panel discussion / JULIA GATLEY

In honour of Jeremy Salmond: Let's talk about old buildings, new work, and design

CONDUCTED IN THE CONFERENCE CENTRE LECTURE THEATRE, UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND WAIPAPA TAUMATA RAU
22 SEPTEMBER 2023

Fig. 1 Jeremy Salmond. [Photograph: Sam Hartnett, 2018]

Julia Gatley (JG): Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa. It is a huge pleasure to welcome you all to this panel discussion tonight, being held in honour of Jeremy Salmond [1944–2023]. Thank you for joining us. Thanks, too, to the Auckland Branch of the New Zealand Institute of Architects [NZIA] for including the event on the Auckland Architecture Week programme, and to Andrew Barrie and Michael Milojevic for inviting me to chair it.

With Jeremy Salmond's death in January this year, New Zealand lost one of its best heritage architects. He was part of the country's first generation of dedicated conservation architects, which emerged in the 1980s, and remained a leader in the field for the duration of his career. His office, Salmond Reed Architects, is the country's largest heritage practice. It has earned numerous architecture

and heritage awards. In addition, Jeremy received the Queen's Service Order in 2007 and the NZIA Gold Medal in 2018, and was recognised as a University of Auckland Distinguished Alumnus in 2021. He was a gentle and generous person, known for his integrity and courtesy, as well as his good humour and quick wittedness. He is much missed.

Before we turn to our panel, we have two guests of honour, who will offer some thoughts and reflections. First, please join me in welcoming Jeremy's soulmate, partner and wife of over 50 years, Dame Anne Salmond, Distinguished Professor of Māori Studies and Anthropology here at the University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau, and much-respected scholar of history and culture in Aotearoa and the Pacific. Kia ora, Dame Anne.

Dame Anne Salmond: Ko te wai e hora nei, ko Waitematā. Ko te marae e takoto rā, ko Waipapa. Ko āku rangatira kua pae nei i te pō nei, tēnā koutou, tēna koutou, tēnā koutou.

Many thanks to Julia and the other organisers for giving me this opportunity to speak in praise of my darling Jem. It's something I wasn't able to do at his funeral at St Matthew-in-the-City in January.

Jeremy was passionate about our heritage in Aotearoa New Zealand in all of its aspects, and fought hard to cherish and take care of it.

First, he loved the whenua itself, and all of its taonga, including ancestral plants and animals. At Waikereru in Gisborne, we worked together for almost 25 years with an extraordinary group of people who became a whānau, restoring the hills, the forests, the streams, and the Waimatā River.

Second, he loved te ao Māori, travelling to hui in many parts of the country and forging close relationships with Eruera and Amiria Stirling, Merimeri Penfold, Graeme Atkins, who spoke at his funeral, and so many others. With Dean Whiting and Lloyd Macomber, he restored marae in many parts of the country.

Fig. 2 Dame Anne Salmond and Rau Hoskins. [Photograph: Candida Rolla, 2023]

Third, he loved our settler heritage, for all its complexities and contradictions, working on iconic heritage sites and buildings and neighbourhoods from the Far North to the Deep South, fighting hard for their ongoing life in our communities.

Fourth, Jem appreciated superb contemporary design—heritage in the making—and admired the gifted architects he worked with, regarding them as co-conspirators rather than competitors. At Salmond Reed, his partners were part of the family—Peter Reed, Rosalie Stanley, and Lloyd Macomber.

Jem was a lovely man, amusing and witty, modest and warm-hearted, gifted and generous—a wonderful dad, grandfather, and husband. He was a joy to live with for 54 years, and we all miss him terribly. Thank you so much for holding this event in his honour.

Nā reira, ka nui āku mihi aroha ki a koutou katoa.

JG: Kia ora, Dame Anne. Thank you so much for sharing those words, which triggered lots of memories, certainly for me, and I'm sure for everyone in the room.

Our second guest is Lloyd Macomber, a current director of Salmond Reed Architects, on where things are up to with the practice now. Welcome, Lloyd.

Fig. 3 Lloyd Macomber. [Photograph: Candida Rolla, 2023]

Lloyd Macomber: Hi, all. Thank you for putting this event on for Jeremy. I won't cover off what Anne has already talked about. Just a 30-second potted history of my beginnings with the practice. It was late 1992 when I first met Jeremy and Anne, and in 1993 I started. So, it's been 30 years. Ten of those were in a small place in Devonport where there were two or three of us. And then 20 years ago this month, we moved to where we are, up until today, in Devonport, and we're moving today and we start our new life in Queen Street as of Monday. So that's the new look of the practice. It was Salmond Architects, it was Jeremy, when I joined. Then it was Peter Reed, and there were one or two others. A few names I can recall—Bruce Wild and then Rosalie Stanley and Bruce Petry joined a year or two later. A few years later, we teamed together. There were five of us. I don't know quite how that worked because five of us owned the practice and only two people worked for us! So yeah, we had our moments in those first few years. But after that it all settled down and we grew, we grew to a steady 20-odd people for quite a few years, and we're still that size. And we've decided after some time to move on and come over to the city. We were kicking that idea around quite a few years ago as well, but nothing eventuated then.

