

The challenge of rehabilitating relocated listed heritage Buildings: Requirements and opportunities

Malin Pedersen^{a,1}, Helga Margaretha Hognestad^{a,1}, Ronja Helle^{a,1,*}, Bjørn Petter Jelle^a

^a Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Rehabilitation
Heritage
Building
Energy efficiency
Building integrated photovoltaics
BIPV
Vacuum insulation panel
VIP
Aerogel

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates three listed farmhouses in Ørland Municipality which are going to be relocated and rehabilitated according to current Norwegian standards and requirements. Accordingly, the study assesses possible challenges and solutions regarding energy upgrading and restoration while preserving their historic features and cultural heritage. The study suggests solutions for the energy rehabilitation of the three farmhouses based on a literature review, hygrothermal simulations and energy simulations. These solutions include thermal post-insulation of external walls and above the framework of joists against the cold attics with mineral wool, vacuum insulation panels (VIP), and aerogel blankets. Additionally, fenestration renovation options and the potential for implementation of building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) are reviewed. Lastly, simulations of multiple energy-saving measures for each of the farmhouses have been conducted.

A new foundation due to the relocation, together with post-insulation of the cold attic are found to be feasible measures considering the preservation of architectural appearance and authenticity. Regarding the external walls, post-insulating externally is preferable for the farmhouses considering moisture issues and interior space savings. However, it is important to consider any possible loss of cultural heritage value. Alternatively, internal thermal insulation with aerogel blankets may be a feasible solution due to its high thermal resistance applying small thicknesses. The results show that in some cases, enhancing old original windows with a secondary glazing is an equally good solution compared to a total replacement of the windows, and is recommended for cultural preservation. Implementation of BIPV contributed to meet the net energy demand requirement. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the chosen BIPV systems resemble an accepted roofing material from the regulatory requirements, e.g., slates, to accommodate the building's architectural aesthetics and authenticity.

This study provides insight and recommendations for the rehabilitation of three listed traditional farmhouses in Trøndelag County, addressing energy efficiency while preserving their cultural significance. The findings show that it is possible to achieve today's energy requirements when rehabilitating listed heritage buildings. Results from energy simulations show that a reduction in net energy demand between 55 % and 75% is possible, while it is essential to note that each building is unique, and a case-by-case approach is needed. Nevertheless, the findings can be applicable for a general energy upgrading of heritage buildings.

1. Introduction

The United Nations General Assembly created 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 as a guideline to restore the natural world by the end of this decade [114]. The building sector alone is responsible for about 40 % of the total energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions globally [115]. As a result, the building sector has a significant environmental impact, making it a crucial task to adopt measures to improve the sustainability of the built environment [68]. In

this context, reuse and energy rehabilitation of already existing buildings may be a feasible solution to decrease the environmental impacts from the building industry. According to Kynbraten and Larsstuen [61] approximately 70–80 % of the buildings that will be in use by 2050 have already been constructed. Rehabilitation can provide benefits regarding the SDGs, in contrast to demolition of old constructions and erection of new ones.

Climate change poses new and intensified challenges for the preservation of buildings and built environments [65]. A more humid and

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: ronja.helle@hotmail.com (R. Helle).

¹ These authors contributed equally.

warmer climate can increase the risk of rot and insect damage, while acute events such as floods, landslides, fires and heavy rainfalls also pose a growing threat. Despite these challenges, the rehabilitation of existing buildings remains a viable solution to reduce the environmental impact from the building sector. The adoption of a circular economy is crucial for the construction industry to achieve sustainability, which involves reusing both buildings and materials to optimize resource utilization. In this context, protecting the cultural and historic value of buildings through use is a significant principle in cultural environment management.

Cultural heritage provides a baseline for understanding societal changes over decades, thereby having the potential of being a positive resource concerning societal development [66]. This is relevant to achieving SDG no.11: “Sustainable cities and communities”[114]. Additionally, continuous use, relocation and recycling of existing constructions and materials can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption [66], contributing to the attainment of SDG no.12: “Responsible consumption and production”[114]. Townscape character and urban spaces are often created by historic buildings [17]. Their visual appearance, materials, and construction techniques may be protected by law to preserve cultural heritage and local building traditions [17,74]. Such houses undergo the term listed heritage buildings.

Listed heritage buildings rarely meet the current standards considering energy and comfort [74]. However, Chandel et al. [21] found that the energy efficiency of a building is not necessarily dependent on the existence of energy requirements in a country. Energy rehabilitation and retrofitting of the building envelope in these houses need to be carried out with respect to historic features and the protection of cultural heritage [74]. Passive energy measures such as well-insulated surfaces, high-performance windows, and techniques for heating and cooling will affect the aesthetic appearance if not carried out with great care. In other words, every approach to the cultural heritage building mass has to combine the architectural conservation principles, and the environmental and economic aspects, whereas the SDGs play a substantial role

[23]. A study conducted by Chandel et al. [22] suggests that the use of energy-efficient features in vernacular architecture, i.e., a design and construction technique using locally available resources based on the environmental, cultural and historical background of people, can offer solutions to various challenges, e.g., high energy usage, indiscriminate depletion of resources, deforestation, degradation of environment quality and greenhouse gas emissions. They suggest that this approach should be adapted in modern architecture by adding energy-efficient features such as built mass, orientation, passive heating and cooling techniques, passive solar design features, as well as design-planning application and adaptive controls.

In a life cycle assessment (LCA) view, a rehabilitated heritage building will have an environmental, social and economic advantage [68]. When comparing a new building and a rehabilitated heritage building, the rehabilitated one will have much lower total emissions as there are no new emissions connected to the building’s footprint, i.e., production of materials, distribution and rising the building [34]. This is because the building has already been built. However, the rehabilitation work itself will have an environmental load, and some of the performance-improving solutions may even have a negative impact on the environment [68]. Also, when looking at the use phase, a new building will have lower emissions connected to operation [34]. Therefore, a key point of rehabilitation is improving the buildings’ energy efficiency to obtain a lower energy demand [68]. Munarim & Ghisi [68] refer to several studies comparing rehabilitation of historic buildings with replacement of buildings. They found that rehabilitating historic buildings resulted in reduced energy consumption, fewer CO₂-emissions, and lesser disruption of the environment “related to climate change, human health, quality ecosystems and natural resources depletion”.

The social value of rehabilitation can be found when solutions preserve the built heritage [68]. Sjöholm [95] explains the definition of built heritage as a socially constructed “product of the present, purposefully developed in response to current needs or demands for it, and



Fig. 2.1. Part of Ørlandet Municipality, showing Ørlandet and Brekstad. The red line represents the red noise zone, and the yellow line represents the yellow noise zone. The current location of the three assessed farmhouses (Trøa, Grande and Viken) and the recently designated Brekstad Bay (Brekstadbukta) area are also indicated. Drawn on the map from norgeskart.no. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

shaped by those requirements". In areas where built heritage no longer can be preserved at the situated site, one option is relocation. This particularly applies to heritage buildings [46]. However, relocation should only be an option when all other possibilities have been considered and the structure is in danger. The original location of a building is part of its cultural heritage. Therefore, when relocating, it is essential that "the new site should provide a setting that is compatible with the heritage". On the other hand, it is also important to consider the current and future issues concerning the environmental and social aspects when relocating built heritage [64]. Through literature studies, Martínez [64] finds that the relocation of buildings is "associated with social modernisation, urban development, and heritage appreciation". Furthermore, Munarim & Ghisi [68] emphasise the importance of providing the building with an active role in the community to which it belongs. For instance, structures established by relocated heritage buildings may lead to a growing interest in history and culture [64]. Also, by creating historic city sites, the local economy could benefit from tourism, generating revenue and new work opportunities.

The main objective of this study is to assess miscellaneous possible solutions for the rehabilitation of three relocated listed residential farmhouses in Ørland Municipality in Norway while preserving their cultural heritage and fulfilling today's energy requirements. Possible solutions are introduced in this work, including alternatives for thermal post-insulation of external walls and cold attics, fenestration renovation, and air tightening. Additionally, an evaluation is carried out to determine the most suitable thermal insulation materials for the three heritage farmhouses. Furthermore, the possibilities for implementation of building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) concerning applicable and feasible solutions for heritage buildings are investigated. Lastly, whether the three farmhouses may be able to achieve today's Norwegian energy requirements while preserving their cultural heritage are evaluated. This study provides insights into utilizing existing resources and preserving traditions, while achieving energy-efficient buildings. Additionally, the research aims to broaden horizons and challenge the traditional norms for rehabilitating listed heritage buildings by using new materials and technologies such as state-of-the-art thermal insulation and BIPV.

2. Case studies: Rehabilitating relocated listed heritage buildings

2.1. Location: Ørland Municipality

Ørland Municipality is located at Fosenhalvøya in Trøndelag County [45]. Most of the population in Ørland Municipality lives near the northern coastline, in Brekstad and on the outer west peninsula, called Ørlandet. Ørlandet is a flat area characterized by agriculture and a military airport. In 2012 it was decided to establish a main combat aircraft base at Ørlandet for The Royal Norwegian Airforce [109]. This development will not only expand the existing base but also bring new aeroplanes. The increased noise levels from these aeroplanes will have an impact on the environment, including potential harm to both people and animals living in the area. As a result, The Norwegian Defence Estates Agency has designated a "red zone" around the base that will be most affected by noise, see Fig. 2.1.

To prevent the buildings located within the red zone to decay, the aim is to relocate them. Several of these buildings are listed heritage buildings. This change will greatly alter the landscape, and the municipality is now faced with the challenge of preserving historic buildings, including residences, barns, sheds, and garages, amidst the demolition of homes.

Relocating buildings is an old tradition in Trøndelag [4]. Many of the buildings in Ørland Municipality were previously moved there from other locations in Norway. By again moving the listed heritage buildings, the historic tradition continues, and the cultural heritage can be preserved. The listed heritage buildings at Ørlandet will be relocated to a

new area in Brekstad Bay (Brekstadbukta), where the coastline has been expanded with filling compounds. This new area will contain a combination of approximately 55 new and relocated buildings [66]. Twenty-six of these are listed heritage buildings, whereas 17 are farmhouses/residences, seven are storehouses and two are firehouses/carriage sheds.

2.2. National and regional requirements and regulations

New buildings in Norway must follow requirements stated in the building code (TEK17) and other regulatory requirements given by the municipality or the county. Regarding existing buildings, the requirements are vague and subject to interpretation. The Norwegian Plan and Building Act § 31–2 states that measures on existing buildings should be designed and executed in accordance with requirements given or authorized by law [110]. This implies that relocated and renovated cultural heritage buildings should adhere to the same standards as new buildings. However, when handling listed buildings, it is more common to deviate from technical requirements rather than fulfilling them [61]. It is the municipality that approves if a deviation is acceptable or not. Kynbraten and Larsstuen [61] state that most exceptions from technical requirements can be permitted, except fire safety measures.

The regulatory plan for Brekstad Bay provides information regarding requirements in the area [71]. It is aimed at preserving cultural heritage while ensuring that new buildings meet the necessary standards. Table 2.1 presents the requirements that will have an impact on the relocation and rehabilitation of listed buildings.




2.3. Selected buildings

For this study, three listed traditional farmhouses from Trøndelag County (trønderlån) in various conditions from the farms Trøa, Grande

Table 2.1
Requirements from the regulatory plan that affect which changes can be made to the listed buildings and specifications regarding noise [71].

Information	Details
New extensions and façade changes	New extensions must be adapted to the main building's size, shape, and style. The façade material must mainly consist of vertical wooden cladding, stone/plastered masonry, and glass. Reflective materials must be avoided as much as possible.
Roofing	Only gable roofs and shed roofs are permitted. New roofing on listed buildings should preferably be slate, alternatively, traditional turf roof, chipped roof or wooden cladding can be accepted.
Colour restrictions	Buildings must be coloured with traditional red tones, ochre, dark green, brown shades, and off-white. White should be avoided as the main colour. Grey is not considered as a traditional colour. Window frames, doors and gates should be in a contrasting colour to the building.
Noise zone	Assumed noise level is 53 dB for the entire plan area due to aircraft noise. This marginally exceeds the requirement of 52 dB and results in a yellow noise zone. Grande will be relocated within the yellow zone for traffic noise.
Height restrictions	The height of the upper side of the internal ground floor shall be no lower than + 3.5 m above sea level, i.e., basements are not permitted.
Universal design	The relocated buildings are exempt from requirements for universal design.
Energy solution	Connection to an external district heating system is not required. Alternative energy sources should be considered when assessing security measures in the event of a power outage.
Preservation and restoration	The exterior of listed buildings must be preserved or restored according to antiquarian principles and in consultation with the cultural heritage authorities. There is no requirement for authentic interior preservation.

Table 2.2
Overview of the three selected buildings for the case studies.

Name	Trøa	Grande	Viken
Photo		 Source: (Taftø Petersen & Johansen, 2016).	
Address	Ulriksborgveien 53	Grandveien 350	Nordgrandveien 4
Category	1	2	3
Description of category	Most antiquarian value due to few changes over time and some original surfaces. Focus on material conservation.	Exterior from newer time that does not reflect the time period in which the building was built. Focus on visual restoration.	Well maintained building in line with the old building practice.

and Viken are chosen (Table 2.2). Hereafter, when referring to Trøa, Grande and Viken, it is only referred to the specific farmhouses and not the entire farm.

Traditional farmhouses from Trøndelag County are characterised by being long and narrow, as a result of gradual extension in the ends to make room for new generations or to satisfy new housing standards [40]. Usually, this type of building has no more than two floors, which is the case for Trøa, Grande and Viken.

In a recent report by Johansen [53], a restoration program was presented to address some of the challenges associated with relocating and renovating cultural heritage buildings in Ørland Municipality. The program involved categorizing buildings based on their condition, antiquarian value, and previous renovations. There are three categories described in the report and each of the selected buildings belongs to a different category, see description in Table 2.2.

2.3.1. Trøa

Trøa was established in the late 19th century and today the construction consists of both logs (laft) and framework [106]. A log construction is a wall construction where horizontal timber logs lay with the root end and top end alternately to each side [113]. The logs are held in place by the joint ends in corners and/or transverse walls. It is assumed that Trøa's log construction was moved to the site and is most likely from the 18th century [106]. The farmhouse rests on a foundation of natural stone and cement, has two floors, and a cold attic. The roof construction is purlins over the logs, and roof trusses over the framework. Originally, the house had a traditional turf roof, but this was replaced with slates in the mid-20th century [118]. The façades have original board-on-board cladding, except the north façade which is post-insulated and therefore has newer cladding. Consequently, the window framings are removed, and the windows do not longer flush with the cladding at this façade. Thus, the north façade is of lower esthetical quality than the other façades. The windows originate from different time periods, and there are both single- and double-glazed windows with and without grids.

The log construction is generally in good condition, except for the southeast corner where water leakages from the roof have caused

damages [118]. The roof needs repairing and upgrading; however, the slates can be reused. Despite their age, some windows are in good condition, although some need replacement. In general, the cladding is in great state, but specific rot-damaged cladding needs to be changed. The farmhouse has two chimneys that are recommended replaced with new ones when relocating the building.

2.3.2. Grande

It is uncertain when Grande was constructed, yet it is confirmed to be prior to 1895 as someone was born inside the house this year [108]. The construction consists mainly of logs, but also some framework and half-timbered wood. Additionally, Grande has a cold roof with purlins and rafters as load-bearing elements. At the west end of the house, there is an unfurnished storage shed (torvbu), which has exposed logs and a framework made of airport planks.

The two-story farmhouse was moved a few meters in 1951, hence some major changes occurred: cast new concrete foundation and base-ment under parts of the building, a framework of joists was installed, cladding was changed, a porch and storage shed (torvbu) was built, and the traditional turf roof was torn down and replaced with steel plates. The façades have board-on-board cladding, as well as awning windows and two-section casement windows from varying time periods. The southwest façade has been post-insulated with mineral wool. While Grande is mostly in adequate condition, there is moisture damage around a second-floor window on the northeast façade [49]. This stems from a hole in the roof due to corroded steel plates. Water has come down inside the wall, gathering around the window and on the floor. Therefore, mould has developed in the window frame, as well as fungal growth in the wall under the interior panelling and in the floor. On the outside, the paint around this area is flaked off. According to Ørland Municipality, the fungal growth has been stopped [70].

2.3.3. Viken

Viken was originally constructed in Skaudalen in Rissa, but underwent relocation to Ørlandet at the end of the 19th century [107]. The wall construction consists mainly of logs, but some newer parts are half-timber [33]. The roof has purlins and rafters as load-bearing elements



Fig. 2.2. Placement of Trøa, Grande and Viken in Brekstad Bay (Brekstadbukta) after relocation. Drawn on site plan received from Ørland Municipality.

with original slates as roofing. The foundation is of natural stone and plaster under the log construction, and concrete underneath the half-timber. The house has two floors, but there is a non-heated basement under parts of the building.

