the use and purchase of indulgences (statues etc) resulted in the creation of the Protestant Churches, who deliberately constructed plainer and less decorative buildings.
growing conviction that Christian art is far superior to pagan... instead of the odious buildings which too frequently figure in our missionary reports, intended for churches, though unfit for barns, [let] the pure style of Christian architecture [be] introduced, eloquent as are all its buildings with mystic import, and calculated to educe those feelings of mingled awe, tenderness, and reverence, which so well befit the Christian's mind (Carey 2010:6).

As a result, Australian church architecture was noted as being almost exclusively British and 'overwhelmingly English in origin up until the 1890s. Design and construction fell into two distinct chronological periods: Georgian and Gothic (Lewis 1991:20). Georgian style is noted for its classical references and its symmetrical design qualities, both of which came to denote wealth and education (Matthews 1998:244). Classical ancient Greek and Roman architecture were the precursors to Classical architecture, with pediments\(^7\) becoming the iconic classical element (Lewis 1991:26). The Gothic style, long-since associated with church architecture, is typified by features such as the pointed arch, the flying buttress, as well as quatrefoils and spires (Andrews 2001:30).

Understandably, Australian church architecture was 'determined by tradition, national heritage, personal taste and available finance' (Kerr 1975:125). The government, local and international architects, and people of authority had a great deal of influence, yet so did the Australian climate. At the start of the 20\(^{th}\) century, architects began to design buildings in response to the Australian climate, with large overhangs and verandas (Baglin and Thiering 1979:19; Hean 2006:9).

\(^7\) Triangular gable ends compete with freestanding columns.
Australian Catholic Church architecture, while based strongly in the Gothic tradition throughout the nineteenth century, was also heavily influenced by the Second Vatican Council. Commonly referred to as Vatican II, it was held from 1962-1965, and was called to determine the ‘crisis, caused in modern society from the [decay] of spiritual and moral values’ (Farah 2009:30). Vatican II recognised the need to update church practices, e.g. liturgies were to be spoken in English rather than Latin, and the location of the altar changed to face the congregation. These new practices brought change to the Catholic Church and, as a result, both church interiors and exteriors were altered to reflect new forms of worship.

3.4 Losing Faith

Up until the early 1960s, Australia, like Britain and America, enjoyed the modest religious boom that had, since the mid 1950s, been enjoyed by all denominations (Hilliard 1997:211). Yet this boom did not last. Religious attitudes changed and as a result, the Catholic and wider Australian Christian community began the slow movement towards a more secular society (Hilliard 1980).

Modernisations, changes in life cycle variations and generational differences have been noted as the three most probable explanations for a decline in Australian religious attendance (McAllister 1998). By modernisation, McAllister suggests that ‘affluence and improving socioeconomic status have undermined traditional religious belief and traditions’ (McAllister 1998:257). Life cycle variations and generational differences are linked to the changing role of the family and varying experiences of different generational groups. For example, the introduction of the contraceptive pill during the second half of the 1960s, Australia’s involvement in the Vietnam War, the increasing number of women in the work force, and the attraction of Sunday sports and competitive entertainment options, all combined to change the way Australian lives
were influenced by the church (Clarke 2010:67; Hilliard 1997:218; McAlister 1998:257). Such changes and an increasingly open and mobile society heralded a move away from the church, both spiritually and physically.

McAllister (1988) and McCullum (1987) suggest that, from the mid 1960s, the decline in religious attendance can be attributed to a rise in secularisation. Clark notes that secularisation in Australia refers to a turning away from the spiritual towards the rational, with a consequent change in the power and influence of the church (1996:148). Jones and Wesson suggest that secularisation has:

… shifted the senses of omnipotence from God to man. This has resulted in a steady decline of interest in God and a growing concern with man’s [sic] ability. So the hierarchical structure has slowly crumbled away, and the Church is left as an organisation apparently without a cause or raison d’être (Jones and Wesson, cited in Clark 1996:147).

Clark further argues that churches have become the victims of modern society, being forced to move their practices into line with the ‘consumer oriented, rational and modern world’ (Clark 1996:149). Secularisation and the ending of government aid to churches in the 19th century resulted in a great deal of property rationalisation. This separation between Church and State forced religious organisations to find alternative sources of funding, particularly donations and willed estates. Declining membership and shrinking donations throughout the 20th century only added salt to the wound. For many congregations, dealing with a decline in church attendance and added economic concerns forced them to close (Moss 1985:62).

A decline in church attendance has certainly led to widespread church closure, resulting in a surplus of ‘irrelevant buildings’. Yet this problem was further exacerbated with the formation of the Uniting Church in 1977. The merging of Presbyterians, Congregationalist and Methodist faiths meant that the Uniting Church had to deal not
only with complex property and legal issues and with gaining the support of congregation communities at the time of their union (at the final vote in 1973, 69 per cent of Presbyterians and 75 per cent of Congregationalists voted in favour of the union, versus 83 per cent of Methodists), but also with three sets of church buildings and three congregations (Breward 1993:181; Clark 1996:149).

As with many Australian cities, Adelaide, has, since the 1960s, witnessed an increase in church closure because of secularisation, inner city development, increased industrialisation, migration and the closure of Congregationalists, Methodist and Presbyterians churches when they amalgamated to form the Uniting Church. New housing areas allowed city residents to move to the suburbs and migration changed the character and religious affiliation of many inner city areas (Breward 1993:188; Thompson 1994:96). Increased industrialisation in areas such as Hindmarsh and Thebarton forced the closure of many Catholic churches (State Library of South Australia), whilst Methodist churches within the southern districts experienced a decline in numbers and consequent closure, because ‘the modern day (religious) attitude is for comfortable seating, carpets and air-conditioning, all within a modern setting’ (The Advertiser, 22nd June 1983).
Chapter Four: Methods

There is no other reason to construct churches than as a place where Christians can assemble, pray, listen to sermons and receive communion. When these reasons are no longer valid, churches should be demolished just as other buildings are demolished when there is no further use for them (Martin Luther, cited in Mork 2008:60).

4.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the methods used to address the way in which adaptive reuse affects the level of significance attributed to religious buildings. Methods involved historical and archival research, the distribution of 160 questionnaires, interviews with the owners of four commercially reused churches, one heritage architect and two church ministers, and the recording of these structures, including details of their architectural style, the physical state of their exterior, and any interior and exterior changes made to the structure through reuse.

4.2 Study Area

As there are more than 30 commercially adapted religious properties in the city of Adelaide, criteria were developed in order to narrow this down to a suitable sample size. The following criteria were developed.

Geographical Area

Two geographical areas within Adelaide were chosen for comparison (Figure 4.1): Study Area 1, encompassing Adelaide City, including North Adelaide; and Study Area 2, including the south-western suburbs of Adelaide. Study Area 1 was defined by East Terrace, South Terrace, and West Terrace, up to and including North Adelaide. Study
Area 2 was defined by Port Road to the north, South Road connecting to King William Road to the east and Brighton Road to the west.

These two study areas were chosen because of the concentration of church reuse within each. Church properties within these two zones are architecturally large, being reused by well branded South Australian companies and present a range of denominations. These two geographical areas also offer a wide time frame of church construction, abandonment and adaptive reuse.

Presence of Alternative Religious Denominations

The contrasts between architectural style, attitudes towards reuse, attitudes to the practice of worship and the qualities of the buildings that house worship were crucial to determining a suitable sample. Informal communication with church ministers and research, for example by Lewis (1991:20) and Mork (2008:62), confirmed that different denominations view adaptive reuse in different ways, from the use of space to the manner in which the place undergoes de-consecration. Subsequently, Catholic churches and Nonconformist churches, namely Baptist, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian, were chosen for comparison in this thesis.

Type of adaptation

There are numerous ways in which a religious building can be reused. Not surprisingly, size, architectural style and location can all influence why they are chosen for reuse. These same features can also determine the way in which a religious building is adapted, for example, into residential, commercial or community space.
Figure 4.1 – Geographical study areas

Source: DEH
Projection: GDA94 MGA 54
Date: November 2010
Before such spaces are considered for reuse, Douglas argues that external factors initially determine the appropriateness of adaptation; for example, the building’s condition, constructability, cost and time considerations, design life and statutory controls (Douglas 2006:40). And as Kiley notes, reuse is further based on two different reuse strategies: ‘those that reuse the singular volume of space, and those that reuse the quality of construction and unique character of the space’ (Kiley 2004:57).

Due to the varying ways in which a church space can be reused, it was decided that only those buildings that had been commercially adapted would be studied. Commercial adaptation was identified as the most extreme form of reuse, changing the role of the church to a marketable object. This extreme contrast was considered important as it would demonstrate the change in values at their sharpest.

4.3 Data Sets

Research was undertaken using three complementary data sets. These were:

1. historical data, comprising background and historical research for each building;
2. questionnaires and interviews (qualitative analysis), giving contemporary data for meaning and value; and
3. architectural and archaeological data, profiling each building.

4.3.1 Historical Data

In order to profile the change of use for churches within the study area, a detailed documentary analysis was undertaken. Sources for this information included:
The Lands Title Office (LTO)

Registry searches have been undertaken at the LTO on six reused religious buildings. These searches show the sale of religious buildings after closure, and also provide information regarding the terms and conditions of sale and mortgage, the final sale price of the property, as well as other processes that have altered the site, for example subdivision and development.

The State Library of South Australia (SLSA)

SLSA’s archival collections of historical records belonging to the Uniting Church were also of interest. These primary sources comprise administrative reports, personal records, meeting minutes, newspaper articles and provided extra insight into the church community. This material was used to identify churches that were demolished or sold to become private and commercial properties.

Material pertaining to the Uniting Church could only be read in the Somerville Reading Room. The drawback in regards to this historic material was the somewhat incomplete reference material kept for the Uniting Church of Australia. Incorrect file labelling also resulted in missing data pertaining to the closure of one of the studied churches.

Also of interest were SLSA’s photographic archives. Early photographs of settlement, images of Adelaide’s first church buildings, and subsequent photographs of their reuse provided a wonderful pictorial insight into the first adaptive reuse of churches in Adelaide. The images also allowed for the comparison of early church structures with the current state and use. Figures 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 show the first commercially reused church in Adelaide. Originally the Hindmarsh Square Congregational Church, it was sold ca. 1932 to become the Australian Broadcasting Corporation’s (ABC) Adelaide live radio studio (J. Wang pers. comm., 3 October 2010).
Figure 4.2 - Congregation Church, Hindmarsh Square.  
*Image taken ca. 1870.  
(Image courtesy of the SLSA - #B62412/14)*

Figure 4.3 – ABC Hindmarsh Square. Interior of former Congregation Church.  
*Image taken ca. 1932.  
(Image courtesy of the SLSA - #B9285)*
Figure 4.4 – ABC Hindmarsh Square. Former Congregation Church. Image taken ca. 1935. (Image courtesy of SLSA - #B9286)

Figure 4.5 – ABC Hindmarsh Square. Former Congregation Church. Image taken ca. 1935. (Image courtesy of the SLSA - #B9287)
Catholic Church Archives and Records Service (CCARS)

CCARS provided a detailed history of the role of the Catholic Church in South Australia. Documents detailed the closure of individual churches within the state. Problems in accessing historical records held by CCARS, however, determined that not all information pertaining to the historical background of the reused churches could be found, resulting in historical data being gained through research at other institutions, namely the State Library of South Australia.

Another limiting factor was gaining access to material held at CCARS. A detailed and satisfactory explanation of this research project was required by CCARS before they would allow any form of archival search. The processing of this request subsequently delayed access to records stored at CCARS.

