

**Notes for oral submission by David Murray to
Heritage Plan Change 1 panel, 22 May 2025.**

- 1.1 Tena koutou. Thank you for the opportunity to submit. My name is David Murray. I research and write about built heritage. I have been contracted to carry out assessment work in the past (now 10-15 years ago). I am a member of the Southern Heritage Trust but don't hold any position within it.
- 1.2 I mostly want to underline some quite general points.
The 2GP states:
"Dunedin's heritage is central to its identity and is protected and celebrated as a core value of the city, through the heritage conservation and retention of important heritage items, and the maintenance and active use of built heritage."
and also
"The elements of the environment that contribute to residents' and visitors' aesthetic appreciation for and enjoyment of the city are protected and enhanced. These include built heritage."
So the city has made a commitment to built heritage that it needs to live up to.
- 1.3 In terms of scheduled buildings, there is a catchup to do. I say this because the first Dunedin District Plan became operative 30 years in 1995, but the only significant round of additions came with the 2GP, and it was smaller than this round.
- 1.4 When that schedule was put together in the 90s, the risk to built heritage was seen to be more with commercial buildings and the centre city. The current schedule still reflects that. Over half of the residential listings are on just four inner city streets (George St, High St, Dundas St, Royal Tce).
- 1.5 Unsurprisingly, for that time, there is relatively little in the way of Modernist architecture – but even less than I would have expected. Without speaking to the merits of individual proposals, I will say that if the schedule is to mean to protect a diversity of styles and building types, and the history and culture of the city post-WW2 as well as before, then Modernist buildings do need more recognition through the schedule. They have not been excluded due to a lack of examples of architectural quality or stories reflecting important historical themes.
- 1.6 There is an opportunity to help remedy the schedule's weakness in terms of the suburbs and beyond. Only about a quarter (27%) of scheduled buildings are outside the CBD. Only one building is scheduled in the entirety of Māori Hill. Some of these suburbs have buildings of landmark quality – for example prominent churches. This should elevate their case for a place in the schedule. The Kaikorai Church is very much a landmark and although not in use for some

years the parish only closed in September last year, so now would be a good time to explore its adaptive reuse. Similar such reuse is well underway at a comparable church in North East Valley. Heritage developer and engineer Steve Macknight has described the Māori Hill Presbyterian Church as an ‘impressive building’ suitable for adaptive reuse. I’ll add that at least eight pre-1940 church buildings have been demolished in Dunedin since 2017.

- 1.7 One example of a landmark within the centre city is the Hospital Psychiatric Services building. When the university, in 2021, put out their vision for a Health Precinct on the old hospital site it showed an open plaza on that site. It is expected that building will become surplus to health sector requirements before long, so the time to ensure it has a future is now, not when it’s at the mercy of market forces. It forms part of an important streetscape grouping with the brick buildings opposite. It should be suitable for adaptive reuse.
- 1.8 Dunedin’s best built heritage will be eroded if it is not safeguarded in an appropriately targeted way. It is good to see that the proposed additions to the schedule look to address some of the aspects in which it currently falls short. I can see a lot of work gone into this process and would like to thank council staff, and also thank you on the panel for listening to me today. Ngā mihi.