The exterior of the building has undergone various changes and renovations over time, nevertheless, its traditional and distinctive character has been effectively maintained. Facing south, a glass veranda was added in 2005 to extend the dining area, replacing an old extension from the 1960 s [33]. In 2005 it was also added 50 mm of thermal insulation to the external walls and most of the windows were changed around the same time [107]. The building is well preserved and holds high functional value, as well as cultural and historic value.

2.3.4. Placement in Brekstad Bay

Today, the three selected farmhouses are rurally located at some distance from the coast. Trøa is located near Uthaug, north of Ørlandet, while both Grande and Viken are situated in the southern part of Ørlandet, see Fig. 2.1. In the new residential area, the buildings' orientations and climate stresses will change. For instance, the proposed site for Viken is situated along the coast, resulting in significant alterations in the weather exposure the building will be subjected to. The farmhouse will be rotated approximately 220° based on cardinal directions (north being 0° and east being 90° etc.). Trøa will be somewhat protected from climate stresses by surrounding buildings, and the proposed orientation remains roughly the same. Grande will be situated farthest away from the coast but close to the road, causing issues concerning noise. Grande will be rotated about 50° from its original orientation. Fig. 2.2 shows the new locations of the buildings in Brekstad Bay.

The change in climate stresses will not only occur due to the relocation of the buildings, but also by the ongoing global climate changes. A building with its miscellaneous materials, components and structures will be subjected to and have to withstand various climate exposures [12]. Climate changes such as variations in temperature and relative humidity (RH) will accelerate the ageing and cause faster degradation of the building materials [62]. This will impact the buildings' lifetime, and consequently emphasizes the importance of considering climate change as a crucial factor in the preservation and maintenance of these listed

heritage buildings. Moreover, the climate change presents challenges regarding heritage tourism [41]. Due to the historical and cultural value these buildings hold, the heritage buildings will likely promote the interest of travelers [3]. Brekstad Bay will offer a unique way to explore cultural buildings and traces of people who lived in the past integrated in today's way of living. It is important to consider how a potential growing number of tourists may affect the listed heritage buildings. AlMasri and Ababneh [5] state that visitors are a cause of deterioration at heritage sites. The increase in visitor numbers may lead to congestion, overcrowding, and traffic loads, which can further exacerbate the wear and tear on the site's infrastructure and amenities. Furthermore, Hall et al. [41] highlight the need for management of heritage tourism sites to maintain their preservation. Although an evaluation of the more rapid climate ageing resulting from climate changes and the potential influence of tourism on the new residential area are not within the scope of this study, these issues should be considered as integral aspects in a comprehensive and holistic assessment of the situation in this project and similar forthcoming ones.

3. Rehabilitation measures for improving energy efficiency in relocated heritage buildings

3.1. New foundation and floor construction

The three selected buildings will need a new foundation and floor construction, because they are going to be relocated. The regional requirement, presented in Table 2.1, gives high restrictions that will affect the foundation. The height of the upper side of the internal ground floor shall be no lower than + 3.5 m above sea level, i.e., basements are not permitted. This results in three possible foundation techniques, namely, slab-on-grade foundation with a concrete stem wall, ring wall with crawl space, or open foundation [87]. It is generally advised against utilizing ring wall with crawl space for permanent residential dwellings due to the high risk of moisture damage. The use of an open foundation leads to an outdoor climate under the joist layer and may result in cold floors, draft problems, and increased energy consumption. Additionally, an open foundation does not align with the architectural design of a traditional farmhouse in Trøndelag County (trønderlån).

Therefore, a slab-on-grade foundation with a concrete stem wall will be the most suitable option.

Thermal insulation of the floor construction will be applied according to new building technical regulations and standards. As Brekstad Bay is situated along the coastline, it is imperative to utilize insulation materials that are capable of withstanding high levels of moisture, such as expanded polystyrene (EPS) and extruded polystyrene (XPS) products.

In Norway, the building code (TEK17) stipulates requirements for radon, which means that the majority of new constructions must be equipped with both a radon membrane and a radon well [86]. To use a membrane as both a radon and moisture barrier, as well as protect it against puncture during construction work, it should be placed below the concrete slab and 50 mm of thermal insulation. However, there is a risk that the insulation layer between the membrane and the overlying concrete may become permanently wet, thereby decreasing its thermal insulation resistance properties. To mitigate this risk, the membrane can be placed between the concrete and the insulation layer. In this case, a protective and sliding layer of 0.8 mm thick plastic or an equivalent material with similar strength must be placed above the membrane to safeguard it against puncture.

3.2. Thermal post-insulation of the building envelope

In Norway, all thermal post-insulation of listed buildings has to be approved by the cultural heritage authority [91]. Post-insulating of façades can either be performed on the external or the internal part of the wall [74]. In addition, half-timber frames may be insulated inside the cavity. External post-insulation with traditional insulation materials is a favourable method for minimizing heat loss and ensuring adequate moisture control when using traditional insulation materials [91]. For example, insulating with plates or mats of mineral wool eliminates thermal bridges. Choosing an exterior cladding that resembles the original one and moving the windows out into the wall is recommended to avoid water leaks and moisture damage. Reuse of old cladding is also a possibility. If the intention is to refrain from installing a new vapour barrier, it is commonly observed that this approach is well-suited for older wooden structures. This is because old timber walls, such as logs, framework and old half-timber, are often rather massive compared to newer light half-timber walls. The rationale for avoiding the installation of a new vapour barrier may stem from the desire to maintain the interior of the wall in its current condition (e.g., to avoid additional renovation work) or to achieve a visible timber/log.

The design of a traditional farmhouse in Trøndelag County allows for external insulation without changing the visible exterior of the building since the cladding covers the log walls. This presents a significant benefit, as the usable area on the interior of the building can be maintained while also improving its energy-efficiency through post-insulation.

Internal post-insulation with traditional insulation materials is only relevant if the façades are in great condition and should be preserved [91]. When adding additional insulation on the inside, the original wall's ability to dry out will be reduced, and it will become more humid. Kalnæs and Jelle [54] point to the risk of low exterior surface temperatures, which can lead to an increased frequency of freezing and thawing cycles. In addition, there is a risk of condensation forming, which can cause damage to the building and promote the growth of mould. Therefore, it is critical to approach internal post-insulation with care and take measures to mitigate these potential issues.

All three farmhouses in this study have a roof construction of purlins and a cold attic. Analogous to the process of post-insulating the external walls, either the roof construction or the joists in the attic can be thermally insulated on the upper side (externally) or on the underside (internally) [92]. However, insulating the roof construction itself would be unfortunate due to limited headroom and inapplicable living space. Additionally, post-insulation on the underside of the joists is not a viable alternative due to height restrictions in the building code (TEK17) for

habitable rooms. To circumvent changes in ceiling height, insulation may therefore be added to the upper side of the joists against the cold attic. A continuous layer of insulation across the roof's entire width is recommended to reduce thermal bridges. Moreover, a cold ventilated roof is advantageous concerning BIPV since they are most efficient when cold (when using crystalline Si solar cells).

Hansen [43] found that small differences in the air change rate in the attic could affect the hygrothermal performance and is consequently a very important factor in whether the cold ventilated roof works or not. Furthermore, when having a non-insulated roof construction, the attic could either be ventilated or not [88]. For weather-beaten areas along the coast, such as Ørlandet, a non-ventilated attic would be beneficial regarding entering snow, lashing rain, and cold air into the insulation. Moreover, a non-ventilated attic will have two continuous layers of air tightening; wind and vapour barrier, whereas a ventilated attic only will have one; vapour barrier. Concerning fire safety, the non-ventilated solution results in less hazard for fire spreading through the attic.

3.3. Airtightness of the building envelope

To improve a building's energy efficiency through rehabilitation, one measure is to increase the airtightness of its envelope [105]. This is important to prevent cold air from entering the thermal insulation and consequently reducing the insulation properties, and hindering water vapour and humid indoor air from entering the construction. Additionally, increasing airtightness will improve thermal comfort and soundproofing. For the case at Ørlandet, air-tightening of log walls and old frameworks, together with wooden roofs, are of interest. This can be accomplished by installing a wind barrier and a vapour barrier, and seal around openings such as windows and doors. It is essential to consider the moisture levels and use a wind barrier with low vapour resistance to enable the wall structure to dry out any income of moisture. The roofs should be air tightened by using an external wind barrier and an internal vapour barrier [92]. Additionally, it is important to assess the ceiling's ventilation and moisture levels to avoid condensation, plus seal around openings for ducts, pipes, and attic hatches. Moreover, if the continuous thickness of the thermal insulation in the walls or roofs exceeds 200 mm, using a convection barrier is necessary [89]. The convection barrier will hinder internal natural convection in the insulation, and thereby further reduce thermal losses and redistribution of moisture.

3.4. Fenestration renovation

Original windows in old buildings contribute to a large part of the building's energy loss due to their low thermal insulation performance, thermal bridging and air leakage [50]. Hence, energy savings can be achieved by restoring or replacing the building's fenestration. Total replacement of windows is currently the most applied fenestration upgrade, also in historic buildings, even though other options exist [63]. This is partly due to technical simplicity, affordability and high energy-saving potential, but also window products producers and suppliers influence this through compelling lobbying activities. Furthermore, it is noticeable that a total replacement of windows is not always the only and better solution for fenestration renovation.

Restoration and/or installation of internal secondary glazing may lead to similar or more energy savings, according to Litti et al. [63]. Illustrating this point is a study conducted by Chandel and Aggarwal [20], where they found that the installation of a secondary glazing contributed to significant reductions in heat losses. Moreover, replacement of windows is not always compatible with preservation of heritage buildings and their cultural value. This is applicable for the case in Ørland Municipality, where there are regulatory requirements about preserving the exterior façades, something that must be accounted for when considering fenestration renovation. The original windows in listed buildings are an important part of building history and traditional craftsmanship [59]. Also, there are multiple reasons to preserve old



Fig. 3.1. Installation of a secondary glazing improving the window's U-value from 4.6 W/(m²K) to 1.6 W/(m²K). Photo: Marte Boro [125].




Fig. 3.2. Possible solutions for upgrading an old single-glazed window with an internal storm window of single or double glazed windowpane [50].

Table 3.1

Indicative thermal transmittance (U-value) for old single-glazed wooden windows improved with secondary glazing, and indicative thermal transmittance (U-value) for new triple-glazed windows [29,93].

Window type	U-value (W/(m ² K))
Old window with single glazing and wood frame	4.1–4.5
Secondary single glazing	2.0–2.1
Secondary single glazing, heat reflective coating	1.5–1.6
Secondary double glazing, air-filled cavity	1.5–1.6
Secondary double glazing, heat reflective coating on both panes, air-filled cavity	1.0–1.1
Secondary double glazing, heat reflective coating on both panes, gas-filled cavity	0.9–1.1
New triple-glazed window, heat reflective coating on two panes, gas-filled cavity	0.9–1.1
New triple-glazed window, heat reflective coating on two panes, gas-filled cavity, insulated frame	0.7–0.9

windows, e.g., historic cultural value, lifetime and quality, economy, and environmental considerations. Fig. 3.1 shows an example of an old window which is improved with an energy-efficient secondary glazing.

It is important to preserve the original windows in heritage buildings and assess whether they can be repaired and improved according to current requirements for comfort, thermal performance, and airtightness, rather than just replacing them with new windows [50]. This is especially significant when both the windows and façades are in generally good condition. A possible solution is internal storm windows with panes with good thermal performance. Litti et al. [63] studied five options for fenestration renovation in a historic building: fenestration

maintenance, fenestration drought proofing, internal storm glazing addition (both single- and double-glazed), glass pane replacement, and total replacement of windows. Within a time interval of 100 years, the building life cycle operating energy reduction was greatest when replacing the windows, but not substantially more than installing secondary glazing or replacing the glass panes. Nevertheless, the study did not grant a clear result for the best and most performing windows retrofitting option, since this depends on the relation between materials' durability and building preservation. Furthermore, they point out the importance of exploring alternatives and not just relying on traditionally effective measures, especially when dealing with heritage buildings.

Homb and Uvsløkk [50] investigated the performance of an old heritage window upgraded with a secondary glazing with various configurations of panes and positions. Four different solutions were tested: single and double glazing, each with a cavity between the panes of 74 mm and 174 mm, see Fig. 3.2. The research included both calculations and measurements in the laboratory, e.g., thermal transmittance (U-value), air tightness and soundproofing. The best results were obtained in both positions with a double-glazed windowpane.

A study conducted by Harrestrup and Svendsen [44] carried out a holistic energy renovation on a heritage building in Copenhagen, Denmark. Concerning the windows, the municipality accepted windows replacement despite the façades being of heritage value, because a test apartment in the building showed that this was the most cost- and energy-efficient option. To preserve the exterior of the building, the new windows were constructed aesthetically as the old ones, only with energy-efficient three-layered glazing. Out of the energy-saving measures that were applied in this building (insulation, mechanical ventilation and replacement of windows), the fenestration retrofitting provided the highest savings.

Table 4.1

Thermal insulation materials comparison: properties, performance data, and estimated insulation thickness for a generic external wall with 6" logs and a U-value of 0.22 W/(m²K).

Materials	Possible site adaptation ^a	Load-bearing capabilities ^a	Fire resistance ^b	Thermal conductivity ^b (W/(mK))	Estimated thickness ^c (mm)	Typical area of use ^b
Traditional thermal building insulation						
Mineral wool	Yes	No	Yes	0.032–0.043	142	Moisture-protected building parts, such as floor dividers, walls and roofs.
Cellulose	Yes	No	Yes	0.037	154	Moisture-protected building parts, such as floor dividers, walls and roofs.
Wood fibre	Yes	No	Yes	0.038	157	Moisture-protected building parts, such as floor dividers, walls and roofs.
EPS	Yes	No	No	0.031–0.041	93	Floors on the ground and ring walls.
XPS	Yes	No	No	0.027–0.039	81	Floors on the ground and ring walls.
PUR	Yes	No	No	0.023–0.038	69	Factory-made wall and ceiling elements with panels on each side.
State-of-the-art thermal building insulation						
VIP	No	No	Dependent on product type	0.007–0.010	21	Moisture-protected building parts, such as floor dividers, walls and roofs ^d
Aerogel	Yes	No	Yes	0.015	45	Moisture-protected building parts, such as floor dividers, walls and roofs, and also translucent or transparent building parts, e.g., windows ^e

EPS: expanded polystyrene; XPS: extruded polystyrene; PUR: polyurethane; VIP: vacuum insulation panel; a: [52]; b: [89]; c: calculations based on a simplified U-value calculation; d: [126]; e: [8].




Fig. 4.1. VIP components [67].

As mentioned, improving windows' thermal transmittance affects the building's energy use. Additionally, the thermal improvement can lead to a longer service lifetime due to less condensation problems [93]. Table 3.1 presents the thermal transmittance for old single-glazed windows that have been improved with different types of secondary glazing, and for comparison, normal thermal transmittance for new triple-glazed windows.

Finally, with respect to a possible dynamic control of the solar radiation through windows, so-called smart windows, e.g. electrochromic windows and others, could be utilized in buildings [78,13,10,79].

4. Thermal insulation materials

4.1. A comparison of thermal insulation materials

Proper thermal insulation is a critical component for energy-efficient buildings. Cabeza et al. [17] have found that most studies concerning improving energy performance of historic buildings have agreed that improving the building's climate insulation is one of the most impactful measures. Listed cultural heritage buildings often have limitations regarding the thickness of their building envelope due to architectural



Fig. 4.2. External ventilated façade retrofitting with VIPs in Malmö (two left photos) and internal installation of VIPs in KUBIK by TecNALIA (two right photos) [116].

constrains, making it impractical to add a thick layer of insulation. Therefore, selecting insulation materials that makes the building energy-efficient while maintaining its historic character is both challenging and important. Table 4.1 provides an overview of relevant insulation materials, including traditional materials that have been used for many years, as well as state-of-the-art materials that are emerging and available on the market.

In Norway, mineral wool is a prevalent insulation material used for walls and roofs, and includes glass and rock wool [117]. Mineral wool is non-organic, which is beneficial as it maintains its thermal properties over time and does not rot [89]. Both glass and rock wool are considered fire-resistant, but rock wool has a higher melting point. Additionally, glass wool can be compressed to 20 % of its original volume, making it easier to transport and store [117]. However, cellulose and wood fibre insulation are also used today, but they have a higher thermal conductivity and need to be handled as hazardous waste due to additives used in their production [89]. They are also more susceptible to rotting over time, which may lead to changes in thermal properties. Plastic-based insulation materials can contain substances that need to be handled as hazardous waste. Polyurethane (PUR) is a plastic-based insulation material that is mainly used where the insulation is protected from moisture. Additionally, during a fire, PUR will release hydrogen cyanide and isocyanates, which are highly toxic. Furthermore, PUR may experience an increase in thermal conductivity over time depending on the gas used in the porous structure, whereas this will normally not be the case for extruded polystyrene (XPS) and expanded polystyrene (EPS).