Online Databases

South Australia’s Heritage Places Database and The National Library of Australia’s Picture Australia website were excellent resources for viewing heritage listing details and historic photographs of reused listed religious buildings in Adelaide. The Heritage Places Database had certain limitations. Firstly, it contains mostly state listed buildings, however, and did not include some local lists, which provided further details pertaining to the original religious denomination of buildings that are currently listed and of non-religious usage. Secondly, relevant site, historical and listing details are often out of date. For example, the website has not been updated to show that St Paul’s is now New Heaven.

Other Sources of Primary Information

Informal meetings with Reverend Carl Aiken; Mrs Eileen Young, Principal at St Mary’s College; and Dr Julie Collins, Collections Manager at the South Australian Architecture...
Museum, provided valuable information regarding other commercially adapted churches in the study area. These contacts also provided further historical material, including personal photographs, newspaper clippings and oral accounts of the history pertaining to individual church buildings before and after their reuse.

4.3.2 Questionnaires and Interviews

According to Berg (2001:2), qualitative analysis refers to the ‘exploration of meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of things’. Differing to quantitative analysis, which studies the ‘quantity’ of something (Holloway 1997:3), qualitative analysis studies the ‘quality’ of something, through the use of participant interviews, questionnaire, photographic techniques and other historical and documentary analysis (Berg 2001:3). Given the aims of this research, namely to explore the connections between adapted church structures and changing social values, it was considered most appropriate to use a qualitative approach, namely questionnaire and interview.

Questionnaires

Preliminary research indicated that a successful questionnaire design should aim to address one of two theoretical areas: attitude or behaviour (Alreck and Settle 2004:13). Surveys designed to assess attitude aim to investigate how knowledge affects action, whilst surveys designed to assess behaviour ask specific questions regarding the ‘who, why and what’ (Alreck and Settle 2004:20). As such, the questionnaire for this research was designed to follow the ‘attitude’ approach. This approach allowed the researcher to gain insight into the attitudes of owners and employees concerning adaptive reuse, and in particular, the reuse of religious buildings.
Approval was obtained from the Flinders University, Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (approval number 4851 and Appendix Two), and, as stipulated by the committee, a letter of introduction and a project outline were personally given to the participants, together with the questionnaire (Appendix Three).

Choice of Sample

In order to obtain a range of views concerning the adaptive reuse of religious structures, both in general and beyond the individual case studies, questionnaires were distributed to all commercially reused church properties within the study areas. Properties were located through archival research, and personal communication with community members and staff within the Archaeology Department at Flinders University. A total of 160 questionnaires were sent to ten properties (see Table 4.1). On distribution of these questionnaires, GPS coordinates were obtained for the ten properties, and their locations were added to a locational layer (a geo-rectified aerial image of Adelaide) in ArcGIS (see Figure 4.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Qty Sent</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Architectural Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chanel Nine</td>
<td>202 Tynte Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s College</td>
<td>253 Franklin Street</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly Dancing Academy</td>
<td>240 Franklin Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cnr Flinders and Pulteney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Heaven</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Lewis</td>
<td>200 South Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toop and Toop</td>
<td>84 King William Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiraz Persian Rug</td>
<td>170 Goodwood Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Floor Sanding</td>
<td>37 Orsmond Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Lane Studios</td>
<td>37 Orsmond Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innerwear</td>
<td>214 Main South Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1 – Overview of qualitative and quantitative methods*
Figure 4.6 – Location of churches contacted (questionnaire and interview)
The number of questionnaires distributed within each organisation was dependant on the number of staff working within each property\(^8\). The participants were given up to two months to complete the questionnaire, after which time each property was contacted and the completed documents were collected. A Microsoft 1997 Excel spreadsheet was produced to collate the data (Appendix Four).

Questions

A ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ selection questionnaire was employed for this research. Stone (2004:28) notes that issues can potentially arise with the use of open questions, as time, knowledge, type and size of replies can cause issues with data analysis and make ‘the construction of comparative statistical tables and graphs impossible’. As this data collection tool comprised closed questions, it ensured that all answers were consistent and data were then able to be standardised (Kumar 2005:135). As such, the questionnaire was formulated so that it was easy to comprehend and was of a reasonable length (Foddy 1988:25; De Vaus 2002:112).

The questionnaire included the following themes: knowledge of the building’s history, reasons for reuse, understanding of significance, religion, community and structure. Within each of these categories the questionnaire addressed a series of issues, requesting that the participant answer either ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. Five of these questions asked the participant to further elaborate, if possible. The questions were:

\[\text{\underline{\text{_________________________}}}\]

\(^{8}\) The term ‘staff’ applied to all workers within the office space, from management through to administration and teaching staff.
Knowledge of the building’s history

- Are you aware that your place of work is a converted religious building?
- Did your company purchase this property, or do they rent it?
- Do you know the history of this building? If No, would you like to know the history?
- Are you aware of the original denomination of this building? If yes, please state:
  - If no, have you considered researching its history?
- Were you the first to ‘adapt’ this building?
- If not, are you aware of the previous use of this building? If so, what?
- Do you feel that it is appropriate to reuse a building, religious or not?

Reason for reuse

- Do you believe that the heritage of this building influenced its choice for reuse?
- Do you believe that the aesthetics of this building influenced its choice for reuse?
- Do you believe that the past religious use of this building influenced its choice for reuse?
- Do you believe that the commercial opportunity presented by this building influenced its choice for reuse?
- Are you aware of the reasons behind your employer’s decision to purchase/rent this church?
  - If yes, please state:
  - If yes, do you hold the same views?

Significance and identity

- Is this building significant to you?
- Do you believe that this building contributes to the community’s sense of identity?
- Do you believe that this building contributes to your company’s sense of identity?
- Religious buildings form part of the urban landscape. Do you believe that the reuse of this building allows for it to remain integral to the community?
- Do you feel that the way in which a building is reused influences the way you ascribe importance to it?
• Do you feel that, with this building’s new use, it holds less importance to the community?
• Do you feel that, with this building’s new use, it holds more importance to the community?

Religion

• Are you religious?
• Does working in a reused religious building make you feel more religious?
• Do you believe that your customers/visitors know that this building was previously a church?
• If no, do you tell them?
• Do your customers make mention that your office/work space is an old church?
• Does your business marketing mention that your building is a converted church?

Community

• Do you feel that the adaptation/reuse of this building changes the way the community values it?
• Do you feel that it is important to keep ‘historic’ and ‘significant’ buildings as part of the community?

Structure

• Do you feel that, after reuse, it is important that the building still ‘looks’ somewhat like a church/religious building?
• Do you feel that reuse and additions to the structure should be carried out in a sympathetic nature, i.e. matching in style or materials?
• Do you feel that, through reuse, religious artefacts associated with this building should be kept and still displayed within the structure?
• Do you feel that, through reuse, religious artefacts associated with this building should be removed?
• Do you feel that this reuse has been successful?
• Do you feel that reusing this building was a better option than destroying it?
Of the 160 questionnaires delivered to the 10 reused properties, 38% (n=60) were completed and returned. Unfortunately, there were limitations that arose from the use of this questionnaire. Five questions asked the participants to provide further details, and in most cases, these were left blank. On discussion, most participants stated that they did not have the time and motivation to provide further details. One other limitation in the data presented was the higher return rate of questionnaires from St Mary’s College staff. The return rate from St Mary’s College presented 55% (n=33) of the overall total. Consequently, the data presented is highly representative of the views held by the staff at St Mary’s College.

Interviews (Case Studies)

Data obtained from the questionnaires provided a generalised view regarding adaptive reuse. In order to gain a deeper insight into these views, four commercially adapted properties were chosen and interviews were carried out with management staff. Six interviews were originally intended but due to cancellations only four were conducted. Interviews were chosen as a data collection tool since they are effective in gaining information about matters that could not be ascertained through questionnaire (Taylor and Bogdan 1998; Silverman 2000).

Choice of Sample

Qualitative data collecting requires a representative understanding of the topic (Minichiello et al 1995:160). The formation of this ‘representative’ sample was based on participants who expressed interest in providing further information on completion of the questionnaire. Of the seven who did this, six were chosen for interview and four were interviewed: two properties from within the Adelaide city study area and two from within the south-western study area. The properties within the Adelaide city study area
were New Heaven and St Mary’s College, whilst those in the south-western study area were Bernie Lewis Home Loans and Toop & Toop.

Along with their desire to contribute to this study, the four interviewees where chosen for their ability to articulate their knowledge of individual locations, including the historical past of the building and reasons for reuse.

Prior to interview, GPS coordinates for all six properties were obtained (see Figure 4.6) and histories were researched. Of the six properties, two are State Heritage Places (P), three are Local Heritage Places (L) and one is a Contributory item (C) (see Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1st Reuse</th>
<th>Section 23</th>
<th>Heritage ID</th>
<th>ID Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's College</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13396</td>
<td>H0201620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Heaven</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H0200152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel Nine Studios</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13497</td>
<td>H0201643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-western suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Lewis</td>
<td>Mile End</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>A,C,D,F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H2110081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toop and Toop</td>
<td>Goodwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>A,D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H0900114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Lane Studios</td>
<td>Hindmarsh</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H2524045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 – Heritage Listings

The objective of these interviews was to determine the current owner’s views and perceptions regarding significance, and whether they considered the level of significance had changed since adaptive reuse. Prior to interview, approval was obtained from the Flinders University, Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (approval number 4851), and as stipulated by the committee, a letter of introduction and a project outline was sent to all participants (Appendix Five).
Questions

Interviews were conducted in person and in an informal manner, yet the format was kept as consistent as possible so that responses were comparable (Bernard 2006:210). This semi-structured manner of interview was useful, as it allowed each participant to expand on the themes of the research, if they so chose (Berg 2001:84). Permission was sought to voice record before the start of each interview, with participants recorded on digital voice recorder (Sony M3P IC Recorder). Complete interviews were then transcribed verbatim, with copies sent to each interviewee for feedback and editing.

The interview questions were based around the six questionnaire themes. The interview and questionnaire questions were linked in order so that results could be compared and any trends and/or difference in view could be analysed, i.e. from staff member to business owner. Interviews were undertaken on site and ten questions were asked of each interview participant. The questions were:

- What do you understand ‘significance’ to be?
- How do you feel about this building?
- Would you say that buildings become more ‘significant’ because of what they once were?
- Does the level of significance change through the manner of reuse?
- How would you rate the importance in reusing old/historic buildings?
- Do you feel there is a need to keep old/historic buildings ‘alive’ within the community?
- How strongly do you believe keeping ‘old’ and ‘historic’ buildings contributes to our sense of identity?
- How would you rate the way in which your students/coworkers react to working ‘space’ within a reused church?
- Do you think that people respond differently to this building, knowing that it is an old religious building?
Are you able to describe, in one word, how you feel about working in a reused church?

Case Studies

Bernie Lewis Home Loans (Holder Memorial Congregation Church)

Two visits were made to this property. In the first instance, an interview was undertaken with Mark Lewis, Director of Bernie Lewis Home Loans. Mr Lewis gave permission to inspect the entire property, including the original church, the old meeting hall and a recent extension to the rear of the meeting hall. Of the buildings, the original church and hall are now used as office space and the extension used as a training space. On the second visit, Mr Lewis gave permission for photographs to be taken of the interior and exterior.

Channel Nine Studios (Primitive Methodist)

Initial contact was made with marketing staff at Channel Nine studios at North Adelaide. Although preliminary requests for interview and questionnaire assistance appeared successful; a site visit was offered and staff showed interest in the topic, it became apparent that staff were unable to assist when questionnaires were not completed and scheduled interviews were cancelled and not re-arranged. As a result, no architectural survey was undertaken.

