The Routledge Handbook of Interior Architecture Research

Edited by Nisha A. Fernando

First published 2026

ISBN: 978-1-032-75657-8 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-75658-5 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-47505-7 (ebk)

Chapter 7

Interior Architecture *and* Adaptive Reuse

Elective Affinities

Francesca Lanz

DOI: 10.4324/9781003475057-9

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

7 Interior Architecture *and* Adaptive Reuse

Elective Affinities

Francesca Lanz

There is no single definition of what exactly adaptive reuse is – or is not. The term, which gained prominence in architectural debates in the early 1970s, is today used as "*an umbrella term for the sheer variety of interventions that involve the transformation of a pre-existing redundant architectural asset or site for a new or different use*" (Plevoets & Lanz, 2023, p. 8). Regardless of how we understand what adaptive reuse is, there is little doubt today that it has become a central matter in the broader contemporary architectural landscape. Since the turn of the 20th century, along with a steady increase in the number, scale, and variety of adaptive reuse interventions across the globe, we have witnessed an upsurge in literature on the subject. These publications address why and how designers should engage with adaptive reuse, delving into the topic from an operational, historical, and critical perspective (Lanz & Pendlebury, 2022). A large share of these publications has been produced by interior scholars. This observation may be no surprise to many, as it reflects the strong bond between interior architecture and adaptive reuse. However, although this relationship is well-known, it is relatively rarely investigated in terms of its reasons, nature, and implications. This is what this chapter aims to do.

Drawing upon extensive subject-specific scholarly literature, the chapter critically addresses the origin, nature, and significance of the link between adaptive reuse and interior architecture. While acknowledging the existence of such a relationship, it argues that this does not imply an equivalence between the two disciplines, nor can it be taken at face value solely based on the similar scopes of these design practices – namely, the alteration or creation of *interior* spaces of a preexisting building. Instead, the chapter suggests that this relationship is best understood as a matter of "elective affinity." The term is most notably associated with Wolfgang Goethe (1809) novel *Elective Affinities*. In this work, Goethe borrowed the concept from early 19th-century chemistry to describe human relationships as akin to chemical reactions, particularly emphasising the tendency of certain individuals (alias substances) to be naturally attracted, combine in predictable ways, and interact under specific circumstances (Goethe, 1809). Since then, the concept has been metaphorically adapted in various disciplines beyond chemistry, including philosophy and sociology, to describe the mutual and often unspoken attraction or compatibility between ideas, disciplines, or social movements, as well as the tendency for certain concepts or practices to exhibit a strong correlation that extends beyond mere coincidence. This chapter employs the idea of "elective affinity" to describe the relationship between interior architecture and adaptive reuse.

Contrary to interpretations that equate adaptive reuse with interior architecture, regard it as a practice exclusive to interior design disciplines, or even as a distinct discipline in itself, this chapter begins by framing adaptive reuse as an emerging and increasingly relevant *methodological, political, cultural, and operational framework for thinking and doing architecture today*. The discussion then delves into the connections and intersections between adaptive reuse

DOI: 10.4324/9781003475057-9

and interior architecture, analysing them in terms of parallel developmental trajectories and operational alignments among the two design practices. Ultimately, the chapter argues that the relationship between adaptive reuse and interior architecture, while in principle reinforced by disciplinary and practical design opportunities, extends beyond these. It posits that their bond is grounded in a deeper epistemological affinity – one that helps explain both their historical connections and their enduring synergistic relationship today.

Adaptive Reuse in Contemporary Architectural Scenario

While buildings, structures, and materials have always been reused throughout history whenever doing so was more convenient, easier, or faster than building anew, adaptive reuse is a relatively new and emerging field in the architectural design context – one that has gained considerable momentum in the past two decades (Brooker & Stone, 2004 2019; Lanz & Pendlebury, 2022; Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019; Wong, 2023). The term "reuse" and its synonyms (such as remodelling, rewriting, rereading, alteration) began to be intentionally used across Western countries – notably in the US and the UK – in the 1970s, to describe design interventions aimed at repurposing disused buildings, particularly industrial ones, as an alternative to demolition and as a means of conservation (Cantacuzino, 1975; Machado, 1976). From that moment onwards, it has gained increasing attention to eventually become a prominent field of practice in the 21st century.