Anne mentioned about Jeremy having a sense of humour and being witty. He certainly was. But I always liked that he was always searching to get the joke and to get the people to, you know, take it on board and to go, "You're a really funny guy, Jeremy." And you know, sometimes it works. Sometimes he was actually quite funny! [laughter]

But one of the many things I remember back in the day when there were maybe four people there, it seemed that time just went very slowly and you had all the time in the world, and he had all the time in the world, to spend, and we'd go over this design and that design, long before the days of CAD. And we just had time. We had time to noodle away, look at books, try this detail, try sketch number 53. That doesn't work; we'll try something else. It was good, you know; I'm showing my age. But it's interesting how things have gone so fast, so quickly, now.

Another thing. I can't remember the people, but I remember times that we'd be

receiving clients or consultants or reps or something. And he had this radar for people who were arrogant or rude. And if they were arrogant or rude, I could just see his hackles come up. And he had this thing where, again, just to counter that and put it in the positive, he was so generous with people. It didn't matter who you were. He was really generous with people who showed an interest and a passion in what we did.

A lot of people don't really realise, but he was as good a writer as he was a drawer and a designer. His writing was so fantastic. I'd write these things and he'd look at them and he'd go, "Yep, yep, yep, but no, no, try it again." And in the end, what read to be so long-winded and so drawn out, so full of detail, he'd apply the Jeremy-factor to it and it would come back with such brevity and clarity and be so well weighted. That, probably more so than design or drawing, has been a harder thing to handle, I think, particularly for architects because we're not naturally born writers, but we realise once we start practising that writing is just as important as anything else, you know, within reason. Most people can do sketches and it's like anything, right—you just practise and practise and practise and you get pretty good at it as a consequence, although I'm pretty rubbish at it now because I don't practise it, but I'm writing more. But you know, Jeremy had all of these things in good measure. He really had it all in good measure.

And the last thing I'll say is that he was always offering to just help out, even if it was at the eleventh hour and all the chips were down. He just had the facility to be so generous and give time to any of us, to all of us. So, thanks Julia, thanks all.

JG: Thanks so much, Lloyd. It really was just a coincidence that we held this event on the very day that Salmond Reed are moving office. And we wish you all the best for life after Devonport.

As a heritage architect, Jeremy positioned himself at the design end of the work, and this positioning gives rise to our discussion today, on old buildings, new work, and design—including, but not limited to, the work of Salmond Reed Architects. It is my pleasure to introduce our panel to you:

Paola Boarin is an associate professor of architecture here at Waipapa Taumata Rau, with research interests and expertise in the fields of heritage, sustainability, and retrofitting. Paola is a co-director of our School's Future Cities Research Hub.

Robin Byron is a senior conservation architect with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, where she provides conservation advice and works with owners, architects, and developers doing new work on heritage buildings.

Pamela Dziwulska is an architect and conservation architect with Salmond Reed Architects, and in October 2023 completes a four-year term as chair of ICOMOS New Zealand—the New Zealand arm of the International Council on Monuments and Sites.

Rau Hoskins (Ngāti Hau, Ngāpuhi) is a director at designTRIBE, teaches in the architecture programme at Unitec Te Pūkenga, and has recently been appointed to the board of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and the Māori Heritage Council.

Sarosh Mulla is a designer who worked at Salmond Reed Architects after graduating and is now a director at PAC Studio, and a senior lecturer in architecture and architectural technology here at Waipapa Taumata Rau.

A very warm welcome to you all. Thank you for joining us tonight. I have a series of questions, and hope to have time to open up to the floor at the end. Also, Paola, Robin, and I teach in the Master of Heritage Conservation programme here at the University, so if you have any questions about that programme, please talk to us at the end.

Pamela, as both an architect and a conservation architect, you are part of the next generation at Salmond Reed, with work and a career developed under Jeremy's influence. It would be great to hear about this, both the way things worked in office with Jeremy and how this has influenced your ways of working, thinking, and designing.

Pamela Dziwulska (PD): I'll start by following on from what Lloyd has said, that Jeremy was always an approachable person, with no problem ever too small or too large, and all problems could be resolved in conjunction with some witty banter. The better the pun, the brighter the sparkle in his eye.

Of great value to Jeremy and in our office is thorough research and finding the authenticity of a building or a site. With heritage buildings in particular, the initial investigations to search out the changes that have occurred and studying these to form an understanding of what is there and therefore guide change, is critical to our design processes.

