

Evaluating the Adaptation Experiences of the Historical Buildings in Iran (Proposing a Framework to Develop Evaluations Model)*

Alireza Naserolmemar^a- Ahmad Aminpour^{b**}

^a Ph.D. Candidate of the Islamic Architecture, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning, Art University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

^b Associate Professor of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning, Art University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran (Corresponding Author).

Received 21 December 2018;

Revised 27 May 2020;

Accepted 02 June 2020;

Available Online 20 March 2021

ABSTRACT

Intervention in the historical buildings to adapt them to the new uses might be contrary to the authentic aspects of the buildings as cultural heritages. Evaluation of these adaptations to assess the desirability of the interventions or ensure the correct decisions for future actions is necessary. Despite the development of these experiences in Iran, a formal and comprehensive evaluation system has not yet been developed. Different models are used to design and implement the evaluations to achieve the considered purposes based on the circumstances. The current research addressed the following questions: What factors influence the evaluation model, and how it can be realized? What is the proper evaluation model based on the circumstances of the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran? Logical reasoning was used to collect and analyze data using qualitative content analysis to answer these questions. Literature review of the evaluation showed that selecting proper approaches and developing the evaluation model depended on the factors caused by the nature of the subject and the context of the evaluation. Then, a model of determining approaches was developed based on the possible situations of the influential factors. In the next step, after identifying the evaluation situations in the adaptation experiences of the historical building and the challenges ahead, especially in Iran, the influential factors in determining the approaches of the evaluation design and implementation were studied in each situation. The studies showed that the situation of some of the factors depended on the case and was unpredictable. Therefore, it was not possible to propose a predetermined model for the evaluations. The useful approaches in each evaluation situation were presented in a guiding framework in conclusion. It can contribute to the development of the evaluation model appropriate to the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran and the particular features of each project.

Keywords: Evaluation Model, Adaptation Experiences, Historical Buildings.

* This paper is derived from the Ph.D. Thesis entitled "Developing a conceptual model to design the evaluations regarding the current projects of the adaptation of the historical buildings in Iran", which is in progress under the supervision of the second author in the Art University of Isfahan.

** E-mail: Aminpour@aui.ac.ir

1. INTRODUCTION

As a concept of determining the value or cost of an object individually or in comparison with similar cases, evaluation has a broad area in the daily discourse. It is also considered a formal, systematic, and conscious activity. In general, evaluation is used to help the decision-making and monitoring to improve the subject and ascertain its accountability, and provide overall judgment, and informing (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, pp. 21-25). Besides these purposes, it also has capacities to enlighten, improve the common understanding, attract support and increase the sense of the ownership to a subject (Stake, 1975 as cited in Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 193; Guba & Lincoln, 2001, pp. 2-3). Evaluations must be designed and implemented in a way to realize their capacities and purposes, to be feasible, reliable, and based on the ethics fundamentals (Yadegarzadeh, Barhami, & Parand, 2007, p. 155). Thus, evaluators have applied various approaches in the form of evaluation models to design and implement the evaluation (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 59). The literature on the evaluation showed that despite the studies on the classification, introduction, and explanation of the capacities and applied approaches in evaluation models, a model was not presented to develop the evaluation model.

Evaluating the projects related to the historical buildings is necessary due to their significance as cultural heritages. Adaptation of the historical buildings is conducted to adapt the building to the new uses. Despite the development of these experiences in Iran, there are no required mechanisms to control it by the society and government (Hodjat, 2001, pp. 106-108), and an evaluation system has not been formally developed to direct and control it¹ (Parhizkar, 2009, p. 6). Considering the necessity to use the capacities of evaluation in the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran and the role of the development of a model in this regard, the current paper addressed the following questions:

1. What are the influential factors in the development of the evaluation model, and how it can be realized?
2. What is the proper evaluation model considering the conditions of the adaptation projects of the historical buildings in Iran?

In this regard, while introducing the evaluation models and identifying the influential factors in taking approaches, a model to form a proper evaluation model was presented. The evaluation situations and decision making in the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings and challenges ahead were investigated and the role of evaluation in these experiences was explained. Then, according to the obtained information, the situation of the influential factors in determining the evaluation model was investigated. Finally, it was attempted to identify the useful approaches in each situation and develop a proper model based on the

proposed model and the situation of the influential factors.

Since the proposed models could be applied to design the evaluations and improve the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings, the current study was applied research. This study was qualitative research in terms of nature used the qualitative content analysis method. Also, the research and international documents in this regard were used. The research strategy to analyze and conclude the data was logical reasoning with discourse/cultural nature because it attempted to explain the factors logically and reasonably and represent their effectiveness in determining the approaches to develop a framework to form a proper evaluation model.

2. EVALUATION MODELS AND INFLUENTIAL FACTORS IN ITS FORMATION

The general process of evaluation in different types of evaluations is similar and includes design (determining the basics and methods), assessment (information collection), and judgment (analyzing the information and conclusion) (Scriven, 1991, p. 139; Gay, 1991 as cited in Saif, 2013, p. 112). However, various models are used to take the different steps of the process.

2.1. Classification of the Evaluation Models and the Role of Determining the Model in the Design of the Evaluation

Various classifications have been presented for evaluation models (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Saif, 2013). Comparison between various models showed that determining the involved groups and their intervention in different steps of the evaluation process are specified in this framework. Accordingly, the evaluation models can be classified into five groups as follows:

1. Assessment-oriented model: These are the models that are based on the predetermined and prioritized criteria by the authorities. The assessment step plays a key role in these models, and the evaluator can achieve an objective judgment based on the data of this step.
2. Descriptive models: Providing descriptive information is the priority in these models and the audiences of the evaluation are responsible to conclude.
3. Judging models: In these models, the focus is on the evaluator's mentality that evaluates and judges based on his/her perception of the expectations.
4. Participatory models: In these models, the stakeholders express their expectations by the facilitation of the evaluator and share their judgments. However, these models are not persistent in achieving a definite result.
5. Negotiation-oriented models: In these models, the representatives of the stakeholders assess the subject based on their agreed criteria with the facilitation of the evaluator and achieve a common judgment.