Several factors contributed to the growing attention on reuse from the 1970s onwards. Deindustrialisation, war-related bombing damage, urban expansion, and evolving construction techniques and standards created an unprecedented stock of redundant buildings. At the same time, debates around what constitutes heritage, why it should be preserved, and how it should be approached reached a tipping point, shaping decision-making, policies, and conservation practices across Europe and beyond (Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019). New and diverse building types began to be recognised as heritage, and more progressive, dynamic conservation approaches emerged alongside traditional restorative methods (Pendlebury, 2008). Technological advancements, coupled with socio-cultural shifts and global geopolitical transformations – particularly in the energy sector since the end of World War II – further fuelled this trend (Wong, 2023). Together, these factors created fertile ground for the rise of adaptive reuse.

However, in those years, when adaptive reuse first gained attention, it was primarily seen as a conservation tactic and an economically viable strategy for urban regeneration, whereas systematic demolitions were increasingly recognised as impractical and unpopular due to widespread dissatisfaction with the results of the "clean-sweep" methods of modernist architecture and urban planning. Reuse, in fact, offered a more sympathetic solution to the growing number of redundant buildings, allowing for transformations that sustained urban regeneration while maintaining a degree of continuity with the past (e.g., Cantacuzino, 1975; Latham, 2000; Robiglio, 2017). It provided a means to preserve historically significant yet often overlooked and unlisted buildings by demonstrating their continued usefulness, aligning with emerging approaches to the socio-cultural, and economic sustainability of heritage conservation (Pendlebury, 2008). Nevertheless, it was still not widely embraced by established architecture design firms, who often regarded it as a secondary task focused mainly on energy upgrades or the preservation of historical buildings.

Since then, adaptive reuse has steadily gained traction, evolving as a design practice and a research field connected to conservation and building energy upgrading, but with its own distinctiveness. Beyond heritage conservation, on the one hand, the growing discourse on the sustainability of the architectural industry and the carbon footprint of demolition and construction

has recently notably contributed to the increasing importance of adaptive reuse. From an ecological perspective, reusing existing buildings generally requires fewer resources and materials than constructing new ones, making adaptive reuse a viable solution for reducing the environmental impact of architectural practice. On the other hand, the reasons for its growing role within today's architectural scenario, must also be researched beyond practicality and pragmatism, into socio-cultural contexts and sensibilities. As Sally Stone observes, adaptive reuse

> has much to do with the post-industrial society's acknowledgment of the worth tied up within existing building stock and ideas of cultural memory, combined with a need to belong to somewhere specific and a desire for something tangible in an increasingly digital and fragmented world.
>
> (Stone, 2020, p. 15)

Today, adaptive reuse importance as an architectural practice is recognised not only for its conservation benefits but also for its broader sustainability gains and the creative and professional opportunities it offers designers. This shift is evident in the growing number of architects and international firms embracing adaptive reuse, the attention devoted to the subject in specialist publications (Teague, 2024), and in the proliferation of dedicated university courses and modules. A comparative chronology of adaptive reuse projects over the past four decades provides clear evidence of this evolution, demonstrating how the scope of "reuse" – including who engages in it, the methods employed, and the underlying motivations – has expanded significantly. Interventions now range from grassroots, community-driven conversions to large-scale urban regeneration schemes, encompassing a diverse array of approaches and possibilities.[1]

Parallel to practice, scholarly research has flourished (Lanz & Pendlebury, 2022), demonstrating that adaptive reuse is not merely a matter of "retrofitting" and energetic upgrades. Instead, it resonates with contemporary socio-cultural and geopolitical concerns and aligns with broad definitions of heritage and sustainability (Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019; Scott, 2008; Stone, 2020; Wong, 2023). Today, scholars, practitioners, and policymakers widely acknowledge adaptive reuse's strategic role in addressing pressing challenges – from preserving dense historic fabrics to fostering sustainability, placemaking, and urban identity in diverse, evolving cities. By embodying both continuity and transformation, adaptive reuse dovetails more naturally with contemporary urban agendas than new construction alone. One could argue that while building from scratch was the dominant conceptual framework for architectural thinking and practice in the 20th century, adaptive reuse has emerged as its alternative and is now a *condition* for doing and thinking architecture today, likely becoming the predominant one.