Jeremy was always about collaboration, internally and externally, because discussion brings fresh ideas and different perspectives to the process of finding the design solution, whether it is two people or the whole office coming together to discuss a project, or just an element of it.

It was also clear that Jeremy was as eloquent with a pen and drawn line as he was with words, so design processes are typically centred around scrap pieces of paper for round after round of drawing, CAD-ing, drawing, CAD-ing, we might check in with the building code every once in a while, until the solution is found. And that process was always ongoing with education too, so he was always passing on what he knew to us, and then us to the next generation.

The influences that drove me to become a conservation architect pre-dated my joining Salmond Reed, though I found an amazing kinship and camaraderie when I did join the practice, and a great deal of support to further my studies in this area when I was awarded the SPAB [Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings] Scholarship in the UK, and when Jeremy nominated me to become chair of ICOMOS New Zealand.

My driver into conservation was actually sustainability and wondering why New Zealand was flooded with leaky buildings, when so many older buildings seemed to work fine—why don't we build like the 100-year-old building, or the 500-year-old building?

In regard to the influences of how I work, think, and design today—I believe in a holistic approach to my design, doing thorough research and understanding the building and site at the head of the project—and not just where a wall is located, but what is the wall made of, how does that material work, what might its significance be to the whole, and how might we change it without it losing its authenticity? And by keeping the building we prevent unnecessary waste and destruction while maintaining a piece of our country's heritage.

JG: Sarosh, at Salmond Reed, you were involved with the design of new work on old buildings, including St Thomas' Chapel at St Matthew-in-the-City. Was Jeremy a mentor for you in putting new into old, and what did you learn about working with old buildings while in the office?

Sarosh Mulla (SM): Well, I learnt a huge amount about working with old buildings and new buildings. I mean the thing about Jeremy is that he loved all buildings, and he was such a designer, first. The one thing that I really feel he was terribly passionate about was that you could reason your way through any problem, whether it be based in heritage or anything else, by applying design.

And so yeah, he was a huge mentor in the work and in the practice. But I think more than the actual built products that I was fortunate enough to work with him on, it was more about the way he operated as a person in the profession, which I took away. And I was always struck by the generosity that he had and the patience, you know, because I was still a student when I started working for Jeremy. And I have to say I was utterly incompetent for the first couple of years [laughter]. And he had a huge amount of patience for that. I mean, I don't know if Peter [Reed] is here. He would attest to how incompetent [laughter], but my point really is that Jeremy was a person who very rarely had a harsh word to say about anyone. And I never met anyone who had a harsh word to say about him. I think that's extraordinary for an architect with such a long career. I also think it's extraordinary for being a graduate in an office, it's not difficult to see that you would find grumbles about your directors and I'm sure graduates who work in our studio now have grumbles about the directors, but none of us ever had a harsh word to say about Jeremy. And it was just because of his patience and his commitment to design. And, you know, I just loved working for Jeremy. I loved it so much that after I stopped working for Jeremy, I sought him out to continue working with him.

JG: Paola, the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter has a very specific meaning for the word "restoration"—returning a building or place to an earlier appearance by putting original materials back in place and/or removing accretions. You've mentioned to me the differences between our "restoration" and the Italian word "*restauro*". Could you please explain this for our audience.

Paola Boarin (PB): The reflection that I started having on the differences between the ICOMOS New Zealand definition and the Italian definition, and understanding, of the practice of *restauro* started years ago, but then continued and was renewed in a way when I started teaching in the Master of Heritage Conservation here. To me, the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter is closer to the theory of restoration developed by Cesare Brandi. That is, if we consider a work of architecture as a work of art, then we guarantee the legacy of the future of that work of art through conservation, where the approach is either that of doing nothing with the material loss or that of reinstating original materials. For sure, understanding restoration as the methodological process of recognising the work of art in both its physical material as well as its aesthetic historic dimension is an important step towards the retention of the legacy, and it is aligned with some of the concepts of sustainability and even that of kaitiakitanga to some extent. But this approach tends to condemn the architecture to remain unchanged while we are continuously changing and cities are continuously evolving and changing.

Fig. 4 Julia Gatley and Paola Boarin. [Photograph: Candida Rolla, 2023]

The key concept behind the Italian *restauro* is that of design, of a coherent, complex, multi-faceted project that requires multiple skills and competencies—historical, artistic, planning competencies—in addition of course to the architectural and technical ones. So we don't call it restoration work. We call it *progetto di restauro*, restoration project. Somehow, the restoration project is no different from a new project in this understanding. It is founded on a critically creative process, whether that results in the conservation of the material fabric as it reached us or in a conscious adaptation, or furthermore in an integration to the original image through contemporary languages. It is an architectural project with conservation goals.