Each group of the models can be used to realize particular applications and has their specific limits and benefits (Worthen & Sanders, 1987 as cited in Saif, 2013, pp. 87-88). The assessment-oriented, descriptive, and judging models are implemented to improve the subject, provide the judgment, or ascertain the accountability. The cooperative models are merely conducted to enlighten on a specific subject and empower the stakeholders. The negotiation-oriented models are also done to improve the subject, provide the judgment, or ascertain the accountability while enlightening. It is suggested that in design and implementation of evaluations, evaluators should form a proper model by studying the efficiency of the various approaches in the considered situation and design and implement the evaluation (Alexander, 2006, p. 14; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 29).

2.2. Influential Factors in Selecting the Approaches and Forming the Evaluation Model

To achieve the influential factors in selecting approaches, the features and realization conditions of each were studied in the literature review. As presented in the classification of the models, the most significant distinction is the extent and way of referring to the opinions of the involved groups in the evaluation. These groups include evaluators, authorities, and other stakeholders. The more the share of the opinions of the involved people and groups in the evaluation process, the more subjective will become the evaluation results. Accordingly, the models are classified into a range of objective to subjective (House, 1983 as cited in Saif, 2013, p. 73). Therefore, the influential factors in taking the approaches of the design and implementation of the evaluation were organized based on the necessity and manner of the survey.

2.2.1. The Necessity of Survey

Generally, the evaluation employers support using assessment-oriented models due to the focus on the predetermined purposes by the authorities and the ability to control and plan the evaluation (Alexander, 2006, p. 14). However, when there is no consensus or adequate knowledge on the subject or its desirability criteria or the qualitative indicators must be evaluated, the use of approaches based on the mentality of the groups is suggested to enlighten the subject (Worthen & Sanders, 1987 as cited in Saif, 2013, p. 87; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 273).

2.2.2. The Possibility of Survey

In some situations, despite the necessity to consider the interests and perspectives of the stakeholders, it is not possible to receive and directly apply their opinions (For example, about the future generations or the future unknown users). In this situation, it is suggested to use

the judging models in which the evaluator performs based on his/her knowledge of the potential demands and needs of the silent stakeholders (Moein, 2009, p. 55).

2.2.3. Consensus and Priority of the Evaluation

In the survey process, after receiving the opinions in the first step, the consensus is investigated² (Butler & Rothstein, 2007, p. 19). If there is a conflict (for example, in the conflict of interests of the groups), especially when the influence power of the groups is different, two approaches are suggested based on the expected results from the evaluation:

- A) If the priority of evaluation is stakeholder empowerment, the participatory models solution is effective in which evaluation is developed while maintaining a plurality of views. Also, conflicts are discussed at various steps that do not necessarily lead to definitive conclusions to improve the issue (Stake, 1975 as cited in Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 384).
- B) If the priority of evaluation is to affect the subject improvement, negotiation-oriented models are efficient in which it is attempted to develop a consensus among the stakeholders (Patton, 2011, p. 14).

In case of the lack of conflict, the present consensus will be taken. In this case, while empowering the stakeholders, evaluation can reach definitive results to improve the issue.

2.2.4. Possibility of Consensus and Development of Evaluation

Building a consensus between multiple views of the stakeholders requires the cooperation of the representatives with negotiation capacity and acceptance of others³ (Ibid, p. 74). In the lack of such conditions, considering the necessity of the effectiveness of the evaluation in improving the issue, the possible approach is gathering the collected opinions and conclusion by the evaluator (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2104, p. 223). Development of the evaluation requires time and cost (Ibid, p. 201) that if it is impossible, given the necessity of keeping the plurality of the opinions, evaluation can be ended by reporting the conflict opinions (Butler & Rothstein, 2007, p. 17). Determining the status of these factors is possible by increasing awareness of the subject and context of the evaluation over time and during the evaluation process. The situation of some of the factors is generally predictable. However, some factors, such as the consensus, possibility of it and development of evaluation, depend on the case and are unpredictable. It leads to the feasibility of the gradual and selective determination of the proper approaches and formation of the evaluation models definitely. However, according to the possibility of recognizing the status of some of the factors, it is possible to determine a set of useful approaches considering the nature of the evaluation subject and involved groups.

2.3. Determining the Approaches of the Evaluation Design and Implementation Considering the Status of the Influential Factors

As can be seen in the analysis of the influential factors, the necessity to study the status of each factor depends on the status of the upstream factor. For instance, if there is a consensus, the next factors are not influential

in determining a proper approach. Considering the possibility of different situations in the various steps of the evaluation, including determining the basics, collecting information, and judgment, the status of the factors must be investigated separately per step and select the proper approach of that step. The following model shows the analysis process of the factors and determining the proper approach.

Table 1. Model of Determining the Approaches of the Evaluation Design and Implementation

The Process of Examining the Status of the Factors Affecting the Determination of the Approach	Necessity of Survey			
	No		Yes	
	Possibility of Survey			
	Ineffective	No		Yes
	Consensus			
	Ineffective		Consensus	Lack of Consensus
	Evolution Priority			
	Ineffective		Unifying the Opinions	Reflecting Different Opinions
Possibility of Consensus				
	Ineffective	Yes	No	Ineffective
	Possibility of Evaluation Development			
	Ineffective			Yes
				No
Useful Approach	Approach 1	Approach 2	Approach 3	Approach 4
	Without Any Survey, Evaluator Can Conclude and Make It a Basis for Action in the Next Step.	The Evaluator Can Reach a Mental Conclusion Based on His / Her Perception of the Views and Interests of the Silent Groups and Use It As a Basis for the Next Step.	The Received Opinions Can Be Used As a Summary of Each Step, The Basis for the Next Step.	Individuals (Group Representatives) Can Conclude By the Evaluator's Facilitation and the Resulted Consensus Can Be the Basis for the Next Step.
	Approach 5	Approach 6	Approach 7	
	The Evaluator Can Reach a Subjective Summary of the Received Opinions and Use It As a Basis for the Next Step.	Group Members Can Express Their Opinions by Evaluator's Facilitation and a Multiple Set of Opinions Can Be the Basis for the Next Step.	Evaluation Can Be Stopped At the Commenting Step and the Result Can Be Reported.	

Considering that in some situations, it might be not possible to receive and apply opinions of some of the evaluation stakeholders, in this situation, the evaluator must play a role as the representative of these groups and one of the experts in the evaluation in the approaches of 3 to 7 in addition to do him/her tasks in each approach. It means combining approach 2 with these approaches.