Interior Architecture and Adaptive Reuse

Ever since its emergence on the architectural scene in the 1970s, adaptive reuse has developed a strong connection with interior architecture – one that has continued to consolidate over time. Many projects hailed as pioneering examples of adaptive reuse are recognised interior architecture "masterpieces," and several designers and architects considered trailblazers of adaptive reuse were leading figures in interior architecture. A prime example is Carlo Scarpa and his musealisation of Verona's medieval castle, Castelvecchio (1958–1975). The project is widely praised for achieving a seamless dialogue between old and new: it enhances the historic fabric without imitating it, reveals the building's various historical layers, and introduces a creative,

modern, and legible intervention that neither subjugates nor overpowers the original structure (Murphy, 2017). For these reasons, scholars frequently cite it as a model of adaptive reuse for its innovative approach to working with a preexisting building (e.g., Brooker & Stone, 2004; Stone, 2019). Before being an example of adaptive reuse, however, Scarpa's work at Castelvecchio is a milestone in the shift in both restoration practice and architectural thinking that began in the post–World War II period, marking the establishment of interior architecture as a discipline within the Italian academic and professional context – in which Scarpa, alongside figures such as Franco Albini, Gio Ponti, Carlo Mollino, and the BBPR group (Gian Luigi Banfi, Lodovico Barbiano di Belgiojoso, Enrico Peressutti, Ernesto Nathan Rogers), played a key role (Bassanelli & Leveratto, 2025; Cornoldi, 2005; Forino, 2010; Forino, 2026; Huber, 1997).

The relationship between interior architecture and adaptive reuse is evident in both practical convergence and theoretical debate, as well as in pedagogical approaches. Many publications on adaptive reuse – particularly the most recent and theoretical – have been authored by interior scholars (e.g., Brooker, 2026, Brooker & Stone, 2004, 2019; Littlefield & Lewis, 2007; Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019; Scott, 2008; Stone, 2019; Wong, 2017, 2023). Likewise, most university courses specialising in adaptive reuse – in Europe and overseas – are bachelor's and master's programmes in interior design or interior architecture. Several interior-architecture scholars and educators have unequivocally identified adaptive reuse as a core area of the discipline (e.g., Brooker & Stone, 2004, 2010; Cornoldi, 2007; de Giorgi & Romanelli, 1994; Kurtich & Eakin, 1993; Lanz, 2018). In their seminal book *Interior Architecture*, John Kurtich and Garret Eakin state:

> Interior Architecture is expressed in several ways. First, it can be the entire building designed as an external shell containing integrated and finished interiors. Second, Interior Architecture can be the completion of space within an existing architectural enclosure. Finally, it can be the preservation, or adaptive reuse, of buildings, historic or otherwise, with a focus on the design of interior space.
>
> (Kurtich & Eakin, 1993, p. 3)

Some authors even identify the alteration of existing buildings as the very essence of interior architecture, equating adaptive reuse with the discipline itself (e.g., Brooker & Stone, 2004, 2010). However, the reasons for this strong bond are seldom discussed explicitly in the literature. This chapter aims to address that gap by identifying and discussing several key elements that underlie the relationship between interior architecture and adaptive reuse.

A key element underpinning their relationship is likely "opportunity," encompassing both the conditions that have facilitated its development and growth, and the mutual benefits arising from this connection. One aspect of this opportunity is its "timeliness," referring to the parallel emergence of interior architecture and adaptive reuse as design practices and disciplines, as well as their alignment with evolutions in the broader architectural discourse that have encouraged their synergies. Like adaptive reuse, the design of interiors is a practice as old as architecture itself. While interior decoration emerged across Europe as a specific artistic and design field within the Arts and Crafts movement in the early 20th century, interior architecture as a distinct design practice in Western countries traces its origins back to the post–World War II period, affirming itself in the early 1970s to eventually establish as a discipline in the 1990s (Cornoldi, 2005; De Vos & Floré, 2025; Hollis, 2018; Kurtich & Eakin, 1993). This timeframe aligns closely with the above-mentioned timeline for the development of adaptive reuse in the same geopolitical context. Such overlap has facilitated the connection between the two and allowed for important synergies to emerge, creating conditions for their "elective affinity" bonding.

