Good evening ladies and gentlemen, honoured guests. I would like to thank my peers in the Institute who have honoured me tonight. Those of you who know me will know that I am the result of a collaboration, and in that respect I would like to thank all of those architects and clients whom I have worked closely with in the making of buildings, and especially to acknowledge my family, each of whom are fired with their own passions yet find time to aid and abet my particular obsession.

It is appalling how quickly one goes from being an enfant terrible to a bemiddled old fart, but I have had a little time to get used to this honour and some of that time has involved a certain amount of reflection. My practice has straddled the digital age, my first project reviewed and illustrated in the monochromatic Home and Building of the early 1980s, my latest, disseminated in saturated full colour pixels via Facebook, Tumblr and a host of other instantaneous media.

*Continued next page...*
Beyond the Visual

I took to the glowing computer screen with a vengeance and love the deluge of beautiful images we are daily presented with. I do though have some reservations that cheap full colour printing and the plethora of lush architectural images that are hourly pushed onto our computers and phones is privileging sight at the expense of other senses. Just as image resolution escalates in devices to create yet sharper and more detailed visual images so we may become less aware, and understand less of touch, smell, air pressure, temperature and those other phenomena which might be in employed to understand the nature of architectural space.

Photographic images of Ronchamp reveal a sculptured form on a hillside, some beautifully suggesting the coloured light channelled to the lower chapel. None though convey the intense cold emanating from the floor in winter and the bleak sense of foreboding that the cold engenders. Thus the promise of redemption and salvation suggested in the painted window glass loses some of its meaning and intensity if the contrast of cold and colour is lost when experienced through vision alone.

While the diminution of the window glass’s moral leverage is a loss of opportunity, it is the diminution of our understanding of space and, more importantly, of our ability to adequately describe it that I lament. The creation and manipulation of space is our profession’s unique skill, it is what we are best at – yet space, other than the dark infinity of the universe, is something that clients are invariably mystified by, and that we architects address somewhat obliquely.

This is something of a paradox: as visual displays and communication technologies improve, the focus of subject matter shrinks. Thus through the wonders of Rhino, Grasshopper and the rest of the digital zoo, we make, and are presented with, increasingly flamboyant forms made with increasingly exotic materials. But for all this acuity of surface definition we are not much better informed about that which the surfaces enclose, yet it is just this potent void that is at the heart of our craft.

Architects concentration on something not immediately apparent, textable or even photographable makes architecture a damned opaque business to most people, and we need to do our best to make things a bit more accessible in this regard.

So I guess I am speaking out for the continued exploration and celebration of space, no expensive equipment, or software, required. We need only the empirical tools of observation, asking of our projects those questions posed by Donald Judd “how big is it, how close is this to that” to which we might add “what will its reverberation time be, what will be the movement of air pressure, the temperature and what will it smell like”? In the face of yet more beautiful imagery coming through the ether I thus urge a consideration of Richard Toy’s great line that the Plan is good, these will be registered, just as criticisms will. If you have a criticism please suggest a better idea. They say they’re
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AGM and Elections: As mentioned last month, the new CE noted at the AGM that we need to coordinate the NZIA’s views of the most salient issues for her to leverage her existing Wellington relationships. We await discussions as to what these may be.

Auckland Council Liaison and Legislative Input: The New Year is well and truly underway, and so it’s time to reignite the flame of discontent with Council’s process. One idea from those who have expressed concern has been received. I will convene a meeting of the agitators and put the pressure on.

Building Consenting: Again more follow up needed. This is a passion for Mike Middlebrook, so his energy will be appreciated.

Unitary Plan: Work being undertaken by the group giving feedback on the Unitary Plan is progressing well. Barry Copeland has done an excellent job of collating the UIG, focusing the topics and sharing the load. I anticipate an excellent submission from the Branch. Barry also did a great job collaring the Mayor at the new premises opening on April 29th, the result of which has been two sit down sessions with the Mayor and senior staff in the last two weeks. Well done to Barry and all who have provided thorough analysis and professional input into this process. Thank you.