3. ADAPTATION OF THE HISTORICAL BUILDINGS AND THE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN THESE EXPERIENCES

Adaptation means any action in the building besides repairment that changes the function, capacity, and

efficiency of the building. That's said, any intervention to adapt, reutilize or improve the building to meet the new needs and conditions (Douglas, 2006, p. 2; Cramer & Breitling, 2007, p. 9). Adaptation provides an opportunity to the prolongation of the life and utilization of the present buildings as saving the sources and meanings and has environmental, economic, cultural, and mental benefits (Fitch, 2001; Murtagh, 1997, as cited in Elsorady, 2014, p. 512; Latham, 2000, pp. 5-12; Cramer & Breitling, 2007, p. 19).

pp. 5-12, Cramer & Breitling, 2007, p. 19). Among the present buildings, historical buildings have more values and their conservation has been considered throughout the history⁴. In the contemporary conservation theories and recent

international documents, creative interventions in the historical buildings as adaptation projects for the practical conservation and continuity of the utilization have been suggested for the buildings that have the capacity for such interventions (Feilden, 2007, p. x; Jokilehto, 2009, pp. 339-343; ICOMOS, 2011b; Florence Declaration, 2014).

The literature review on the conservation and

adaptation of the historical buildings showed that the process of adaptation of a building begins after determining a building and recognizing the possibility of its adaptation in an upstream conservation plan. Also, the most significant situations of the decision makings, the supportive evaluations of the decisions, and required assessments are as follows:

Table 2. The Situations of Decision Makings, Evaluations, and Assessments Related to the Adaptation Projects of the Historical Building

Row	Decision-Making Situations	Evaluations	Assessments
1	Selecting Building	Evaluating the cultural value of the building	The cultural value of the building in terms of various aspects (ICOMOS, 2000; Latham, 2000, pp. 55-57; Fielden, 2007, p. 261)
		Evaluating the condition of the building	Degree of building's obsolescence (Demas, 2000, p. 34; Langston et al., 2008, p. 1710)
2	Determining the Manner to Deal With the Building		The adaptability degree of the building economically, legally, and physically (Douglas, 2006, p. 6; Shahbazi, Bemanian, & Saremi, 2017, p. 70)
		Evaluation of the management context	The desirability of the accesses and infrastructural and monitoring facilities (Demas, 2002, p. 41)
3	Determining the Function and Utilization Pattern		The influence power and needs of the stakeholders (ICOMOS, 2000; Latham, 2000, pp. 55-57; Demas, 2002, p. 41)
			The social, economic, and cultural welfare of the place (ICOMOS, 1999)
4	Determining the Method and Extent of the Physical Interventions		The adequacy of the human, information, and financial resources (ICOMOS, 2000; Demas, 2002, p. 41)
		Evaluating the previous experiences	The degree of realization of the purposes and desirability of the effects of the similar experiences (Douglas, 2006, p. 511)
			Evaluating alternatives
5	Determining the Implementation Method		The degree of desirability of the possible effects and the feasibility of the alternatives (ICOMOS, 2000; Latham, 2000, pp. 55-57; Douglas, 2006, pp. 510-512; Kincaid, 2002, p. 104)
6	Determining the Conservation and Maintenance Method After Implementation		
7	Determining the Necessity of Changing the Previous Decisions	Evaluating the processes	The degree of desirability of the goal setting, design, and implementation processes (ICOMOS, 2000; 2011a; 2011b; Douglas, 2006, p. 545)
		Evaluating the results of the actions and after exploitation of the project	The degree of desirability of the exploitation effects and realization of the project purposes (ICOMOS, 2000; 2011a; 2011b; Douglas, 2006, p. 547)

In explaining the role of the evaluation in the architectural process, Lang classified it into two groups of evaluations before implementation and evaluations after implementation and exploitation (Lang, 2007, p. 50). The identified evaluations related to the adaptation experiences can be considered as follows:

1. Evaluations before and during implementation to help the decisions makings and supervision to improve its process and product.
2. Evaluations after implementation and exploitation to assess and share the learned to promote future projects or define a new set of interventions.

In prioritizing and selecting a building to intervene, it is necessary to evaluate the cultural value and assess the degree of building obsolescence (recognizing the necessity of making a change in the building's condition) by comparing the current situation with the expected desirability.

In determining the method to deal with the building and then after selecting the possible alternative of the adaptation, in determining function, designing interventions and determining method of implementation and conservation, besides evaluating the cultural value (In recognizing and prioritizing the aspects required to be conserved), the following has been suggested: assessing the adaptability of the building (recognizing the convertibility, destructibility, recyclability, expandability, and flexibility in physical legal, economic, and technical aspects), assessing the degree of obsolescence (in determining the extent and aspects required to be intervened) (Douglas, 2006, p. 3), evaluating the management context (identifying the limits and opportunities affecting the ability of the management) (Mason, 2002, p. 7; Demas, 2002, p. 34), evaluating the previous experiences (in case of not implementing the periodical assessments in each project or the lack of access of the evaluator to documents related to the evaluations), and evaluating the alternatives.

In the systematic attitude to the evolution, especially regarding the subjects like plans and projects, evaluating the context, input, process, and output of the subject (Stuffelbeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 333), and meta-evaluation of the evaluations (Ibid, p. 631) are suggested. The stated evaluations can be classified into the evaluation of the context and input of the adaptation projects. Also, all the processes in these types of projects, including the decision makings processes in the planning and designing, the implementation processes, and conducted evaluations, must be evaluated. Moreover, evaluating the results of the actions and the project after exploitation as the output evaluation, is critical.

3.1. Challenges and Approaches of the Decision Making in the Conservation and Adaptation of the Historical Buildings

Generally, there are two approaches in the conservation plans: Value-based and community-based approaches (Poulios, 2010, p. 170). The privileged tendency is the dominance of the experts and elites in the decision makings, which is in the value-based approach. In this approach, the building values and its prioritization in terms of the perspectives of the elites or the consensus of the experts are considered the base for the conservational decisions, and the demands of the stakeholders are the second priority. The foundations and process of decision making in this approach face the following challenges:

1. Plurality of the indicators and involved specialized

areas (Mason, 2002, p. 5; Feilden, 2007, pp. 261-262).
 2. The subjectivity of some of the indicators (Hodjat, 2001, p. 96; Poulios, 2010, p. 173; Jokilehto, 2009, p. 318).