New Heaven Nightclub (St Paul’s Cathedral)

One interview was undertaken with Orlando Farese, the current part owner of New Heaven Nightclub. This interview was undertaken outside New Heaven. Due to time constraints and Mr Farese's busy schedule, the interview lasted 15 minutes. Security issues also meant that the property could be entered, but no interior photographs were allowed to be taken. Mr Farese gave permission for photographs of New Heaven’s
exterior to be taken. Internet research also uncovered interior images, which were downloadable from the company's website http://www.heaven.com.au/.

Chapel Lane Studios (Hindmarsh Congregational Church)

Contact was made with Mr Joshua Neumann regarding Chapel Lane Studios at Hindmarsh. Discussions were had over the telephone about the reuse of the old Hindmarsh Congregational Church. Mr Neumann gave permission for a site visit whereby interior and exterior photographs were taken. Two interviews were arranged but these were cancelled by Mr Naumann. Eventually Mr Neumann’s assisted stated that he was extremely busy and would not be able to assist in this research. As the architectural survey of Chapel Lane Studios had already been undertaken, it was decided that these survey results would still be included and discussed.

St Mary’s College (St Mary’s Catholic Convent School)

Two visits were made to St Mary’s College. On the first visit, a 40 minute interview was undertaken with Mrs Eileen Young. Mrs Young is the Principal at St Mary’s College. On the first occasion that St Mary’s College was visited, a tour of the school grounds was undertaken. This included the chapel, staff common room, staff offices and the administration areas. All of these spaces were once part of the original St Josephine, and later Dominican Sisters’ chapel and prayer rooms. Exterior and interior photographs were taken on the second visit.

Toop & Toop (Unley Methodist)

Two visits were made with Toop & Toop. On the first visit, an interview was undertaken with Anthony Toop, Managing Director of Toop & Toop. This interview was conducted at 123 Kensington Road, Kent Town. On this occasion Mr Toop was only able to talk for 25 minutes. A second interview was arranged and took place at Toop
and Toop’s newly fitted out office space within the old Unley Methodist church. At this time Mr Toop gave permission for photographs of the building to be taken and a tour of the property was undertaken.

Interviews – Other

An interview was also conducted with Michael Queale of Grieve and Gillett Architects. Mr Queale was selected for interview because of his specific knowledge of the adaptive reuse process and of general heritage issues in the city of Adelaide.

Two further interviews were undertaken with Reverend Carl Aiken, from the Baptist church and Father Kevin O’Loughlin, a Catholic Minister. Reverend Aiken and Father O’Loughlin were selected for interview because of their knowledge and interest in the reuse of churches within the Baptist and Catholic denominations.

4.3.3 Architectural Survey

In order to provide a comparable set of data, an architectural and visual survey of the interior and exterior of the buildings were conducted, where possible. Fieldwork was undertaken to document the architectural and stylistic elements and any subsequent structural changes that took place after reuse. A recording form was created to document the architectural changes (Appendix Six). This form was created so that data collection was consistent. Where possible, photographs of exterior and interior alterations were taken (using a Nikon D60 camera).

Adaptation of Exterior

The physical aspects of each building, i.e. size, building material, stylistic elements, architectural style and condition were recorded. Firstly, these were recorded as they are indicators of wealth. Bluestone and sandstone construction were more expensive,
in comparison to brick (Stone 2010:82). Secondly, physical attributes were recorded in order to demonstrate how, and to what extent, reuse had contributed to the maintenance of the building. In order to be sure of the extent and degree of change, these features were compared to original photographs of the building, where available.

Adaptation of Interior

Interior changes were recorded, for example additions and types of addition to the original structures. As with most adaptive reuse cases, interior structural elements were modified, changed and altered to suit new uses and to meet stringent building and occupational, health and safety guidelines, for example the addition of emergency exists and disabled access.

Religious Ornamentation

The presence or absence of religious material and objects was documented. The objects chosen for study included: the Cross, doors, windows, foundation stones, religious statues, memorials, religious furniture and the church ceiling (in terms of its form). These items were recorded as they are the items that most distinguish a church from any other building (Hean 2006: 38, 42).
Chapter Five: Results

I once thought churches and temples were like hills, permanent in location and singular in shape. The truth is, many go where the customers go. They build and rebuild (Albom 2009:26).

5.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the results obtained from the questionnaire, interview and architectural survey. Firstly, the questionnaire results are presented with an analysis of all data obtained within each subsection, namely: knowledge of the building’s history, reasons for its reuse, understanding of significance, religion, community and structure. These results are then followed by an interrogation and cross examination of the ‘Catholic’ data, namely the results from St Mary’s College (as their questionnaire return rate was equivalent to 55% of the data presented). Secondly, an interview analysis explores the discussions with the four commercial companies that now work within reused church spaces. Discussions with Mr Michael Queale of Grieve and Gillett Architects, Carl Aiken and Father O’Loughlin are also considered. These discussions draw on the perceptions of reused space and the changing levels of significance resulting from the process of reuse. Lastly, the data obtained through the architectural survey are discussed, revealing the extent of physical change occurring through adaptive reuse.

5.2 Questionnaire

For this study, 160 questionnaires were delivered to ten reused religious properties within, Adelaide (including North Adelaide) and the south-western area. The return rate was 38% (n=60) (see Table 5.1). As generally acknowledged, typical survey return
rates tend to be low (Alreck and Settle 2004:25), so this return rate was considered reasonable.

This survey had two limitations. The first was that respondents failed to provide further details in regards to the five questions that asked for additional information. On enquiry, most participants stated that they did not have the time or motivation to complete these sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Qty Sent</th>
<th>Qty Returned</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Nine</td>
<td>202 Tynte Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's College</td>
<td>253 Franklin Street</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly Dancing Academy</td>
<td>240 Franklin Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Heaven</td>
<td>Cnr Flinders and Pulteney Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-western suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Lewis</td>
<td>200 South Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toop and Toop</td>
<td>84 King William Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiraz Persian Rug Gallery</td>
<td>170 Goodwood Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Floor Sanding</td>
<td>37 Orsmond Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Lane Studios</td>
<td>37 Orsmond Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innerwear</td>
<td>214 Main South Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1- Questionnaire return rate*

The second limitation was a sampling bias (Figure 5.1). As the return rate of questionnaires from St Mary’s College staff represented 55% (n=33) of all surveys, these results highly influenced the overall data. St Mary’s College also represented 100% of data returned from reused Catholic churches (no other businesses within this ‘Catholic’ subsample completed and returned the questionnaire). Subsequently, St Mary’s College results were interrogated independently (refer to Appendix Seven for complete results).
5.2.1 Overall Results

Knowledge and History

In order to assess the respondents’ general knowledge about their work place, nine ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ questions and two further explanatory questions were asked within the first section of the questionnaire. Of the respondents, 78% (n=47) stated that they were aware that their place of work was previously a church (Figure 5.2). In comparison, only 43% (n=26) of the respondents knew the history of their place of work, suggesting that, even though they might be aware of the building’s architectural form, namely that it looks like a church, they did not know the intricacy of its history, i.e. its denomination or age.

![Chart showing questionnaire return](chart.png)

*Figure 5.1 - Questionnaire return*
This lack of historical knowledge can be unpacked further. Only 34% (n=20) stated that they knew the original denomination of the church that used the building. Of the twenty that knew of their building’s denomination, only eighteen recorded this (Figure 5.3).
When asked if respondents knew of the previous owners of their space, only 5.4% (n=9) of the respondents were able to answer this question. As only three of the properties surveyed—Topp&Toop, Belly Dance Company and New Heaven—had moved into previously reused church buildings, the response to this question was low. Finally, 57% (n=35) of the respondents stated that they felt that the reuse of religious buildings was appropriate.

**Reasons for Reuse**

In contrast to the above section, the themes in this section sought to determine each respondent’s views of church reuse. Seven questions were asked in this section: six were of the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ type and one asked the participants to further explain. This section of the questionnaire was reasonably thoroughly completed, with 97% of the questions answered (Figure 5.4).

![Figure 5.4 - Results from ‘reason’ section of questionnaire](image)
This section showed that 45% (n=26) of the participants felt that the ‘heritage’ of the building influenced their choice to reuse it, whilst 63% (n=38) felt that it was the building’s ‘aesthetics’ that made it a suitable candidate for reuse. Of course these can be the same thing in many ways, since aesthetic significance is part of heritage. Furthermore, 22% (n=13) stated that they believed the building was chosen for reuse because of its past ‘religious’ nature. Responses to this question demonstrated that 67% (n=39) of the participants were unsure whether the building’s past ‘religious-ness’ had anything to do with its choice for reuse.

Sixty-six percent (n=37) of the respondents stated that the building’s ‘commercial opportunity’ influenced its choice for reuse. Yet, interestingly, when asked if they knew why the building was chosen for reuse, some 82% (n=49) did not. The ‘commercial opportunity’ answer appears unsubstantiated, although it is also possible that the link between the two questions was not clear enough. The final question in this section proved problematic. Seeing that only 13% (n=8) of those surveyed knew why their employer had chosen a religious structure for reuse, 83% of the respondents did not respond to this question (with only nine participants stating that they were aware of their employer’s reasons behind reuse, and one stating that they were unaware of it).

Finally, Figure 5.5 demonstrates the overall theme of this section, in that most of the respondents held the belief that a building’s ‘commercial opportunity’ and ‘aesthetics’ were the main reasons behind its choice for reuse.
Understanding Significance

The survey's third theme comprised seven questions concerning changing levels of significance. Of the 60 respondents, 32% (n=19) stated that they felt that the building was significant to them, 33% (n=30) stated that the building held no significance, whilst 18% (11) suggested that they were unsure of the building's significance. In regard to the 18% who answered 'unsure' to this question, it is not possible to distinguish whether respondents did not understand the term 'significance' or simply felt that the building was of uncertain significance.

Two questions within this theme asked the participants whether they felt that the reuse of a religious building contributes to maintaining a community's identity and to developing their company's character, respectively. Of the respondents, 48% (n=29) confirmed that church buildings contributed to a community's identity, whilst only 22% (n=13) stated that the building contributes to their company's commercial identity. Figure 5.6 demonstrates this difference and presents results of another question, in which the respondents were asked whether they felt that, through reuse, religious...
buildings remained an integral (visible) component of the landscape. Interestingly, 57% (n=33) of the respondents stated that they were unsure whether, through reuse, a religious building continues to be a visual component of the landscape. This presents an opposing view when compared to an earlier question within this theme, where nearly half of the respondents (48%) stated that church buildings contributed to a community’s identity.

![Graph](Image)

**Questions**

*Figure 5.6 – Results from ‘significance’ section of questionnaire*

When participants were asked whether significance levels attributed to reused church buildings were related to the type of reuse, i.e. from church to nightclub or lingerie store, just under half of respondents (46%, or n=26) felt this to be the case. A further 30% (n=17) thought that significance levels were not influenced by the type of reuse. Twenty two percent (n=13) were ‘unsure’ whether reuse type affected the way a building was valued by the community.

Similar views were expressed regarding reuse and significance levels (Figure 5.7). Of the respondents, 53% (n=29) stated that reuse did not lessen the ‘importance’ of the
building, whilst 16% (n=9) indicated that reuse impacted on the way in which a community valued a building.

Figure 5.7 – Reuse and community value (n=38)

Religion

The fourth section of the questionnaire asked each participant about their religious views. The outcome of this section can be viewed in Figure 5.8. Of the respondents, 33% (n=20) stated that they were religious, whilst 57% (n=34) stated that they were not, and a further 10% (n=6) ticked the ‘unsure’ box. Asked whether they felt more ‘religious’ because of their work environment, 67% (n=40) of the respondents stated that they did not and a further 23% (n=14) stated that they were unsure. Six respondents (10%) felt more religious.