At that time, the prevailing notion in architecture schools and the design world across the Euro-centric contexts mostly was that "real architecture" involved building and designing structures from scratch, focusing on style, form, and composition of autonomous pieces. Therefore, most architects were not interested in adaptive reuse, which was regarded as a practice ancillary to conservation or merely as retrofitting, and therefore believed to offer little to no room for the free artistic expression and spatial experimentation typical of "true" architecture (Scott, 2008). In contrast, interior architects early recognised the reuse and alteration of existing buildings – also referred to as *Costruire sul Costruito* (Italian) *Bauen in Bestand* or *Umbaukultur* (German), that is, "building on the built" – as a vital area for practice and research, viewing it as a professional and intellectual opportunity (Cornoldi, 2007; de Giorgi & Romanelli, 1994; Forino, 2010; Forino, 2026). They embraced it as an unexplored and promising field, to carve out their own niche and develop distinct expertise.

In particular, during the post–World War II reconstruction, salvaging historical buildings damaged by war bombing was a priority. Meanwhile, new approaches to heritage definition were emerging, which meant more buildings were now considered heritage and, therefore, listed and protected. At the same time, more progressive approaches to the conservation of historic buildings were developing, laying the groundwork for architectural interventions that went beyond traditional restoration and allowed for the reuse and modification of historical buildings (Pendlebury, 2009; Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019). Later, in the 1980s, deindustrialisation and the energy crisis led to a surplus of redundant buildings, creating more and new opportunities for reuse as an alternative to demolition. Due to the reticence of many architects in engaging with reuse, several of these interventions were undertaken by interior architects. This not only helped interior architecture thrive as a discipline and field of practice but also set the framework for its privileged relationship with adaptive reuse.

This was particularly evident in Italy, with notable examples including Carlo Scarpa's interventions at Castelvecchio in Verona (1958) and Palazzo Abatellis in Palermo (1954); Franco Albini and Franca Helg's museum conversions of Palazzo Rosso (1953–1961) and Palazzo Bianco (1950) in Genoa; the BBPR group's musealisation of Castello Sforzesco in Milan (1954–1956); and the transformation of the former medieval hospital Ca' Granda in Milan into the Università Statale di Milano by Ambrogio Annoni, Piero Portaluppi, and Liliana Grassi (1951–1958), to name a few. Classified under the category of *restauro critico* (critical restorations), these projects diverged from traditional restoration-focused architectural conservation by adopting a more open, discursive approach to existing structures (Carbonara, 1997; Torsello, 2005). They aimed to preserve and valorise preexisting structures while transforming them functionally, spatially, and aesthetically, emphasising material traces and incorporated the architect's creativity within the restorative process. Foundational to the Italian museographic tradition, these projects choreographed spatial experiences where the museum environment, exhibition design, and collection display contributed equally to the visitor's cultural and aesthetic engagement (Huber, 1997; Lanz & Leveratto, 2023). Their sensitivity to the existing fabric, human scale, and multiscale approach seamlessly combining architectural, furniture, and interior design, marked by meticulous attention to detail and a holistic architectural vision, set a methodological precedent for interior architecture and paved the way for its emergence as an autonomous and recognised discipline in Italy in the early 1990s (Cornoldi, 2005, 2007).[2] For similar reasons, these projects are often referred to today as forerunners of creative reuse, with an instrumental role in challenging reductive views of adaptive reuse as merely functional or pragmatic exercises in energy adaptation and spatial reorganisation, merely aimed at conservation.