Regarding moisture-technical properties, mineral wool, plastic insulation, aerogel insulation and VIPs will absorb little or no moisture from the air [89]. Mineral wool will, however, retain water if exposed to it. Cellulose and wood fibre insulation are hygroscopic and have an equilibrium humidity approximately the same as other wood materials. There is not necessarily a need to use a vapour barrier when using hygroscopic insulation as it carries water away instead of retaining it. This results in a more “breathable” construction. EPS and XPS have high compressive strengths and absorb little moisture, i.e., they are suitable for insulation in moist areas. XPS has higher compressive strength and is more moisture resistant than EPS, but has a cost three times higher [117]. XPS insulation is typically the preferred choice for insulating constructions that require high pressure resistance, such as foundation walls.

Traditional insulation materials are well known, but the introduction of newer materials has opened new avenues of possibilities. Hence, the state-of-the-art insulations VIPs and aerogels represent two examples of material solutions that could be interesting to explore further regarding their conditions of use and effect.

4.2. Vacuum insulation panels

A vacuum insulation panel (VIP) is formed of a core of porous material enclosed by an airtight foil, from which the air is pumped out

forming a vacuum [89]. VIPs have very low thermal conductivity, in fact, the insulation performance is 5–10 times better, dependent on ageing, compared to conventional thermal insulation [54]. The VIP technology represents one of the most up-and-coming building insulation material solutions for commercialization today. Information about the construction of VIPs, and different types, may e.g., be found in the overview given by Kalnæs and Jelle [54]. Fig. 4.1 displays the components of a VIP.

VIPs make it possible with highly insulated floors, walls and roofs, especially when rehabilitating old buildings with limited space [54]. However, it is crucial with thorough planning with regards to durability, lifetime expectations, thermal bridges, and lack of flexibility, in order to integrate VIPs effectively. Due to their modest thickness, VIPs may be a great choice for internal post-insulation in existing buildings. This may be very beneficial for listed buildings where the exterior needs to be preserved [116], i.e., like the case in Ørland Municipality. Compared to traditional thermal insulation, VIPs offer the same thermal performance but with a much slimmer construction that utilizes significantly less of the indoor area. However, there are some downsides with VIPs, such that they cannot be cut on-site, they will have a loss of vacuum over time due to air and vapour diffusion, and they can easily be damaged which will reduce their thermal insulation performance. These issues have held back the use of VIPs in the construction sector.

Throughout their studies, Uriarte et al. [116] discovered that one of the main issues to make the installation process fast and smooth are the VIPs’ tolerances. Nevertheless, the use of VIPs seems promising with regard to space heating energy savings, with a reduction of 23 % and 36 % in the respective study. Sallée et al. [80] studied the use of VIPs for internal thermal insulation in existing buildings with façades with high architectural character, as an alternative to external thermal insulation systems. They found that the use of VIPs can yield a 30 % reduction of the whole U-value, while external thermal insulation systems can give a reduction of 50 %. This study was carried out on a mock-up of a connection between an external wall and a partition wall both made of concrete. A study conducted by Sveipe et al. [104] investigated the use of VIPs for retrofitting half-timber frames, both on the cold (exterior) and warm (interior) side. The study concluded that “timber frame buildings thermally insulated with 100 mm mineral wool, might be retrofitted at the exterior side by adding 30 mm VIPs in a continuous layer”, based on the results from the experiments, the simulations, and the condensation controls [104]. On the other hand, the condensation calculations highlighted the importance of preventing puncturing of the VIPs and to account for the VIPs’ qualities in aged conditions. The solution with VIPs for interior retrofitting showed the best results concerning moisture, i.e., no condensation occurred during the test. Examples of VIPs used for external and internal insulation are shown in Fig. 4.2.

In a study conducted by Yuk et al. [123], retrofitting with VIPs on a wooden roof in a historic building was investigated. A VIP with a thermal conductivity of 0.0034 W/(mK) was developed for this specific



Fig. 4.3. Spaceloft® Aerogel insulation blanket developed by Aspen Aerogels, Inc. [39].

retrofitting case, accordingly, allowing a thickness of only 0.015 m to obtain the same thermal insulation performance as a much thicker layer of conventional insulation materials would have given. The study confirmed that applying VIPs only to the roof, reduced the roof thermal transmittance by 88 % and consequently the heating and cooling energy usage was lowered by 55 %. However, Yuk et al. [123] emphasize that historic buildings need to be preserved and that the use of passive technologies should be studied with regard to possible damages. Nevertheless, they conclude that “the conservation of historic buildings was possible through the application of advanced insulation materials” [123].

On the façades, an uninterrupted insulation layer that will reduce the impact of thermal bridges can be fulfilled with VIPs [54]. Retrofitting with VIPs at the inside will not eliminate thermal bridging between construction elements such as two floors, unlike retrofitting at the outside [104]. Accordingly, exterior thermal insulation is advantageous seen from a thermal insulation point of view.

The service life of VIPs is an important factor to account for when using VIPs in buildings [32]. Given that a building should be dimensioned with a service lifetime in a range of 50–100 years, the VIPs’ lifetime should have an equally long-term performance [54]. An increase in internal gas pressure and water content over time will lead to an increase in thermal conductivity. The time until the thermal conductivity in the centre of a panel reaches a critical level is the functional lifetime. Nevertheless, the VIP will still function when the critical value is reached, but the U-value and the heat loss will continuously increase. Currently, there are still uncertainties around the practical lifetime of VIPs in use, consequently, there is some scepticism about the implementation of VIPs in the building sector.

4.3. Aerogels

Aerogels are materials with high porosity and very low thermal conductivity, made of dried gels [8]. In addition, aerogels have other beneficial properties for building applications, such as vapour diffusion openness, strong hydrophobicity, and good fire resistance [36]. Currently, aerogel-based insulation materials are niche products which are quite costly. Space savings, reduction in operation costs, longevity and chemical resistance are reasons why aerogels may be worth the investment according to Koebel et al. [57]. Due to their low thermal conductivity, aerogels are considered an innovative alternative to conventional thermal insulation materials [8].

There are three different types of aerogels: silica, carbon and

alumina, whereas silica is the most common [25]. Silica aerogels can be used in both opaque and translucent building parts, e.g., roofs, walls and windows [8,25]. The process of creating aerogels is described thoroughly by Baetens et al. [8] and Cuce et al. [25]. Aerogels come in different product types, e.g., blankets (see Fig. 4.3), render and boards [36]. Due to low thermal conductivity, the products are slim and ideal when space saving is crucial [25]. By using aerogel materials instead of conventional thermal insulation materials, a given insulation performance is achievable with about half the thickness [36]. Hence, aerogel materials may be suitable for the rehabilitation of cultural heritage buildings. Furthermore, this was investigated by Ganobjak et al. [36] with respect to a historic building’s authenticity, integrity, reversibility and compatibility. The projects presented in the mentioned article are mainly quarry and brick walls retrofitted with exterior aerogel render. Ganobjak et al. [36] concluded that heritage requirements, as well as a decrease in energy demand, can be obtained with aerogel-based insulation for retrofitting preserved heritage buildings. However, additional insulation may cause moisture problems, especially internal thermal insulation must be carefully evaluated. Elshazli et al. [28] performed full-scale experimental tests to study the performance of aerogel insulation blankets used as internal insulation in a student residential apartment. The study showed a reduction in energy usage by 23 % and 38 % for single and double layers of aerogel, respectively. Anyhow, Elshazli et al. [28] emphasize that type of building, type of building envelope and thickness, type of thermal insulation, and windows and configurations will affect the energy-saving percentages. More studies about building retrofit with aerogels have been conducted by Cuce & Cuce [24], Ibrahim et al. [51], Koebel et al. [57] and Koh et al. [58].

High costs are one of the main challenges of using aerogels in building applications [36]. Additionally, with the thin insulation thickness of aerogel materials, the effect of thermal bridging can be more critical compared to conventional insulation materials. On the other hand, the small thickness and low thermal conductivity are beneficial when it comes to feasible solutions for energy retrofitting and at the same time preservation of heritage values. Good energy performance and thermal comfort can be achieved with aerogel materials.

5. Building integrated photovoltaics

5.1. Building integrated photovoltaics in historic buildings

The integration of solar energy in historic buildings can be difficult [17] and in the recent past, this was not recommended [75]. Now, it is increasingly possible due to the high compatibility of new products. The integration of photovoltaics (PV) in historic buildings will challenge both the preservation of heritage and the need to adapt to provisions concerning energy improvement by using renewable energy [76].

Considering aesthetics and function, building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) can satisfy strict requirements governing heritage conservation, whereas standard building applied photovoltaics (BAPV) would be prohibited [69]. Not only do BIPV systems contribute to generate electricity, but they are also a constructive part of the building envelope [11,76]. Using BIPV as cladding or roofing could lead to less material usage and potentially reduced costs compared to BAPV [16]. New product designs allow better integration of BIPV in historic buildings due to similarities towards traditional building elements [76], for instance: “crystalline silicon modules, thin films, coloured solar cells, homogenised black appearance and integration of high-resolution images” [72]. Future developments and opportunities with new BIPV systems are explored by Jelle et al. [11] and Jelle [15].

The market is receptive to new solar products that will satisfy regulations and requirements [35]. Polo López et al. [76] emphasize that coloured PV recently has been considered a necessity for gaining market acceptance, as they allow better integration in historic buildings and landscapes. The colour in BIPV or BAPV appears from “coloured glass, pattern coatings or printing on front glazing treatments or coverings”.



Fig. 5.1. Rural farmhouse in Switzerland from 1859 with terracotta coloured BIPV (right photo). The left photo shows the building before the energy upgrade. Photos from [75].



Fig. 5.2. Dyaqua Invisible Solar terracotta roofing tile [26].



Fig. 5.3. PV-technology under development from Dyaqua [26]. PV with realistic-looking wood (left), stone (middle) and concrete (right) surface.

According to Pelle et al. [72], coloured PV modules seem to be the best alternative to create a balance between conservation and energy issues in architecturally sensitive areas. There exists a wide range of possible colours and the PV can be applied to for example roofs, façades and shading systems. Also, the finishing layer can portray miscellaneous textures, uneven surfaces, fouling and time-related performance decay. The technology of coloured BIPV hides the original material of the PV cells behind coloured patterns. However, the colouring works as a “shade” over the PV cells, resulting in a consistent reduced energy production compared to regular PV cells [76]. In addition, the colour can also hinder the PV by reflecting solar radiation which could otherwise be used to generate electricity [72]. Another drawback is often high costs [75]. For further information about coloured BIPV systems see e.g. the study by Røyset et al. [6].

Pelle et al. [72] find in their study that integration of BIPV in historic buildings consists of three integration levels: (i) aesthetic integration, i. e., the capability to include PV in a building’s architectonic rules; (ii) technological/functional integration, i. e., the PV system’s potential to substitute traditional building components; and (iii) energy integration, i. e., the PV’s ability to efficiently integrate to the applicable energy

system to maximise self-consumption and contribute to the implementation of energy-efficient communities. To visualize this; during an energy upgrade of an 1859 rural farmhouse in Switzerland (Fig. 5.1), terracotta-coloured PV modules were used to meet requirements [76]. These solar panels are integrated in the building, and they have anti-reflective glass, cover a 250 m² area and produce 16 500 kWh per year.

The Italian company Dyaqua Invisible Solar has taken it one step further and recently launched an invisible solar roofing tile that realistically resembles a traditional terracotta roofing tile [26], as shown in Fig. 5.2. The PV cells are hidden underneath a low molecular polymeric compound surface which is opaque to human eyes, but transparent for sun rays. These tiles have a peak power of 7.5 Wp and weigh 2 kg per tile. The same company are also developing PVs that realistically look like other building materials, such as wood, stone and concrete, see Fig. 5.3, which can be applied to roofs, walls and pavements. However, the three last-mentioned products are not on the market yet. Still, they are worth a mention to show where the development of PV and BIPV technology is headed. Such realistic PV tiles could be of great importance for the integration and acceptance of PV in general, and especially for cultural heritage buildings and areas.



Fig. 5.4. Powerhouse Telemark (left) [77]. Two Norwegian houses with BIPV roofs (middle and right) [16].



Fig. 5.5. PV Slates from GB-Sol [38].

5.2. Building integrated photovoltaics in Norway

Over the past few years, the accumulated capacity of solar power plants has increased in Norway [60]. Typical for Norway is to apply the PV panels to existing buildings as BAPV, and not installed as ground-mounted systems or BIPV. Nevertheless, the country has a growing interest for BIPV [16], and they are highly applicable due to low temperatures and low sun angle, especially on south-facing façades [60]. However, there are few agreed-upon and recommended solutions for building structures with BIPV, and this is not yet included in the “SINTEF Building Research Design Guides” (Byggeforskserien) [16], which is an important national information channel, knowledge base and quality standard used by builders, contractors, engineers, and architects [94]. Still, BIPV can be found in several Norwegian buildings, e.g., Powerhouse Brattørkaia, Telemark and Kjørbo [77], ZEB Laboratory in Trondheim (ZEB [124]), and several others shown in the studies by Bunkholt et al. [16] and Kvalbein & Stensrud Marstein [60]. Some of the aforementioned buildings with BIPV are depicted in Fig. 5.4.

The production of energy generated by a PV system is impacted by climate and weather conditions [16]. Coastal areas, topography, and elevation above sea level heavily influence the Norwegian climate, which is known for its significant geographic disparities and significant yearly fluctuations in temperature and solar radiation. Façades and roofs are often subject to freeze-thaw cycles, temperature variations and stresses caused by wind and precipitation, especially snow and wind-driven rain. Therefore, Norway has strict rules for constructing buildings, including BIPV installations [16] which must fulfil the same

building-technical requirements and exhibit equivalent performance as the elements they replace [83].

Due to the Norwegian climate, special requirements for rain tightness and ventilation of solar panels appear, to provide resistance towards moisture and secure efficiency [83]. During periods of much solar radiation, it is crucial to ensure proper ventilation to keep the temperature of the PV cells low, i.e., enhanced production. According to Bunkholt et al. [16] the efficiency of solar cells is reduced by approximately 0.5 % per °C temperature increase, i.e., areas of lower temperatures, such as Ørlandet, given adequate solar radiation, could be beneficial. Proper ventilation is also needed to dry out condensation on the PVs backside and to reduce deterioration [16]. Therefore, diagonal roofs with BIPV are often built as ventilated roofs with an air gap in the underside of the panels. Simulations of installation method and the geometry of the air gap has demonstrated that the height and angle of the air gap impacts the temperature and thus the efficiency of the panels. Increasing the slope of the roof and height of air gaps, while decreasing the length of air gaps can provide improved efficiency due to reduced temperatures. However, steeper roof angles and larger air gaps can generate increased air circulation through natural convection in the gap. Regarding BIPV and their weather resistance versus wind-driven rain exposure see the experimental studies by Breivik et al. [19] and Fedorova et al. [1,2].

During winter, snow and ice could potentially cover the entire or a portion of the roof, i.e., shadowing the BIPV and impend an efficient energy production [16]. Additionally, this could affect the service lifetime. Moreover, snow is highly reflective, meaning that a thin layer of




Fig. 5.6. Hexagon coloured pattern on ColorBlast PVs (left). Kuijpers - Helmond with ColorBlast PVs in orange shades from a distance, appearing as homogenous colours (right). Both images are retrieved from [96]. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Fig. 5.7. Alegra 10 Wevolt solar roofing tiles by Wienerberger [121,120].

snow could reduce the radiation significantly. If the layer exceeds 10 cm, the energy production will be nearly zero. Also, with BIPV roofs there are challenges associated with runoff of rain and snow [83]. Snow and ice sliding off the roof could pose a threat to humans and equipment on the ground [16]. While snow traps eliminate this threat, they can cause snow and ice to accumulate on parts of the BIPV roof, thus also reducing the energy production. To prevent snow and ice accumulation, Bunkholt et al. [16] suggests a combination of active and passive measures. An active measure could for instance be heating, while passive measures could be using special material surfaces, e.g., (i) self-cleaning surfaces where snow, ice, dust and other contaminants do not stick to the panels; (ii) hydrophilic surfaces that attracts water; (iii) hydrophobic surfaces that repels water; and (iv) rough surfaces with micro/nanostructure which impacts the hydrophobic properties. For further aspects concerning BIPV and challenges with snow and ice accumulation and removal see the studies by e.g. Andenæs et al. [27], Borrebæk et al. [73], Jelle [14] and Jelle [15].

5.3. Possible building integrated photovoltaics for heritage buildings at Ørlandet

Ørlandet, being a coastal region in the mid-northern part of Norway, is especially exposed to rain and snow, so the mentioned challenges in Chapter 5.2 are important if BIPV is incorporated into the three farmhouses. Further barriers arise with strict regulatory requirements for façade and roofing materials and colours, see Table 2.1. Here, coloured BIPV could be a fitting solution. One permitted roofing material is slate, which can be resembled by anthracite or grey-green colour [72]. The British company GB-Sol offers a product called PV Slate, which looks like slate stones [37]. They claim the PVs will work seamlessly with natural slates, see Fig. 5.5. This could be an option for Ørlandet to satisfy regulations; incorporating both natural slate and PV slate. The PV slates come in different shades, are lightweight compared to natural slate, and have a power output of 132–138 Wp/m² depending on dimensions. Alternatively, they could be used on the entirety of the roof, as they offer

edge-to-edge solutions.