The remaining questions within this theme dealt with the manner in which the adaptive reuse of the church was promoted, both to specific clients and to the general public. When asked whether the respondents felt that their clients knew of the building’s original use, 75% (n=45) said that they did not, whilst 17% (n=10) stated that visitors to
the site made mention of the site’s previous use. Of the respondents who answered the question, 25% (n=15) stated that they would (and have) intentionally mentioned to clients and visitors that their workplace was previously a church, whilst 67% (n=40) stated that they did not bring up this fact. Similarly, of those surveyed, 63% (n=38) stated that visitors did not inform them of their building’s history. This result possibly suggests that site visitors do not know the building’s history or that they did not feel obliged to inform staff of this information.

Somewhat surprisingly, and in relation to the final question within this theme, 67% (n=40) of the respondents stated that their company did not market or promote the fact that their workplace was located within a reused church.

An overall examination of the results from within this theme suggests that religion and being religious are not prerequisites in the appreciation of reused religious structures; nor are they a catalyst for the sharing of information about a building’s history. Even though respondents appear to have some understanding of their building’s history (in
reference to question three from within the History theme) they are not concerned with sharing this information with clients or visitors. Figure 5.9 demonstrates this, with 43% (n=26) of the respondents stating that they were aware of their building’s history, but only 25% (n=15) acknowledged that they directly and/or indirectly shared this information.

![Figure 5.9](image)

*Figure 5.9 – History and communication, a comparison*

**Community**

Theme five was concerned with the manner in which businesses dealt with community concerns about a church’s reuse. It consisted of two questions (see Figure 5.10). Of the respondents, 43% (n=26) made it apparent that, through reuse, communities may change the way they value the building, whilst 30% (n=20) stated that this was not the case. Importantly, it should be noted that this question did not allow participants to further elaborate, so it is hard to establish whether the respondents believed that ‘value change’ was a positive or negative consequence of adaptive reuse. Not surprisingly,
over half of the respondents, 58% (n=35), confirmed that it was important to keep older/historic buildings.

![Bar chart showing responses to the 'community' section of the questionnaire.

Structure

The final theme raised issues about the structural changes that occur when a building undergoes the process of adaptive reuse (see Figure 5.11). This theme directly ties in with the third data set; namely the architectural survey, in that it aims to determine whether adaptations, both exterior and interior, change the way people ascribe significance to a built structure.

The theme’s first question asked participants about how important it was that a church still looked like a church after adaptive reuse. Seventy five percent (n=45) of the respondents stated that a church should still resemble a church after reuse and a further 89% (n=50) suggested that extensions and other work carried out should be matching in style and/or materials.
Within this theme, questions three and four asked about the inclusion or removal of religious objects within a reused church. The data shows that 85% (n=45) of respondents believed that religious objects should be kept and displayed within the reused church, whilst, on the other hand, 31% (n=17) believed that they should be removed.

![Figure 5.11 - Results from 'structure' section of questionnaire](image)

Finally, the last two questions asked each respondent whether they felt that the reuse of religious structures successfully meets historic and environmental demands. Eighty three percent (n=45) agreed that the reuse of religious buildings, particularly in relation to their office space, was successful. A further 82% (n=46) suggested that the reuse of religious buildings far outweighed their abandonment and possible final destruction. Of these two final questions, respondents were either in agreement with the statements or were unsure/did not respond. None of the respondents answered ‘no’ to these questions.
5.2.2 Comparative Results

As noted above, a major limitation to the collection of this data was the high percentage of completed questionnaires from St Mary’s College staff—55% (n=33). St Mary’s College was the sole representative from the Catholic dataset, so their results were analysed separately and compared with the overall data. The key differences are discussed below.

Knowledge and History

All responses within the history theme presented similar results. The only major difference was in relation to question four, which asked participants whether they would ‘like to know the history of their building’. The results showed that none of the Catholic respondents felt they needed to know further information about the building’s history. This can be explained by the previous question; where 100% (n=13) of the respondents stated that they knew of the building’s original denomination. Also, people employed at a Catholic school are more likely to be knowledgeable concerning religious matters than people who worked in other reused churches.

Reasons for Reuse

Theme two presented some interesting results. Catholic responses indicated that reuse was influenced by the building’s heritage (33%, n=20) and past religious usage (17%, n=10), whilst non-Conformists felt that reuse was depended on aesthetics (30%, n=18) (Figure 5.12). Even though Catholic responses also indicted that they felt that the aesthetics of the building influenced reuse, their responses were more spread out amongst the first three questions.
Of further interest within this theme was the response to the question concerning their employer’s reason for reuse. Non-Conformist responses to this question demonstrated they were unaware of the reasons behind reuse (57%, n=34). Catholic responses to this question indicated that they were more inclined to be aware of this reason (12%, n=7).
Understanding Significance

The major difference within this theme related to the way in which respondents viewed significance (see Figure 5.13). Catholic responses indicated that the reused church building was more significant to them (28%, n=17) whilst only 3% (n=2) of the non-Conformist responses indicted that they felt the building was significant. When relating these results to the first theme, it is interesting to note that Catholic respondents had a greater awareness of their building’s past and note that the building is more significant to them. Consequently, this suggests that an understanding of a site’s history enhances value and significance.

Figure 5.13 - Results from ‘significance’ section of questionnaire
Catholic vs. Non-Conformist
Religion

Responses within this theme were consistent. Catholic and non-Conformist views only differed when asked if working in a reused church made the participants feel more religious (Figure 5.14). The results showed that Catholics felt slightly more religious because of their working environment, some 10% (n=6) of the respondents noted this, whereas no non-Conformists respondents stated that they felt more religious.

Figure 5.14 - Results from ‘religion’ section of questionnaire
Catholic vs., Non-Conformist
Community

Within this theme, Catholic and non-Conformist respondents equally felt that church reuse contributed to maintaining community identity and worked in creating a sense of place.

Structure

Again, views within this theme were somewhat similar. Forty two percent (n=25) of the Catholic respondents and 33% (n=20) of the non-Conformist respondents felt that after reuse, a church should still resemble a church (see Figure 5.15). Difference in views between the two denominations only arose with the questions regarding the retention or removal of religious items. Here, 48% (n=29) of the respondents from the Catholic reused property stated that religious items should be kept, compared to 27% (n=16) from non-Conformist reused properties.

![Figure 5.15 - Results from ‘structure’ section of questionnaire Catholic vs., Non-Conformist](image-url)
5.3 Interviews

As mentioned in Chapter Four, a series of interviews were undertaken with owners and/or managers of four reused church properties. Interviews were undertaken to further develop and elaborate on the questionnaire results. The selected four interviewees were chosen because of their willingness to contribute to this research and because of their ability to articulate their knowledge of individual locations, including the historical past of the building and the reasons for reuse. A further three interviews were undertaken with Michael Queale of Grieve and Gillett Architects, Baptist Pastor Mr Carl Aiken and Father Kevin O'Loughlin, a Catholic Minister. Presented below are the results from these interviews, following the order of the questionnaire themes (Transcripts to all interviews can be found in Appendix Eight).

History and Significance

The first question asked in each interview was aimed at determining how each participant viewed the term significance. As such, each participant was asked to explain its meaning. Most of the interviewees were aware of the term significance and were able to articulate this and in turn relate the significance of their church building. Mr Queale was able to further elaborate on this term and its use within the historical architectural arena. When asked to define significance, Mr Queale stated that:

... (significance) ... I guess it's a two edged thing for what I do; either as an architect or as a heritage advisor for Council. Definitely with conservation practices, to work out the significance of what we're dealing with first and what the elements of that ... and what elements of the building are the things that informs that significance, so you work out what things are important and which things are negotiable or of no value and you can work with (Michael Queale, 5 December 2010).
Furthermore, Mr Toop, Director of Toop and Toop, stated that (in reference to The Abbey on King William Road Unley) ‘significance should be about [the building] being in absolute connection with the community’. So much so, that the site makes ‘people smile and people talk about it with affection’ (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010). Mrs Young, Principal of St Mary’s college suggested that:

... so for me, [significance] is about [this building's] role over time, what was the initial role, then what are the things that happened in [its] history ... [they are what make] this place important (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

In terms of the question regarding their building’s significance and the knowledge of their work place, all participants keenly noted that they were aware of their building’s history. They recounted past stories about their work place, making it apparent that, even if they personally did not carry out historical research, they had spoken and engaged with community members about the building.

Accounts by Mr Toop further demonstrated his knowledge about the site and its past. Mr Toop remembered the impact of finding out that his grandfather was a Minister at the Unley Methodist Church. He said:

My grandfather was a Methodist Minister in that church; that wasn’t the reason we bought it ... that was found out actually after we had bought it, but it was kind of very cool, almost like karma ... And then subsequent to that, I found out my sister-in-law had these old photographs ... (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010).

Mr Lewis, Executive Chairman of Bernie Lewis Home Loans, further reinforced this site knowledge and was able to describe accounts when past worshipers returned to the site and retold stories:

One of the most moving [moments] ... was [when] this guy from Queensland rang ... and said “look, it’s our 60th wedding anniversary, do you mind if we
come down, we hear it’s not a church anymore, do you mind if we ... we’d still like to come and have a look” ... anyway, he brings his wife in, she has a blindfold on ... [he] took the blindfold off and she just burst into tears. Even though it’s an office now and not a church anymore, she instantly recognised it ... after 60 years ... so that was quite good (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

In talking about people’s memory of the site, Mr Lewis also noted that people still visited the building, and their presence within it evokes memories:

... people still do come in here and when they say, oh you know, I got married in here or I went to church here or whatever, they certainly have a sense of belonging to it ... it doesn’t happen so much now, probably because the passage of time sort of changes ... but in the first few years, we had a lot of people come in (Mark Lewis, 9th September 2010).

When asked about the history and significance of the old chapel at St Mary’s College, 253 Franklin Street, Adelaide, Mrs Young said:

If you're talking about the church or the chapel here on this campus ... its significance is huge, historically in Adelaide ... and of course now, internationally, because originally this site was the site where ... the St Joseph’s sisters first came and hence, Mary MacKillop, to Adelaide ... she moved here and started up a little school called St Joseph’s School for the Poor (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

Mr Farese, part owner of New Heaven, when asked about the same two issues, loosely confirmed that ‘clients’ of the nightclub had talked of past memories and reminisced about events but he did not further elaborate:

Oh yeah, they do, yeah, they tell me that came here before ... well ... before when it was still a nightclub ... years ago (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

In contrast to the other interviews, Mr Farese’s knowledge of the building’s history was somewhat limited. He was able to detail recent events, i.e. the current purchase of the building and details of the interior fit out, but he could not recall much of the building’s
historic nature. This became even more evident when talking about the heritage listed Tiffany windows, which were relocated to Pulteney Grammar’s School chapel in the early 1980s and then moved to the Art Gallery of South Australia in 2001 (The Advertiser, 27 June 2009; Rowney 1988:83). Mr Farese was asked about the stained glass windows and in particular about the installation of the replacement windows in the western wall, to which he replied that ‘the windows are original!’ (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

Reasons for Reuse

Interviewees were asked to explain the reasons behind developing and working within a reused religious structure. Mr Toop, Mr Lewis and Mr Farese all stated that the church’s architectural form was a great draw-card. The buildings are easily recognisable and they already come with a connection to the community, people already know of the place, either in a historical manner, i.e. as noted by Mr Lewis, Mr Toop and Mrs Young; or in a locational manner, as noted by Mr Farese.