Another "opportune" alignment between interior architecture and adaptive reuse underpinning their strong bond, is the shared scope of these two design practices – namely, working on

the interior of a preexisting building. This alignment is often discussed in terms of common design tactics and strategies (e.g., Brooker & Stone, 2007, 2008, 2009). Without wholesale denying shared design approaches and strategies among adaptive reuse and interior architecture, however, discussing their relationship solely on the basis of their "domain" or "scope" has significant criticalities (Lanz, 2018; Lanz & Pendlebury, 2022). First, limiting the realm of adaptive reuse interventions to the interiors of a historical building assumes the preexisting edifice as a mere "shell" or "host," a passive vessel for a new function. Such an assertion implies an oppositional duality between the old (the preexisting building) and the new (the architectural reuse intervention), as well as between form (the façade and exterior) and function (a potentially ever-changing, versatile, and independent interior). This perspective fails to recognise the deeper implications of working *within* (i.e., both ***with*** and ***in***) an existing structure, as well as the fundamental nature of adaptive reuse practice as practice of building on the built and a process of "palimpsest creation" and "translation" (Lanz & Leveratto, 2023; Stone, 2019). In that, it overlooks the fact that a reuse intervention is a practice and a process that generates a new meta-continuum in which the new function and spatial organisation introduced by the intervention, intertwine with the preexisting – its materiality and memories – to create a new architectural space with its own unique form and use where past and present are fused into a new architectural whole. By doing so, it risks reducing adaptive reuse to mere facadism, thereby overlooking its transformative potential on the building fabric and beyond – including the building's significance, meanings, memories, and its contribution to the sense of attachment and identity for local communities, as well as the broader impact of a reuse intervention at the neighbourhood and urban scales.

On the other hand, defining interior architecture merely as the practice of designing within the limits of a contained space of an autonomous given structure fails to acknowledge that interior architecture is, in fact, an approach to architectural design rather than a subbranch of architecture solely defined by its presumed scope or domain. Such a reductive view risks perpetuating a prejudicial cliché that interior architecture is a secondary practice – one that is subordinate in terms of both time and importance in the design process of a building, and mostly limited to furniture placement, finishing, decoration, and minor spatial adjustments, with no meaningful impact on its architectural design, including volumetric considerations and the façade. This is a key observation, which leads to the conclusion of this chapter, whose central argument is in fact that the relationship between interior architecture and adaptive reuse is best understood as an elective affinity, influenced by specific conditions but rooted in the convergence and complementarity of underlying philosophies, objectives, and aspirations of both interior architecture and adaptive reuse.

Conclusion: Elective Affinities

Similarly to adaptive reuse, which first emerged as a reaction to the "tabula rasa" mindset characterising modernism, interior architecture also arose as a critical – if not polemical – response to this paradigm, criticised for being overbearing, patriarchal, indifferent to heritage and memory, and dismissive of people's needs and identities (Cornoldi, 2005; de Giorgi & Romanelli, 1994; Diaz, 2007; Kurtich & Eakin, 1993; Zevi, 1948). Adaptive reuse has introduced a new perspective on conservation, emphasising transformation alongside preservation. It contributes to highlighting the socio-cultural and economic roles of built heritage – including ordinary and non-officially listed buildings and places – and to demonstrating their importance in fostering identity, belonging, and attachment within local communities (Plevoets & Van Cleempoel, 2019). Likewise, interior architecture, has been driven by an overarching effort to restore a

more "humanistic approach" to architectural practice. This approach seeks to re-centre the design process on the human scale, not merely in terms of proportions and ergonomics but, more importantly, by addressing the social and psychological dimensions of inhabiting space (Boeri, 1980).[3]

