

2.6 LISTING BUILDINGS OF HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST

The major objective of listing is to identify which buildings are of importance in an area and should be preserved or conserved. In this survey regard was paid not only to the individual quality of each building, but also to their relationships with one another as formal and informal groupings.

2.6.1 CRITERIA FOR LISTING

After a close examination of every building in Rhodes, each one was evaluated according to the following five basic criteria: A - Architectural quality; B - Historical association; C - Environmental contribution; D - Usability or adaptability; E - Integrity of the original design.

Each of these criteria was subjected to further detailed criteria which were assessed in 4 grades: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair/Poor.

An arbitrary maximum, 100, was chosen and each of the 5 basic criteria was assigned a share of the maximum score according to their importance to the survey.

The next stage was to assign a maximum number of points to each of the detailed criteria. The sum of the points for the detailed criteria could exceed the maximum given to their basic criterion as long as the total that was actually recorded did not exceed it (see example of Building Evaluation Sheet).

The building's total score then placed it in one of a series of groups of significance.

75-100 points: A - Preservation: Buildings of major importance which should be preserved (the building should be protected from alteration or further deterioration and under no circumstances be demolished).

60-74 points: B - Conservation: Buildings of importance which should be conserved with a 100% respect for the original fabric; repair if possible replace parts if necessary.

50-59 points: C - Control over alteration. Buildings of value as part of the streetscape.

0 - 49 points: D - Not rated: Of no importance and could be demolished from a conservation point of view.

The buildings' ratings would then form a guideline for future planning proposals.

Resulting from a careful overview of 108 buildings, 76 were finally listed in terms of the criteria established. Of these, 15 were awarded grade A, 20 grade B and 40 grade C.

The positions of the listed buildings are shown on the map together with those that have group value. Buildings with group value can be defined as those which lend supportive character to each other and are dependant on one another for a distinctive and harmonious streetscape.

It is of vital importance that the list is not viewed as being the final and complete assessment, but that it should be subject to periodic review.

EXAMPLE OF BUILDING EVALUATION SHEET

BUILDING EVALUATION SHEET			
NAME <i>Dutch Reformed Church</i>			
LOCATION <i>c/o Church and Muller Street</i>			
LOT <i>158 and 159</i>			
REFERENCE NO			
OWNER <i>Dutch Reformed Church of S.A.</i>			
A. ARCHITECTURE		MAXIMUM	35
1. STYLE	<i>Gothic Revival</i>	20	(10) 5 0
2. CONSTRUCTION	<i>Dressed stone with double pitched corrugated iron roof</i>	15	(8) . 0
3. AGE	<i>limestone, 15th of June 1892, laid by Dr. H. Muller</i>	(10)	5 . 0
4. ARCHITECT		8	. . (0)
5. DESIGN	<i>Symmetrical front facade with pointed arch windows, Netherlands</i>	8	(4) . .
6. INTERIOR	<i>exposed timber truss above gallery, pitched metal ceiling under gallery, timber pulpit (dating from 1934)</i>	8	(4) . .
			35
B. HISTORY		MAXIMUM	20
PERSON		20	(0) . .
EVENT		20	(5) . .
9. CONTEXT <i>Only church in Rhodes except for the mission church</i>		20	(10) . .
			15
C. ENVIRONMENT		MAXIMUM	15
10. CONTINUITY	<i>Group value with Post Office bldg, continuity of materials</i>	10	(5) 2 0
11. SETTING	<i>In a noisy, compatible</i>	5	(2) . 0
12. LANDMARK	<i>Yes</i>	10	(5) 2 0
			12
D. USABILITY		MAXIMUM	15
13. COMPATABILITY	<i>Institutional - church</i>	(8)	4 2 0
14. ADAPTABILITY	<i>Multipurpose hall</i>	8	(6) 2 0
SERVICES		8	. 2 0
16. COST		8	. 2 0
			12
E. INTEGRITY		MAXIMUM	15
18. SITE <i>Original</i>		(5)	. . 0
19. ALTERATIONS <i>1905 Narbonne built onto front; 1909 gallery and limestone added in front; 1916 new steel windows</i>		5	(3) . 0
20. CONDITION <i>Good</i>		(5)	3 . 0
			13
TOTAL SCORE			87
RATING			A
EVALUATED BY <i>M. G. Malherbe 24/8/87</i>			
RECOMMENDATION <i>Preservation</i>			
REVIEWED BY <i>S. Batt 29/8/87</i>			