Mr Farese stated that St Paul’s was the perfect venue for a nightclub:

The space is great and people know the place ... how many people pass here every day? ... And it’s kind of close to Rundle Street ... and close to Hutt Street; there’s not that many residential people living around the area so we weren’t going to disturb too many people, uh, it was the perfect size, it lent itself to the name, um, everything kind of just seemed to gel (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

New Heaven also has the advantage in that its predecessor, Heaven, also a nightclub, had previously utilised the site. At the time of this research, no signage had yet been installed, but people already knew the location of New Heaven, ‘you just have to say “New Heaven” and “St Paul's” in the one sentence, and people are like “oh yeah ... the place on Pulteney street ... that old church” (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).
When Mr Toop was asked about his purchase of The Abbey, he admitted that there were many reasons behind choosing the site which has subsequently become Toop and Toop’s new Hyde Park office (Appendix Nine). Of the building, Mr Toop stated that:

... it’s a very beautiful building, it’s symmetrical, it’s built well, and it’s just a gorgeous looking, architectural piece of ... and I suppose that there are a whole host of things... a common thread I suppose, is the gathering of people, so if you weren’t at all religious you could argue that it’s a meeting place and it’s a place where things are shared and that’s the common thread ... (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010)

And in regards to the economic commitment associated with the reusing of an older building, Mr Toop further explained that:

... we do it because we actually love it and we have a real sense of, probably purpose with it, you know like, and we really, you know, we’ve had the opportunity to have modern offices, we’ve had, in fact, it would be a lot easier, you know ...but we’ve stuck with this and we don’t actually probably know exactly why so it’s (Anthony Toop 17 September 2010).

A similar discussion was had with Mr Lewis. When asked why he had chosen to purchase and reuse the old Holder Memorial Church, he replied:

You know ... we were looking, we were in the city, we were justleasing an office in the city and um, my father decided, the lease was coming up, and I’d been trying to convince him to go out to the suburbs for a while, primarily out to Greenhill Road or somewhere like that, because I always said to him “people hate coming into the city for their appointments” ... I drove past here (200 South Road) one day and it basically had the portable cyclone fencing up, around the car park area, which were tennis courts, and a big sale sign .. it was run down and decrepit. Anyway, I mentioned it to the old man and he said “let’s organise to go and have a look at it” ... And um, anyway, the priest he let us in and we had a look at it ... it was dark and dingy and [had] sloping floors ...
Anyway, dad said “look, let’s get the architect down here, let’s have a look” and he was sort of driving it and he sort of quite liked the idea of a church (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Here, Mr Lewis highlighted his attraction in reusing a ‘different’ type of building, one that creates a ‘point of conversation’. During the course of the interview, discussions also arose about the ‘type’ of person who chooses to reuse older buildings. Mr Lewis notes that a potential developer ‘needs [to be] a loving owner-occupier ... one who has a vision for something ... for something special’ (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Mr Toop also made mention of the type of person who works in reused religious buildings. ‘They tend to find that intangible connection’, and this connection he had with The Abbey:

... it's a useless building for an office in many ways ... The Abbey is just not suited, really, for what we're doing with it, but I'll put money on [and into it] if you like .. I have that feeling ... it's hard to define (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010).

Mrs Young talked about the reuse of the old Chapel and associated buildings at St Mary’s College. Although the reasons for reusing St Mary’s were somewhat different to those mentioned above, they were similar in that they:

... honour the history, but [also] use [the buildings] in a contemporary way ... the [sister's] bedrooms are now the staff room ... (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

**Religious Objects**

A further interview theme enquired about the appropriateness of keeping religious objects in reused buildings. Mr Lewis noted that no religious objects could be removed from the old Holder Memorial Church because of an encumbrance placed upon it by the Uniting Church. Because of this, the foundation stone, all stained glass windows, and all inscriptions had to remain. Mr Lewis was adamant that the religious
objects should stay with the building, stating that ‘Yeah yeah everyone knows it’s a church, and um, yeah, the leadlight kind of gives it away if the shape doesn’t ... it’s absolutely fantastic. I mean, look at what sits there above my desk [Mr Lewis points to the stained glass window above his desk, it reads—“and here God sits”]’ (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Mrs Young also commented on the retention of religious objects within the old Chapel. Upon redevelopment of the old Chapel at St Mary’s College in 1994, heritage architects found original paint work—a frieze along the north western corner and gold leaf stars on the ceiling on the sanctuary. The frieze was carefully removed and framed and all items were reproduced. This, Mrs Young suggested, ‘is the best part of reusing a building; finding these hidden objects and bring[ing] them back to life’.

Another issue raised by Mr Lewis, which was repeated by Mr Neuman, was the apparent lack of interest from relevant religious groups concerning the removal of religious furniture at the time of church closure. Mr Lewis, not being aware of Methodist views concerning the church i.e. that it was the people who made a church the house of God (Hean 2006:9), showed his disgust at the lack of care shown by the minister at its sale:

... we asked them “did we have to de-consecrate it or anything like that?” and they said “oh no, you don’t have to worry about that”. And we said “ok, well, we’d like to, you know, to take the spire off the top of the thing” and they said “yeah, go ahead”. It was this whole …laissez faire! They didn’t really give a shit attitude. To them, it was just a building. And I thought that’s really strange because there must’ve been a lot of history here, there must’ve been a lot of um….um...you know, for the people that came here, a lot of feelings of …a lot of memories ... all that kind of stuff (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Even though Mr Toop and Mr Farese purchased already altered church properties, both agreed that the retention and use of religious objects, like the stained glass...
windows, added to the authenticity of the site, ‘there’s as much authenticity as possible, trying to keep it if anything’ (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010).

Heritage Issues, Building Codes and Subsequent Costs

Both Mr Lewis and Mr Toop raised the array of ‘hidden’ issues that slow down the reuse process. They both highlighted the difficulty in meeting stringent building codes, all whilst preserving the building’s heritage.

Mark Lewis noted the structural changes associated with the reuse of the old Holder Memorial Church. Originally a Methodist church, when Mr Lewis purchased the property it had sloping floors and these presented a problem when redesigning the interior space:

They’re the original boards [pointing to the floorboards], we actually ripped them up ... one by one ... painstakingly ... so we were trying not to break the tongue and groove, and then levelled the floors, re-laid the piers, re-laid the boards ... we managed to salvage 90% of the boards (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010)

As the building is heritage listed, Mr Lewis faced limitations in the type of building works that could be undertaken. Interior alterations were ‘cantilevered, out of the ground, so that the walls were not touched’ and exterior additions were designed to keep the ‘lines of the original church’ (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Likewise, the reuse of New Heaven required structural alterations. The inclusion of an intermediary concert floor gave much needed extra space, and it was also required to keep the building structurally sound. Mr Farese noted that these alterations took place before the site came to house Heaven and most recently, New Heaven. Mr Farese stated that the ‘structural sounding’ enabled the building to be ‘continually used and
enabled it to become a successful enterprise’ (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

Mr Farese also carried out other internal alternations to New Heaven, and discussed the costs associated with the rigging of lights and sound systems to the internal (and original) wooden ceiling beams, ‘something that the lighting engineers found very strange ... and you know, we had to make sure that the roof could support it’ (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

Mrs Young, principal of St Mary’s College, also mentioned the difficulties that arose in regards to building and council regulations:

... we wanted reflective glass [on the new performing arts centre]; from floor to ceiling – 3 floors – because we felt the reflective glass would reflect the chapel, which is a beautiful building and this essentially, critically historical building in terms of Adelaide history and Adelaide church history would be reflected in the glass beautifully. Adelaide City Council didn’t want that ... (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

Community

Each interview participant was asked about how they felt the community reacted to the commercially reuse church. Mrs Young and Mr Toop both felt that adaptive reuse enabled the church structure to remain a visible part of the landscape, while Mr Toop stated that ‘the building [The Abbey] represents stability, grounding, and being a church ... it mean[s] a great deal to people’ (Anthony Toop, 7 September 2010). Likewise, Mrs Young stated that she encouraged her students to understand the old Chapel’s past:

... every single Year 8 class at the beginning of the year, I bring them down of a morning, when they’re new students, sit them in this room for example, and I ask them to look around the room and tell me what they think it used to be used
for in the old days and they look and their thinking ‘‘it’s her office, what could it have been?’’ I say ‘‘look at the fireplace’’, ‘‘look at this’’, now ‘‘look at the front door’’ and a few bright sparks will say ‘‘the front lounge room’’ (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

Mrs Young also ensured that parents were able to celebrate the history of the building:

We deliberately have our ‘open Principal tour’ mornings, in our new building because that’s the building we can actually sit in comfortably now and it’s attractive. We do the talk there and then they go for our walk and then we bring them back for morning tea into the old school room and the chapel and that’s where they talk and ask questions with that more intimate interface. So, we use several areas of the school inclusive of the heritage part and in my presentation, I talk about the past, the history of the college, what it is we value, I also say to them ‘‘I hope you can see that in the aesthetic blend of the old and the new as you walk around’’ so it’s something I consciously say to them (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

Mr Toop stated that he hoped that the community would still feel connected to The Abbey. Creating this connection was important. Mr Toop said that he wanted to:

... have events for our clients and for public and really get them into the building, it’s quite interesting because that congregation is a very big part of how we want to use that building as an office, so that meeting of people, and only through talking with you now, you know, I sort of realise that that meeting of people is going to be a big part of that building and that’s what it’s designed for. (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010).

Mr Toop, Mrs Young and Mr Lewis all felt that reuse enabled the community to still connect and engage with the building, with the added enjoyment and satisfaction in seeing such landmark buildings being reused.
5.4 Architectural Survey

As noted in Chapter Four, an architectural and visual survey of each church was undertaken. Architectural and stylistic elements were documented, along with any subsequent structural changes to the exterior and interior. The retention or removal of religious objects was recorded.

Adaptation of Exterior

Reference was made to the three influential styles of Australian church architecture in Chapter Three; Georgian, Classical and Gothic. All five churches within this study area are classified as Gothic and all five possess its characteristics, namely pointed arches and flying buttresses (see Figures 5.16 and 5.17).

![Figure 5.16 – Pointed arches on windows, Bernie Lewis Home Loans, 200 South Road, Mine End (Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)](image1)

![Figure 5.17 – Buttresses, Toop&Toop, King William Road, Unley. (Photograph: L.Holt 2nd October 2010)](image2)

There appeared to be a consistency in the use of building materials within the two study areas. As noted by Stone and Howell, access to funds influenced the choice of building material and the type of building construction in Adelaide (Stone 2010:202; Howell 2002:59), and this was represented in the study areas. The most common type of building material was bluestone, with three churches being constructed from this
material. It is reasonable to conclude then, that these congregations had access to
greater funds, and could subsequently build ‘wealthier’ looking churches.

Furthermore, of the three bluestone churches, two were located within Study Area 1
(Adelaide city and North Adelaide). Since settlement, this area has been an enclave
for the wealthy and as such, the use of bluestone would project this image (Howell
2002:60). Sandstone and brick churches each represented one of the sample and both
of these churches were located within Study Area 2. This area has been previously
noted as being less affluent, which may explain the use of these two materials.

Church dimensions and orientations were recorded. Four of the religious buildings had
floor space larger than 800 square metres and three faced east. Churches traditionally
face eastward, so that the chancel faces the rising sun. This architectural feature came
to signify church construction from the early Saxon period, although, despite being a
common church feature, it is not a fixed rule (Taylor 2007: 28).

Of the five churches studied, Bernie Lewis Home Loans and Chapel Lane Studios had
undertaken exterior adaptations (see Figures 5.18 and 5.19). Bernie Lewis undertook a
major extension as they had outgrown the space, adding a two storey 700 square
metre office at the rear of the old Holder Memorial Church. Mr Lewis noted that
‘visually, from the outside, it’s quite sympathetic to the original structure, but it’s a
modern building, it’s got modern amenities and that sort of thing’ (Mark Lewis, 9
September 2010) (see Appendix Ten).