The Dutch manufacturer Kameleon Solar offer coloured PV, called ColorBlast, with a variety of 4000 + colours, and customizable shapes and glass finishes [56]. The output is colour-dependent, but they have the potential to reach 168 Wp/m². In addition, they offer several other types of PVs, e.g., with design/image print, as well as metallic and matte surfaces. However, these have a lower output between max 150–168 Wp/m². Kameleon Solar uses metric patterns of hexagons to create a homogenous colour/image from a distance, while allowing light to pass through the gaps. This is beneficial as colour works as a shade for solar radiation. See Fig. 5.6. For Trøa, Grande and Viken, a green PV could, for instance from a distance and colour point of view, resemble a turf roof (permitted roofing material), alternatively a turf-print could be applicable. Furthermore, woodprint PVs could be incorporated into the façades.

Wienerberger is a Dutch manufacturer producing PVs which resemble roofing tiles, named Alegra 10 Wevolt solar roof tile [119]. Regular roofing tiles are not permitted according to regulatory requirements; however, Alegra 10 Wevolt solar roof tiles are still considered an applicable option as they do not appear as PVs, but rather standard roofing tiles as shown in Fig. 5.7. These solar roofing tiles are combined with a traditional ceramic roofing tile, making them easy and flexible to lay (Wienerberger, 2023a). They have an output of 106 Wp/m². Further BIPV options are presented in Table 5.1.

6. Exploring possible rehabilitation solutions within given requirements

6.1. Recommended new foundation and floor construction





As addressed in Chapter 3.1, a new slab-on-grade foundation with a concrete stem wall is the best option for the new foundation and floor construction for the three buildings. Considering the high moisture levels present at the coast, XPS has been identified as the most suitable thermal insulation material. Furthermore, insulation thickness is not a concern due to the foundation being remade and ample space being available in the ground. Fig. 6.1 illustrates the composition of the floor construction.

The U-values for the floor construction was determined in THERM (THERM - [111]). Two simulations for the foundation were performed, one with 200 mm XPS and one with 400 mm XPS. This gives a U-value of 0.16 W/(m²K) and 0.08 W/(m²K), respectively. Today's minimum requirement for floor constructions in Norway is a maximum U-value of 0.18 W/(m²K). As the foundation will be built according to today's requirements the risk of moisture accumulation within the floor construction and how moisture will move through the construction, was not deemed problematic. Therefore, no WUFI simulations [122] were carried out.

The concrete stem wall must be designed for each case dependent on the final thickness of the wall construction to ensure architectural






Table 5.1

Possible BIPV for heritage buildings: product name, manufacturer, and properties (not comprehensive list).

Product name	Manufacturer	Photo	Output (Wp/ m ²)	Efficiency (%)	Service lifetime (year (performance))	Dimensions l × w (mm × mm)	Weight (kg)	Colour/ finish	Application	Source
Alegra 10 Wevolt solar Roof Tile	Wienerberger AG Mail: office@wienerberger.com Web: https://www.wienerberger.com/en.html		106	17.1	≤ 12 (90 %) 12–25 (85 %)	304 × 477	49.29 kg/ m	Black	Roof	[120,119,121]
HanTile Solar Roofing tiles	Haenergy Thin Film Power Mail: businessdevelopment@hanergy.eu Web: https://www.hanergy.eu/		105	25.1	≤ 30 (100 %)	721 × 500	6.5	Black	Roof	[42,81,81,112]
Pixasolar – Fully coated solar panel	Hermans Technisolar Mail: info@hermanstechnisolar.nl Web: https://hermanstechnisolar.com/		100–160		≤ 30 (80 %)	600–2400 x 600–1200	28 kg/m ²	Customizable	Façade, wall, signage	(Hermans [48] (Hermans [47,18])
PV Slate 500 x250 500 × 300 600 × 300	GB-Sol Mail: info@gb-sol.co.uk Web: https://www.gb-sol.co.uk/		138 138 132		≤ 10 (90 %) 10–25 (80 %)	1009 × 200 906 × 200 906 × 250	3.2 3.0 3.8	Light grey, blue-grey, black	Roof	[38,37]

(continued on next page)

Table 5.1 (continued)

Product name	Manufacturer	Photo	Output (Wp/m ²)	Efficiency (%)	Service lifetime (year (performance))	Dimensions l × w (mm × mm)	Weight (kg)	Colour/finish	Application	Source
BiSolar roofing tile	BiSolar Mail: info@roofilestechnology.com Web: https://www.bisolarroof.com/		173	17.3		300 × 445 Customizable	5.7	Dark grey	Roof	[9]
Suncol Façade	Sunage Mail: info@sunage.ch Web: https://sunage.ch/en/			11–16.5	≤ 25 (80 %)	Customizable		Customizable	Façade	[99,100,102,30]
Suncol Tile	Sunage Mail: info@sunage.ch Web: https://sunage.ch/en/			11–16.5	≤ 25 (80 %)	Customizable	20 kg/m ²	Customizable	Roof	[103,101,99,31]
ColorBlast	Kameleon Solar Mail: info@kameleonsolar.com Web: https://kameleonsolar.com/		≤ 168 (depending on colour)		≤ 30 (80 %)	Customizable	~24 kg/m ²	Customizable	Façade, roof, balustrades, sun shading	[55,96]
Soluxa Solar Panels	Soluxa Contact: https://www.soluxa.solar/contact/Web : https://www.soluxa.solar/#intro		≤ 190 (depending on colour)					Customizable	Façade	[98,97]




Fig. 6.1. Illustration of suggested new floor composition.




Fig. 6.2. Wall construction post-insulated with external mineral wool. The left wall suggests BIPV as exterior cladding, and the right wall illustrates traditional board-on-board cladding. Monitor positions and names for WUFI simulations are shown as pink dots. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

authenticity. The surface treatment can be altered based on the desired aesthetic effect. Today, both Grande and Viken have a mix of natural stone with a protective coat of render and concrete with render. This is fairly easy to replicate the appearance of when relocating the buildings. Trøa, on the other hand, have natural stone with some mortar of gravel and silt. To replicate the appearance of this, a stamped concrete finish or natural stone veneers could be applied to the surface of the stem wall.

6.2. Possible solutions for external walls

In Norway, if the external wall of a building consists of 6' logs or thicker there is no additional requirement for the U-value. This is the case for all three buildings in the study. However, to meet the required

net energy demand, insulating the external walls is advantageous since 6' logs only give a U-value of approximately 0.84 W/(m²K) [85]. In comparison, the minimum requirement for other types of wall constructions in Norway is a maximum U-value of 0.22 W/(m²K). Table 4.1 highlights that when considering insulation material for wall constructions, the most advantageous options in terms of thickness are mineral wool, aerogel, and VIP, when looking at both traditional and state-of-the-art materials. Cellulose and wood fibre could be an option, but they result in a thicker wall construction compared to mineral wool to achieve the same U-value. Therefore, there will not be presented solutions with these materials. Regarding placement, aerogel and VIP could both be placed externally and internally, while mineral wool should only be placed externally to avoid compromising the inside area




Fig. 6.3. Wall construction post-insulated with external VIP (B), and internal VIP (C). Monitor positions and names for WUFI simulations are shown as pink dots. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)




Fig. 6.4. Wall construction post-insulated with external aerogel insulation (D), internal aerogel insulation (E), and both (F). Monitor positions and names for WUFI simulations are shown as pink dots. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

considerably.

For the following solutions (A-F), only the changed layers are named in the figures. Also, BIPV is suggested as a possible cladding for all wall

solutions, but traditional board-on-board cladding is still an option. Fig. 6.5 shows a summary of the simulated U-values from THERM and the total wall thicknesses. Fig. 6.6, Fig. 6.7 and Fig. 6.8 illustrate the





Fig. 6.5. U-values simulated in THERM and total thicknesses for different wall solutions.




VIP. vb.: Solution C internal VIP with vapour barrier; D1.1. ext. ag.: Solution D external aerogel; D1.2. ext. ag. vb.: Solution D external aerogel with vapour barrier; E1. 1. int. ag.: Solution E internal aerogel; E1.2. int. ag. vb.: Solution E internal aerogel with vapour barrier; F1.1. ext. int. ag.: Solution F external and internal aerogel; F1.2. ext. int. ag. vb.: Solution F external and internal aerogel with vapour barrier; R1.w. ref.: Wall reference measured on interior surface.

Fig. 6.6. Relative humidity (%) for external wall measured in centre log (monitor position 1) for solution A-F.

relative humidity (RH) in wall solutions A-F, simulated in WUFI both with and without a vapour barrier.

Fig. 6.2 Presents a solution of a wall construction externally post-


insulated with 150 mm mineral wool (solution A), which gives a U-value of 0.26 W/(m²K). The mineral wool is placed in a framework and fills the gaps in the logs. While obtaining an adequate U-value, the



A2.1. ext. mw.: Solution A external mineral wool; A2.2. ext. mw. vb.: Solution A external mineral wool with vapour barrier; B2.1. ext. VIP.: Solution B external VIP; B2.2. ext. VIP. vb.: Solution B external VIP with vapour barrier; C2.1. int. VIP: Solution C internal VIP; C2.2 int. VIP. vb.: Solution C internal VIP with vapour barrier; D2.1. ext. ag.: Solution D external aerogel; D2.2. ext. ag. vb.: Solution D external aerogel with vapour barrier; E2.1. int. ag.: Solution E internal aerogel; E2.2. int. ag. vb.: Solution E internal aerogel with vapour barrier; F2.1.(i) ext. ag.: Solution F external aerogel; F2.2. (i) ext. ag. vb.: Solution F external aerogel with vapour barrier; F2.1. (ii) int. ag.: Solution F internal aerogel; F2.2. (ii) int. ag. vb.: Solution F internal aerogel with vapour barrier; R1. w. ref.: Wall reference measured on interior surface.

Fig. 6.7. Relative humidity (%) for external wall measured in centre insulation (monitor position 2) for solution A-F.

Relative humidity (%) for external wall measured in junction between log and insulation



A3.1. ext. mw.: Solution A external mineral wool; A3.2. ext. mw. vb.: Solution A external mineral wool with vapour barrier; B3.1. ext. VIP.: Solution B external VIP; B3.2 ext. VIP. Vb.: Solution B external VIP with vapour barrier; C3.1. int. VIP.: Solution C internal VIP; C3.2. int. VIP. Vb.: Solution C internal VIP with vapour barrier; D3.1. ext. ag.: Solution D external aerogel; D3.2 ext. ag. vb.: Solution D external aerogel with vapour barrier; E3.1 int. ag.: Solution E internal aerogel; E3.2. int. ag. vb.: Solution E internal aerogel with vapour barrier; F3.1. (i) ext. ag.: Solution F external aerogel; F3.1. (ii) int. ag.: Solution F internal aerogel; F3.2 (i) ext. ag. vb.: Solution F external aerogel with vapour barrier; F3.2. (ii) int. ag. vb.: Solution F internal aerogel with vapour barrier; R1. w. ref.: Wall reference measured on interior surface.

Fig. 6.8. Relative humidity for external wall measured in the junction between log and insulation (monitor position 3) for solution A-F.

drawback of solution A is a total thickness of ca. 385 mm which will affect the eaves and window placement in the wall, and consequently the building's architectural appearance. Moreover, deeper window posts also result in less daylight inside. WUFI revealed that the centre of the

logs (A1) will dry out well with this solution, see Fig. 6.6. In the centre of the mineral wool (A2), the graph (Fig. 6.7) demonstrates that the relative humidity (RH) fluctuates stably and gradually downward sloping. The peaks are during autumn and the troughs are during spring,




Fig. 6.9. Three possible solutions for post-insulating above the joists against the cold attic: Solution G with mineral wool, Solution H with VIPs, and Solution I with aerogel and mineral wool. Monitor positions and names for WUFI simulations are shown as pink dots. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

meaning the insulation dries out during winter. In the junction between the mineral wool and the logs (A3, Fig. 6.8, solution A displays the best results out of all the solutions (A-F). Adding a vapour barrier gives slightly better results over time in all positions, than without vapour barrier, i.e., using a vapour barrier results in lower RH in solution A.

Fig. 6.3 illustrates how to post-insulate with 20 mm VIP externally (solution B) and internally (solution C). Applying VIPs results in a slimmer construction than mineral wool, approximately a total thickness of 300 mm. The VIPs are connected to the logs in a 23–36 mm framework, where the log gaps are filled with up to 50 mm mineral wool. Both external and internal VIPs will provide a U-value of 0.25 W/(m²K). In both centre log (B1, C1, Fig. 6.6) and the junction between logs and insulation (B3, C3, Fig. 6.8), the VIP solutions causes a rather high relative humidity in the wall. Solution B with vapour barrier hardly decreases from 80 % RH over 7 years in the log-centre and increases somewhat in the junction. This is because a VIP is vapour diffusion tight and works as a vapour barrier, resulting in a vapour tight layer on both sides of the log. Therefore, post-insulating externally with VIPs (solution B) cannot be combined with a vapour barrier since the moisture will be “trapped” inside the construction. An RH of 80 % together with the right temperature (25–30 °C) could cause mould growth and rot in the logs [90]. However, solution B without vapour barrier will give the logs an opportunity to dry out more. Solution C, both with and without vapour barrier also decreases only marginally from 80 % RH over seven years in

both the centre log (Fig. 6.6) and the junction between logs and insulation (Fig. 6.8), i.e., this is not a good solution.

Fig. 6.4 Shows three solutions for post-insulating with aerogel blankets. according to Table 4.1, it would be necessary to use five layers of aerogel blankets to achieve a U-value of 0.22 W/(m²K). Because aerogel is an expensive product, it is not a feasible alternative to use five aerogel blankets to achieve a U-value which isn't required. Therefore, it is only suggested to use two aerogel blankets of 10 mm each, either placed externally (solution D), internally (solution E), or both (solution F). Like the alternative with VIPs, the total wall thickness is estimated to be 300 mm. The aerogel blankets are connected to the logs with screws, and the log gaps are filled with up to 50 mm mineral wool. With two layers of aerogel the U-value is 0.33 W/(m²K) for solution D, 0.32 W/(m²K) for solution E and 0.30 W/(m²K) for solution F. The aerogel blankets used for these simulations are hydrophobic, yet breathable, i.e., repelling liquid water, but allowing vapour to pass thorough [7].

Measurements from the log centre (Fig. 6.6) and between the logs and the insulation (Fig. 6.8) show that external aerogel gives the best result out of the three solutions, where this solution both with and without vapour barrier results in low RH in the log, but over time the solution with vapour barrier will be the best by decreasing the most. Combined external and internal aerogel gives tolerable results by reducing the RH in the centre log (F1, Fig. 6.6) both with and without vapour barrier. In the junction between logs and insulation (F2 (i) and





Fig. 6.10. U-values and insulation thickness for three different roof solutions for post-insulation above the joists against the cold attic simulated in THERM.



G1-4. mw.: Solution G, monitor position 1-4, mineral wool; H1-4. VIP.: Solution H, monitor position 1-4, VIP; I1-4. ag. mw.: Solution I, monitor position 1-4, aerogel and mineral wool; R2. r. ref.: Roof reference measured on interior panelled ceiling.

Fig. 6.11. Relative humidity (%) in roof boards and joists against cold attic (monitor position 1–4) for solution G, H, and I.

(ii, Fig. 6.8) the solution with vapour barrier gives more RH on the internal side than the external. It is the opposite case for the solution without vapour barrier. Also, the RH is higher. Internal aerogel insulation gives a relatively high RH both with and without vapour barrier in the log centre (E1, Fig. 6.6) and the junction between logs and insulation (E3, Fig. 6.8), but somewhat lower RH without vapour barrier. In the centre of the insulation (Fig. 6.7), the internal aerogel in solution F has the lowest RH when combined with a vapour barrier, but the appurtenant external insulation contains more moisture. Solution E with a vapour barrier has the second-lowest RH, while the same solution without a vapour barrier is higher. Solution D has approximately the same high RH with and without vapour barrier.

6.3. Possible solutions for the roof construction

Concerning the roof construction, possible solutions for the three farmhouses are to insulate above the joists against the cold attic, either with mineral wool, VIPs or aerogel blankets. The floor framework in the

attic is assumed to be non-insulated in the three farmhouses, and there is a mix of raftered and panelled ceiling on the underside. A solution could be to insulate the joists, but in cases with raftered ceiling and limited headspace this would not be feasible. Placing the vapour barrier under the floor framework becomes necessary if the joists are insulated. This can complicate the installation process or require dismantling of the panelled ceiling. If it is desired to preserve the panelled ceiling this may not be an optimal solution. The simulations are based on a raftered ceiling; hence the floor framework is not included as an insulating layer in the U-value simulations performed in THERM.