Giovanni Carbonara, another important conservationist in the conservation theory and practice scenarios, defined it as being neither the project for the new nor the repurposing of the old, but the design for the old. And this is where the essence of this difference lies between Italy and New Zealand, in my opinion. And this is also why both Restoration Theory and Restoration Studio are a compulsory subjects in the training of architects in Italy. We all go through a conservation and restoration studio there, and we do strongly, strongly believe that that is part of a graduate's profile and the practice of architects, whether they work with new or old buildings.

Another difference between conservation approaches in Italy and here is that reconstruction is almost never considered when there is permanent loss of material. But again, we talk about a restoration project where, in this case, the contemporary language takes even more space. In general, the restoration project emphasises the role of the contemporary project, with all its difficulties, conflicts, dialectic, and even polemic elements, sometimes, with all the stakeholders engaged. And there are three main reasons why this is a very complex activity. First, architectural conservation is articulated, multi-disciplinary, and can be interpreted in different ways depending on the point of view of the different stakeholders involved—the client, the local authority, the conservation authority, the designers, and so forth. Second, professionals in this field, especially I would say in Italy, tend to hide and protect themselves behind a case-by-case

scenario. And this has oftentimes led to poor decisions, in my view. But in most of the times, they rightly stand behind the case-by-case, because buildings are unique. Third, conservation authorities over there play a relevant role in orienting the project's approach, but they are often more committed to preservation itself rather than to understanding the wider context, including sustainability principles. But nonetheless, they are a key factor and key professionals for the retention of the architectural, historic, and artistic legacy of our buildings.

Now, of course, with the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine, there is debate around the loss of material. And these debates will, of course, influence the conservation, the practices, for many years ahead. But in Italy, as well as in the rest of Europe, we've always coexisted with the concept of conservation, reconstruction, adaptation, since the origin of our cities. And this debate was particularly important after World War II.

I think the different interpretations of restoration, and a different interpretation of restoration, more closely connected with the concept of the project and design would be beneficial to New Zealand as well, because the acknowledgement of contemporary needs beyond the retention of materiality could help with the retention of heritage too. What we see in some of the cases now, that are at the forefront of our built environment and cities in New Zealand, is that they are an act of freezing the heritage architecture to a state that it is no longer fit for purpose and, therefore, they are not even considered a living body anymore, but they are not also capable of retaining the legacy. And this is really critical when we talk about the examples of façadism that we see around. Of course, this needs to be supported by two key aspects. The first one is, in my view, more power in the hands of conservation authorities, as the people who can guarantee the integrity of this process. And on the other side, through architecture education. So having more people informed on what is heritage, what is the value of heritage, why is it important to retain heritage and, let's say, have it ready for the next generation. And, of course, we can play a relevant role there.

JG: Robin, the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter also gives advice on adapting or altering heritage buildings. The 1993 edition said that the new work should be identifiable as such, whereas the 2010 edition says that the new work "should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material." What is your experience with working with these two different clauses intended to guide new work on old buildings?

Robin Byron (RB): Thirty years ago, when the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter of 1993 set out principles around the relationship and incorporation of new work into heritage buildings, there tended to be a propensity for new work to be more emulating or imitative of existing buildings. There was a need to be clear about distinguishing between what was original and what was later added material, even if it involved date-marking of materials to make the distinction. But as heritage practice evolved and the charter of 2010 was revised, it responded to a position being taken that in many instances it was appropriate that new additions were more honestly modern in relationship to a heritage building, and that a clear visual, architectural distinction be made between what was contemporary and what was original. And so there needed to be more direction around how something recognisably new was going to be constructed in the context

of a heritage building, and how it was that we considered those relationships. Synergies could be achieved by respecting the geometry, scale, and form of the heritage structure, the proportions, looking at the rhythm of fenestration, how the materials and colour could be potentially complementary, or if they were the same, how you treat them in a different manner but in a way that they speak to each other. And so more of an outline of what you needed to consider emerged. It reflects the idea of being more honest about what's new and making a clear distinction from the old, but being sensitive and respectful of it.

Fig. 5 Pamela Dziwulska and Robin Byron. [Photograph: Candida Rolla, 2023]

JG: We have heard that Māori heritage and the conservation of marae buildings have long been an important aspect of Salmond Reed's work. At a recent conference in Sydney, I heard an Indigenous Australian speaker comment that she used to use the word "heritage," but has now largely stopped using it and tends to use the word "culture" instead. Rau, what are your thoughts on these words—"heritage" and "culture"—do you see them as the same or different?

Rau Hoskins (RH): Tēnā koe Julia—tuatahi e tika ana me mihi au ki a koe e Ani, koutou ki tō whānau i te wehenga ō tō hoa Rangatira. No reira e Jeremy, haere, haere, hoki atu rā.