Likewise, Chapel Lane Studios added an extension because of limited space. The
single sloped ‘lean-to’ extension along the west wall was built directly onto the church’s
exterior wall and acts as an entrance hallway.
The condition of each building was noted, taking into consideration the way in which reuse has possibly contributed to the care and maintenance of each building. Table 5.2 shows that, of the five churches, Berne Lewis Home Loans, St Mary’s College and Chapel Lane Studios have been well maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Condition</th>
<th>Toop&amp;Toop</th>
<th>Bernie Lewis</th>
<th>St Mary’s</th>
<th>Chapel Lane</th>
<th>New Heaven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overrun gardens</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth over building, i.e. ivy/grass in gutters</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fretting brick work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeling paint</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaking roof</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty windows</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracked stone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 – Evidence of building’s condition

Not surprisingly, the reuse of these three properties was undertaken by the current owners. Considerable time and effort has been put into their design and care (Lewis, 9 September 2010; Young 27 August 2010). As such, they demonstrate the long held belief that a building’s wear and tear comes with disuse, not use.
On the other hand, the Abbey on King William Road (Toop&Toop) and St Paul's (New Heaven) on Pulteney Street appear to be in poorer condition. Along the Abbey's eastern wall cracks and damage to the bluestone and mortar are evident, and could possibly be the result of its near complete coverage in ivy, which has been present since the early 1930s⁹ (see Figures 5.20 and 5.21). The variable condition of properties reflects whether they have been left vacant.

Previous to the recent occupation, the Abbey and St Paul's were empty for extended periods during which they became rundown. Not surprisingly, both Mr Toop and Mr Farese reported that they had invested considerable amounts of money in the adaptation and redevelopment of these two sites.

---

⁹ The extensive aerial root system of the common garden ivy (*Hedera helix*) has been known to cause damage to stone work, bricks and mortar.
Interior Adaptation

There is a marked difference in the adaptation of church exteriors. Although all five churches had evidence of structural change, these differed. For instance, St Mary’s College undertook minor changes, opening up the Josephites’ dormitory and turning the space into staff rooms, whilst Bernie Lewis Home Loans installed a cantilevered mezzanine towards the front of the old Holder Memorial Church. As previously stated, Toop&Toop and New Heaven were not the first to reuse the spaces that they now reside in. The interiors in both of these cases had been previously altered and both had mezzanine levels installed. These increased the floor space but ensured that the structure remained sound.

There is immense space within a church building, so it is not surprising that three of the churches studied within the course of this research included a mezzanine to utilise this space. This singular volume of space can be seen as ‘wasted space’, especially within the commercial arena. The use of a mezzanine level overcomes this space problem without ‘boxing in the initial selling point’ (Michael Queale 3 December 2010). Figures 5.22 and 5.23 demonstrate this mezzanine usage.

Figure 5.22 – View from 2nd floor down through mezzanine level
Toop&Toop
(Photograph: L.Holt 12 November 2010)

Figure 5.23 – Internal and freestanding mezzanine,
Bernie Lewis Home Loans.
(Photograph: L.Holt 22 October 2010)
Religious Ornamentation

The retention of religious features and the use of religious furniture and fixtures is a common occurrence in reused churches (Table 5.3). The most commonly retained religious items are stained glass windows and foundation stones. Both of these occur in all five case studies. This result is not surprising, as these two items are part of the church’s structural framework and cannot be easily removed. Stained glass windows are a quintessential feature in religious buildings and are, as noted by Mr Lewis, an attractive feature to have in an office space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Ornamentation</th>
<th>Toop&amp;Toop</th>
<th>Bernie Lewis</th>
<th>St Mary’s</th>
<th>Chapel Lane</th>
<th>New Heaven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior furniture</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stained glass windows</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation stone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious statues</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorials</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious furniture</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3 – Presence or absence of religious ornamentation*

The inclusion of these items may reflect the encumbrance requirements. Mr Lewis stated that, upon purchase of the old Holder Memorial Church building, the Uniting Church required that all stained glass windows and the church memorial/foundation stone be kept in place (see Figures 5.24, 5.25, 5.26 and 5.27).
Original ceilings were retained in all churches studied. Mr Lewis stated that the ‘ceiling has not been touched’ and efforts were made to repair it to its former glory (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010). Mr Farese further noted that the beams within the old St Paul’s church (now New Heaven) came in very handy, as they provided a great
structure onto which the night club’s rigging (for lighting and sound) could be attached (see Figures 5.28 and 5.28).

Of the three churches with mezzanine levels, two interviewees stated that they had not installed complete levels because they wanted the original ceiling to remain a key feature in the reuse of the building. Also, the retention of the beams would appear to be based on their structural function. The removal and/or covering of these features would be both costly and difficult (Douglas 2006:167).

Figure 5.28 – Original wooden ceiling, Bernie Lewis Home Loans
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 5.29 – New Heaven nightclub.
(Image courtesy of Heaven website. Retrieved 18 November 2010 from:

Religious statues and the cross were the two least kept and reused religious objects, and they only remained in the old Chapel at St Mary’s College. St Mary’s College still runs a Dominican school and still utilises the space accordingly. Their retention could also suggest that Catholics have more attachment to them as religious symbols. The cross, after all, is Christianity’s most important symbol (Taylor 2007: 56). St Mary’s College, Chapel Lane Studios and Bernie Lewis Home Loans also retained religious and interior furniture. Both St Mary’s College and Chapel Lane Studios used the original church pews whilst Bernie Lewis retained and reused the original interior church doors (refer to Appendix Eleven for further architectural survey photographs).
Chapter Six: Discussion

... this place [allows for a] gathering of people, so if you weren’t at all religious you could argue that it’s a meeting place ... and it’s a place where things are shared ... and that’s the common thread. (Anthony Toop, 17 September 2010).

6.1 Introduction

Four key themes can be drawn from this research (Figure 6.1). Firstly, there appears to be a connection between heritage, values and reuse. Secondly, there are no substantial differences in the way Catholic and non-Conformist churches are reused after closure. Thirdly, the success of church adaptive reuse is based on keeping the building’s iconic ‘churchy’ look, namely, keeping its architectural features. Fourthly, adaptive reuse is an expensive process and those that undertake the process are often aware of the costs involved.

Figure 6.1 – Four key themes from research
6.2 Heritage, Values and Reuse

This research demonstrates that knowledge of a space must exist before it can become significant. As discussed in Chapter Two, the uncertainty of space becomes replaced with certainty, be this through memory, meaning or faith. The process by which a place becomes endowed with value lies at the core of the shift from space to place. Our relationships with ‘place’ ensure that meanings are transplanted into it; space gains meaning and significance through experience.

Through the myriad of data gathered via questionnaire and interview it is apparent that respondents knew, in part, some details about their workplaces, both before and after reuse. This outcome shows that there is an awareness of the building’s past and that the respondents were positive in their acknowledgement of the site, even if they stated that they were not religious. Adaptive reuse, in a way, acknowledged the past and enabled continual connection with it. An example of this connection can be demonstrated by St Mary’s College. Through the reuse of the old Chapel, staff and students were able to celebrate aspects of its past, for example, the life of Mary MacKillop:

... especially with people’s awareness of Mary MacKillop this year, this chapel is an extremely significant site in her story, in the drama of her story, and hence now, her canonisation (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

Research shows that adaptive reuse is considered to be a positive conservation process. Respondents felt that adaptive reuse is the best option for redundant church structures. Instead of falling into disrepair or being demolished, ‘adaptive reuse enables the building to have another life’ (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010). Interview respondents also stated that they felt ‘honoured’ and ‘privileged’ to be working within reused religious buildings:
... we could use [the old Chapel] and honour the history, but use in a contemporary way as well ... [I am] bringing people into the story, ah, holding it [the building], you know, holding it in time for a period of time, that’s my task and my privilege at the moment (Eileen Young, 27 August 2010).

These feelings reflect a positive connection to place, and demonstrate that reused churches are still important landmarks within the landscape.

6.3 Unwavering Faith

Interview and questionnaire results demonstrate that a building’s original denomination does not influence the success of its adaptive reuse. As noted in Chapter Three, the closing liturgy which transfers a sacred building into a secular one breaks the sacred connection with place and allows for the building to be reinterpreted by the community in any way they choose. The openness to the reinterpretation of religious buildings occurs across Catholic and non-Conformist denominations.

Although there are fundamental differences in the way that Catholic and non-Conformist churches deal with closure, these differences do not influence their reuse. The Catholic community demonstrated that a church is sacred and should be built to symbolise Christianity, both visually and figuratively (Clark 1996:150; Debuyst 1967:21), research has shown that the building, once removed from religious service, is best sold. Father O’Loughlin noted:

‘The development of physical attachments to the church building come about because of the events that happen within the church and of course there will be sadness when the congregation moves, the church gets demolished or reused, but this is inevitable, especially since the church is seen as a keeping place of memories ...’ (Kevin O’Loughlin, 27 November 2010).

Likewise, and somewhat unsurprisingly, research and interviews have confirmed that non-Conformist faiths do not consider the church building to be of importance (Carl
Interviews conducted with commercial companies working within reused non-Conformist buildings noted that, upon their purchase, church furniture remained within the building and could be used by the purchaser as they saw it.

Ultimately, the de-consecration of a church creates a space that is no longer sacred. The church community may experience a sense of loss at the closure of their church, as many life changing events have taken place within the building, including christenings, marriages and funerals. However, once a church’s spiritual significance has been removed, an alternative social significance emerges. Changes the use of the building also add additional layers of significance.

6.4 Lest We Forget

Successful church adaptive reuse is based on the preservation of a building’s spatial form. As such, the research reveals that successful commercial church reuse relies on the retention of three key features: the building’s ‘churchy’ form, its large internal space and the preservation of significant pieces of religious ornamentation, such as stained glass windows.

6.4.1 Form

A church will always be a church. Its size and its architectural style ensure its iconic status. Easily distinguished from other buildings, the form of a church will never let you forget that it is, and, after reuse, once was a church.

In all studied cases, the church’s form was not altered. All participants stated that making significant changes to the exterior of their buildings was never an option. Mark Lewis and Orlando Farese noted that it was important that they did not interfere with
the streetscape (the church being a major part of the streetscape) as their buildings acted as connections between the community and the past:

We still wanted to preserve that original look of the church, hence why we didn’t put signs, in fact, Dad at one stage, wanted to put a sign across the front and I said “no, we’re not doing that”. And that’s the one and only time I reckon, I don’t know if he was drunk at the time or what, but, that was the one and only time when he wasn’t thinking about the original structure and preserving both the visual and cultural heritage of the building (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Mr Farese also noted that the building’s form was, in a way, a form of advertising:

‘... we didn’t really need to do a lot of work to it, because it, you know, the site speaks for itself’ (Orlando Farese, November 17 2010).

Mr Toop noted that the church’s distinct form made the place easily recognisable. Within the landscape, ‘these buildings are easy to find ... for when you are driving King William Road ... from miles away you can see the steeple’ (Anthony Toop, 23 September 2010).

As also touched upon in Chapters Two and Three, church architecture is ‘ecclesiastically distinct’, and the churches studied within this research conformed to these distinct forms. All five churches were built in the Gothic style; two with flying buttresses and all with pointed arched windows. The use of this architectural style demonstrated the congregation’s adherence to popular religious architectural styles at the time of construction.

Retention of form was discussed by Mr Lewis. Being the only building to have undergone external extensions, Mr Lewis explained that extensions to the exterior of the church were sympathetic to the original building, as he did not want to change the look of the building.
6.4.2 Space

The large ‘heavenly’ space of a church building determines its reuse potential, especially within the commercial market. This research shows that interior spaces are adjusted to suit the building’s new function.