The proposed solutions (G-I) are illustrated in Fig. 6.9, and the only difference between them is the insulation layer. All the studied solutions satisfy the maximum U-value requirement of 0.18 W/(m²K), see Fig. 6.10. Solution G has a thick layer of mineral wool, hence more of the attic space is used but the obtained U-value is relatively low; 0.11 W/(m²K). The large thickness could be a disadvantage if the space is limited and are going to be used for storage, e.g., for ventilation and BIPV equipment. In this case, solution H using VIPs may be more suitable




Fig. 6.12. The pictures show an old original slatted window on the first floor and a newer two-section window on ground floor of Trøa. Photos: [106].



Fig. 6.13. Left: Old slatted window found at the farm held over an awning window of Grande. Middle: two-section casement window of Grande. Right: Awning windows on the southwest and southeast façades of Grande. Photos: [49].

since it takes up very little space. However, this solution has a higher U-value; $0.16 \text{ W}/(\text{m}^2\text{K})$. Solution I is a combination of aerogel blankets and mineral wool. To meet the technical energy requirements by only using aerogel blankets would require about seven layers, hence a combination with aerogel and mineral wool is studied. This solution consumes more of the attic space compared to the VIPs but is about half the thickness compared to the alternative with mineral wool alone. Nevertheless, the U-value for this solution is $0.18 \text{ W}/(\text{m}^2\text{K})$.

A vapour barrier is necessary underneath the insulation to prevent warm and humid air from entering the insulation. Although the VIP itself is vapour tight, a vapour barrier is also included in this alternative to ensure a consistently air and vapour tight layer, especially in the joints between the VIPs. Fig. 6.11 shows the relative humidity (RH) in four measuring points for each solution. On the underside of the roof boards,

i.e., in measuring points G4, H4 and I4, the RH is alarmingly high ($>80\%$) in all the suggested solutions. The post-insulation will cause cooler temperatures and consequently a higher RH in the attic. Moreover, the underside of the roof boards is likely cooler than the air in the attic, and the RH is even higher here. With the right temperature, for example during the summer, this can cause rot and mould growth. To avoid this, it is crucial with sufficient aeration in the attic to lower the RH. The remaining measuring points have lower RH that fluctuates evenly through the simulated years with peaks during the autumn and troughs/valleys during the spring. The moisture levels are increasing from the interior side to the attic side of the joists, but the RH is never higher than 80% .

The presented alternatives have BIPV as roofing, despite that BIPV systems are not being a part of the regulatory requirements. To optimize



Fig. 6.14. The east (left) and north (right) façade of Viken depicting the current windows [107].

Table 6.1

Energy-saving measures and combinations of measures for Trøa, Grande and Viken.

No.	Building part	Description
1	Foundation/ floor	New foundation with 200 mm XPS.
2	Foundation/ floor	New foundation with 400 mm XPS.
3	External wall	Post-insulation with 100–150 mm mineral wool.
4	External wall	Post-insulation with 20 mm VIP.
5	External wall	Post-insulation with 20 mm aerogel.
6	External wall	Post-insulation with 10 mm aerogel both externally and internally.
7	Roof	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 300 mm mineral wool.
8	Roof	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 40 mm VIP.
9	Roof	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 10 mm aerogel and 150 mm mineral wool.
10	Windows	Fenestration renovation with new triple-glazed energy-efficient windows.
No.	Building part	Description
11	Windows	Improve the old windows with secondary glazing.
12	Windows	Fenestration renovation with new doors and new energy-efficient windows on the ground floor, and improvement of the old windows on the first floor with secondary glazing (only applicable for Trøa).
13	Building envelope	Air tightening from an infiltration of $10h^{-1}$ to $6h^{-1}$ (n50) (requirement for log constructions. Estimated leakage with new foundation and post-insulation of the roof).
14	Building envelope	Air tightening from an infiltration of $10h^{-1}$ to $4h^{-1}$ (n50) (estimated leakage with some additional air tightening)
15	Building envelope	Air tightening from an infiltration of $10h^{-1}$ to $1.5h^{-1}$ (n50) (requirement for non-log constructions).
16	Roof	BIPV with 18 % efficiency for the relevant roof surface.
17	Facade	BIPV with 18 % efficiency for the relevant façade.
18	Combination	Preserve cultural heritage.
19	Combination	Most energy-efficient.
20	Combination	Recommended solution.

the efficiency of the BIPV, a relatively large, aerated slat-layer is necessary as this will secure sufficient ventilation and cooling. Dependent on the product type for BIPV, they must be mounted according to the manufacturer's specifications. In addition, a combination of active and passive measures presented in Chapter 5.2 should be incorporated

to prevent snow and ice accumulation on the roof. To secure an airtight envelope, a dual-purpose underroof and wind barrier is needed outside the roof boards. Ideally, the wind barrier in the external walls should overlap with the wind barrier on the roof to avoid any air leakages. This results in a cold non-ventilated attic with two air-tightening layers.

6.4. Possible solutions for fenestration renovation

The windows in the three buildings, Trøa, Grande and Viken, have been evaluated regarding their energy- efficiency and suitability for preservation. Trøa was found to have a number of old windows in relatively good condition, which could be repaired and reused, making it ideal to use internal storm windows that preserve the building's historic appearance externally. This is in line with the regulatory requirements for the area, which states that the exterior of listed buildings must be preserved or restored according to antiquarian principles. Today's minimum requirement for windows in Norway is a maximum U-value of $1.2 \text{ W}/(\text{m}^2\text{K})$.

The remaining windows in Trøa are not original and therefore suggested replaced by new energy-efficient windows that resemble the original ones with slats. Fig. 6.12 shows some of the current windows in Trøa.

Grande has both awning windows and two-section casement windows from varying time periods, see Fig. 6.13. Especially the awning windows do not fit the antiquarian principles from the construction period. However, some slatted windows were discovered at the farm, which are believed to be old windows from Grande. Although they are in bad condition, they can serve as a template for designing new windows that replicate the old ones. The aim for Grande is to restore the windows in line with antiquarian principles by recreating the slatted windows found at the farm.

Viken has mostly newer windows which both meet today's building requirement in terms of thermal insulation performance and are in line with antiquarian principles, see Fig. 6.14. Therefore, the focus is to take care of the existing windows and compensate with post-insulation in other parts of the climate shell to achieve the required energy efficiency.

6.5. Energy-saving measures and recommended solutions

6.5.1. General energy-saving measures and results

To assess the most energy-efficient measures for the three buildings,

Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand




Fig. 6.15. Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand for all three buildings. Energy-saving measures and combinations of measures as given in Table 6.1.




Fig. 6.16. Trøa's net energy demand after each individual measure and the combined measures, as well as original net energy demand and regulatory requirement for net energy demand with and without BIPV. Energy-saving measures and combinations of measures as given in Table 6.1.

various measures were set up for analysis. Table 6.1 presents 17 individual measures and three combinations of measures that were simulated in the Norwegian energy calculation program SIMIEN [82]. SIMIEN applies methods from the standards EN 15265 and NS 3031 to conduct dynamic simulations of energy demands, and ensures compliance with Norwegian requirements and standards. The simulations are based on today's climate data, but rising climate changes pose new threats and could result in different requirements to the robustness of constructions in the future.

The individual measures include thermal post-insulation, fenestration renovation, air-tightening and use of BIPV, and are the same for all three buildings. The three different combinations of measures are meant to reflect three different solutions: (no. 18) conservation of cultural heritage; (no. 19) most energy-efficient; and (no. 20) the recommended solution. Note that the combination of measures is different for each of the three buildings. For a more detailed explanation of changes and risks associated with each measure see Appendix B.

The impact of each measure for all three buildings are compared as a reduction in percentages of the net energy demand and presented in Fig. 6.15. Which measure that has the greatest impact on the net energy demand varies between the buildings, e.g., measures one and two have a much greater impact on Viken than on Trøa and Grande. Not surprisingly, the largest energy savings for the combined measures can be accomplished in Trøa, due to its poor present condition compared to Grande and Viken. Later, individual graphs for the three buildings will be presented to show the resulting net energy demand for each

individual measure and how they compare to the requirement specified in the Norwegian technical requirements. When implementing BIPV, it should be noted that the requirement increases by 10 kWh/m² due to the production of self-generated energy. By increasing the energy requirement and reducing the net energy demand, the integration of BIPV could become the determining key factor in fulfilling the energy requirements.

For all three buildings, the difference in energy savings with 200 mm insulation versus 400 mm insulation in the foundation is just 1 % at the most, consequently it is recommended to only use 200 mm to minimize the material usage and costs. Generally, post-insulating the wall with VIP gives the greatest reduction in net energy demand, closely followed by mineral wool. However, mineral wool is not an ideal solution due to the required thickness. For the roof construction, mineral wool gives up to 1 % more reduction than VIP and aerogel for all three buildings. Even though this requires a thick insulation layer, it is considered the best solution due to its affordability and availability of sufficient space in the attic. Utilising a combination of blown in insulation along the eaves and batt insulation on the remaining area gives both advantages with sealing tiny cracks and crevices and easy removal for future inspection of the joists.

Air-tightening of the building envelope is recommended to lower the energy demand for all three buildings. Generally, by implementing a vapour barrier in the roof construction together with a new foundation, a 4–7 % reduction is achieved (no. 13). With some additional air sealing around windows and doors, this number goes up to 8–11 % (no. 14). With a new vapour and wind barrier in the external wall it is assumed




Fig. 6.17. Grande’s net energy demand after each individual measure and the combined measures, as well as original net energy Demand and regulatory requirement for net energy demand with and without BIPV. Energy-saving measures and combinations of measures as given in Table 6.1.




Fig. 6.18. Viken’s net energy demand after each individual measure and the combined measures, as well as original net energy demand and regulatory requirement for net energy demand with and without BIPV. Energy-saving measures and combinations of measures as given in Table 6.1.

Table A1 Relevant material properties for the components used in the floor construction ^a.

Material	Thickness (mm)	Thermal conductivity (W/(mK))	Thermal resistance ((m ² K)/W)
R _{si}	–	–	0.17
Floor	22	0.13	0.17
Moisture-resistant subfloor	22	2.3	0.22
Concrete	100	2.5	0.04
Plastic	0.8	2.3	0.0003
Radon membrane	0.4	0.5	0.0001
Thermal insulation - XPS	200/400	0.034	5.88/11.76
R _{se}	–	–	0.04

a: For the foundation, it has not been an area of interest to control the moisture content or movement since it is selected as a modern pre-accepted solution which is commonly used in Norway. The input data in Table A1 is therefore only relevant for the THERM simulations.

that air-tightening of infiltration can reach 1.5 h⁻¹ (n50) (no. 15), resulting in a reduction up to 15 %. However, a too tight building envelope would require a ventilation system to achieve a good indoor climate.

Regarding the implementation of BIPV, it is not in line with cultural heritage preservation. For the façade, it will alter the appearance in various amounts depending on the type of BIPV used. Despite the

availability of coloured BIPV with flat finish, a façade covered in BIPV may be more reflective than original wooden cladding. This contradicts the regulatory requirements that states that reflective materials must be avoided as much as possible. Moreover, the use of BIPV on the façade does not provide the same superficial structure as traditional board-on-board cladding. The visibility of the issue is enhanced by the proximity of viewers to the façade, which allows for a more detailed look. Nevertheless, the use of BIPV systems that simulate or resemble conventional roofing and cladding materials can be appropriately incorporated to achieve desirable outcomes perceived from afar.

6.5.2. Results and suggested solution for Trøa

Each different measure (no. 1–17) has about the same impact on Trøa’s net energy demand, a reduction in a range of 4–13 % according to the simulations, see Fig. 6.16. Measure no. 18–20 are combinations of the individual measures, thus resulting in a high reduction in the net energy demand (67–80 %). The combination, aiming at preserving the cultural heritage (no. 18), includes post-insulation of the external walls with aerogel both externally and internally. Since it is most likely necessary to dismantle the existing board-on-board cladding and the interior panelling, this is viewed as the most optimal choice considering moisture, U-value, air tightness and preservation. Additionally, measure no. 18 includes a new foundation, insulating above the joists against the cold attic, and improving the airtightness of the building from 10 to 1.5 h⁻¹ (n50). It is assumed that it is possible to achieve such good airtightness by installing a new vapour barrier and a new wind barrier in continuous layers around the building envelope.

Concerning Trøa’s windows, the suggested solution for cultural

Table A2Relevant material properties for THERM and WUFI simulations for the exterior wall ^a.

Material	Thickness (mm)	Thermal conductivity (W/(mK))	Thermal resistance ((m ² K)/W)	Density (kg/m ³)	Water vapour diffusion resistance factor (-)
R _{se} horizontal (R _{se} and ventilated cladding)			0.04 (0.13)		
Cladding	22 + 22			420	50
Aerated horizontal slats	36			1.3	0.32
Aerated vertical slats	19			1.3	0.32
Wind barrier	15	2.3	0.30	280	144
Thermal insulation	Mineral wool	100	0.034 (0.046 ^b)	60	1.3
	VIP	20	0.007	200	1 500 000
	Aerogel	10 + 10	0.015	146	4.7
Log	150	0.13	1.15	510	50
Vapour barrier	1	2.2	0.01	130	70 000
Interior panelling	12	0.12	0.10	420	50
R _{si} horizontal		0.13			

a: The wall is simulated with board-on-board cladding. It is assumed the results will be approximately the same when using BIPV due to ventilated air slats; b: Combined thermal conductivity for mineral wool and timber-frame where it is assumed 13% framework and 87% mineral wool [84]: $\lambda_{(t+mw)} = A_t \cdot \lambda_t + A_{mw} \cdot \lambda_{mw}$.

Table A3Relevant material properties for THERM and WUFI simulations for the roof ^a.

Layer	Material	Thickness (mm)	Thermal conductivity (W/(mK))	Thermal resistance ((m ² K)/W)	Density (kg/m ³)	Water vapour diffusion resistance factor (-)
	R _{se} (upwards) + R _u ^b		30	0.04 + 0.20		
1 ^c	Roof membrane	1	0.5		2 400	100 000
2 ^c	Roof boards (particle board)	19	0.14		610	50
3	Fibre building board	22	0.14		610	50
4	Thermal insulation	Mineral wool (convection barrier)	300 (1)	0.034 (0.42)	60 (120)	1.3 (3 000)
	VIP	40	0.007		200	1 500 000
	Mineral wool + Aerogel	M: 150 A: 10	M: 0.034 A: 0.015		M: 60 A: 146	M: 1.3 A: 4.7
5	Vapour barrier	1	2.2	0.01	130	70 000
6	Flooring boards	15	0.13		420	50
7 ^c	Air	150	0.94		1.3	0.07
8 ^c	Ceiling boards	15	0.13		420	50
-	R _{si} (upwards)			0.13		

a: The roof is simulated with a roof membrane as the exterior surface and it is assumed the results will be approximately the same when using BIPV due to ventilated air slats.; b: Value only included in simulations in THERM.; c: Layers only included in moisture simulations in WUFI.

preservation is measure no. 12: a combination of window restoration with secondary glazing and window replacement with new energy-efficient windows that resemble the old original ones. Compared to replacing all the windows with new ones (no. 10 and no. 19), the suggested solution results in only 1 % lesser savings in the net energy demand. Noteworthy, the fenestration renovation is the measure alone that will have the greatest impact on the net energy demand.

The suggested combined measures that preserve the cultural heritage in the best possible way to reduce the net energy demand by 67 %, i.e., from 326 kWh/m² to 107 kWh/m², hence the regulatory requirement for net energy demand (100 + 1600/m² heated UFA) of 112 kWh/m² or less is accomplished. Combined with a solution including BIPV on the roof, the net energy demand is reduced by 75 %. This is the recommended solution, i.e., measure no. 20. A BIPV system on the façade is not recommended as it probably would change the appearance of the building, and the energy requirement is fulfilled without it. Measure no. 19 represents the most energy-efficient measures combined, hence an 80 % reduction in Trøa's net energy demand. This combination does not take the cultural value or hygrothermal aspects into consideration and is therefore not recommended as the final solution.

6.5.3. Results and suggested solution for Grande

Grande currently has a net energy demand of 305 kWh/m². Fig. 6.17 shows that after performing the individual measures (no. 1–17), there is a slight reduction in the net energy demand: all being between 250 and 300 kWh/m². However, the combined measures (no. 18–20) show a

significant reduction.

For the combined measures focusing on preserving cultural heritage, it is only included measures that best ensure architectural integrity and authenticity. Therefore, 20 mm of external aerogel insulation is preferred as insulation for the external walls, as it gives a slimmer construction and shows good results regarding moisture. Since it is unnecessary to tear down both exterior cladding and interior panelling in Grande, this alternative will be without a vapour barrier. When not installing a vapour barrier, the building envelope will probably not fulfil the Norwegian airtightness demand of 1.5 h⁻¹ and is consequently thought to be reduced from the original 10 h⁻¹ to 4 h⁻¹. Yet, it is assumed that exterior cladding, wind barrier, insulation, and the log itself provide sufficient air tightness. Because Grande currently has a blend of windows in different styles from different time periods, retaining the windows as they are do not restore the structure's original architectural integrity. Hence, it is desired to change the old windows and doors into new triple-glazed energy-efficient windows and new doors which both resemble the originals. Also, the foundation is insulated with 200 mm XPS and there is mineral wool above the framework of joists against the cold attic. These combined measures resulted in a net energy demand of 122 kWh/m², i.e., a reduction of 60 %. However, this does not fulfil the energy requirement (100 + 1600/m² heated UFA) for Grande which is 110.8 kWh/m² or less.