I made a short presentation and sat on a discussion panel at a Committee for Auckland function yesterday evening. Co-panelists were David Halsey (Fletcher Residential) and Penny Hulse (Deputy Mayor). It was another opportunity to get our message across at the highest levels. The CFA will contact us regarding inputting into their submission on the Draft Plan.

Reminder: ‘comments’ (submissions) must be in by the end of the month. Be advised that these will be electronically sorted, so please use the same terminology as in the plan for your comments to be registered. Please also make comments where you believe the Plan is good, these will be registered, just as criticisms will. If you have a criticism please suggest a better idea. They say they’re open to ideas.

New NZIA Premises: The formal opening of the new National offices took place the evening of April 29th. This was a well-attended event with the Mayor officiating. The value of these shoulder-rubbing exercises is demonstrated in the ‘Unitary Plan’ section above. John Balasoglu is organizing more events in the new offices, these include: Sponsors and patrons; Allied professionals - feedback I have received is that the Allied Professional Membership is invisible to outsiders. Here’s a chance to make it right. Student piss up - in my view, we need to get more of these energetic future architects closer to the Institute; ‘BYO night(s)’ - another idea to get members to visit the national office (Auckland Branch Clubrooms!)

Local Awards: Finding a venue is hard, but there is progress. With a little shuffling of the awards budget (less on venue more on festivities) I have the sense that this year’s awards evening will be a true celebration- watch this space.

Squirrel Fund: Standing message - got a worthy cause with a compelling story? Please share. Andrew Barrie has a pretty good template for an application. Please contact him or me. a.barrie@ auckland.ac.nz or richard@peddlethorp.co.nz.

NZIA Calendar: June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tue, 11th</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Environmental Issues Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, 16th</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>The Authentic City (repeated Fri, 21st, 7:30 p.m.) GAPS, 17A Powell Street, Avondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 21st</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Waterproofing Seminar Pullman Hotel, Cnr Waterloo Quadrant &amp; Princes Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 24th</td>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 5:15 p.m.</td>
<td>NZIA CPD Days 2013 ASB Showground, Greenlane, Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue, 25th</td>
<td>8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>NZIA CPD Days 2013 ASB Showground, Greenlane, Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on p.5...
If only you could make a copybook presentation every time. Well, with us you actually can!

Send us your plans, profiles, submissions, specifications, reviews or recommendations. We’ll not only copy them but also enlarge, reduce, collate, bind, finish, mount, laminate or whatever else you want us to do with them. You really will have a Copybook presentation. And we can pick up and deliver.

Call us at Copybook now and experience what it is that makes us original.

Ph 303 4716 copy@copybook.co.nz www.copybook.co.nz

---

Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland has a unique geography, with an extensive coastline abutting urban areas. While architects and planners often discuss the importance of “the waterfront” in our city, the view of this watery edge is frequently restricted to the inner city and the exclusive beach suburbs. However Auckland “fronts” the water in many different ways, most of which are ignored in an urban sense. The space resulting from one of these ways is the Te Whau (The Whau River estuary).

Te Whau bisects the inner west of Auckland. Its path creates a portage, connecting the Waiomatā and Manukau harbours, permitting the movement of waka between the east and west coasts without the need to circumnavigate the upper North Island. This portage has seen over 1000 years of occupation and use. Prior to European colonisation of Auckland, Te Whau was one of the main active frameworks of social connection and economic production along the coastlines of Tāmaki. In the colonial economy it played a crucial role in the settlement and urbanisation of Auckland’s West, as both a transport route for food, from areas south of the isthmus, and as a source of clay. Along the riverbanks, numerous brick and pipe works produced an astonishing array of goods, all shipped by barge along the waterway to building sites in the inner city. In latter decades, however, Te Whau lost its importance. No longer a transport route, and for much of the recent past a boundary between municipalities, it increasingly became the site of multiple conflicts across jurisdictional, economic, land use and natural systems. Aesthetically unremarkable, Te Whau now moves as a muddy tide through the mangroves to residential and industrial spaces revealing nothing of the crucial role it has played in the inhabitation of this city.