I think the use of English terminology in the world of Māori architecture is in flux. And I think the terms that are being used in many different forums are under scrutiny right now. The term "urban design" is something that we in the Māori architectural profession have really pushed against, because the notion of urban design, in the mind's eye, tends to exclude the people. It has a notion of urbanity, of buildings, modified environments, and when we talk about urban design in Māori communities, it's just unhelpful. And similarly with terms like "heritage". You use the term heritage in Māori communities, on marae, and it's like, "Um..." So I think there's an ongoing role for us at the core of these conversations, and of course the wider heritage community, to be open to a process of really drilling into these names. And of course starting to use Māori names is one approach. And of course there are some English words which are better than others, or have got better resonance than others. We tend to use the term "cultural landscapes" instead of urban design. And I think the word culture has at least got some resonance there. I think it would be good to have an Indigenous forum at some point where we are across Australia, Hawai'i, North America, and into

Fig. 6 Sarosh Mulla and Rau Hoskins. [Photograph: Candida Rolla, 2023]

Norway, of course, and Canada, we can start to have some similar conversations that we've had in other areas. So I think the short answer is that there's work to be done and conversations to be had and some of those are beginning.

JG: Could you also please tell us about Māori understandings of, or attitudes towards, heritage listings and scheduling within Māori communities that you've worked with, either with marae buildings or buildings outside of the marae situation.

RH: As I sat in at my first Heritage New Zealand board meeting a couple of months ago, there was a lot of angst there about, you know, why marae aren't listing their buildings and listing themselves as entities. And I did mention that from all the marae projects I've been involved with, any perception that there's any other entity with a stamp of authority over those last remaining bastions of rangatiratanga will be resisted. And the next question is, what's the benefit? You know, what is the benefit? Does it automatically mean that we get Ōranga Marae [Department of Internal Affairs] funding? Well, no. But what I have seen is that Māori are quite keen to embrace those types of protections outside of the marae environment. We have a kōhatu [significant rock] one kilometre up the road from our marae. It used to be a kōhatu where tūpāpaku [deceased] were laid during the journeys north and south, and that's right on the main State Highway 1. So places like that we're very keen to use what protections there may be to stop, you know, Transit New Zealand and Waka Kotahi and other entities from just widening the road when they want to and just seeing this as any other rock. So I think in terms of the listings process, none of these processes were devised with Māori. There's a lot of re-work to be done in this space, and I guess it's fair to say that ten years ago I would have declined an invitation to sit on the Heritage New Zealand board, but could see enough progress to want to join this year.

JG: We have also heard that Salmond Reed have often collaborated with other architecture practices on design projects for the redevelopment or reuse of heritage buildings. Pamela, could you tell us how some of these collaborations have worked, particularly in relation to design, and should the conservation input be more strongly recognised as design input?

PD: Yes, absolutely it should, conservation input should be recognised as design input. Our design philosophy will always be to respect and work with existing buildings and their authenticity—respecting the original design intentions of that building, and respecting the materials already used in a building. We find that this helps us to deliver better design solutions, where materials are integrated better with one another, regardless of whether changes are subtle or dramatic. Design matters such as material choice, proportions, and final execution to us are fundamental and the end result is always to seek design excellence.

Conservation for us is asking the question, how long has this been here for? How much longer can we make it last? And for new design, elements or whole pieces—how long do we intend this to last? 50 years? 100 years? 1000 years?

When we've worked on projects where our input using the conservation approach has been valued, the results can be fantastic, albeit subtle, because the ideas have been absorbed and form part of the design, which shows that the design process has benefitted from this philosophy leading to a great result. One isn't over-riding the other.

On projects where guidance hasn't been taken on board, the results can be tragic for a building and for the owner—an example of this can be a disagreement on the approach to weathertightness. In a masonry building with materials that are meant to allow for moisture movement through the walls, which is an inherent quality of that material, if this pathway is blocked by a thick waterproofing coating, these tend to prevent moisture getting in, but in masonry walls it prohibits the moisture movement and stops the pathways from working efficiently, so now you have a building that has an irreversible modern coating on the outside and the interior will be in a constant state of damp, with constant efflorescence, and a programme of ongoing interruptions for a building owner who will be quite frustrated by a programme of regular maintenance that stops them from using their building all the time.

The quality that we as conservation architects share with our peers is that first and foremost, Jeremy, myself, and other conservation architects in New Zealand first trained and qualified as design architects, and the practice has a collaboration process that includes our design architects—Lloyd, Rosalie, Peter Reed, Rachel Allen, Philip Graham, our British-trained conservation architect Ali deHora, and building surveyors Tracey and Phillip Hartley—to all of us the process is the same, that conservation is a design parameter, not unlike working with existing contours of a landscape, or a maximum height-to-boundary relationship. Conservation as design provides us with a mechanism and strategy for managing change, of which we are aided through our intimate knowledge of building materials.