Before being a specific, autonomous design discipline, interior architecture in fact is an approach to architecture itself – a "*mental structure, nothing more or less than our way of thinking about things*" (Diaz, 2007). Mindful of Bruno Zevi's assertion that architecture "*does not consist in the sum of the width, length, and height of the structural elements which enclose space, but in the void itself, the enclosed space in which man lives and moves*" (1948, pp. 22–23), an interior approach to architecture focuses precisely on the design of this void – on the "interiority" of architecture, rather than merely its "interior." In other words, interior architecture is not simply about designing the interior of something or within something, but about designing "from within," with a key emphasis on the "inner" dimension of architecture (Argan, 1945) and on what Carlo De Carli referred to as "primary space," that is, "*a space of relationship*" and a "space of the gesture" (De Carli, 1982; Ottolini, 1997). This approach stems from the belief that the quality of a building is not just a matter of architectural volumetric composition, façade design, or style, but rather a complex interplay of elements that bridge the gap between interior and exterior, private and public, work and domestic life. For this reason, an interior approach emphasises space's affordances and its spatial and material qualities, with key attention to the human scale, the design of spatial margins and thresholds, the relationship between space and furniture, the design of the details beyond its technical role, and, crucially to any historical trace embedded in the context, as these elements are seen as vital to fulfilling the relationship between the spatial project and the more-than-functional needs of its inhabitants (de Giorgi & Romanelli, 1994: Brooker, 2016).

As an approach to architectural thinking, interior architecture offers a distinctive theoretical and design-oriented position[4] to address many of the challenges that contemporary society poses to architecture, including those related to environmental, economic, and social sustainability, as well as the forms and needs of contemporary living. Its scope of inquiry spans from housing, retail, museum and exhibition design, and other enclosed environments, to public spaces and urban interiors (Kurtich & Eakin, 1993; Pimlott, 2016). Crucially, it also includes interventions within historical preexisting structures, involving their conservation, requalification, and transformation for a new use – that is, their adaptive reuse. "Doing" interior architecture and "being" an interior architect, therefore, is not merely a matter of disciplinary fields or fields of professional practice but is an epistemological, and methodological choice, one that presupposes the cultivation of specialised theoretical, critical, and professional knowledge through the integration of diverse disciplines and skills and based on an holistic and humanistic approach to the design act in all its different scales and measurable and unmeasurable dimensions.

Interior architects were early adopters of reuse interventions, approaching them without prejudice. For them, working in a "duet" – to borrow Scott's (2008) metaphor – with an existing building, drawing inspiration from its material traces, and turning constraints into design cues has never been a limitation on their independent artistic expression, but rather a stimulating challenge and an invitation to rethink the very act of space production. They have consistently recognised adaptive reuse not only as a professional opportunity, but also as a design opportunity offering stimulating possibilities that naturally align with their skills, sensibilities, and approaches to architecture. Precisely for these reasons, also today, interior architects remain uniquely positioned to undertake adaptive reuse, and many of them specifically train in this area. While the "opportunities" discussed above have undoubtedly played a pivotal role in forging such a strong relationship between adaptive reuse and interior architecture, attributing the nature

of this bond solely to coincidence or circumstantial opportunity would be overly reductive. More importantly, it would obscure the broader implications of this relationship, particularly from ontological and epistemological perspectives.

Adaptive reuse today is more than just a design practice of conservation or spatial, technical, aesthetic, or energetic upgrade, and even more than a design discipline on its own. While not denying the relevance of adaptive reuse for sustainability, carbon reduction, and conservation issues, its significance within the contemporary context reflects contemporary sensibilities and attitudes towards both the past and the future, extending beyond the contingencies and practicalities of managing our built stock. It entails a care for the past in both its tangible and intangible forms while being forward-looking. It involves rethinking how we inhabit and create inhabitable spaces in ways that are attentive to ethical, cultural, and environmental concerns, thus fostering sustainability in a broader sense. It serves as a fresh and meaningful "conceptual framework" for conceiving the creation of space through practices of transformation, reappropriation, and resignification (Lanz & Pendlebury, 2022, p. 457) – practices that respond to contemporary and emerging cultural attitudes, aesthetics, and ethical considerations regarding the socio-cultural and environmental sustainability of architectural practice, and which are naturally aligned with an interior architectural approach to architectural deed.

If adaptive reuse today constitutes a condition of how we approach architecture – understood as a practice of "inhabiting the world" (Heidegger, 1971) – and if interior architecture represents an approach to the architectural deed centred on creating places to "inhabit" (where "inhabiting" signifies not only dwelling but also living in, experiencing, appropriating, belonging to, and engaging with a space's essential social dimension), then the connection between interior architecture and adaptive reuse lies in their shared pursuit of design-led interventions that enable the re-inhabitation of our built environment. Within this common ethos and understanding of space production, the affinity between adaptive reuse and interior architecture emerges, forming the basis of their mutual relevance and underscoring their key role in addressing both current and future challenges in architectural practice.