For the most energy-efficient combined measures (no. 19), cultural heritage preservation and feasibility are not considered. Therefore, only the most net energy demand reducing measures are simulated, i.e., 400

Table B1

Trøa – rehabilitation measures, results from SIMIEN and associated risks.

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
1	New foundation with 200 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.15	309.0	5 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
2	New foundation with 400 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.08	307.0	6 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
3 ^a	Post-insulation with 100–150 mm mineral wool	External wall	0.84	0.26	299.0	8 %	High risk for changed architectural appearance; reduced eaves, new windows placement in wall	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive. Requires more work due to new window placement.
4 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm VIP	External wall	0.84	0.25	298.4	8 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Varying risk of high relative humidity depending on internal or external insulation and with or without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
5 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm aerogel	External wall	0.84	0.32	302.9	7 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Some risk of high relative humidity when applied internally without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
6 ^a	Post-insulation with 10 mm aerogel both externally and internally	External wall	0.84	0.30	301.6	7 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive. Both external and internal insulation will affect both interior and exterior surfaces.
7	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 300 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.11	299.1	8 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
8	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 40 mm VIP	Roof	0.96	0.16	300.8	8 %	No risk.	Risk of high relative humidity.	Can be challenging to implement since VIP cannot be altered at the building site.
9	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 10 mm aerogel and 150 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.18	301.4	8 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
10 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and triple-glazed energy-efficient windows	Windows	4.5	0.8	283.7	13 %	Some risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Requires a template for imitating the old windows found at the farm.
11 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and improvement of the old windows with secondary glazing	Windows	4.5	1.5	292.0	10 %	Some risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Requires precise measurements and evaluation of each case to ensure that there is adequate space within the current window frame, potentially adapt to new wall thickness.
12 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and new energy-efficient windows on ground floor, and improvement of the old windows on first floor with secondary glazing	Windows	4.5	0.8 / 1.5	287.3	12 %	Low risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Combination of measurement no. 10 and 11.

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
13	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 6h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for log constructions)	Building envelope			314.0	4 %	No risk.	No risk.	Presumed satisfied by implementing a new foundation and post-insulating the roof.
14	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 4h ⁻¹ (n50) (Estimated leakage with sealing of roof and new foundation)	Building envelope			307.0	6 %	Low risk due to possible changes when sealing around doors and windows.	No risk.	Presumed that some additional air sealing around windows and doors will be needed in addition to new foundation and post-insulation of the roof.
15	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 1.5 h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for non-log constructions)	Building envelope			300.0	8 %	Some risk. To achieve this level of air tightening, a new wind and vapour barrier must be installed for the building envelope. This may entail changes in the architecture of the building.	An assessment of the implementation of ventilation systems must be carried out to ensure sufficient air supply.	Labour intensive. Would require a new vapour and windproof layer to be implemented for the entire building envelope, as well as new windows and doors.
16 ^c	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Roof			288.7	11 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. The use of BIPV that simulates conventional roofing materials can be appropriately incorporated to achieve desirable outcomes perceived from afar.	No risk.	Somewhat labour intensive.
17 ^c	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Façade (south)			295.9	9 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. Will alter the appearance of the façade in various amounts depending on the type of BIPV used. The visibility of the issue is enhanced by the proximity of viewers to the façade, which allows for a more detailed look.	No risk.	Given that the façade is required to be replaced or dismantled for repair, the additional effort required to install BIPV will not be substantial.
18	Combined measures: 1, 6, 7, 12 and 15 (preserve cultural heritage)				107.3	67 %			
19	Combined measures: 2,4,7,10,15, 16 and 17 (most energy-efficient)				66.1	80 %			
20	Combined measures: 1, 6, 7, 12, 15 and 16 (recommended solution)				81.1	75 %			

a: The U-value of 0.84 W/(m²K) is for the log construction. After the measure it is assumed that all exterior walls will have equivalent U-values. Assuming the new insulation will replace the existing post-insulation on the north façade; b: Trøa currently has a blend of windows in different styles from different time-periods. Retaining the windows as they are do not restore the structure's original architectural integrity. New windows may not be an exact replica of the originals but can resemble the structure's original design; c: Net energy demand with BIPV: Total calculated energy demand minus energy delivered to the building from the BIPV (kWh/m² NIA) (NIA = 138.7 m²).

Table B2

Grande – rehabilitation measures, results from SIMIEN and associated risks.

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
1	New foundation with 200 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.15	284	7 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
2	New foundation with 400 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.08	282	7 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
3 ^a	Post-insulation with 100–150 mm mineral wool	External wall	0.84	0.26	264	14 %	High risk for changed architectural appearance; reduced eaves, new windows placement in wall	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive. Requires more work due to new window placement.
4 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm VIP	External wall	0.84	0.25	263	14 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Varying risk of high relative humidity depending on internal or external insulation and with or without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
5 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm aerogel	External wall	0.84	0.32	269	12 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Some risk of high relative humidity when applied internally without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
6 ^a	Post-insulation with 10 mm aerogel both externally and internally	External wall	0.84	0.30	268	12 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive. Both external and internal insulation will affect both interior and exterior surfaces.
7	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 300 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.11	274	10 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
8	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 40 mm VIP	Roof	0.96	0.16	276	9 %	No risk.	Risk of high relative humidity.	Can be challenging to implement since VIP cannot be altered at the building site.
9	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 10 mm aerogel and 150 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.18	277	9 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
10 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and triple-glazed energy-efficient windows	Windows	2.3	0.8	290	5 %	Low risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Requires a template for imitating the old windows found at the farm.
11 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and improvement of the old windows with secondary glazing	Windows	2.3	1.5	296	3 %	High risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Requires precise measurements and evaluation of each case to ensure that there is adequate space within the current window frame, potentially adapt to new wall thickness.
12 ^c	Fenestration renovation with new doors and new energy-efficient windows on ground floor, and improvement of the old windows on first floor with secondary glazing	Windows							

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
13	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 6h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for log constructions)	Building envelope			290	5 %	No risk.	No risk.	Presumed satisfied by implementing a new foundation and post-insulating the roof.
14	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 4h ⁻¹ (n50) (Estimated leakage with sealing of roof and new foundation)	Building envelope			282	8 %	Low risk due to possible changes when sealing around doors and windows.	No risk.	Presumed that some additional air sealing around windows and doors will be needed in addition to new foundation and post-insulation of the roof.
15	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 1.5 h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for non-log constructions)	Building envelope			273	11 %	Some risk. In order to achieve this level of air tightening, a new wind and vapour barrier must be installed for the building envelope. This may entail changes in the architecture of the building.	An assessment of the implementation of ventilation systems must be carried out to ensure sufficient air supply.	Labour intensive. Would require a new vapour and windproof layer to be implemented for the entire building envelope, as well as new windows and doors.
16 ^d	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Roof			288	6 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. The use of BIPV that simulates conventional roofing materials can be appropriately incorporated to achieve desirable outcomes perceived from afar.	No risk.	The entire roof must be replaced anyways and integrating BIPV will therefore not entail much additional work.
17 ^d	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Façade (south)			267	13 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. Will alter the appearance of the façade in various amounts depending on the type of BIPV used. The visibility of the issue is enhanced by the proximity of viewers to the façade, which allows for a more detailed look.	No risk.	Installation of BIPV for the entire west and south façade will entail additional work, because the current west and south façade are in good condition.
18 ^e	Combined measures: 1, 5, 7, 10 and 14 (preserve cultural heritage)				122	60 %			
19	Combined measures: 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16 and 17 (most energy-efficient)				73	76 %			
20	Combined measures: 1, 5, 7, 10, 14 and 16 (recommended solution)				106	65 %			

a: The U-value of 0.84 W/(m²K) is for the log construction. After the measure it is assumed that all exterior walls will have equivalent U-values. Assuming the new insulation will replace the existing post-insulation on the south-west façade. However, further insulation of the external wall results in the destruction/alteration of interior and/or exterior surfaces which are mostly in good condition; b: Grande currently has a blend of windows in different styles from different time-periods. Retaining the windows as they are do not restore the structure's original architectural integrity. New windows may not be an exact replica of the originals, but can resemble the structure's original design; c: Not applicable for Grande; d: Net energy demand with BIPV: Total calculated energy demand minus energy delivered to the building from the BIPV (kWh/m² NIA) (NIA = 148 m²); e: External aerogel gives a slim construction and is better than VIP regarding moisture in the wall. Also, it will preserve the inside panelling.

Table B3

Viken – rehabilitation measures, results from SIMIEN and associated risks.

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
1	New foundation with 200 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.16	211	16 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
2	New foundation with 400 mm XPS	Foundation/floor	0.96	0.08	208	17 %	No risk.	No risk.	Easy to implement.
3 ^a	Post-insulation with 100–150 mm mineral wool	External wall	0.42	0.26	244	2 %	High risk for changed architectural appearance; reduced eaves, new windows placement in wall	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive. Significant additional workload in accordance with its level of necessity (reduction in net energy demand).
4 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm VIP	External wall	0.42	0.25	244	2 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Varying risk of high relative humidity depending on internal or external insulation and with or without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
5 ^a	Post-insulation with 20 mm aerogel	External wall	0.42	0.32	246	1 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Some risk of high relative humidity when applied internally without vapour barrier.	Labour intensive.
6 ^a	Post-insulation with 10 mm aerogel both externally and internally	External wall	0.42	0.30	246	2 %	Low risk for reduction of heritage value.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Labour intensive.
7	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 300 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.11	214	14 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
8	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 40 mm VIP	Roof	0.96	0.16	217	13 %	No risk.	Risk of high relative humidity.	Can be challenging to implement since VIP cannot be altered at the building site.
9	Post-insulation above frame of joists against cold attic with 10 mm aerogel and 150 mm mineral wool	Roof	0.96	0.18	218	13 %	No risk.	Low risk of high relative humidity.	Easy to implement.
10 ^b	Fenestration renovation with new doors and triple-glazed energy-efficient windows	Windows	1.5	0.8	234	7 %	No risk.	Low risk of window condensation.	Easy to implement, but a lot of work and high cost in relation to the reduction in energy demand.
11 ^c	Fenestration renovation with new doors and improvement of the old windows with secondary glazing	Windows							
12 ^c	Fenestration renovation with new doors and new energy-efficient windows on ground floor, and improvement of the old windows on first floor with secondary glazing	Windows							
No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
13 ^d	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 6h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for log constructions)	Building envelope			233	7 %	No risk.	No risk.	Presumed satisfied by implementing a new foundation and post-insulating the roof.

(continued on next page)

Table B3 (continued)

No.	Description	Building part	Original U-value (W/(m ² K))	U-value after measures (W/(m ² K))	Net energy demand after measure ((kWh)/m ²)	Reduction in percentages of original net energy demand (%)	Risk for reduction of heritage value	Risk for building physical damages	Necessary workload and scope of intervention
14 ^d	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 4h ⁻¹ (n50) (Estimated leakage with sealing of roof and new foundation)	Building envelope			223	11 %	Low risk due to possible changes when sealing around doors and windows.	No risk.	Presumed that some additional air sealing around windows and doors will be needed in addition to new foundation and post-insulation of the roof.
15 ^d	Air tightening from an infiltration of 10 to 1.5 h ⁻¹ (n50) (requirement for non-log constructions)	Building envelope			213	15 %	Some risk. In order to achieve this level of air tightening, a new wind and vapour barrier must be installed for the building envelope. This may entail changes in the architecture of the building.	An assessment of the implementation of ventilation systems must be carried out to ensure sufficient air supply.	Labour intensive. Would require a new vapour and windproof layer to be implemented for the entire building envelope, as well as new windows and doors.
16 ^e	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Roof			215	14 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. The use of BIPV that simulates conventional roofing materials can be appropriately incorporated to achieve desirable outcomes perceived from afar.	No risk.	Labour intensive.
17 ^e	Building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) with 18 % efficiency	Façade (south)			227	9 %	High risk. Not in line with cultural heritage preservation. Will alter the appearance of the façade in various amounts depending on the type of BIPV used. The visibility of the issue is enhanced by the proximity of viewers to the façade, which allows for a more detailed look.	No risk.	Labour intensive.
18 ^e	Combined measures: 1, 7 and 14 (preserve cultural heritage)				138	45 %			
19	Combined measures: 2, 4, 8, 10, 15, 16 and 17 (most energy-efficient)				77	69 %			
20	Combined measures: 1, 7, 14 and 16 (recommended solution)				111	55 %			

a: The U-value of 0.84 W/(m²K) is for the log construction. After the measure it is assumed that all exterior walls will have equivalent U-values. Assuming the new insulation will replace the existing post-insulation. Note that further insulation of the external wall results in the destruction/alteration of interior and/or exterior surfaces which are mostly in good condition; b: Most of the windows are from the early 2000 s and fit the architectural expression; c: Not applicable for Viken; d: In reality, Viken already has a relatively new wind barrier and windows. As a result, Viken most likely have a better infiltration than 10 h⁻¹; e: Net energy demand with BIPV: Total calculated energy demand minus energy delivered to the building from the BIPV (kWh/m² NIA).

mm XPS, insulating the wall with VIP, mineral wool above the framework of joists, new doors and triple-glazed energy-efficient windows, a presumed airtightness of 1.5 h^{-1} , and BIPV on both the whole roof and on the west and south façade. Only these façades are deemed fitting for BIPV, because they are more exposed to solar radiation. These energy-efficient measures result in a net energy demand of 73 kWh/m^2 , i.e., a reduction of 76 % fulfilling the demand. When including BIPV, the energy requirement becomes 120.8 kWh/m^2 for Grande. Although this solution is the most energy-efficient, it is not recommended due to the lack of cultural preservation. The recommended solution of combined measures (no. 20) is therefore similar to the cultural heritage solution, with the addition of BIPV on the roof. This combination of measures results in a net energy demand of 106 kWh/m^2 , which fulfils the demand and constitutes a reduction of 65 %.

6.5.4. Results and suggested solution for Viken

For Viken, a new foundation has the greatest impact closely followed by post-insulating the roof and improving the overall airtightness of the building envelope (Fig. 6.18). Based on the results from the simulations, post-insulating the external walls further, have little to no effect on the overall energy demand (no. 3–6). Regarding the integration of BIPV the reduction in the overall net energy demand is around 14 % for BIPV on the roof and 9 % for BIPV on the east façade. Adding BIPV on the remaining façades was considered excessive and inefficient due to the location of the building in the new residential area.

When constructing the combinations of measurements for preserving cultural heritage (no. 18), only measures that would not alter the exterior appearance of the building envelope were selected. The result was a 45 % reduction in net energy demand, which gives an annual net energy demand of 138 kWh/m^2 . This is higher than the requirement of 106 kWh/m^2 ($100 + 1600/\text{m}^2$ heated UFA). The most energy-efficient solution (no. 19) involves taking apart the exterior walls to add new insulation together with a new wind and vapour barrier. This is considered a significant additional workload in accordance with its level of necessity, considering the current condition of both the interior and exterior surfaces in the wall. Nevertheless, a reduction of 69 % can be achieved which gives an annual net energy demand of 77 kWh/m^2 .

For the recommended solution (no. 20), the exterior walls were considered sufficient regarding both energy efficiency and architectural expression in their current state. The suggested measures are post-insulating the roof, a new foundation, a more airtight building envelope and BIPV on the roof. It is not recommended to install BIPV on the façades since they produce less energy than BIPV on the roof. Also, integrating BIPV on both the roof and the façade results in a negligible difference in energy reduction. The combined measures result in a 55 % reduction in the original net energy demand. Since the recommended solution includes BIPV, the building technical requirement for energy efficiency is fulfilled, as shown in Fig. 6.18. The annual net energy demand will be 111 kWh/m^2 .

7. Future perspectives

Energy rehabilitation and reuse of existing buildings have the potential to contribute to sustainable heritage conservation while embracing new energy efficiency principles. Reducing energy consumption aligns with several of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Additionally, considering the building sector's large impact on total energy consumption globally, energy rehabilitation presents a feasible solution to mitigate these environmental impacts. Incorporating sustainable solutions that not only prioritize energy reduction but also safeguard cultural heritage is imperative. This is particularly significant considering that many of the existing buildings possess historical value, cultural heritage, or architectural traditions. Energy-generating systems such as BIPV need further development to secure affordable and efficient integration. Additional options for BIPV that accommodate cultural heritage and architectural authenticity will

also be needed in the nearest future. The implementation of smart technologies within energy rehabilitation projects could also enhance energy efficiency and optimize energy consumption. By embracing energy rehabilitation, the industry can make progress towards achieving the SDGs, reducing energy consumption, and preserving our cultural heritage. Promoting and recognizing the importance of engagement and education are crucial factors in order to succeed in sustainable development. Also, multidisciplinary cooperation and communication can contribute to tackle challenges and risks related to energy rehabilitation, cultural preservation and climate change. Moreover, developing a multidisciplinary framework would be of significant interest.