And I'll finish with a quote from Jeremy: "In the preservation of historic buildings, however, it is those without imagination in the present who impoverish the future."

JG: Paola, the reuse of existing buildings aligns with the imperative to design for a more sustainable future, because it makes use of existing materials and their embodied energy and helps to minimise waste. What are some of the key findings from your research in this field, including retrofitting for improved environmental performance?

PB: Well, it's very aligned with something Pamela just said. I'm really glad to

find this approach in common. Let's start from the concept that sustainability starts with historic buildings, way before starting with new buildings. In heritage conservation, maximising the use of existing materials, existing infrastructure, reduces waste and preserves all the historic character and the extraordinary craftsmanship that we have in our cities and buildings. One important first assumption for working on historic buildings is to consider them as non-renewable resources. We can't have them back once they are lost, and sometimes when we don't plan our conservation work correctly, we can risk losing them. Now, today, we also have to deal with all the important aspects and risks related to climate change. We need to consider that historic buildings are more sensitive to climatic changes and severe weather events. They are more sensitive to other natural pressures like earthquakes. And we know that very well in New Zealand and in Italy. They are more sensitive to the effects of neglect, sub-use, and poor indoor conditions. Sub-use of heritage buildings is very dangerous because it doesn't preserve them as living bodies. They need to work as living bodies in order for them to work properly. But that, of course, involves considerations that are beyond the materiality and beyond their material significance. Another key concept in retrofitting and working with heritage buildings to me is the distance between minimum performance requirements to be achieved and performance improvement. To me, when we work with historic buildings, we have to talk about performance improvement. Do the best you can with the resources that are available in the building and by respecting the building. And let's not want necessarily to meet predefined standards, because, and I go back to the point of the case-by-case that I mentioned earlier, that will never work across the board. So when we enhance the existing capability and opportunities in the historic building, we have done a good job in retaining the heritage and improving the qualities in order for them to withstand the future events—climatic events, natural events.

Energy efficiency in historic buildings is not only related to reducing operational carbon. I hear oftentimes people saying, "Yeah, I've changed existing bulbs to LED and that's energy efficient." Yes, it is. But there's much more beyond that. We need to look at how, in a concerted way, we can improve the energy quality of the building while reducing the causes of decay, because that can have huge impacts on the material loss and the loss of heritage. Most of the time we have infiltration in the building, we have air infiltration, thermal asymmetries, fluctuations of temperature, indoor thermal bridges, and all these will cause condensation that will end up, in the long run, in material decay because of mould growth and so forth.

There was a very important key moment in the theory of conservation, in my view, and that happened around 2015. It was when Giovanni Carbonara started talking about energy efficiency as a protection tool. Hearing that message from a conservationist was really powerful because it was not coming from an architect, it was not coming from an engineer, it was not coming from a designer, it was coming from a conservation architect. And it was extremely powerful because before that. Conservationists had never accepted the concept of energy retrofit for heritage buildings, or barely accepted that. Yes, of course, they would acknowledge the embedded energy, thermal values, and performance of historic buildings, but never worked on improving those qualities. Energy retrofit also improves the indoor environmental quality and comfort conditions for the people, because we have more stable indoor temperature, we have more comfortable

environments for people to live in, to work in, and this keeps adding value to the concept of heritage buildings as living bodies.

For New Zealand, of course, we have another challenge, and it is again a thing in common with Italy: we have to combine energy efficiency with seismic strengthening. We've conducted some research here at the School of Architecture and Planning, especially through PhD work. One of my former students, Priscila Besen, has investigated the mutual benefits between seismic upgrades and energy retrofits in unreinforced masonry buildings in New Zealand, using case studies from Auckland, Wellington, and Dunedin, and she proved that contextually carrying out such works, especially in regards to the use of material that can contribute to increasing energy efficiency and increasing seismic resistance at the same time, like using plywood as diaphragms, can really, in a very powerful manner, contribute to both agendas. On the other side, though, we need to be very conscious that when we use, for instance, steel elements for the structural strengthening of buildings, we may create thermal bridges and that can exacerbate the energy condition of the building and produce the material decay that I mentioned before.

The big trouble for New Zealand in this moment is that there is no comprehensive example of good energy retrofit on historic buildings, especially in conjunction with seismic retrofit as well. There is little expertise among professionals, and there are no incentives from the central government to do that. So, this is really a call for action for everyone in these categories, to work together to advocate for that to happen. Of course, it is important always to remember that any solutions that we put forward for the energy retrofit of historic buildings need to be considerate of potential reversibility and compatibility, which are key conservation principles. We can never forget about those, especially in heritage buildings. And that's why extensive audits, analysis, energy audits, diagnostic tests on materials, on structures, before the development, before starting the project, are so key to the success of this process.