3. The possible conflict and contradiction of the indicators (Mason, 2002, p. 5; Feilden, 2007, pp. 261-262; Poulios, 2010, p. 173).

4. Ambiguity in the priority of the indicators (Feilden, 2007, pp. 261-262; Poulios, 2010, p. 173).

5. Differences in the power of influence and expression of experts in related fields and disregarding each other's views (Feilden, 2007; pp. 261-262).

6. Unreliability in predicting the future demands and needs of the stakeholders (Kincaid, 2002, p. 103).

7. The possibility of disregarding the real interests and expectations of people (Elsorady, 2014, p. 520; Poulios, 2010, p. 174).

8. Possibility of paying attention only to the physical aspects of conservation (Poulios, 2010, p. 174).

9. The Possibility of social conflict and people's resistance to expert decisions (Coeterier, 2002, p. 111). These challenges generally occur in situations which the stakeholders' range includes the general public. These situations are the following: the evaluation of the cultural value of the building, assessment of the building's obsolescence, assessment of the stakeholders and the welfare level, evaluation of the previous experiences, evaluation of the alternatives, particularly in determining the function evaluation of the processes leading to the effective decisions on the people, and evaluation of the project after exploitation. To solve the stated challenges, a tendency has been created towards the reduction of the experts' dominance and leaving the decision makings to the people, which forms the community-based approach. This approach was formed for more consistency of the conservation purposes to the people's expectations on the one hand, and increasing the sense of belonging and responsibility in people to realize the social sustainability. In this framework, the vernacular adaptive reuse with the bottom-up approach is raised against the common method of up-bottom and expertise-oriented approach (Plevoets & Sowinska-Heim, 2018, p. 13). The necessity to consider the cultural differences and the participation of the local communities in the conservation decision makings with different degrees has been observed in the international documents and charters of the conservation (ICOMOS, 2011a; 2011b; Declaration, 2014; Habibi & Maghsoudi, 2012, p. 150). Decision making also faces some challenges in this approach:

1. Plurality of the stakeholders (Kincaid, 2002, p. 13; Yung & Chen, 2011, p. 459).
2. The change in stakeholders and expectations overtime (Mason, 2002, p. 5; Poulios, 2010, p. 175; Yung & Chen, 2011, p. 465).
3. Cultural diversity of the stakeholders (Morente, 2001 as cited in Vinas, 2002, p. 28).
4. Stakeholders' conflict of interests (Kincaid, 2002, p. 14; Yung & Chen, 2011, p. 459; Poulios, 2010, p. 173).

5. Stakeholder's inattention to others' interests and attitudes, the rights of the weak and silent groups (Vinas, 2002, p. 30; Kincaid, 2002, p. 14).
6. Insufficient knowledge of stakeholders regarding conservation and inability to analyze the various and diverse specialized indicators (Hodjat, 2001, p. 106; De la Torre, 2002, p. 4; Yung & Chen, 2011, p. 459).
7. Inattention to the intangible values of the building and the mere tendency to the economic aspects (Hodjat, 2001, p. 108; Vinas, 2002, p. 30).
8. Effectiveness of the advertisement of the powerful stakeholders (Yung & Chen, 2011, p. 456).
9. The lack of stakeholder's participation mechanism (Ibid, p. 463).

Some of these challenges are more probable in the communities that have weak relationship with the heritages. As mentioned in the Florence Declaration, experts play a significant role in establishing a relationship between society and heritage as well as controlling the adverse effects of public participation (Declaration, 2014). According to experts, overcoming the stated challenges is possible by organizing an interactive and conversation-based process. While using the participation of the stakeholders, the experts can play a role as a guide, facilitator of fair participation, and representative of the future generations. This method is known as the negotiative conservation, which is focused on achieving a consensus between the involved parties in the conservation, including stakeholders and experts in decision makings (Vinas, 2002, p. 30).

3.2. Capacities of Evaluation to Solve the Decision Making Challenges in the Adaptation Experiences of the Historical Buildings in Iran

In Iran, the conservation of historic buildings due to archaeological and cultural values is generally in the form of maintenance and restoration within the framework of government duties. In recent years, with the recognition of the economic potential of historical buildings and a change in attitudes toward conservation through rehabilitation as the concept of reviving the building, the adaptation of the historical buildings in the form of restoration and rehabilitation projects has expanded.

In general, a tendency towards the community-based approach and emphasis on the stakeholders' participation has been recently raised in the decision makings of the conservation in Iran, including the adaptation projects of the historical buildings⁵ (Pakzad, 2017, p. 72). However, the value-based approach is still dominant due to the difficulties in the community-based approach practically⁶. In recent years, various public organizations have been formed in heritage conservation to increase sensitivity and public awareness and affect the conservation movement. However, since their position has not been recognized by the public institutions, such as municipalities, and

these organizations are only in contact with a particular class of the youth, experts, and enthusiasts, they were not efficient (Rezae & Faraji, 2018, pp. 33-34). Studies showed that the following were the reasons for the emergence of the social conflicts and failure of some of the conservation and adaptation experiences of the historical buildings: lack of public awareness about the capacities of the historical buildings and their conservation, the lack of relationship between the experts and the stakeholders, and neglecting the attraction of their participation, and consequently, the inconsistency of the purposes with the real needs of the stakeholders⁷ (Razegh, Pubabaei, & Nadimi, 2014, p. 49; Partovi, & Farzad Behtash, 2014, p. 22).

On the other hand, according to the researchers, public participation in the formal areas in Iran faces profound and mental challenges. Despite the willingness of the legal authorities for the participation and the existence of the related mechanisms, pursuing the processes of cooperative decision making to realize the real participation is not practical (Piran, 1997 as cited in Musai & Shiani, 2010, p. 265; Pakzad, 2017, pp. 67-71; Shirazi, 2017, pp. 330-331). To overcome these obstacles in the short term, participation must be done in organized, low-cost, and step-by-step processes during the formation and implementation process of the plans and projects. Then, in the long-term, by increasing the cooperative experiences, it will be gradually possible to solve the mental challenges and develop the participation culture (Alavitabar, 2000, p. 50; Musai & Shiani, 2010, p. 265; Habibi & Foroughifar, 2014, p. 12; Pakzad, 2017, pp. 71-72). As a systematic process, in accordance with the process of projects, and cost-effective in comparison to other opportunities that provide the supervision as well, evaluation is such a process and has proper capacities to realize the real participation and influence of the stakeholders in decisions.