Notes

1 For example, as documented in adaptive reuse atlases published between the 1970s and early 2000s (e.g., Baum & Christiaanse, 2012; Brooker & Stone, 2020; Cantacuzino, 1975; Latham, 2000; Oevermann et al., 2023; Robert, 1989; Thiebaut, 2007; Wong & Berger, 2021).

2 In 1992, interior architecture, furniture design, exhibition design, and museography were grouped together by the MIUR (The Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research) under the scientific disciplinary sector ICAR/16-Interior Architecture and exhibition design, ratifying interior architecture as an autonomous and specific discipline within architectural design macro area.

3 Cini Boeri's Introductory chapter to her 1980 book Le Dimensioni Umane dell'Abitazione has been translated by Alessandro Bava for the online magazine *Pin-up* as: *The Human Dimensions of the House: Notes for a Design That is Attentive to the Physical and Mental Needs of Man.* https://archive.pinupmagazine.org/articles/book-excerpt-cini-boeri-human-dimensions-of-the-house#43 [Last Accessed, 10.05.2024].

4 With reference to epistemology theories and the idea of positionality in research, "position" here refers to a clearly defined stance or perspective from which a researcher/reflective practitioner approaches a topic or a project, informed by theoretical frameworks, evidence, and critical analysis.

References

Argan, G. C. (1945). A proposito di spazio interno. *Metron*, *28*(1948), 20–21.

Bassanelli M. & Leveratto J. (2025). Thinking in the expanded field. *Theorising Interior Architecture in Italian education, Interiors,* 15(1), 19–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/20419112.2025.2546253