Continued next page...
MUDDY URBANISM was a special urban-research workshop at the University of Auckland School of Architecture and Planning that engaged in the critical mapping of Te Whau in order to visualise the many conflicts that have been hidden from institutional thinking and to propose new interfaces between urban policy, ecological systems and community participation for the regeneration of this catchment.

This studio amplified the local as a critical site of intervention to design operational frameworks for rethinking existing land use, public and environmental infrastructure, and neighbourhood-based socio-economic development, in order to reimagine a productive coastline for the many different waterfronts of Ōrākei Mākaurau Auckland.

MUDDY URBANISM was one project in the 5th Auckland Triennial Lab, curated by Hou Hanru. It was led by Kathy Waghorn from the University of Auckland School of Architecture and Planning in collaboration with Teddy Cruz (San Diego) as a guest of the School. Below, Teddy presents his thoughts on the Muddy Urbanism project, its importance for students, and its relationship to a wider social and political agenda for architecture.

Teddy Cruz: It’s really about engaging in the issues and conditions of the site and its history, and also beginning to find ways of those conflicts being projected. I’m interested in that set of dynamics. On one hand, the conversation is organised around issues of concern by truly understanding the specificity of the political as inscribed in a particular territory. So, the opportunity for me coming here was exactly that, to be familiar, to become a part of a conversation, but also become aware of the very specific set of issues across a variety of registers from social, political, and economic to cultural dynamics in the area. For me, that became an emblematic aspect of what the triennial can produce – the opportunity of engaging in the meeting of knowledge.

I came with my own set of procedures from my own history and engagement with the particular area where I work in the Tijuana and San Diego border. As I came to encounter the investigation done by the students with Kathy – in that sort of meeting of those processes – a lot of conversations began to emerge that were truly operational in reimagining not only the potential of these spaces but the possibilities of transformation of institutional thinking that can be enabled by the meeting of that knowledge.

In a sense, as I was mentioning to the students, this became a learning experience for me because I was introduced to a very specific situation – the Whau River. Not only its current condition as almost forgotten, but also at times I imagine it almost as an invisible natural system to the institutions. I began to see it as a dumping site at times or an indifferent relic, a type of left over space. It wasn’t doing that much or producing much in terms of social, cultural or public space. As Kathy and the students guided me through those environments, it truly resonated and echoed the types of institutional indifference that I’d been engaging in my own locality; the institutional stupidity that has enabled the types of conflicts or collisions across communities and jurisdictions; the types of separations between urban policies that tend to operate in a faulty way, unable to include the kinds of bottom up natural and social economic dynamics. So, the same types of issues began to surface.

We then began to construct a process throughout barely a week of work – which is another thing, that this is a very difficult issue and requires a deep level of involvement to make sense of the issues, a luxury I did not have. But nevertheless, because of the intelligence of the kind of work Kathy and the students had already produced, there was a fertile platform to begin with, for me at least, in order to then engage in a one-week workshop where the effort was to attempt to organise the kind of epistemological systems, the kind of theoretical reflections, the types of operational concepts that the process itself had produced.

In other words, the students produced propositions – at times buildings, at times reflections on historical processes – a variety of approaches that produced a kind of cloud of not only of propositions but issues, conditions as well. I’ve been quite interested in the construction and designing of conditions within which opportunities can be organised. Not only material systems as an architect but really propositions in rethinking urban policy, economics – or a kind of political economy of urban development – and so on. So simply, the exercise became, with the students, a conversation. It was really organising what I ended up reflecting on as the architecture of a conversation.