Therefore, in the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran, the evaluations not only play a role in directing and improving the current or future projects but its capacities can also be used to enlighten and improve the common understanding about the values of the building and conservation purposes, and eventually, solve the decision-making challenges in the lack of a cooperative decision-making system.

4. INVESTIGATING THE STATUS OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE SELECTION OF THE APPROACHES IN POSSIBLE EVALUATION SITUATIONS IN THE ADAPTATION EXPERIENCES OF THE HISTORICAL BUILDINGS IN IRAN

Regarding the consensus, the possibility of consensus, and the possibility of evaluation development, determining the status depended on the received

opinions, behavioral and personal traits of the involved groups, and available temporal and financial facilities for evaluation, and is unpredictable.

Regarding the priority of the evaluation, all the identified evaluations were conducted to progress and improve the current project except for the project evaluation after exploitation, and they must reach a definitive result in this regard. Therefore, unifying the opinions was the priority in the evaluations. Evaluating project after exploitation was conducted to contribute to decision making in the future project or to give information. The evaluation priority would be different than unifying the opinions in the first mode and reflecting various opinions in the second mode. The status of necessity and possibility of the survey can be investigated based on the nature of the introduced evaluations in the previous section and the contextual features of the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran.

4.1. Evaluating the Cultural Value of the Building

1. The necessity of survey: In this evaluation and the framework of the community-based approach, paying attention to the multiple meanings of the historical buildings from the perspective of various groups is important. Also, given the limitation in taking the cooperative decision-making processes in Iran, its significance is doubled. Therefore, it is required to receive the opinions of groups, including stakeholders of the building and experts of the conservation, regarding determining and assessing the indicators of building significance as a qualitative and subjective issue.

2. Possibility of survey: It is possible to receive and apply the opinions of the authorities due to the direct presence of them in the project, the knowledge on the probable aspects of the building value, and the tendency to advance the project. As previously mentioned, there is a tendency and possibility of participation in the evaluation among the audible interest groups of the project. Also, problems, such as groups' lack of knowledge or the inequality in the participation opportunity, can be solved through the experts' support and the evaluator's facilitation. Since the interests of the future generation are raised in this evaluation, the possibility of surveying is generally limited.

4.2. Evaluating the Building Condition

1. Necessity of survey: Receiving opinions is necessary for the assessment of the degree of the building's obsolescence due to its dependency on the desirability of the building from the user's perspective, in particular, in terms of functional and semantic aspects. However, determination of this factors condition is not necessary for the assessment of building adaptability due to the studied objectivity and being quantitative of the aspects and criteria.

2. Possibility of survey: Other than experts in the relevant areas, receiving the current users' opinions on assessing the degree of building's obsolescence is important. As previously mentioned, it is possible to survey these groups. In assessment of buildings adaptability, this factor is not effective as there is no need to receive opinions.

4.3. Evaluating the Management Context

1. The necessity of survey: Receiving opinions is necessary in assessing the influence power^s and needs of the stakeholders and the cultural, economic, and social welfare level of the place due to the subjectivity and being qualitative of the studied issues. However, determination of this factor condition is not necessary for assessing the desirability of the accesses, and infrastructural and monitoring facilities as well as the quality of the human, information, and financial resources (required expert forces) (Demas, 2002, pp. 41-42) due to the objectivity and being quantitative of the studied aspects and criteria.

2. Possibility of survey: In assessing the stakeholders' influence power and needs, the possibility of receiving and applying the opinions is limited due to the matter of the interests of the future generations and stakeholders. However, the interests and opinions of the local people matter in assessing the cultural, economic, and social welfare of the place. Thus, it is possible to survey them, as previously mentioned. In other sub-assessments of this evaluation, as it is not necessary to receive the opinion, investigating this factor is not influential.

4.4. Evaluating Previous Experiences

1. Necessity of survey: In this evaluation, the extent of the success of the thought and implemented approaches in similar samples to achieve the purposes and desirability of its effects according to the authorities and stakeholders of each project in different intervals is assessed. Therefore, it is necessary to receive their opinions in this evaluation.

2. Possibility of survey: The possibility of receiving and applying the opinions in this evaluation is limited due to the probability of the lack of access to some of the stated groups at the time of the evaluation..

4.5. Evaluating Alternatives

1. Necessity of survey: Making the decision about some of the alternatives, such as the manner of dealing with the building, function, intervention, implementation, and maintenance methods, is influential in the stakeholders' interests of the project. Therefore, surveying them along with the authorities of the relevant areas is important in assessing the desirability of the alternatives.

Possibility of survey: The possibility of receiving and applying the opinions in this evaluation is limited due to the lack of access to some stakeholders, such

as future clients of the building and generations as the silent groups.

4.6. Evaluating the Processes

1. Necessity of survey: Evaluating and decision-making processes lead to the information and decisions affecting the groups' interests, and its desirability depends on the realization of applying and receiving the stakeholders' opinions or the evaluator, as the representative of the silent stakeholders. Therefore, their satisfaction with the process and survey method is important⁹. In evaluating the executive processes, Assessing the adaptation of the process to the regulations and the project plan, and controlling the considered qualitative and quantitative features are a matter of fact. In this case, there is a possible necessity to change in order to advance the project, depending on receiving and exchanging the authorities of the design and implementation parts of the project and the related supervisors (Douglas, 2006, p. 547). Therefore, in evaluating the processes, it is necessary to receive the opinions of the authorities and the active stakeholders.
2. Possibility of survey: As previously mentioned, it is possible to survey these groups.

4.7. Evaluating the Results of the Implementation Processes and the Project after Exploitation

1. Necessity of survey: Similar to evaluating the alternatives, it is necessary to receive stakeholder's opinions in evaluating the results of the implementation of the alternatives and evaluation of the project after exploitation, since the desirability of its effects matters from the stakeholders' opinions and reaching their considered purposes,
2. Possibility of survey: The possibility of receiving and applying the opinions in this evaluation is limited due to the matter of the future users' interests (in evaluating the results of the action before exploitation) and future generations.