Further development of this research is essential to fully make the project feasible. This would involve enhancing the level of detail pertaining to building components and their miscellaneous junctions. Exploring additional possibilities for post-insulation, such as utilizing combinations of different materials, could be of great interest. Regarding the BIPV, a detailed analysis concerning irradiance and energy production potential, as well as mounting and architectural appearance, needs to be performed. The rehabilitation measures need to satisfy requirements to fire safety, hence a fire safety assessment would be required. In addition, an evaluation of the indoor environmental quality is necessary to adapt the buildings to new use and to ensure required thermal comfort, daylight, air quality and sufficient low noise levels. The environmental impact from the relocation and rehabilitation also needs addressing, e.g. by conducting a life cycle assessment (LCA). In a holistic study other aspects may also be considered, such as e.g. climate changes towards a harsher climate, nearby traffic loads, increased and new usage of the buildings, and impacts from growing activities from residents and visiting tourists and others. Furthermore, it would be necessary to do a comprehensive economic analysis to evaluate the total costs related to this project and similar ones in the years ahead.

8. Conclusions

Rehabilitation of listed heritage buildings while preserving their cultural significance includes adaptive reuse and restoration. To balance modern energy efficiency with architectural cultural integrity, a combination of new and authentic materials is recommended. Where it is possible, e.g., exterior cladding, interior panelling and load-bearing elements, the original materials should be used if they are in good condition. New windows and materials, such as thermal insulation and wind and vapour barriers, will provide better air-tightening and hygrothermal properties. When choosing specific solutions, the building's unique situation must be considered as different approaches will have varying impacts on each individual building, i.e., the available options must be carefully considered for the respective cases.

In this specific case study, the relocation of the buildings makes all Norwegian technical requirements applicable. Nevertheless, significant deviations can be accepted under municipality discretion. However, the findings in this study indicate that it is feasible to meet current energy standards with minimal deviations when rehabilitating listed heritage buildings. Despite this, the regulatory requirements appear antiquated and resistant to new technologies such as building integrated photo-voltaics (BIPV), something that was necessary to implement in two of the studied cases to fulfil the requirements to net energy demand.

For the three listed heritage buildings in Ørland Municipality, the simulated results show that different individual energy-saving measures have about the same impact in reducing their net energy demand. The exception is where measures previously have been implemented, such as Viken where the external wall is post-insulated, a new wind barrier is installed, and the windows are changed. As a result, further improvements to these building parts on Viken only reduce the total net energy demand by 1–2 %. However, if elements significant to the building's architectural expression have been lost during previous renovations, a major part of the rehabilitation process will involve restoring the

building to its original identity. One example is Grande where there is installed awning windows that do not fit the original building style, i.e., a good opportunity to get new energy-efficient windows that resemble the original ones and therefore maintaining the building's original characteristics. Due to the relocation, the three farmhouses will receive a new foundation that will benefit the energy consumption and moisture properties. The new foundations will lower the buildings' net energy demand by 5–16 %. In addition, the implementation of coloured building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) on the roof contributes to renewable power generation, i.e., lowering the buildings' net energy demands, while also maintaining the traditional look of an original roofing material.

Regarding the most suitable thermal insulation material for rehabilitation of the listed heritage buildings in Ørland Municipality, the results show that aerogel and mineral wool are best suited. High moisture levels and poor adaptability on-site are reasons why vacuum insulation panels (VIP) are not recommended as a solution in this case. Generally, the choice of thermal insulation material is dependent on various factors such as available space, desired U-value, moisture transport and costs. State-of-the-art thermal insulation materials with a much lower thermal conductivity than traditional materials offer the advantage of adding thinner layers of insulation that may not compromise the architectural expression of the building. Hence, aerogel blankets appear to be a promising material solution due to its ability to breathe, thinness, water-repellent properties, and adaptability on-site. However, where there is sufficient space to lay a thick insulation layer, it is advantageous to use traditional insulation materials such as mineral wool since it is more readily available and costs significantly less.

Generally, there is a need for further development to make it more feasible and universal to combine BIPV with the architectural authenticity of heritage buildings. It is crucial to take a proactive approach and not resist change but find ways to preserve the cultural and essential values of heritage buildings while also incorporating sustainable solutions. The development of high-quality and aesthetically pleasing solar panels makes it possible to integrate BIPV in a seamless manner. It is essential for the municipality to embrace the advancements in technology and move forward towards a sustainable future, even when not conforming to the regulatory requirements. The integration of BIPV can be incorporated on the roof and the façades, however, for the listed heritage buildings at Ørlandet it is primarily recommended on the roof, as BIPV of the façades provide partly limited energy production, more visibility and difficulties with replicating traditional board-on-board cladding. The use of coloured BIPV should be incorporated and customized to match or resemble the original roofing material, such as slate, turf or wood.

It is evident that rehabilitating culturally and historically protected buildings to meet today's energy standards is a complex and challenging task, nevertheless it is achievable. This work has identified several possible solutions, focusing on rehabilitation measures guaranteeing energy efficiency while also preserving cultural heritage. The effectiveness of the methods proposed in this study are expected guaranteed by using Norwegian standards and regulations and the esteemed simulation program SIMIEN. Through simulations it is demonstrated that the net energy demand can be lowered by 75 %, 65 % and 55 % for Trøa, Grande and Viken, respectively, and thereby satisfy the current Norwegian requirements. Additionally, use and preservation of already existing building mass contributes to face current and emerging societal challenges by reducing environmental impact and preserving cultural heritage and traditions. This provides a sense of continuity and nourishes identity and belonging, which in turn contributes positively to the local community. The results provide a general basis for future energy rehabilitation of listed heritage buildings, nevertheless it is essential to note that each listed heritage building is unique, hence a case-by-case approach is needed.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the very helpful support from Thomas Engen and others in Ørland Municipality.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Appendix

A - Material properties for THERM and WUFI simulations.

B - Energy-saving measures, combinations of measures and associated risks.

References

- [1] A. Fedorova, B.P. Jelle, B.D. Hrynyszyn, S. Geving, A testing methodology for quantification of Wind-Driven rain intrusion for Building-Integrated photovoltaic systems, *Building and Environment* 199 (107917) (2021) 1–12.
- [2] A. Fedorova, B.P. Jelle, B.D. Hrynyszyn, S. Geving, Quantification of Wind-Driven rain intrusion in Building-Integrated photovoltaic systems, *Solar Energy* 230 (2021) 376–389.
- [3] O. Akova, O. Atsiz, Sociocultural impacts of tourism development on heritage sites, Routledge, In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism Impacts*, 2019.
- [4] ALM. (2021). Detaljplan Brekstadbukta småhusområde—Tema kulturmiljø—Forsvarsbygg (Detailed plan for Brekstad Bay individual housing area—Theme cultural environment—The defence sector's properties).
- [5] R. AlMasri, A. Ababneh, Heritage management: Analytical study of tourism impacts on the archaeological site of umm qais—Jordan, *Heritage* 4(3), Article 3 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage4030138>.
- [6] A. Røyset, T. Kolås, B.P. Jelle, Coloured building integrated photovoltaics: Influence on energy efficiency, energy and buildings 208 (109623) (2020) 1–13.
- [7] Aspen Aerogels. (2017). Spaceloft Datasheet English. <https://www.aerogel.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Spaceloft-Datasheet-English.pdf>.
- [8] R. Baetens, B.P. Jelle, A. Gustavsen, Aerogel insulation for building applications: A state-of-the-art review, *Energy and Buildings* 43 (4) (2011) 761–769, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.12.012>.
- [9] Bisolar. (2023). BiSolar—Beautiful Solar Roofs. Bisolar. <https://www.bisolarroof.com/>.
- [10] B.P. Jelle, A. Hynd, A. Gustavsen, D. Arasteh, H. Goudey, R. Hart, Fenestration of today and tomorrow: A State-of-the-Art review and future research opportunities, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 96 (2012) 1–28.
- [11] B.P. Jelle, C. Breivik, H.D. Røkenes, Building integrated photovoltaic products: A State-of-the-Art review and future research opportunities, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 100 (2012) 69–96.
- [12] B.P. Jelle, Accelerated climate ageing of building materials, components and structures in the laboratory, *Journal of Materials Science* 47 (2012) 6475–6496.
- [13] B.P. Jelle, Solar radiation glazing factors for window panes, glass structures and electrochromic windows in buildings - measurement and calculation, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 116 (2013) 291–323.
- [14] B.P. Jelle, the challenge of removing snow downfall on photovoltaic solar cell roofs in order to maximize solar energy efficiency - research opportunities for the future, *energy and Buildings* 67 (2013) 334–351.
- [15] B. P. Jelle, "Building Integrated Photovoltaics: A Concise Description of the Current State of the Art and Possible Research Pathways", *Energies*, 9, 1-30, Article no. 21, 2016.
- [16] Bunkholt, N. S., Time, B., Gullbrekken, L., Grynning, S., & Kvande, T. (2021). Bruk av bygningsintegrerte solceller (BIPV) i Norge. Kunnskapsstatus. In 38. SINTEF akademisk forlag. <https://sintef.brage.unit.no/sintef-xmlui/handle/11250/2766886>.
- [17] L.F. Cabeza, A. de Gracia, A.L. Pisello, integration of renewable technologies in historical and heritage buildings: A review, *Energy and Buildings* 177 (2018) 96–111, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.07.058>.
- [18] Caminogroup. (2021, May 3). PIXASOLAR: Innovatief systeem voor esthetische zonnepanelen (PIXASOLAR: Innovative system for aesthetic solar panels). Camino. <https://www.caminogroup.be/nl/nieuws/nieuws/pixasolar-innovatief-systeem-voor-esthetische-zonnepanelen>.
- [19] C. Breivik, B.P. Jelle, B. Time, Ø. Holmberget, J. Nygård, E. Bergheim, A. Dalehaug, Large-Scale experimental Wind-Driven rain exposure investigations of building integrated photovoltaics, *Solar Energy* 90 (2013) 179–187.
- [20] S.S. Chandel, R.K. Aggarwal, Performance evaluation of a passive solar building in western himalayas, *Renewable Energy* 33 (10) (2008) 2166–2173, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2008.01.008>.
- [21] S.S. Chandel, A. Sharma, B.M. Marwaha, Review of energy efficiency initiatives and regulations for residential buildings in india, *Renewable and Sustainable*

- Energy Reviews 54 (2016) 1443–1458, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.060>.
- [22] S.S. Chandel, V. Sharma, B.M. Marwah, Review of energy efficient features in vernacular architecture for improving indoor thermal comfort conditions, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 65 (2016) 459–477, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.07.038>.
- [23] P. Cucco, G. Maselli, A. Nesticò, F. Ribera, An evaluation model for adaptive reuse of cultural heritage in accordance with 2030 SDGs and European quality principles, *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 59 (2023) 202–216, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2022.12.002>.
- [24] E. Cuce, P.M. Cuce, the impact of internal aerogel retrofitting on the thermal bridges of residential buildings: an experimental and statistical research, *Energy and Buildings* 116 (2016) 449–454, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.01.033>.
- [25] E. Cuce, P.M. Cuce, C.J. Wood, S.B. Riffat, Toward aerogel based thermal superinsulation in buildings: A comprehensive review, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 34 (2014) 273–299, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.03.017>.
- [26] Dyaqua. (n.d.). Rooftile | Invisible Solar Dyaqua. Retrieved 23 March 2023, from <https://www.dyaqua.it/invisiblesolar/en/rooftile-invisible-solar-integrated-for-heritage.php>.
- [27] E. Andenaes, B.P. Jelle, K. Ramlo, T. Kolås, J. Selj, S.E. Foss, the influence of snow and ice coverage on the energy generation from photovoltaic solar cells, *solar energy* 159 (2018) 318–328.
- [28] M.T. Elshazli, M. Madaqiq, T. Xing, A. Ibrahim, B. Johnson, J. Yuan, Experimental study of using aerogel insulation for residential buildings, *Advances in Building Energy Research* 16 (5) (2022) 569–588, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512549.2021.2001369>.
- [29] Enova. (2012). Hjelp til deg som skal kjøpe energieffektive vinduer (Help for those who want to buy energy-efficient windows). https://www.enova.no/upload_images/CB2B889C445B43E8A55E2E7C9C653518.pdf.
- [30] EURAC RESEARCH. (n.d.-a). BiSolar roof tile. Retrieved 11 April 2023, from <https://integratedpv.eurac.edu/en/products/modules/bisolar-roof-tile.html>.
- [31] EURAC RESEARCH. (n.d.-b). Suncol. Retrieved 11 April 2023, from <https://integratedpv.eurac.edu/en/products/modules/suncol.html>.
- [32] S. Fantucci, S. Garbaccio, A. Lorenzati, M. Perino, Thermo-economic analysis of building energy retrofits using VIP - vacuum insulation panels, *Energy and Buildings* 196 (2019) 269–279, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.05.019>.
- [33] S. Feragen, S. Gulstad, A. Eneberg, A. Baia, Viken, NTNU, 2016, p. (p. 63) [Project report].
- [34] C. Flyen, A.-C. Flyen, S.M. Fufa, Miljøvurdering ved oppgradering av verneverdige bebyggelse (Environmental assessment when upgrading listed buildings), SINTEF akademisk forlag. (2019). https://ra.brage.unit.no/ra-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2616792/Miljø%20vurdering_SINTEF_FAG_RAPPORT_58.pdf?sequence=1.
- [35] Frontini, F., Manfren, M., & Tagliabue, L. C. (2012). A Case Study of Solar Technologies Adoption: Criteria for BIPV Integration in Sensitive Built Environment—ScienceDirect. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876610212016293>.
- [36] M. Ganobjak, S. Brunner, J. Wernery, Aerogel materials for heritage buildings: Materials, properties and case studies, *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 42 (2020) 81–98, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2019.09.007>.
- [37] GB-Sol. (2022). PV Slate—Solar slates for beautiful solar roofs. https://www.gb-sol.co.uk/files/PV%20Slate%20brochure%20v2_3.pdf.
- [38] GB-Sol. (2023). PV Slate solar slate tile. <https://www.gb-sol.co.uk/products/pvslates/default.htm>.
- [39] Glava AS. (2013). Datablad Spaceloft Aerogel (Data Sheet for Spaceloft Aerogel). <https://media.bluestonepim.com/5f8cb111-138a-4137-a4b3-cb659fe3b82e/89b9b06b-22e0-4e9f-aa88-a1f371b32746/77dhSFCQq0tcsHfihyFGx5COW/zthVqMiLrJryhxm622aQPfM.pdf>.
- [40] Gunnarsjaa, A. (2021). Trønderlån (Traditional farmhouse in Trøndelag). In *Store norske leksikon* (The Great Norwegian Encyclopedia). <https://snl.no/tr%C3%B8nderl%C3%A5n>.
- [41] C.M. Hall, T. Baird, M. James, Y. Ram, Climate change and cultural heritage: Conservation and heritage tourism in the anthropocene, *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 11 (1) (2016) 10–24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2015.1082573>.
- [42] Hanergy. (2020). Hantile solar roof tiles. Hanergy. <https://www.hanergy.eu/hantile-solar-roof-tiles/>.
- [43] T. Hansen, vapour barrier in cold ventilated attics: the use of vapour barriers in ceilings against cold ventilated attics, with different amounts and types of insulation materials, Aalborg (2019). Universitetsforlaget.
- [44] M. Harrestrup, S. Svendsen, Full-scale test of an old heritage multi-storey building undergoing energy retrofitting with focus on internal insulation and moisture, *Building and Environment* 85 (2015) 123–133, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2014.12.005>.
- [45] Haugen, M. O. (2023). Ørland. In *Store norske leksikon* (The Great Norwegian Encyclopedia). <http://snl.no/%C3%98rland>.
- [46] Heesom, D., Boden, P., Hatfield, A., De Los Santos Melo, A., & Czarska-Chukwurah, F. (2020). Implementing a HBIM approach to manage the translocation of heritage buildings. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 28(10), 2948–2966. [10.1108/ECAM-06-2020-0405](https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-06-2020-0405).
- [47] H. Technisolar, PIXASOLAR - fully coloured solar panel, Hermans Technisolar. (2022). https://hermanstechnisolar.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/PIXASOLAR-%E2%80%89fully-coloured-solar-panel_Datasheet_v1-1.pdf.
- [48] H. Technisolar, Pixasolar, Hermans Technisolar. (2023). <https://hermanstechnisolar.com/products/pixasolar/>.
- [49] J. Hesthol Lovik, V. Nes, S. Stensheim Jørgensen, J. Thoresen Mofoss, M. Vilhelmsson, *Grande 164/17* (2022) (p. 53) [Semester project AAR4825].
- [50] A. Homb, S. Uvsløkk, SINTEF Byggforsk (SINTEF Building Research Design Guides, Energieffektive bevaringsverdige vinduer (Energy-efficient windows worthy of preservation) No. 3D1110 (2012), <https://www.byggogbevar.no/media/7901/energieffektive-bevaringsverdige-vinduer.pdf>.
- [51] M. Ibrahim, P.H. Biwole, P. Achard, E. Wurtz, G. Ansart, Building envelope with a new aerogel-based insulating rendering: Experimental and numerical study, cost analysis, and thickness optimization, *Applied Energy* 159 (2015) 490–501, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.08.090>.
- [52] B.P. Jelle, Traditional, state-of-the-art and future thermal building insulation materials and solutions – Properties, requirements and possibilities, *Energy and Buildings* 43 (10) (2011) 2549–2563, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.05.015>.
- [53] Johansen, D. (2022). Restaureringsprogram for husene som skal flyttes fra rød sone til Brekstad (Restoration program for the houses to be moved from the red zone to Brekstad).
- [54] S.E. Kalnæs, B.P. Jelle, Vacuum insulation panel products: A state-of-the-art review and future research pathways, *Applied Energy* 116 (2014) 355–375, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.11.032>.
- [55] Kameleon Solar. (n.d.-a). Kameleon Solar | ColorBlast. Retrieved 12 April 2023, from <https://kameleonsolar.com/products/colorblast/>.
- [56] Kameleon Solar. (n.d.-b). Kameleon Solar | Home. Retrieved 13 April 2023, from <https://kameleonsolar.com/>.
- [57] M. Koebel, A. Rigacci, P. Achard, Aerogel-based thermal superinsulation: an overview, *Journal of Sol-Gel Science and Technology* 63 (3) (2012) 315–339, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10971-012-2792-9>.
- [58] C.H. Koh, K. Schollbach, F. Gauvin, H.J.H. Brouwers, Aerogel composite for cavity wall rehabilitation in the Netherlands: Material characterization and thermal comfort assessment, *Building and Environment* 224 (2022), 109535, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109535>.
- [59] Korsaksel, A., & Stige, M. (2014). Vinduer—Vedlikehold av vinduer i bevaringsverdige bebyggelse—Informasjonsark (Windows—Maintenance of windows in buildings worth preserving—Information sheet). Byantikvaren i Oslo (Cultural Heritage Management Office in Oslo). <https://www.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/134091-1444143604/Tjenester%20og%20tilbud/Plan%20og%20bygg%20og%20eiendom/Byggesaksveiledere%20og%20normer%20og%20skjemaer/Vinduer%20-%20vedlikehold%20av%20vinduer%20i%20bevaringsverdige%20bebyggelse%20-%20Informasjonsark.pdf>.
- [60] Kvalbein, L., & Stensrud Marstein, E. (2018). Muligheter og utfordringer knyttet til Bygningstilgitte solceller (BIPV) i Norge 2018 (Opportunities and challenges related to Building Integrated Solar Cells (BIPV) in Norway 2018). <http://bipvno.no/publications/BIPViNorge2018.pdf>.
- [61] Kynbraten, E., & Larstuen, K. (2015). Tekniske krav ved tiltak i eksisterende bygg—Eksempelsamling (Technical requirements for measures in existing buildings—Collection of examples). https://dibk.no/globalassets/eksisterende-bygg/veiledningsstoff/tekniske-krav-ved-tiltak-i-eksisterende-bygg-eksempelsamling_nkf.pdf.
- [62] M. Lacasse, A. Gaur, T. Moore, Durability and climate change—Implications for service life prediction and the maintainability of buildings, *Buildings* 10 (2020) 53, <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings10030053>.
- [63] G. Litti, A. Audenaert, M. Lavagna, Life cycle operating energy saving from windows retrofitting in heritage buildings accounting for technical performance decay, *Journal of Building Engineering* 17 (2018) 135–153, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobbe.2018.02.006>.
- [64] P.G. Martínez, the ‘preservation by relocation’ of huizhou vernacular architecture: Shifting notions on the authenticity of rural heritage in china, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 28 (2) (2022) 200–215, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2021.1955728>.
- [65] Ministry of Climate and Environment, K. (2021, October 19). Kulturhistoriske bygninger og bygningsmiljøer (Cultural-historical buildings and built environments). Regjeringen.no; regjeringen.no. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/klima-og-miljo/kulturminner-og-kulturmiljo/insiktsartikler-kulturminner/bygningsvern-i-norge/id2343540/>.
- [66] Mittet, I. (2022). Sluttbehandling—Detaljregulering for Brekstadbukta småhusområde (Final processing—Detailed regulation for Brekstad Bay individual housing area).
- [67] S. Molleti, D. Lefebvre, D. van Reenen, Long-term in-situ assessment of vacuum insulation panels for integration into roofing systems: Five years of field-performance, *Energy and Buildings* 168 (2018) 97–105, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.03.010>.
- [68] U. Munarim, E. Ghisi, Environmental feasibility of heritage buildings rehabilitation, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 58 (2016) 235–249, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.334>.
- [69] Novak, E., & Vcelak, J. (2019). Building Integrated Photovoltaics (BIPV) in Line with Historic Buildings and Their Heritage Protection—IOPscience. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/290/1/012157/meta>.
- [70] Ørland Municipality. (n.d.). Oversikt bygg (Overview buildings).
- [71] Ørland Municipality. (2022). Reguleringsplan Brekstadbukta småhusområde—Reguleringsbestemmelser (Regulatory plan Brekstad Bay individual housing area—Regulatory regulations).
- [72] Pelle, M., Lucchi, E., Maturi, L., Astigarraga, A., & Causone, F. (2020). Coloured BIPV Technologies: Methodological and Experimental Assessment for