Another really important point is that we need to have the right people around the table, and we need to have them early rather than later. These include architects, engineers, quantity surveyors, but of course heritage specialists and conservation specialists need to be part of the process from the very beginning, before the design, during the design, during the construction, and I would suggest also during the first years of operation of the building, to understand how those strategies that have been put in place are working, whether they are successful or not, whether they are leading to expected results, whether people are using the building the way we meant and the way we thought they would use it, and that's for the preservation of the identity, of the heritage, of the fabric. Beyond energy efficiency, there is much more that leads to sustainable heritage conservation in sustainable heritage buildings, starting from the conservation site itself. There are a lot of mechanisms through which we can reduce the use of water in the conservation sites, the use of electricity, how we can integrate new materials that can, for instance, reduce the urban heat island and are at the same time compatible with the historic fabric. There's been a lot of advancements in terms of new materials for heritage conservation and the integration of renewable energy sources. We need to start thinking about future resilience and energy resilience of our buildings as a network, and heritage buildings are part of that network, again in a compatible manner, in a sensitive manner, also thinking

about the capability and potential of each building. We can't do everything on every building. We have to be selective. We have to be considerate. But as a whole, our cities can be efficient and resilient at the same time.

Adaptive reuse is another very good way of achieving sustainability in our heritage buildings. Retention of fabric is really important, but also again contributes to the effect of keeping buildings alive, and continuing and extending their lives. We can have more informed decisions about the use of materials with low emissions in terms of volatile organic compounds emissions, and that starts from the conservation-related treatments that we choose to use in our buildings. But of course, we also have everything that is related to what we call regional priorities. So also working with culturally sensitive practices and local traditional techniques that can inform a better way to work with our heritage. So engaging with all the people at the right moment is key for any project and particularly for energy retrofit projects, in my view.

JG: Robin, in your job, you are asked to comment on a lot of proposals to alter and add to heritage buildings. I imagine some of these would lift your spirit while others would be disheartening. Could you tell us about some of those that have excited you, and also about the kinds of proposals that make your heart sink.

RB: Fortunately, in my experience, most owners of heritage buildings appreciate the values that are associated with their places and try to do the right thing by them to maintain those values. Not always, of course.

In terms of the most heartening projects, I think that the regeneration of the warehouses in the Britomart precinct stands out for many reasons. The first is that Cooper and Company takes a long view of the conservation, upgrading, and adaptive reuse work they undertake on all the buildings in the precinct. Beyond the short-term immediate adaptation, they anticipate how in the future, if the building were to be further readapted or have a change of use, they plan for that, and therefore the investment they put into the building is able to accommodate and be flexible enough that change can be achieved relatively easily without starting over. I think that's one really important aspect.

Combined with this foresight, I think Cooper and Company also has a business savvy, and this helps to ensure that the buildings will have an ongoing sustainable economic use, enabling the buildings to stay alive, relevant, and appreciated by the people using them. This is important as there have been wonderful adaptive reuse projects elsewhere that for one reason or another languish, and don't immediately go on to enjoy successful new life in the same way. Victoria Park Market may be one of these examples where, following the conservation and adaptation of the mid-2000s, it hasn't experienced the activity and vibrancy it had pre-regeneration.

Above all, I think that Cooper and Company has always taken an approach where it looks to achieve high-quality treatment of the original material fabric of the buildings and their features. I know that the conservation work in the precinct was expertly guided from the beginning by Jeremy Salmond. And I don't know how he ever persuaded Cooper and Company to reconstruct that gigantic parapet on the P. Hayman Building—but he did! Jeremy had a lot of integrity and could be firm when required to achieve the best heritage outcomes. We can all be grateful for that.

But Cooper and Company's approach also combines thinking about new interventions in a way that are successfully integrated into the heritage buildings and their settings. And it demands that new design is of high quality commensurate with the high quality of the heritage buildings themselves. In this way, it looks to incorporate lasting, high-grade materials, with sensitive design articulation and detailing, and to a very high level of craft. I like the statement made by Cooper and Company's chief executive at the opening of Hotel Britomart. He said, "We ask our architects to make the old buildings feel new and the new buildings feel old."