5. CONCLUSION

Evaluations enjoy various capacities to improve,

provide the judgement about a specific subject and ascertain the subject's accountability, enlighten it, and empower the stakeholders. They are also implemented and designed in various models. A set of approaches in each model are applied that determine the involved groups and their roles in evaluation. Given the development of the adaptation experiences of the historical buildings in Iran and involving the private sector in this section on the one hand and the lack of the formal evaluation system of these projects, it is necessary to design and implement the evaluations in a proper model to benefit from its various capacities. Thus, the status of the influential factors in determining the approaches in possible evaluations in the adaptation of the historical buildings was investigated considering the contextual features of these experiences in Iran. Considering the status of these factors and using the approach determination model (Table 1), the involved groups and their role in each evaluation can be identified. Considering that the effectiveness of each factor depends on the status of the upstream factor in this model, the status of each factor was adapted to the model and the next factors were involved if necessary to identify the approaches. Identifying the definitive status of some factors depends on the received opinions, behavioral and personal traits of the involved groups, and the available temporal and financial facilities to implement the evaluation, and is unpredictable. Thus, in some situations, the probable status of effective factors was considered, and subsequently, a set of approaches consisting of involved groups and their role in the evaluation was presented. In order to use the framework, it is first necessary to identify the desired evaluation from the items in the first and second columns. In the next step, the six columns related to the status of the factors affecting the determination of solutions are examined. At this step, if unpredictable factors are effective, it is necessary to specify a row corresponding to the situation in the project for each step of evaluation separately. Finally, by considering the involved groups and their role in the evaluation and assessment, the approach corresponding to the above row can be used in the design and implementation of different steps of evaluation.

Table 3. Framework to Form a Suitable Model in Evaluable Situations that Can Be Used in the Adaptation Experiences of Historical Buildings in Iran

Situation of the Influential Factors in Determining the Approaches			Involved Groups and Their Role in Evaluation		The Possible Approaches According to the Model of Determining Approaches	
Possibility of Evaluation Development			Ineffective			
Possibility of Consensus	Ineffective	✓	-	✓	2 & 3: The alignment views of groups and the evaluator as the representative of the silent groups as a summary can be used as a basis for the next step.	
Assessment Priority	Ineffective	Achieving a Definitive Result	Ineffective	Achieving a Definitive Result	2 & 4: Representatives of groups and evaluator as the representative of silent groups can reach an agreed conclusion as a basis for the next step by the evaluator's facilitation.	
Consensus	Consensus	Lack of Consensus	Consensus	Lack of Consensus	2 & 5: The evaluator can reach a mental conclusion as a basis for the next step according to the opinions of the groups and his/her perception from the point of view and interests of the silent groups.	
Possibility of Survey	Limited	✓	✓	Ineffective	3: The opinions received can be used as a basis for the next step. 4: By evaluator's facilitation, group representatives can reach an agreed conclusion as a basis for the next step. 5: The evaluator's mental summary of the received opinions can be used as a basis for the next step	
Necessity of Survey	✓	✓	-			
Assessments	Degree of Cultural Value of the Building in Terms of Various Aspects	Degree of Obscence of the Building in Terms of Physical, Functional, And Semantic Aspects	Degree of Building Adaptability	The Desirability of Access And Facilities	1: The evaluator can reach a conclusion at each step without surveying and use it as a basis for the next step.	
Evaluations	Cultural Value of The Building	Building Situation	Management Context			1

Situation of the Influential Factors in Determining the Approaches		Involved Groups and Their Role in Evaluation		The Possible Approaches According to the Model of Determining Approaches	
Possibility of Evaluation Development		Ineffective			
Possibility of Consensus	Ineffective	✓	-	2 & 3	
Assessment Priority	Achieving a Definitive Result	Ineffective	✓	2 & 4	
Consensus	Consensus	Consensus	Consensus	2 & 5	
Possibility of Survey	Limited	✓		3	
Necessity of Survey	✓	✓	-	4	
Assessments	Stakeholders' Influence Power and Needs	The Cultural, Social, and Economic Welfare of the Place	Adequacy of Financial, Information and Human Resources	5	
Evaluations	Management Context		Previous Experiences	1	

				The Possible Approaches According to the Model of Determining Approaches
Situation of the Influential Factors in Determining the Approaches		Involved Groups and Their Role in Evaluation		
Possibility of Evaluation Development		Involved Groups and Their Role in Evaluation		
Possibility of Consensus	Ineffective	Evaluator: Identifying groups, commenting as a representative of future generations and future users, helping to comment and advising stakeholders - Relevant authorities and active project stakeholders: Comment on the assessment indicators, their priority, and the desirability of the alternatives	Ineffective	2 & 3
Assessment Priority	Achieving a Definitive Result	Ineffective	Evaluator: Identifying groups, helping to comment and advising stakeholders - Relevant authorities and active stakeholders of the project: Comment on assessment indicators, their priority and desirability of processes	2 & 4
Consensus	Consensus	Ineffective	- Evaluator: Identifying groups, commenting as a representative of future generations and future users, helping to comment and advising stakeholders - Relevant authorities and active stakeholders of the project: Comment on the evaluation indicators, their priority and the desirability of actions and the project	2 & 5
Possibility of Survey	Limited	Ineffective	- Evaluator: Identifying groups, commenting as a representative of future generations and future users, helping to comment and advising stakeholders - Relevant authorities and active stakeholders of the project: Comment on the evaluation indicators, their priority and the desirability of actions and the project	3
Necessity of Survey	✓	✓	- Evaluator: Identifying groups, commenting as a representative of future generations and future users, helping to comment and advising stakeholders - Relevant authorities and active stakeholders of the project: Comment on the evaluation indicators, their priority and the desirability of actions and the project	4
Assessments	The Desirability of Possible Effects and the Feasibility of Alternatives	The Desirability of Decision-Making and Implementation Processes	The Desirability of the Effects of Actions and the Realization of Project Objectives	5
Evaluations	Alternatives	Processes	Results of Actions and Projects	2 and 6: The multiple sets of contrary views of groups and the evaluator as the representative of the silent groups can be used as the basis for the next step. 2 and 7: Evaluation can be stopped after collecting the opinions of groups and the evaluator as a representative of silent groups and a set of multiple opinions can be reported.

