

INTRODUCTION

My name is Vaughn Malkin, and I am the owner of 38 Michie St. I'd like to thank the commissioners for the opportunity to speak today.

I'm going to keep this short and sweet.

SOUTHERN HERITAGE TRUST

I am disappointed the S42 Report does not explain **why** the Trust is involved in the scheduling process when building owners hardly got a look in.

It's astonishing that a "charity" with no more legal standing than any average person, gets this influence. The trust is not a party directly affected by the scheduling of my house, so their involvement is inappropriate. I'd bet money that the council doesn't allow random strangers to decide building consents or policies. An explanation is absolutely warranted.

With regard to Heritage Evidence – Appendix D

The claim of published significance rests on a short chapter written by Michael Findlay. Despite his extensive knowledge of Dunedin's heritage scene, Michael had no idea that our apparently significant house even existed.

The chapter is mostly a description of the interior rooms of the house, with some historical notes. Our "esteemed historian" offers no further facts to support the house's impact on Dunedin.

The Council submission is a veritable tsunami of words about everything, except the concrete evidence of the specific attributes of the house that contribute a significant impact on heritage.

Where is the clear, easily seen "ripple effect" of this house on historic and design significance in Dunedin?

For example: that the building of this house changed the way architects did things in Dunedin. Or the presence of this house changed the way large plots of land were developed. There is nothing!

I have never denied my home is a modernist house or that it has architectural merit. But architectural merit is not significant heritage value. The RMA bar for significance in heritage is deliberately high.

What you are doing is scheduling a modernist house for a variety of reasons, but not because of any factual evidence showing a significant heritage contribution to Dunedin.

With regard to Section 42 Report proper.

The report mentions the Heritage Fund. I'm aware of a report (heritage action plan: implementation options report) tabled with Council January 2025 that shows the Heritage Fund is oversubscribed, and its true dollar value has decreased due to inflation.

It warns that due to the influx of new heritage buildings, that under the current criteria, grant values and the number of successful applicants will likely be reduced.

The council continues to promote the Fund to new heritage owners without mentioning its precarious state. This is basically the only thing the council has to offer building owners - why no full disclosure on problems with the fund?

Regarding communication, the council chose to keep building owners at arm's length; this was not required by the RMA or the Local Government Act (Section 82), which emphasises communication must be responsive, inclusive, and transparent. People (building owners) are not just informed, but heard and considered on their terms, not the councils. The council seems to deflect responsibility by claiming it is bound by rules—rules it largely sets itself.

Section 4.2 Property value – The council agrees that scheduling affects property value – in my case a possible loss of \$120,000.

Section 4.5 Insurance and Section 4.6 Compliance Costs – the council agrees that scheduling can or does impose additional costs here

Finally - Market Economics Consultancy Report and Support of Owners.

I'm pleased an independent report on the cost to heritage owners was commissioned—and that its findings align with what submitters have been saying. Similar concerns have been raised as far back as 2007. It's disappointing this remains an issue.

The report highlights that despite public benefits, the cost is carried by private owners. It also highlights that heritage scheduling should be based on rational criteria. There is more the council can do to support owners here (offering compensation, incentives, rates).

Heritage policies should be more balanced and consider all the stakeholders, not just the fan-base. A more fair and transparent process can only be a good thing!

I'll stop now. Thank you for listening. I wish you well in your deliberations.

