



the architectural centre inc.
PO Box 24178 Wellington

20 December 2018

Andrew Coleman
Chief Executive
Heritage NZ
andrew.coleman@heritage.org.nz

Tēnā koe Andrew

1. We acknowledge your letter of 3 December. We appreciate getting a reply to our letter. We look forward to your replies to our previous letters, answering questions and providing information requested.
2. We note you write that the HNZ Board "*has thoroughly investigated heritage orders as a method of protection.*" Could you please provide us evidence that this is the case, including dates when this issue was thoroughly investigated? The timing of the investigation is a highly relevant matter. We would also appreciate copies of any advice tabled and minutes from Board meetings.
3. We note your statement that "*If the order was challenged ... [t]he withdrawal ... could have negative reputational effects for Heritage New Zealand.*" We are disappointed and concerned that the current reputational damage HNZ is experiencing through not acting in relation to protecting the Karori campus has not been given the same level of consideration.
4. We are equally disappointed that HNZ appears to be prioritising its PR concerns over delivering on its statutory obligations to protect historic heritage.
5. We acknowledge your reference to court procedures being "*not free of potential financial risks as we could be made to compensate for costs incurred by Ryman Healthcare.*" The possibility of court costs was stated in our letter of 11 November at paragraph 13. We again note that it is not unusual for HNZ to participate in court action. Recent HNZ court action includes the Whakatane Airport appeal (settled in mediation), and the Harcourts case. These instances were all potentially vulnerable to court costs which would be a "business as usual" cost for a country's leading historic heritage agency.
6. In addition, any costs arising from RMA s191 would be dependent on HNZ as HPA accepting the recommendation for conditions of a heritage order. We also note that "*additional costs of upkeep*" (s191(3)(a)) would be a direct result of actions by HNZ as HPA.

7. Regarding your statement that "*communication ... also factored into [the] Board's deliberation,*" could you please explain how this communication has altered Ryman's plan from the beginning of this year to demolish approximately 50% of the buildings on the site and destroy Lopdell Gardens?
8. We note your reference to the HNZ Board being "*comfortable and confident that the continued consultation ... is the most effective way forward in attaining the best possible heritage outcome for this site.*"
 - a) What is the "best possible heritage outcome"?
 - b) What factors outside of those in the Heritage NZ Act have limited this outcome?
 - c) How does this differ to Ryman's decision to demolish 50% of the building on the site?
 - d) How does this outcome measure up against the heritage evaluation of the heritage significance of the site contained in the HNZ listing report?
9. Finally we note your request for an in-person meeting to discuss HNZ understanding of the situation. We will be open to a meeting after receiving the information sought for in previous letters and above.

We consider this matter to be one of the utmost urgency. We understand that the interiors of the WTTTC are currently being demolished. Further delay will see the demolition of another heritage site under HNZ's watch.

Nāku iti noa, nā



Christine McCarthy
President, Architectural Centre
arch@architecture.org.nz

- cc. Hon. Grant Robertson, MP, Wellington Central
- cc. James Blackburne, Chair, Historic Places Aotearoa
- cc. Richard Bentley, Save the Karori Campus Group
- cc. Ian Bowman, Chair, ICOMOS NZ
- cc. Philip Hartley, Chair, Docomomo
- cc. Stefan Corbett, Manager, Heritage Policy, Ministry for Culture and Heritage