It must be noted that the evaluator in the required situations advises the participants and in all evaluations, is responsible for the organization of the evaluation and reporting the results. The presented framework is an initial suggestion to organize the design and implementation of the evaluations related to the adaptation projects of the historical buildings in Iran.

Considering the role that participation in evaluation plays in realizing the real participation of people and reducing the social conflicts in these kinds of projects, it is suggested that when the interests of the general public of the project indirectly matter, the approaches based on the participation and survey (approaches 3, 4, and 6) be the priority.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

It is required that the presented framework be examined and modified practically similar to other logical systems. Therefore, it is recommended that researchers

use this framework to develop the model and design of the evaluations and contribute to its development and improvement. It is noteworthy that besides the evaluation model, determining the type of the evaluations also plays a role in designing evaluations. It will be investigated in future papers.

END NOTE

1. At the time of writing this paper, according to the studies conducted, the preparation of a system for monitoring rehabilitation activities (evaluation, technical monitoring, and project control) in "The Fund for Revival and utilization of the Cultural and Historic Buildings and Places" in the country is under development.
2. The existence of a definite consensus is less possible in real circumstances, and a degree of consensus between opinions is accepted as a soft consensus. For this purpose, various models have been developed to measure the closeness of opinions and confirm the existence of consensus (Herrera-Viedma, Cabrerizo, Kacprzyk, & Pedrycz, 2014, p. 8)
3. Researchers have considered several factors to be effective in reaching consensus in negotiations, some of which are related to the personality and emotions of individuals that cannot be controlled by the negotiator (Ryan, 2000, p. 25; Butler & Rothstein, 2007, p. 22).
4. In History of Architectural Conservation, Jokilehto examined the evolution of attitudes toward the monument and, consequently, the way it was dealt with throughout history and in different cultural contexts in detail (Jokilehto, 2009).
5. This approach is reflected in Iran in the Charter of Architectural Restoration (Falamaki, 2016, p. 225), which mentions the need for stakeholder participation in conservation programs.
6. Hodjat rejects the two common approaches of relying on the opinion of experts or merely referring to the demands of the people. While emphasizing the importance of gaining the support of the people, especially in the provision of resources, due to their lack of awareness, he points to the need to raise the cultural level of the people and raise their awareness of the intrinsic values of heritage (Hodjat, 2001, pp. 106-108).
7. In this regard, we can point to the dissatisfaction of the residents of the historical context with the change of the historic houses function to hotels and the cultural consequences of guest traffic in the context which in some cases has led to harassments on guests (Manouchehri, 2016).
8. In their research, Ghasemi, Hossein Gholizadeh and Noghani extracted qualitative factors affecting the distribution of power from the relevant literature and benefited from commenting in this field (Ghasemi, Hossein Gholi Zadeh, & Noghani Dokht Bahmani, 2018).
9. The evaluator, as an agent in receiving and applying opinions, can have an opinion on how he acts, which is defined in the form of self-evaluation. However, as mentioned, it is preferred to have a meta-evaluation in this regard.

REFERENCES

- Alavatabar, A. (2000). Participation in Managing of Cities. 1. Study on Pattern of Citizens Participation in Managing of Cities. Tehran: Municipalities Organization of Iran.
- Alexander, E.R. (2006). Evaluation in Planning: Evolution and Prospects, Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Butler, C.L., & Rothstein, A. (2007). On Conflict and Consensus: A Handbook on Formal Consensus Decision-making, Citeseer.
- Coeterier, J.F. (2002). Lay People's Evaluation of Historic Sites. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 59(2), 111-123.
- Cramer, J., & Breitling, S. (2007). Architecture in Existing Fabric: Planning, Design, Building. Walter De Gruyter.
- De La Torre, M. (Ed.). (2002). Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research Report. Los Angeles, CA, Getty Conservation Institute.
- Demas, M. (2002). Planning for Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites. In Teutonico, J., Teutonico, J.M., Palumbo, G., Palumbo, D.A.C.G., Institute, G.C., & University, L.M. Management Planning For Archaeological Sites: An International Workshop Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute and Loyola Marymount University, 19-22 May 2000, Corinth, Greece: Getty Conservation Institute. Proceedings (27-54).
- Douglas, J. (2006). Building Adaptation. 2nd Edition. Routledge.
- Elsorady, D.A. (2014). Assessment of the Compatibility of New Uses for Heritage Buildings: The Example of Alexandria National Museum, Alexandria, Egypt. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 15(5), 511-521.
- Falamaki, M. (2016). Chart of Architectural Restoration. Tehran: Faza.
- Feilden, B. (2007). Conservation of Historic Buildings. 3rd Edition. Routledge.
- Florence Declaration. (2014). Florence Declaration on the Links between Biological and Cultural Diversity. 1st European Conference for the Implementation of the UNESCO-SCBD Joint Program on Biological and Cultural Diversity. Florence, Italy.
- Ghasemi, Z., Hossein Gholi Zadeh, R., & Noghani Dokht Bahmani, M. (2018). Factors Affecting the Distribution of Power in the Organizational Network with Emphasis on the Network Analysis Approach. *Organizational Resources Management Researchs*, 8(1), 133-155.
- Ghiyaei, M., Partovi, P., & Farzad Behtash, M. (2014). Analytical Framework and Methodology for Revitalizing Historical Districts and Areas Case Study Kerman's Bazaar Shah District. *Scientific Journal of Maremat & Me'mari-E Iran (Quarterly)*, 3(6), 1-26.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2001). Guidelines and Checklist for Constructivist (Aka Fourth Generation) Evaluation. Retrieved From <Https://Wmich.Edu/Evaluation/Checklists>
- Habibi, S.M., & Foroughifar, M. (2014). Finding Some Strategies for Encouraging People to Cooperate in Urban Renovation Plans Based on the Game Theory. *MEMARI-VA-SHAHRSAZI (HONAR-HA-YE-ZIBA)*, 18(4), 5-14.
- Habibi, S.M., & Maghsoudi, M. (2012). Urban Renovation. 6th Edition. Tehran: University of Tehran.
- Herrera-Viedma, E., Cabrerizo, F.J., Kacprzyk, J., & Pedrycz, W. (2014). A Review of Soft Consensus Models in a Fuzzy Environment. *Information Fusion*. 17, 4-13.
- Hodjat, M. (2001). Cultural Heritage in Iran: Policies for an Islamic Country: Iranian Cultural Heritage Organization.
- ICOMOS, General Assembly. (1999). International Cultural Tourism Charter, Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance. Available At: Http://International.Icomos.Org/Charters/Tourism_E.Pdf
- ICOMOS, Australia National Committee. (2000). The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 1999: With Associated Guidelines and Code on the Ethics of Co-Existence: Australia ICOMOS. Retrieved From <Http://Australia.Icomos.Org/Publications/Burra-Charter-Practice-Notes/Burra-Charter-Archival-Documents>
- ICOMOS, General Assembly. (2011, A). The Paris Declaration. On Heritage as a Driver of Development. Retrieved From Https://Www.Icomos.Org/Paris2011/GA2011_Declaration_De_Paris_EN_20120109.Pdf
- ICOMOS, General Assembly. (2011, B). The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas. Available At: Https://Www.Icomos.Org/Paris2011/GA2011_CIVVIH_Text_EN_FR_Final_20120110.Pdf
- Jokilehto, J. (2009). History of Architectural Conservation. (M.H. Talebian & KH. Bahari, Trans.). Tehran: Rozaneh.
- Kincaid, D. (2002). Adapting Buildings for Changing Uses: Guidelines for Change of Use Refurbishment: Spon Press.
- Lang, J.T. (2007). Creating Architectural Theory: The Role of the Behavioral Sciences in Environmental Design. (A. Einifar, Trans.). Tehran: University of Tehran.