Mr Queale noted that current adaptive reuse methods are very different to processes that were undertaken a few years ago. For example, Mr Queale suggested that ‘St Paul’s and The Abbey were converted into commercial businesses in the 1980s and their interiors demonstrate reuse practices of that time’ (Michael Queale, 4 November 2010). St Paul’s large interior space no longer exists. It has been ‘boxed in’ (a term used by Mr Queale), partly to ensure the structural safety of the building and partly to provide more usable space. Major interior work to The Abbey during the 1980s has also meant that its large and ‘heavenly’ space is no longer evident.

Nowadays, the transformation of a church from a place of worship to a commercial entity involves, in most cases, heritage architects and consultation with local councils (especially if the building is either Local or State heritage listed). This process was discussed at length with all interviewees. Mrs Young and Mr Lewis made mention of the consultation process and believed that all works carried out under the guidance of the heritage architects proved to be successful. Furthermore, Mr Lewis noted that:

... the use of the glass balustrade and the way the framework of the balustrade, the metal framework, blends back in to the workstations and stuff. And if you sort of look at the architectural elements of it, using open treads on the staircase; it doesn’t close it in ... there’s all of these things that we used to create that feeling of space (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).
6.4.3 Religious Ornamentation

Questionnaire, interview and architectural survey results further highlights the belief that, even after reuse, a church should still look like a church. As such, the retention of religious ornamentations, such as stained glass windows, church furniture and foundation stones proved to be paramount in keeping the ‘churchy’ look.

As discussed in Chapter Five, most religious features, like stained glass windows and foundation stones were integral structural components and could not be removed. Yet, on discussion all respondents stated that even if they could be removed they would not do it.

The retention of religious ornamentation works to ensure that the church’s story is still told. Being the first to reuse the Holder Memorial Church, Mr Lewis was able to take his pick as to which items he wanted to keep and display. As noted in the previous chapter, memorials, door plaques, stained glass windows and altar are ‘on display’ within the Bernie Lewis Home Loans office space. Furthermore, these items allow the user to:

... draw that [story] out more or, you know, by adding fine grain to the story rather than just that it’s a church (Michael Queale, 3 December 2010).

6.5 (Please) Pass the Collection Plate

As previously alluded to, there are external factors that initially determine the appropriateness of adaptation, for example, the building’s condition, constructability, cost and time considerations, design life and statutory controls (Douglas 2006:40). Of the above, all interviewees noted that adaptive reuse is a costly process. External additions, internal alternations and structural changes are expensive. Consequently,
interview participants stated that adaptive reuse can only really be successfully undertaken if money is not a major concern. Mr Lewis stated that:

... to go in and do anything with them, (a) it requires the right kind of person with the right vision and (b) the costs of doing it; you need somebody to go in there who’s not looking at the thing from a financial point of view, they’re looking at the thing because they have a vision or they ...it fits their brand or whatever, and it’s just ...you know, given the economy and the times we live in ... it’s only going to get tougher, it really is (Mark Lewis, 9 September 2010).

Mr Farese also commented on the costs associated with reuse:

... it took a lot of money to get it to where it is and it takes a lot of money to run it, but it’s, it’s just something we kept coming back to, you know, there was lots of cheaper alternative places that we could’ve leased out, but how majestic the building was and it lent itself to what we were doing (Orlando Farese, 2 November 2010).

6.6 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to see whether church adaptive reuse reflected the process of modernisation and a changing of identity in Adelaide, South Australia. Firstly, research has shown a church building’s level of significance and its landmark status does not change after reuse. Rather, adaptive reuse enables and promotes the transferral of values and meaning across time and space and from space to place. The research demonstrates that change, through adaptive reuse, does not equal loss. Furthermore, it shows that successful adaptive reuse provides the opportunity for heritage to be preserved within the guidelines enshrined in the Burra Charter.

The churches studied within the course of this research have shown that in keeping a church building’s architectural form, namely its façade and structural appearance and
its 'churchy' look and ‘heavenly’ space, the buildings landmark and iconic status is maintained.

Secondly, this research has shown that Catholic and non-Conformist denominations carry out the act of closing a church differently. Yet once a church is de-consecrated, Catholic and non-Conformist denominations view the place as no longer sacred and it can be sold, demolished or reused. As such, the church’s spiritual significance is removed, but through adaptive reuse, an alternative social significance emerges.

No place can retain an original set of meanings, and adaptive reuse allows for another layer of significance, another set of meanings, to be added. Developing an alternative social significance shows that meaning does not have to be locked in time. As such, reused church buildings, and more specifically ones that maintain their ‘churchy’ features, connect the past with the present and allow people to gain enjoyment and satisfaction in seeing landmark buildings being reused (Choi and Simon 2010:81).

The third research question inquired about the influence of form and typology in determining a church building’s potential for adaptive reuse. The research has shown that successful commercial adaptive reuse is connected to the buildings aesthetic qualities and to the retention of its ‘churchy’ features. Bluestone churches were most commonly reused and those that outwardly still resembled a church were popular. The quintessential church form was a major influence the reuse of these buildings and as such the exterior of these buildings were not greatly altered through the process of adaptive reuse.

In conclusion, this research has shown that the adaptive reuse process allows our built heritage can be successful changed to meet sustainability, economic and environmental demands. Yet ultimately, the process enables our built past to be part of our built present. The successful reuse of our built heritage, whereby the building’s
significance is respected, ensures that those who engage with the place, whether in tangible or intangible ways, can still do so. Reuse allows past experiences and their levels of significance to transfer from old to new, along with new experiences and new levels of significance.

In a similar vein, the adaptive reuse of church structures follows suit. And within Adelaide, the reuse of these buildings will ensure that Adelaide remains known as ‘The City of Churches’.

6.7 Further Research

At this time, two opportunities for further research present themselves. Firstly, the study area could be widened to include the eastern and southern suburbs. Adelaide’s eastern suburbs have long been known as a wealthy enclave and church construction within these suburbs differs greatly to Adelaide’s city centre and the south-western suburbs. The second avenue would be the study of non-Christian denomination reuse i.e. mosques and synagogues. Architectural style within non-Christian denominations vary greatly to Christian styles, so a contrast may provide further insights into the use of space and the reuse of place.
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Appendices
29 Pioneer Rd, Stanley
Price: $340,000
Agent: Frecklington Real Estate, (08) 8723 1991

Built in 1900, this home is a classic example of historic architecture. The former All Saints Church was built in 1872 and deconsecrated in 1982. It features a substantial steeple and an ornate archway. The property is currently used as a family home with a pool and a large garden.

VIC

SA

61 Jeffcott St, North Adelaide
Price: $525,000
Agent: Two Real Estate, 6201 4895, Andrew Dyer, (08) 9188 3305

Right in the heart of North Adelaide, this former Christ Church Bay School Hall built about 1850 will have you singing ladles. The property consists of three bedrooms and two bathrooms, perfect for your needs. The formal lounge and dining areas offer a range of options to either entertain or create a large family home. This property is situated on a quiet court, subject to council approval. In addition, there are plans for a pool and a separate living area.

Your Place
Houses of the Holy

TAS

135 Goulburn Street, Hobart
Price: $255,000
Agent: Harcourts North Valley - Harwood, (03) 6279 0669, Tracey Harwood, (03) 6277 0909

The 1882 Half-consecrated church boasts three bedrooms and a delightful garden. The property is currently used as a family home with a pool and a large garden.

VIC

NSW

39 Bridge St, Mornagall
Price: $695,000
Agent: Clunes - Alstonville, 1069 770 57

The converted church is a historic landmark with a rich history. The property is currently used as a family home with a pool and a large garden.

The Adelaide Advertiser, 2010 SA Weekend, 29 May 2010
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You are also required to report anything which might warrant review of ethical approval of the protocol. Such matters include:

- serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants;
- proposed changes in the protocol (modifications); and
- unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

In order to comply with monitoring requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (March 2007) an annual progress and/or final report must be submitted. A copy of the pro forma is available from http://www.flinders.edu.au/research/info-for-researchers/ethics/committees/social-behavioural.cfm. Your first report is due on 10 June 2011 or on completion of the project, whichever is the earliest. Please retain this notice for reference when completing annual progress or final reports. If an extension of time is required, please email a request for an extension of time, to a date you specify, to human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au before the expiry date.

Andrea Jacobs
Executive Officer
Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee
15 June 2010

c.c Dr Heather Burke, heather.burke@flinders.edu.au
3 - Questionnaire Letter of Introduction
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

April 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter is to introduce Ms Louise Holt who is a Masters student in the Department of Archaeology at Flinders University. She will produce her student card, which carries a photograph, as proof of identity.

She is undertaking research leading to the production of a thesis on the subject of how the adaptive reuse of church buildings reflects the process of modernisation and wider changes in Australian identity.

She would be most grateful if you would volunteer to assist in this project, by granting time to complete a questionnaire which covers certain aspects of this topic. No more than 30 minutes on one occasion would be required.

Be assured that any information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and none of the participants will be individually identifiable in the resulting thesis, report or other publications. You are, of course, entirely free to discontinue your participation at any time or to decline to answer particular questions.

Any enquiries you may have concerning this project should be directed to me at the address given above or by telephone on 8201 3795, by fax on 8201 3635 or by email (heather.burke@flinders.edu.au).

Thank you for your attention and assistance.

Yours sincerely

A/Prof Heather Burke
Head of Department
Department of Archaeology

This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number 4851). For more information regarding ethical approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au.
4 - Questionnaire Excel Spreadsheet (see CD at back cover)
5 - Interview Letter of Introduction
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

April 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

This letter is to introduce Ms Louise Holt who is a Masters student in the Department of Archaeology at Flinders University. She will produce her student card, which carries a photograph, as proof of identity.

She is undertaking research leading to the production of a thesis on the subject of how the adaptive reuse of church buildings reflects the process of modernisation and wider changes in Australian identity.

She would be most grateful if you would volunteer to assist in this project, by granting an interview which covers certain aspects of this topic. No more than one hour on two occasions would be required.

Be assured that any information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and none of the participants will be individually identifiable in the resulting thesis, report or other publications. You are, of course, entirely free to discontinue your participation at any time or to decline to answer particular questions.

Since she intends to make a tape recording of the interview, she will seek your consent, on the attached form, to record the interview, to use the recording or a transcription in preparing the thesis, report or other publications, on condition that your name or identity is not revealed, and to make the recording available to other researchers on the same conditions.

Any enquiries you may have concerning this project should be directed to me at the address given above or by telephone on 8201 3795, by fax on 8201 3635 or by email (heather.burke@flinders.edu.au).

Thank you for your attention and assistance.

Yours sincerely

A/Prof Heather Burke
Head of Department
Department of Archaeology

This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number 4851). For more information regarding ethical approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au.
6 - Architectural Recording Form
# From Prophet to Profit: Architectural Survey

## Recording Form

### Commercial Name:

### Address:

### Architectural Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Denomination</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Size</th>
<th>Brick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Material</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weatherboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adaptation of Exterior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in style</th>
<th>Where? Façade etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in building material</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Electrical/plumbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning/subdivision/development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adaptation of Interior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in building material</th>
<th>Where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior modification</td>
<td>Size?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Ornamentation</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell tower</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Stain glass, leadlight etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation stone</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious statues</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memories</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious furniture</td>
<td>Pews, font, organ, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

……………………………………………

……………………………………………

……………………………………………

……………………………………………
7- Survey Data (see CD at back cover)
8 - Interview Transcripts (see CD at back cover)

8.1 Mark Lewis, General Manager, Bernie Lewis Home Loans
8.2 Anthony Toop, Director, Toop&Toop
8.3 Eileen Young, Principal, St Mary’s College
8.4 Orlando Farese, Owner, New Heaven Night Club
8.5 Michael Queale, Grieve and Gillett Architects
8.6 Carl Aiken, Baptist Pastor
8.7 Father Kevin O’Loghlan, Catholic Minister
Toop & Toop

Inside Story
www.insidesstory.toop.com.au

Hot Real Estate Goss... just a heads up on what we are up to. Toop & Toop have purchased The Abbey, a landmark building at 84 King William Road and we are going to open our Toop & Toop Hyde Park office there.