Taking as a point of departure, the stuff, the things the students produced and also the pieces of thinking they approximated and trying to extract from all of that a series of maps or conceptual diagrams. These could give us very pointed provocations about how to critique institutions, about how to amplify the conflicts that we were dealing with, how to even reimagine certain definitions. For example, one that I carried with me, but was also enabled here, was the possibility of rethinking the meaning of infrastructure as a monofunctional thing, as a top down large project that is indifferent to the smaller scales and the emergent informal dynamics in the city. Or infrastructure as a way of mediating and organising complexity, as one of the students of Kathy suggested in the conversations.

The work the students produced was so rich in sets of relations from which to theorise. I love this notion where reality demands a new theory. I think it’s important to say that the students were engaged in the construction of a theory and of a language as we were moving through the projects and the sites.

Teddy Cruz Biography

As a research-based practice Estudio Teddy Cruz has amplified urban conflict as a productive zone of controversy leading to constructive dialogue and new modes of intervention into established politics and economics of development in marginal neighborhoods as sites of artistic experimentation. In 2008 Cruz represented the US in the Venice Architecture Biennial and in 2010 was part of the important exhibition Small Scale: Big Change New Architects of Social Engagement at the Museum of Modern Art. In 2011 he was the recipient of a Ford Foundation Visionaries Award. Teddy Cruz is currently a professor in public culture and urbanism in the Visual Arts Department at University of California, San Diego, and the co-founder of the Center for Urban Ecologies.

Announcing Block Lecture 2013

The Block Foundation is pleased to invite Block readers to a formal lecture on the ‘state of the art’ to be delivered by David Mitchell, director of Mitchell-Stout Architects, NZIA Gold Medallist, and leading New Zealand Architect.

David’s lecture will be delivered at the Northern Club on August 1st at 6:30pm. The evening will include a three course dinner. Tickets are $95 and include dinner and drinks. Dress will be formal and numbers will be limited.

Previous Block lectures have been fully subscribed so we urge you to reserve your place by contacting Sean Flanagan at Cheshire Architects – sean@cheshirearchitects.com.
In addition to fostering GPS in partnership with other interest projects, the Council on all major projects, such as by incentivising higher additional frameworks to encourage developers to work with the non-statutory and is still in development. The Council is instituting more structured engagement with architects may be a challenge.

council’s role is to enable positive development through statutory information portal for Aucklanders to learn about the UP and to discuss what they think about the proposal. Megan emphasised that the key emphasis of UP is “quality compact city”, in which the council’s role is to enable positive development through statutory reinforcements. I think that achieving ‘quality design’ without more structured engagement with architects may be a challenge especially given that the Architectural Design Manual is going to be non-statutory and is still in development. The Council is instituting additional frameworks to encourage developers to work with the Council on all major projects, such as by incentivising higher buildings in zones identified for intensification.

Comité for Auckland Update – May 7th

The four teams had the second Dragon’s Den session with CFA alumni and stakeholders to report back on the progress on the legacy projects. See last month’s report for more detail on the four projects.

Guerrilla Playspaces (GPS) General Update

In addition to fostering GPS in partnership with other interest groups in this space (AUT creative technologies, University of Auckland), the team has elected to pursue its own installations as part of the pilot. GPS has drilled down from over 80 concepts to just 6, out of which at least 4 will be built before November 2013. Each idea has been selected on the basis of achieving the key principles of GPS (connecting communities, encourage play, make it fun, create vibrant spaces, bring a sense of wonder, improve well being), but also rates highly in terms of environmental impact, cost, and feasibility. See attached inspiration board for the six ideas: retrofitting bus shelters – light therapy, surveillance, playing with light; flower petal seats – mobile kid-sized seats and tables in flower shape; guerrilla lounge – makeshift parasitic tubing that creates seats onto existing structure or parts of building to offer contemplative spaces; path less travelled – maze constructed adjacent to existing pathways; pop-up play – recyclable, child-friendly ‘noodles’ that are deployed into a space for fun, impromptu play; volcanic cone – inspired by Auckland’s volcanoes