- Langston, C., Wong, F.K.W., Hui, E.C.M., & Shen, L.Y. (2008). Strategic Assessment of Building Adaptive Reuse Opportunities in Hong Kong. *Building and Environment*, 43(10), 1709-1718. [Doi: Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1016/J.BUILENV.2007.10.017](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/J.BUILENV.2007.10.017)
- Latham, D. (2000). Creative– Re-Use of Buildings: Principles And Practice: Donhead.
- Manouchehri, S. (2016). The Manouchehri House Experience. The Fourth Meeting of the Fifth Series of Thematic Meetings of Urban Development and Revitalization Corporation on the Reuse of Valuable Buildings.
- Mason, R. (2002). Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices. In De La Torre, M. (Ed.), Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage, 5-30. Los Angeles, CA, Getty Conservation Institute.
- Moein, M.H.M. (2009). Program Evaluation Principles. Tehran: Moein Institute of Empowerment Evaluation.
- Musai M., & Shiani, M. (2010). Participation in Urban Affairs and Its Requirements in City of Tehran. *Social Welfare*, 1(38), 245-268.
- Pakzad, J. (2017). Historical Obstacles Preventing Public Participation in Iran: A Planning Practitioner’s Point of View. In Dienel Hans-Liudger; Shirazi M Reza; Schröder Sabine, Schmithals Jenny. Citizens’ Participation in Urban Planning and Development in Iran. 55-73. Taylor & Francis.
- Patton, M.Q. (2011). Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use, Guilford Press.
- Parhizkar, A. (2009). Document for Revival and Utilization of Historical and Cultural Places. The Fund for Revival and Utilization of the Cultural and Historic Buildings and Places.
- Plevoets, B., & Sowinska-Heim, J. (2018). Community Initiatives as a Catalyst for Regeneration of Heritage Sites: Vernacular Transformation and Its Influence on the Formal Adaptive Reuse Practice. *Cities*, 78, 128-139.
- Poulios, I. (2010). Moving Beyond a Values-Based Approach to Heritage Conservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 12(2), 170-185.
- Razeghi A., Pirbabaei, M.T., & Nadimi, H. (2014). Causes for the Emergence of Social Conflicts in Architectural Heritage Conservation (A Case Study: The World Registered Heritage of Soltaniyeh Dome and Citadel). *Journal of Studies on Iranian-Islamic City*, 4(13), 45-54.
- Rezae, N., & Faraji, F. (2018). An Evaluation of the Role of Ngos in Heritage Conservation; a Comparative Study on Iran and France. *Hoviatshahr*, 12(33), 27-36.
- Ryan, M.F. (2000). Factors Affecting Consensus in the Community Stakeholder Committee Process to Prepare a Solid Waste Management Strategy for the Halifax Region, Dalhousie University.
- Saif, A.A. (2013). Educational Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation. 6th Edition. Tehran: Doran.
- Scriven, M. (1991). Evaluation Thesaurus, SAGE.
- Shahbazi, M., Bemanian, M.R., & Saremi, H.R. (2017). Analysis of Effective Key Factors in Adaptability of a Building in the Future with an Emphasis on Flexibility in Historical Buildings (Case Study: Bu-Ali of Hamadan). *Space Ontology International Journal*, 6(1), 69-78.
- Shirazi, M.R. (2017). Concluding Remark: Paradox of Citizen Participation in Iran. In Dienel Hans-Liudger; Shirazi M Reza; Schröder Sabine, Schmithals Jenny. Citizens’ Participation in Urban Planning and Development in Iran. 327-331. Taylor & Francis.
- Stufflebeam, D.L., & Coryn, C.L.S. (2014). Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications, Wiley.
- Viñas, S.M. (2002). Contemporary Theory of Conservation. *Studies in Conservation*, 47(Sup1), 25-34.
- Yadegarzadeh, G.R., Bahrami, A., & Parand, K. (2007). Introduction to Evaluation Models. Tehran: Yadvare-E Katab.
- Yung, E.H., & Chan, E.H. (2011). Problem Issues of Public Participation in Built-Heritage Conservation: Two Controversial Cases in Hong Kong. *Habitat International*, 35(3), 457-466.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Naserolmemar, A., & Aminpour, A. (2021). Evaluating the Adaptation Experiences of the Historical Buildings in Iran (Proposing a Framework to Develop Evaluations Model). *Armanshahr Architecture & Urban Development Journal*. 13(33), 179-193.

DOI: 10.22034/AAUD.2020.164614.1795

URL: http://www.armanshahrjournal.com/article_127765.html