Baum, M., & Christiaanse, K. (2012). *City as loft: Adaptive reuse as a resource for sustainable urban development*. Gta Verlag.
Boeri, C. (1980). *Le Dimensioni Umane dell'Abitazione*. FrancoAngeli.
Brooker, G. (2016), Interior matter(s): Proximities, inhabitation, identities. *Journal of Interior Design*, *41*, 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/joid.12084
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2004). *Rereadings: Interior architecture and the design principles of remodelling existing buildings*. RIBA Enterprises.
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2007). *Form and structure: The organisation of interior space*. AVA Publications.
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2008). *Context and environment: Sites and ideas*. AVA Publications.
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2009). *Elements and objects: Occupying space*. AVA Publications.
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2010). *What is interior design?* Rotovision Publishers.
Brooker, G., & Stone, S. (2019). *Re-readings: 2: Interior architecture and the principles of remodelling existing buildings* (1st ed.). RIBA Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367814601
Brooker, Graeme (2026). *The superREUSE manifesto*. Routledge.
Cantacuzino, S. (1975). *New uses for old buildings*. Architectural Press.
Carbonara, G. (1997). *Avvicinamento al restauro Teoria, storia, monumenti*. Liguori.
Cornoldi, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Architettura degli Interni*. Il Poligrafo.
Cornoldi, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Gli Interni nel Progetto sull'Esistente*. Il Poligrafo.
De Carli, C. (1982). *Architettura, Spazio Primario*. Hoepli.
de Giorgi, M., & Romanelli, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Rassegna* (Dichiarazione di interni: appartamenti italiani 1947-1993*)* II, 58.
De Vos E. & Floré F. (2025). Educating interior designers: expanding interior design history through educational narratives. *Interiors,* 15 (1), 1–18. DOI: 10.1080/20419112.2025.2572231
Diaz, L. (2007). Towards a history of interior architecture. In J. Gigli (Ed.), *Thinking inside the box: A reader in interiors for the 21st century* (pp. 167–176). Middlesex University Press.
Forino, I. (2010). Many voices, one story: Interiors through Italian eyes. *Interiors*, *1*(3), 177–196. https://doi.org/10.2752/204191210X12875837638813
Forino, I. (2026) Italian Interior Reuse: A Dialogue with the Past. In C. Ebert (Ed.), *Theorising Interior Architecture and Design* (1st ed., pp. 91–101). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003032113
Goethe, W. (1809). *Die Wahlverwandtschaften [Elective Affinities]*. J. G. Cottaische Buchhandlung.
Heidegger, M. (1971). Building, dwelling, thinking. In *Poetry, language, thought* (A. Hofstadter, Trans., pp. 141–160). Harper Colophon Books.
Hollis, E. (2018). (Re)constructing histories: A short historiography for interior architecture. In G. Marinic (Ed.), *The interior architecture theory reader*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315693002
Huber, A. (1997). *Il Museo Italiano*. Lybra Immagine.
Kurtich, J., & Eakin, G. (1993). *Interior architecture*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.
Lanz, F. (2018). Re–inhabiting. Thoughts on the contribution of interior architecture to adaptive intervention: People, places, and identities. *Journal of Interior Design*, *43*(2), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/joid.12121
Lanz, F., & Leveratto, J. (2023). Exhibitions and design: A perspective on the project of Museum display. In E. Redaelli (Ed.), *Visiting the art museum: A journey toward participation* (1st ed., pp. 67–86). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12089-3_5
Lanz, F., & Pendlebury, J. (2022). Adaptive reuse: A critical review. *Journal of Architecture*, *27*(2-3), 441–462. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2022.2105381
Latham, D. (2000). *Creative re-use of buildings*. Donhead.
Littlefield, D., & Lewis, S. (2007). *Architectural voices: Listening to old buildings*. Wiley.
Machado, R. (1976). Old buildings as Palimpsest: Towards a theory of remodelling. *Progressive Architecture*, *11*, 46–49.
Murphy, R. (2017). *Carlo Scarpa and Castelvecchio revisited*. Breakfast Mission Publishing.
Oevermann, H., Polyák, L., Szemzö, H., & Mieg, H. (2023). *Open heritage: Community-driven adaptive reuse in Europe: Best practice*. Birkhäuser. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035626827
Ottolini, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Carlo De Carli e lo Spazio Primario*. Laterza.
Pendlebury, J. (2009). *Conservation in the age of consensus*. Routledge.
Pimlott, M. (2016). *The public interior as idea and project*. Jap Sam Books.
Plevoets, B., & Lanz, F. (2023). Adaptive reuse. In R. Beunen, M. Duineveld, & K. Van Assche (Eds.), *Elgar encyclopedia in urban and regional planning and design* (1st ed., pp. 8–10). Edward Elgar. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800889002

Plevoets, B., & Van Cleempoel, K. (2019). *Adaptive reuse of the built heritage: Concepts and cases of an emerging discipline* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315161440
Robert, P. (1989). *Reconversions: Adaptations, new uses for old buildings*. Editions du Moniteur.
Robiglio, M. (2017). *Re-USA. 20 American stories of adaptive reuse: A toolkit for post-industrial cities*. Jovis.
Scott, F. (2008). *On altering architecture*. Routledge.
Stone, S. (2020). *Undoing buildings: Adaptive reuse and cultural memory* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315397221
Teague, L. (2024). *Journalism as activism: How does adaptive reuse fit into the editorial agenda of the architectural press?* Paper for the Interior Educator Conference 2024 "Practice", November 2024 (pp. 21–22). Northumbria University.
Thiebaut, P. (2007). *Old buildings looking for new use: 61 examples from Europe*. Edition Axel Menges.
Torsello, P. B. (2005). *Che cos'è il Restauro* (8th ed.). Marsilio.
Wong, L. (2017). *Adaptive reuse: Extending the lives of buildings*. Birkhauser. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783038213130
Wong, L. (2023). *Adaptive reuse in architecture: A typological index* (1st ed.). Walter de Gruyter GmbH. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035625646
Wong, L., & Berger, M. (2021). *Interventions and adaptive reuse: A decade of responsible practice*. Birkhäuser. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035625035
Zevi, B. (1948). *Saper vedere l'architettura*. Einaudi. (English translation) (1957). *Architecture as space. How to look at architecture* (M. Gendel, Trans.). Horizon Press.