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND REPORT: Mike Davis

The 5th Auckland Triennial was opened by the Mayor on May 9th to much fanfare. Central to the Triennial is The Lab, located in the Chartwell Gallery of the Auckland Art Gallery. Over the next three months it will feature work from 5 groups of contributors including 3 from UoA: Kathy Waghorn (with Teddy Cruz), Andrew Barrie, and Sarosh Mulla. Andrew Barrie also collaborated with Shanghai-based artist Michael Lin and architects Atelier Bow Wow to create the Model Home (2013) project also exhibited in the Auckland Art Gallery. The Triennial has also helped bring international visitors Teddy Cruz and Bijoy Jain of Studio Mumbai into our public program.

Melanie Pau with Yusef Patel, and Stefan Panovski were received first place in the prestigious international 2013 Bentley Student Design Competition for their project, “Onehunga Primary School Entranceway.” It took the award in the “Engineering-Structural, Mining, or Hydro/water Disciplines” category.

Appointments to two positions in Sustainability are imminent.

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND STUDENT REPORT: Adam Hunt

The University of Auckland is well in to the second half of the semester, with graduation and the SoAP prize giving taking place last week.

The beginning of the second half of the semester saw the commencing of the intensive studio run by Teddy Cruz from research-based practice Estudio Teddy Cruz. The studio produced interesting studies of the wider issues surrounding the Whau River.

Communique 2013 has provided a wide range of lectures from international architects such as Bijoy Jain from well-known Indian based practice Studio Mumbai, described as a human infrastructure of skilled craftsman and architects who design and build work directly. Students also listened to Sarosh Mulla; an Auckland based designer working across academic design research, professional practice and experimental architecture. A graduate of the University of Auckland, in 2011 he was selected as one of the top twenty-four architectural graduates in the world.

Last week saw the opening of The Lab, a joint project between the architecture and spatial design faculties of AUT University, the University of Auckland and UNITEC. Working alongside students, local academics, designers and architects are developing a series of two to three-week-long interdisciplinary design projects as part of the 5th Auckland Triennial.

URBAN ISSUES GROUP: Barry Copeland

Unitary Plan – Meetings with Mayor Len Brown: Following an opportunistic discussion with the Mayor at the opening of the new NZIA National Office, he invited us to discuss about our
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concerns in advance of the end-May submissions deadline. A small group had two short meetings with him on 3rd and again on 8th May, the latter attended by Penny Pirrit. The thrust of the discussion was primarily concerned with both proposed zones for intensification and the need to update development control rules to assist current housing shortages by making more effective use of land. We also touched on the NZIA’s strong concerns regarding the protection of Auckland’s unique character (its villages and landscape), and the need for the planning process to encourage creativity and quality. We made the point that these are not just town planning issues but also architecture and urban design issues. He made the welcome suggestion for round table meetings next month (after the submissions on the Draft are in).

Unitary Plan – NZIA Submission: Since the last UIG meeting a small group has been active putting together a detailed response – David Gibbs (intensification and zoning maps), Peter Hollenstein (quality issues), Julie Stout (volcanic cones, landscape), Graeme Scott (control rules), Barry Copeland (transport). Other strands to be co-ordinated are sustainability (Alec Couchman/Megan Rule), business zones (Christina van Bohemen) and heritage (Adam Wild). Others are also contributing.

The timeframe is very tight:
• Friday May 17th - draft sections completed
• Tuesday May 21st - UIG meeting to discuss and agree on drafts
• Wed May 22nd Tidy up drafts for inclusion in newsletter
• Friday May 24th publish draft submission in NZIA email newsletter
• May 22nd to 31st - finalize drafts and lodge on Friday 31st May

An editorial meeting involving Teena H-P and John W is projected on 8 May, the latter attended by Penny Pirrit. The thrust of the meeting was primarily concerned with both proposed zones for intensification and the need to update development control rules to assist current housing shortages by making more effective use of land. We also touched on the NZIA’s strong concerns regarding the protection of Auckland’s unique character (its villages and landscape), and the need for the planning process to encourage creativity and quality. We made the point that these are not just town planning issues but also architecture and urban design issues. He made the welcome suggestion for round table meetings next month (after the submissions on the Draft are in).