I'm disheartened by the wilful neglect of heritage buildings. An example is the St James' Sunday School Hall in Mt Eden, where the underlying land value was of paramount interest, not the encumbrance of the heritage structure. And when a resource consent for demolition was applied for, it was refused. But then through the Environment Court appeal that decision was reversed and demolition was granted, albeit with a direction that the heritage materials of the building, when it was demolished, should be salvaged and reused in any new building instead of going to landfill. The judge in that decision said that while he appreciated there were important heritage values associated with the hall, health and safety concerns trumped heritage, a result due to the degraded state of the hall after all those years of neglect of the building. And it was especially sad, too, because through the Environment Court case there had been a scheme produced by Matthews and Matthews Architects which was very sensitive and very agreeable in looking at how the building could be retained and adaptively reused. It was costed and demonstrated that the building, if the retention and adaptive reuse were to happen, could have a viable economic use. And then, again sadly, the building was largely destroyed by an act of arson—not long after the decision came out from the Environment Court. And that, of course, sped up the demolition of an important place of heritage significance that will never be recovered.

JG: Sarosh, you spent quite a bit of time in Gisborne with Jeremy and Dame Anne, getting your Welcome Shelter built at their Waikereru property at Longbush. They weren't your clients as such, but you designed it for their land and built it there. Did they bring any client-type requirements to the project, or did they allow you a free rein with the design?

SM: That project was unlike anything that I had ever worked on or will ever work on. I came back from overseas and I was a couple months into a PhD with Andrew [Barrie] and Michael [Milojevic]. And I really didn't have a clear idea of where I was going. I think both of these guys knew that. I think it was just a suggestion to talk about it more widely, my research. I went and saw Jeremy in the office, and I remember him turning down Concert FM, and he said, "Well, you know, what are you working on?" And I talked about landscape and this definition of landscape and how we treat it and how architecture is applied and all of these kinds of layers of culture and heritage over the top. And he said, "Well, you better come and see what Anne and I are doing [at Waikereru], because all of the stuff you're talking about is happening." And I cheekily saw an opening and said, "You guys need a building." And he said, "Well, that's all very well, but we don't have any money for that." And I said, "Well, if you let me do a building, I'll figure the rest out." And I can't imagine anyone saying yes to that. But Jeremy did. And that was the start of five years of the most amazing adventure and lots of highs on site with huge groups of volunteers, many of whom are here. I remember standing in many ditches with Ryan [Mahon] digging in the rain and those

sorts of relationships all came out of Jeremy's, I suppose, belief originally in what you might call a pitch, but also just the kind of faith that both Jeremy and Anne put in me to, kind of, go for it. And there were very few restrictions. It was more a kind of discovery together. And that was just wonderful. There were several times through that project, because it was funded through donations and built by volunteers, that I wasn't entirely sure we'd make it. And in all of those moments, Jeremy was my rock. He got me through all of that and we became really close as a result. I miss those days on site and I miss him terribly.

JG: [to the audience] I know we're slightly over time, but I also know that we've got these five fantastic people, and I'm sure that lots of you are dying to ask them some questions. So maybe just one or two questions?

Member of the audience: Kia ora koutou. I'd like to ask Rau a question. I'm really interested in what you talked about as cultural landscape instead of urban design. And I'm interested to hear that expanded a little bit more in terms of the future of our country and how we negotiate tangata whenua and tangata titiri relationships and enhancing a dialogue with those in our cities and landscapes.

RH: I think because so much of our urban landscape is not of tangata whenua or mana whenua making, it's only in the last ten or fifteen years that hapū and iwi have been re-engaged in directly contributing to design outcomes in our city and town spaces. So I think there's a much greater emphasis at the moment from those groups in new work and not much affection for the colonial fabric of the cities which was actually exclusive of their identities and generally replicating of North American, European, British architecture. So I think that's a reality of where we are right now. And I think that in Tāmaki Makaurau we are on quite a positive journey in that space; it's not quite the same in other parts of the country. But we are seeing, mainly through our CCOs [council-controlled organisations], we're seeing good partnership relationships being forged, and in particular, our mana whenua artists being able to fulfil quite overt roles in reappropriating city spaces. And that's the key. You've got to be reasonably overt if you're going to convince your rangatahi that this is actually still their city, or is their city once again. You can't be too subtle about those interventions. And that causes tension with some individuals, some architects as well. But I think we are on a positive path. But it is variable around the motu. But I'm generally optimistic and of course, you know, working with you and Jeremy and FJC and Jasmax on the museum was an opportunity to reclaim that cultural edifice, that colonial edifice in fact. And while we were locked, literally locked into that space, into the 1969 and 1929 components of the museum, we did what we could and Jeremy was actually obviously very good to work with when of course he was dealing with an incredibly protected building. So that was a case in point of fleshing out those working relationships and enabling mana whenua to reclaim those critical parts of the city, which they have certainly felt excluded from.

JG: Thank you so much to Dame Anne for joining us tonight, with your family, and also thank you, Lloyd, it is great to have heard the updates from Salmond Reed. Thank you to everyone on our fabulous panel, I appreciate your time and your experience very much. Thank you again, and I wish you all an enjoyable evening.