We are aiming, by August, to have completed the necessary renovations and to have approvals in place to get things up and running for Spring 2010.

While a number of the team have put their hands up to work from this amazing building and location, details are sketchy as we start the process of refurbishment.

I must say I am hugely excited. Sylvia and I have been trying all the local restaurants out over the past few weeks as we visualise how this office could look and feel. We love Adelaide’s early architecture and over the years have developed a reputation for helping to save some of our historic buildings. Pretty much all of our offices are iconic or heritage buildings which we have refurbished and renovated. Our first was at 23 The Parade Norwood back in 1987 which remains our head office today.

The Abbey is so exciting. We want to demonstrate how such a magnificent building can be equipped and fitted out with the very latest technology, to become a modern hip and happening office that the entire community will hopefully be proud of.

The Abbey

The Adelaide Advertiser, April 17th 2010
10 - Holder Memorial and Bernie Lewis Home Loans
Fears for future of historic church

One of Adelaide's most historically significant buildings faces an uncertain future. Charmaine Newton reports.

The impending sale of a Mile End church named after one of the fathers of Australian federation, and first speaker of Federal Parliament, has sparked demolition fears.

The Holder Memorial Church, South Rd, is being sold by the Uniting Church because of a declining congregation and the organisation's plan to rationalise properties.

But local historians and West Torrens Council are worried about the church's future, especially given the Uniting Church has rejected an offer that would have seen the building retained.

Last month, the council urged Urban Planning Minister Diana Laidlaw to intervene and take an interim local heritage listing for the church, to increase protection against demolition.

The church, built in about 1914, has been included on the council's local heritage list which has not yet been approved by the State Government.

The church was built as a Methodist church and named after Sir Frederick Holder, a former South Australian premier who was one of the founding fathers of federation and the first speaker of the Federal Parliament.

Kevin Koeding, of Thebarton Historical Society, said he believed the church wanted about $800,000 for the site, despite an approximate $470,000 valuation.

He believed the organisation wanted to use the money to build a large church at Brookfield Park.

He was worried the Uniting Church would try to sell at auction, and then: "We could end up having a cash and carry there, or something.

West Torrens Council city manager Trevor Stace said the architecture was "too unique" but described the church as an "important historical building for SA."

"It is a building that in terms of history has a great deal of interest and historical perspective about the people that were involved in running the State and running the Commonwealth," he said.

He said Transport Minister Diana Laidlaw had not yet responded to a council request for an interim heritage listing.

But John Maddern, Adelaide West parish minister, said the church would prefer to see the building kept.

"We are trying to find a purchaser that would use the existing buildings," he said.

"It hasn't been put on the open market because we would hope there would be a purchaser that would use the existing building.

"The word demolishing hasn't come into our thinking but it is true that the Uniting Church is not looking to continue using it."

He confirmed the Uniting Church was looking at building a new church on the former Adelaide College site, Brookfield Park. "It is true that we are looking to rationalise our properties and build four church congregations into one on that site," he said.

The Holder Memorial Church congregation had chosen to stop worshipping at the Mile End church because of declining members.
Bernie buys Mile End church

The future of an historic Mile End church seems secure. Louise Treccasi reports:

BERNIE LEWIS Home Loans is the new owner of the historic Holder Memorial Church at Mile End.

The contract for the South Rd church, which is of local heritage significance and was named in honour of one of the founding fathers of Federation Sir Frederick Holder, was settled on Friday, May 11.

Mr Lewis, who bought the church for $51,000, said the building would be converted into commercial offices.

But he said the existing buildings and heritage value of the property would be retained.

“we recognise the sensitivity of the site and are definitely going to preserve the ambience of the building,” he said.

“We will not damage or interfere with the character of the building.”

The church was sold by the Uniting Church of Australia because of a declining congregation and the organisation’s plan to rationalise properties.

A condition of the sale is the church will retain the ownership of the pipe organ, all stained glass windows and memorials on the property.

Uniting Church property sales executive officer Dennis Chapman was happy with the sale.

“One of the benefits of the take-over is the owners are going to retain the building and not add any additional buildings,” he said.

The Thebarton Historical Society, which has campaigned for months to save the church, was pleased the building would be retained.

“Our number one aim has always been to preserve the church because it is a historical landmark in the area,” society president Kevin Kaeding said.

“We are delighted a local heritage-listed building will remain in Mile End.”

West Torrens Council mayor John Trainer was also happy with the outcome.

“I am confident the new owners will do everything they can to keep the fabric of the church and preserve the character of the building,” he said.

The church was built in 1914 as a Methodist church and named after Sir Frederick – a former SA premier who was first speaker of the Federal Parliament.

An active Federalist, Sir Frederick resigned as premier in 1901 to take a seat in the Federal House of Representatives. He was speaker of the House until 1906 when he died.

The church is included in a Thebarton heritage report which grants it extra protection from demolition.
The renovation of a 1914 heritage-listed church at Mile End was commended by the Civic Trust’s annual Awards and Brickbats last week.

The Holder Memorial Church on South Rd was transformed into offices late last year by Studio 9 Architects to accommodate Bernie Lewis Home Loans.

Civic Trust chairman Darian Hiles said “the challenges to adapt a 1914 building for use as modern offices... were considerable”.

He said the judging panel appreciated “the care with which the changes had been made” and recognised that many of the church’s original features had been retained.

Studio 9 director Andrew Verrasi said the old church had “little or no airconditioning, only eight light globes and four or five power points when we first started”.

He said it was hard to maintain the building’s historic value and make sure it could be restored as a church in the future.

“We gave a lot of thought to that, so that in 100 years time there is an opportunity for it to be returned to its original condition.”

The development was the only site in the western suburbs to receive an accolade at the awards.

Holdfast Bay Council was commended for giving priority to community consultation during a review of its residential development strategy.

AMY ROHRLACH
11 - Architectural Survey Photographs
11.1 Bernie Lewis Home Loans (Figures 11.1.1 – 11.1.20)
Figure 11.1.1 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – South
(Photograph: L.Holt 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010)

Figure 11.1.2 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Street view
(Photograph: L.Holt 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010)
Figure 11.1.3 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Buttresses
(Photograph: L.Holt 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010)

Figure 11.1.4 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Entrance
(Photograph: L.Holt 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010)
Figure 11.1.5 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans
(Photograph: L. Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.6 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Bernard Derek Lewis Memorial
(Photograph: L. Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.7 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Rear extension
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.8 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Gable entrance
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.9 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Northern door plaque
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.10 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Southern door plaque
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.11 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Wooden ceiling beams
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.12 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Wooden ceiling beams (close-up)
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.13 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans - Pulpit
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.14 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Pulpit plaque
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.15 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Mezzanine level within ceiling space
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.16 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Mezzanine level within ceiling space (2)
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.17 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Northern wall stained glass window
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.18 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Office space looking north
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.1.19 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Mezzanine level looking north
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.1.20 – Bernie Lewis Home Loans – Mezzanine level looking south
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
11.2 Toop&Toop (Figures 11.2.1 – 11.2.17)
Figure 11.2.1 - Unley Methodist Church, King William Road
 Image taken ca. 1927
 (Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – B#4365)

Figure 11.2.2 - Unley Methodist Church, King William Road
 Image taken ca. 1927
 (Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – B#4367)
Figure 11.2.3 - Unley Methodist Church, King William Road.
Image taken ca. 1930
(Image courtesy of Mr Toop)

Figure 11.2.4 – Toop&Toop, King William Road.
(Photograph: L.Holt 28th October 2010)
Figure 11.2.5 – Toop&Toop, King William Road
(Photograph: L.Holt 28\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010).

Figure 11.2.6 – Toop&Toop, King William Road
Read extension and church hall
(Photograph: L.Holt 28\textsuperscript{nd} October 2010)
Figure 11.2.7 – Toop&Toop
Foundation Stone
(Photograph: L.Holt 28th October 2010)

Figure 11.2.8 – Toop&Toop
‘The Abby Inn’ (first reuse of site) officially opened in 1988
(Photograph: L.Holt 28th October 2010)
Figure 11.2.9 – Toop&Toop  
Enterance and foyer  
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)

Figure 11.2.10 – Toop&Toop  
Original location of organ  
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)
Figure 11.2.11 – Toop&Toop
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)

Figure 11.2.12 – Toop&Toop
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)
Figure 11.2.13 – Toop&Toop
Original ceiling and banister
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)

Figure 11.2.14 – Toop&Toop
First floor
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)
Figure 11.2.15 – Toop&Toop
View of ground and first floor from second floor
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)

Figure 11.2.16 – Toop&Toop
First Floor (looking east)
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)
Figure 11.2.17 – Toop&Toop
(Photograph: L.Holt 28nd October 2010)
11.3 St Mary’s College (Figures – 11.3.1 – 11.3.10)
Figure 11.3.1- Pupils of the Dominican Convent, Franklin Street
Image taken 1906
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – B#32318)

Figure 11.3.2- Mary’s Dominican Convent. Colour tinted photograph, in postcard format. Postcard was written by E. Humphreys to Miss Lizzy McEvoy of Vernon Street, Norwood.
Image taken 1908
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – PRG 1419/8/5)
Figure 11.3.3- St. Mary's College Franklin Street, west side, works being carried out. Image taken ca. 1972
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – B#26888)

Figure 11.3.4- Sister Mary Matthew of St. Mary's College in Franklin Street with new pupil (Convent in background) Image taken ca. 1989
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia – B#59514)
Figure 11.3.5 - Stained glass window in Chapel  
(Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)

Figure 11.3.6 – Original wooden ceiling in Chapel  
(Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)
Figure 11.3.7 – Evidence of the original room dividers in staff room (Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)

Figure 11.3.8 – Evidence of the original room dividers in staff room (Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)
Figure 11.3.9 – Chapel entrance (not in use)  
(Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)

Figure 11.3.10 – Chapel (left) with later Dominican extension (right)  
(Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)
Figure 11.3.11 – Chapel reflected by the St Mary’s new drama centre
(Photograph: L.Holt 13th December 2010)
11.4 New Heaven Night Club (Figures 11.4.1 – 11.4.4)
Figure 11.4.1 - St Paul's Church and Rectory in Flinders Street, Adelaide.
Image taken ca. 1865
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia - # B 58367)

Figure 11.4.2 - St. Paul's Church, north east corner of Pulteney Street and Flinders Street, Adelaide.
Image taken ca. 1870
(Image courtesy of the State Library of South Australia - #B977)
Figure 11.4.3 – Former Heaven Nightclub, now trading as New Heaven. (Image courtesy of Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Retrieved 18 November 2010 from: http://www.abc.net.au/reslib/201009/r644114_4484105.jpg)

11.5 Chapel Lane Studios (Figures 11.5.1 – 11.5.10)
Figure 11.5.1 – Chapel Lane Studios
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.5.2 – Chapel Lane Studios
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.5.3 – Chapel Lane Studios
Extension to western wall
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.5.4 – Chapel Lane Studios
Front entrance with original door handle
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.5.5 – Chapel Lane Studios
Foundation stone
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.5.6 – Chapel Lane Studios
Entrance decoration
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.5.7 – Chapel Lane Studios
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.5.8 – Chapel Lane Studios
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)
Figure 11.5.9 – Chapel Lane Studios
(Photograph: L.Holt 22nd October 2010)

Figure 11.5.10 – Chapel Lane Studios