Unitary Plan – NZIA Submission: Since the last UIG meeting a small group has been active putting together a detailed response – David Gibbs (intensification and zoning maps), Peter Hollenstein (quality issues), Julie Stout (volcanic cones, landscape), Graeme Scott (control rules), Barry Copeland (transport). Other strands to be co-ordinated are sustainability (Alec Couchman/Megan Rule), business zones (Christina van Bohemen) and heritage (Adam Wild). Others are also contributing.

The timeframe is very tight:
• Friday May 17th - draft sections completed
• Tuesday May 21st - UIG meeting to discuss and agree on drafts
• Wed May 22nd Tidy up drafts for inclusion in newsletter
• Friday May 24th publish draft submission in NZIA email newsletter
• May 22nd to 31st - finalize drafts and lodge on Friday 31st May

An editorial meeting involving Teena H-P and John W is projected on 8 May, the latter attended by Penny Pirrit. The thrust of the meeting was primarily concerned with both proposed zones for intensification and the need to update development control rules to assist current housing shortages by making more effective use of land. We also touched on the NZIA’s strong concerns regarding the protection of Auckland’s unique character (its villages and landscape), and the need for the planning process to encourage creativity and quality. We made the point that these are not just town planning issues but also architecture and urban design issues. He made the welcome suggestion for round table meetings next month (after the submissions on the Draft are in).

UNITEC REPORT: Tony van Raat

The School welcomes Caterina Steiner from Siena and Alberto Foyo from New York, both now with us for spells teaching as Visiting Professors until the end of the semester.

Mark Mismash is coordinating with Architecture for Humanity to deliver a project in the second semester designing, documenting and rebuilding facilities at a swimming pool in New Brighton, part of the ongoing Christchurch rebuild. This work is done in close association with community groups.

Still in Christchurch a group of last year’s graduates have been working with David Mitchell and Julie Stout on a project to rebuild a school extensively damaged in the earthquakes. It now seems likely that this will end up as a commission for Mitchell & Stout, which would be a pleasing outcome to the process.

The School is operating study trips to Italy and to Shanghai during the mid-year break. The Italy project, co-taught with universities in China and in Florence, is a cultural center for the Chinese population of the Tuscan city of Prato. In Shanghai students will be working at the Sino-Finnish Centre, a cooperative establishment of Tongji and Aalto Universities where they will be researching issues of urban density.

Dr Schnoor has started work on planning the 2014 SAHANZ conference, of which the theme is ‘Translations’. It will be held in Auckland in early July 2014.

UNITEC STUDENT REPORT: Stu Penno

Well into the second quarter of the first semester, the First Year Bachelor students have settled into life at Unitec. Using the work explored in the first part of the semester, the students are now exploring descriptive geometry to develop their work further.

Meanwhile the First Year Masters students have New York architect Alberto Foyo as a visiting professor in studio. Also continuing on from their first quarter work, their projects explore, and try to create, a link between the urban and rural in Auckland both aesthetically and conceptually.

Second Year Masters have completed the first round of crits for the year. The 30-minute critiques provided good feedback for the continued development of their projects. Some interesting projects are developing. The next round of crits are scheduled for June, while mid-year examinations are likely to take place in July.

Planning is also well underway for two Unitec student trips to take place at the end of the first semester. The first trip sees students off to Shanghai to explore urban density at the Sino-Finnish Centre. While the second trip sees Unitec students off to Prato, in Italy, to undertake a project looking at the creation of a Chinese cultural center within the city.
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