- Architecturally Sensitive Areas. *Energies*, 13(17), Article 17. 10.3390/en13174506.
- [73] P.-O.-A. Borrebæk, B.P. Jelle, Z. Zhang, Avoiding snow and ice accretion on building integrated photovoltaics - challenges, strategies, and opportunities, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 206 (110306) (2020) 1–12.
- [74] C.S. Polo López, F. Frontini, Energy efficiency and renewable solar energy integration in heritage historic buildings 48 (2014) 1493–1502.
- [75] C.S. Polo López, E. Lucchi, G. Franco, Acceptance of building integrated photovoltaic (BIPV) in heritage buildings and landscapes: Potentials, Barrier and Assessment Criteria. (2020) 1636–1844. https://www.rehabend.unican.es/2020/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/12/Libro-RES%C3%A9AMENES_v2-1.pdf.
- [76] Polo López, C. S., Troia, F., & Nocera, F. (2021). Photovoltaic BIPV Systems and Architectural Heritage: New Balance between Conservation and Transformation. An Assessment Method for Heritage Values Compatibility and Energy Benefits of Interventions. *Sustainability*, 13(9), Article 9. 10.3390/su13095107.
- [77] Powerhouse. (n.d.). Powerhouse—Projekter (Projects). Retrieved 13 April 2023, from <https://www.powerhouse.no/prosjekter/>.
- [78] R. Baetens, B.P. Jelle, A. Gustavsen, Properties, requirements and possibilities of smart windows for dynamic daylight and solar energy control in buildings: A State-of-the-Art review, *solar energy Materials and solar Cells* 94 (2010) 87–105.
- [79] R. Tällberg, B.P. Jelle, M. Hamdy, T. Gao, R. Loonen, Comparison of the energy saving potential of adaptive and controllable smart windows: A State-of-the-Art review and simulation studies of thermochromic, photochromic and electrochromic technologies, *Solar energy Materials and Solar Cells* 200 (109828) (2019) 1–30.
- [80] H. Sallée, D. Quenard, E. Valenti, M. Galan, VIP as thermal breaker for internal insulation system, *Energy and Buildings* 85 (2014) 631–637, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.08.039>.
- [81] Sangsolar. (2021). Solar roof tile. https://www.sangsolar.com/product/solar_thin_film/solar-roof-tile/.
- [82] SIMIEN. (n.d.). SIMIEN. Retrieved 26 May 2023, from <https://simien.no/>.
- [83] SINTEF. (2023, March 21). Bygningsintegreerte solceller kan spare både energi og byggematerialer (Building integrated photovoltaics can save both energy and building materials). SINTEF. <https://www.sintef.no/siste-nytt/2023/bygningsintegreerte-solceller-kan-spare-bade-energi-og-byggematerialer/>.
- [84] SINTEF 471 (401) (2012). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/4045/u-verdier_vegger_over_terreng_med_bindingsverk_av_tre_med_gjennomgaaende_stendere?gclid=CjwKCAjw67ajBhAVEiwA2g_jEJthCjQkOKaXoinYal5RRVQacmiTgT_ATJpqUSFoNP-gziyqiQ6PhoCZwMQAvD_BwE.
- [85] SINTEF 471 (431) (2013). Walls over terrain—Log walls, https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/4101/u-verdier_vegger_over_terreng_laftet_tre.
- [86] SINTEF 520 (706) (2018). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/326/sikring_mot_radon_ved_nybygging.
- [87] SINTEF 521 (011) (2005). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/327/valg_av_fundamentering_og_konstruksjoner_mot_grunnen.
- [88] SINTEF 525 (106) (2020), 525.106 Skrå tretak med kaldt loft (Incline wooden roof with cold attic, https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/385/525106_skraa_tretak_med_kaldt_loft.
- [89] SINTEF 573 (344) (2020). Types and properties, https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/604/varmeisolasjonsmaterialer_typer_og_egenskaper#i17.
- [90] SINTEF 701 (401) (2005). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/3231/muggsopp_i_bygninger_forekomst_og_konsekvenser_for_inneklimaet#i33.
- [91] SINTEF 723 (511) (2004). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/679/etterisolerings_og_yttervegger_av_tre.
- [92] SINTEF 725 (403) (2005), 725.403 Etterisolering av tretak (Post-insulating of wooden roof, https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/690/etterisolering_av_tretak.
- [93] SINTEF 733.161. (2016). SINTEF Building Research Design Guides. 733.161 Eldre vinduer. Vindusformer og materialer (Old windows. Shapes of window and materials). https://www.byggforsk.no/dokument/701/eldre_vinduer_vindusformer_og_materialer.
- [94] SINTEF information, English—Informasjon på engelsk—Byggforskskierien (English—Information in english—SINTEF research design guides). (n.d.). Retrieved 27 March 2023, from https://www.byggforsk.no/side/278/english_informasjon_paa_engelsk.
- [95] J. Sjöholm, Authenticity and relocation of built heritage: The urban transformation of kiruna, sweden, *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 7 (2) (2017) 110–128, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-11-2015-0041>.
- [96] SolarLab. (n.d.). ColorBlast – SolarLab. Retrieved 13 April 2023, from <https://solarlab.ch/colorblast/>.
- [97] Soluxa. (n.d.). Soluxa Colored Solar Panels – Facade Solutions – Facade Solutions. Retrieved 12 April 2023, from <https://www.soluxa.solar/#facade>.
- [98] Stultiens, E. (2021, July 29). Solar Magazine—Proef Soluxa met gekleurde zonnepanelen aan gevel universiteit Nijmegen van start (Trial Soluxa with colored solar panels on the facade of the University of Nijmegen has started). <https://solarmagazine.nl/nieuws-zonne-energie/i24985/proef-soluxa-met-gekleurde-zonnepanelen-aan-gevel-universiteit-nijmegen-van-start>.
- [99] Sunage. (2021a). General conditions of Limited warranty “Suncol BIPV Modules”. https://sunage.ch/pdf/Sunage-Warranty-BIPV_en.pdf.
- [100] Sunage. (2021b). Suncol Facade. https://sunage.ch/pdf/Suncol-Facade-Presentation_en.pdf.
- [101] Sunage. (2021c). Suncol Tile M3. https://sunage.ch/pdf/Suncol-Tile-Presentation_en.pdf.
- [102] Sunage. (2023a). SUNAGE | Suncol Facade. <https://sunage.ch/en/suncol-facade>.
- [103] Sunage. (2023b). SUNAGE | Suncol Tile. <https://sunage.ch/en/suncol-tile>.
- [104] E. Sveipe, B.P. Jelle, E. Wegger, S. Uvsløkk, S. Grynning, J.V. Thue, B. Time, A. Gustavsen, Improving thermal insulation of timber frame walls by retrofitting with vacuum insulation panels – experimental and theoretical investigations, *Journal of Building Physics* 35 (2) (2011) 168–188, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744259111403439>.
- [105] Svensson, A., Haugen, A., Kalbakk, T. E., & Gåsbak, J. (2012). Energieffektivisering i eksisterende bygninger. Energisparings konsekvenser på kulturhistorisk verdifulle bygg. (Energy efficiency improvement in existing buildings. The consequences of energy savings on buildings of cultural and historical value.) (SBF2011F0105). SINTEF Byggforsk (SINTEF Building Research Design Guides). https://www.byggogbevar.no/media/7837/energieffektivisering_sintefrapport.pdf.
- [106] S. Taftø Petersen, 74–9 trøa/Beinangården, Ørland (2015). Municipality.
- [107] Taftø Petersen, S., & Johansen, D. (2015). 64-24 Viken (p. 16). Ørland Municipality.
- [108] S. Taftø Petersen, D. Johansen, 64–117 grande, Ørland (2016). Municipality.
- [109] The defence sector’s properties. (2014). Om prosjektet (About the project—The defence sector’s properties). Forsvarsbygg.no. <https://www.forsvarsbygg.no/no/vi-bygger-og-drifter/byggeprosjekter/kampflybase/om-prosjektet/>.
- [110] The Planning and Building Act. (2008). Lov om planlegging og byggesaksbehandling (plan- og bygningsloven)—Kapittel 31. Krav til eksisterende byggverk (The Planning and Building Act—Chapter 31. Requirements for existing buildings) (LOV-2008-06-27-71). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2008-06-27-71/KAPITTEL_4-12%2%A731-2.
- [111] THERM - Berkeley Laboratory. (2019). THERM. <https://windows.lbl.gov/software/therm>.
- [112] K. Thoubboron, June 2). HanTiles solar roof, The Complete Review | EnergySage. EnergySage Blog. (2019). <https://news.energysage.com/hantiles-a-new-solar-roof-tile-from-a-leading-thin-film-company/>.
- [113] J.V. Thue, Lifting (notching). In *Store norske leksikon (The Great Norwegian Encyclopedia)*, 2021.
- [114] United Nations. (2021). Visual Feature: Measuring Progress; environment & SDGs. <https://www.unep.org/interactive/measuring-progress-environment-sdgs>.
- [115] United Nations. (2022, September 11). CO2 emissions from buildings and construction hit new high, leaving sector off track to decarbonize by 2050: UN. UN Environment. <http://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/press-release/co2-emissions-buildings-and-construction-hit-new-high-leaving-sector>.
- [116] A. Uriarte, I. Garai, A. Ferdinando, A. Erkoreka, O. Nicolas, E. Barreiro, Vacuum insulation panels in construction solutions for energy efficient retrofitting of buildings. Two case studies in Spain and Sweden, *Energy and Buildings* 197 (2019) 131–139, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.05.039>.
- [117] Vetejord, S. (2019, August 20). Isolasjon – hva er det og hvilke typer finnes? (Insulation—What is it and which types exist?). <https://byggvalg.no/isolasjon-hva-er-det-og-hvilke-typer-finner/>.
- [118] Wærnes, E., & Solgård, R. (2019). 417206-05 Kampflybase—PG3, Riving av eiendomme i rød støysone (Fighter base—PG3, Demolition of properties in red noise zone).
- [119] Wienerberger. (2022). Wevolt Zonedakpan. Zonne-energie met behoud van karakter (Wevolt Solar roof tile. Solar energy while retaining character). https://www.wienerberger.nl/content/dam/wienerberger/netherlands/marketing/documents-magazines/technical/technical-product-info-sheet/roof/NL_MKT_DOC_Wevolt_Alegra_10_Zonedakpan_Technische_Datasheet.pdf.
- [120] Wienerberger. (2023a). Solar Roof Tiles: Energy Systems of the Future. Corporate Website. <https://www.wienerberger.com/en/stories/2022/20220126-photovoltaic-on-roof-netherlands.html>.
- [121] Wienerberger. (2023b). Wevolt Zonedakpan (Wevolt Solar roof tile). <https://www.wienerberger.nl/wevolt/wevolt-zonedakpan.html>.
- [122] WUFI - Fraunhofer IBP. (2023). WUFI. <https://wufi.de/en/software/what-is-wufi/>.
- [123] H. Yuk, J.Y. Choi, Y.U. Kim, S.J. Chang, S. Kim, Historic building energy conservation with wooden attic using vacuum insulation panel retrofit technology, *Building and Environment* 230 (2023), 110004, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.110004>.
- [124] Z.E.B. Laboratory, October 20), ZEB Laboratory, ZEB Lab, 2022 <https://zeblab.no>.
- [125] Directorate for Cultural Heritage. (n.d.). Råd om energisparing i gamle hus—Riksantikvaren (Advice on energy savings in old houses—Directorate for Cultural Heritage). Retrieved 16 February 2023, from <https://www.riksantikvarer.no/veileder/rad-om-energisparing-i-gamle-hus/>.
- [126] SINTEF 573.344. (2020). SINTEF Building Research Design Guides. 573.344 Varmeisolasjonsmaterialer. Typer og egenskaper (Thermal insulation materials. Types and properties). <https://www.byggforsk.no>.