chapter six

dunedin precinct plans
6.1 Dunedin Precinct Plans

Introduction

The preceding chapters have discussed the Master Plan for the campus as a whole, setting out the broad principles and overall shape of the campus. In this section, each part of the campus is reviewed in more detail to illustrate how the Master Plan principles can be applied in the form of spaces and buildings in each area. In order to do this, the campus has been divided into Precincts, each covering an area of approximately 450 metres square, or two “Kettle grids” of the city. Using this approach the campus can be read as forming eight Precincts arranged in three arms radiating north, east and south from a central area around the Union lawn. Each of these eight Precincts is described in the following pages.

It should be noted that, even though these precinct plans provide a higher level of specificity, they remain conceptual and will require further localised briefing, planning and architectural design development. To assist this subsequent process, a commentary on design guidelines is provided for each.
6.2 Central Precinct

Role in the campus

The Central Precinct is both spatially and functionally the heart of the modern campus, at the crossroads of pedestrian movement. It currently contains the most-used core functions for the majority of students and staff. The Master Plan proposes to reinforce the social, cultural and educational role of this central Precinct in the campus. The central precinct, perhaps more than all others, will be the place where the aspirations to reinforce collegial culture, to promote interaction and dialogue, and for the University to be expressed as a whole, will be most vividly realised.

Precinct Analysis

1. The Union Lawn is currently a pleasant but under-performing, landscaped space surrounded for the most part by indifferent buildings. It is understood that a refurbishment of the Union Building is planned and this will be a welcome initiative, but it is considered by the Master Plan team that additional (and different) food and beverage, recreational and social facilities would augment the Precinct’s role as the social heart of the campus.

2. Similarly, the block south of the Archway Building, bounded by Union Street, Leth Walk and the Water of Leith, is also considered to be under-performing. Designated the “Leith Bend” site for the purposes of this Master Plan, this is a geographically significant site, located at the heart of the campus and comprising the rock escarpment that forms the last turn in the Water of Leith before it heads to the sea. With the exception of the Home Science Building, two of the larger buildings on this site (the ITS Building and Gregory) are of limited architectural merit and the smaller ones either temporary or re-locatable. As such they represent a significant underutilisation of such an important location on the campus.

3. The Central Precinct is dominated by some of the University’s largest buildings. The Information Services Building (ISB) and adjacent Link Building form the educational heart of the Campus, containing the Central Library and significant informal study space. The ISB is of international significance as one of the best examples of its type, but it is suffering from capacity problems. Put simply, it is proving too popular with students.

4. The Richardson Building on the eastern side of the Union Lawn is the tallest on campus and a city landmark. However, its height also generates significant microclimate issues at its base, notably wind shear.

5. The Arts Building dominates Albany Street and is suffering from significant external degradation. This poor condition exacerbates its unattractive appearance.
Key projects and initiatives

The following projects are proposed in this precinct.

1. Upgrading of the Union Lawn
2. New public-facing buildings on the western and northern sides of the Union Lawn, replacing Smithells Gymnasium, Union Court, and the relocation of the HEDC villa at 65 Union Place
3. New podium to the Richardson Building and Castle Lecture Theatres
4. Expansion of the Union Building
5. Expansion of ground floor informal study space within the ISB by relocating non-essential functions
6. New covered walkway between the Link and Arts Buildings and re-landscaping of the adjacent courtyard
7. Development of a new Teaching and Learning Centre on the Leith Bend site
8. Review of the proposed flood mitigation works to the Water of Leith
9. Re-cladding and extension of the Arts Building
10. Upgrading of the proposed new bridge at Leith Walk
11. New landscaping of Union Street
12. Expansion of pedestrian crossing zone at Cumberland Street
13. Streetscape upgrading and re-zoning of Albany Street

These projects are described in more detail as follows.

1. **Upgrading of the Union Lawn**
   
The Master Plan proposes a complete transformation of the Union Lawn, with new lawns, artwork and paving designed to respond to the complex patterns of pedestrian movement across the space, to improve its amenity and utilisation and to expand its usable area to enable it to accommodate large scale events, such as farmers’ markets.

2. **New public facing buildings by Union Lawn**
   
The new buildings proposed to replace the Smithells Gymnasium and Union Court will be important in providing additional amenity and services in this Precinct. Intended to be highly transparent, they are proposed to accommodate a variety of food and beverage outlets that complement those in the Union Building, retail services, galleries and exhibition space. Upper levels could house OUSA activities, provide facilities for special interest groups such as international and/or postgraduate students and function and conference facilities. The ground floor of the building facing Cumberland Street is proposed to be open, or capable of being opened up, to enable the Union Lawn to be visible from Cumberland Street and to provide undercroft space for markets and other events. The intent is that these buildings attract student, staff and public patronage over extended hours, injecting life into the heart of the campus.

3. **New podium to the Richardson and Castle Street Lecture Theatres**
   
A new podium is proposed for the Richardson Building to open up the ground level areas of the building for informal study and break-out space. It is proposed that the new structure be highly transparent with internal and external walls of the Richardson building removed where practicable to increase the usable area and to provide views through to the Leith beyond. The new structure is also intended to provide a human-scaled active frontage to Union Lawn and mitigate high wind speeds at ground level caused by the tower. The height of the new structure should be consistent with that of the other buildings fronting the Union Lawn and its design will need to be carefully considered to retain the visual and physical integrity of the existing building.

4. **Expansion of the Union Building**
   
Rebuilding and extending the northern façade of the Union Building to create a more open frontage facing onto the new landscape of the Union Lawn will increase the social vitality of this north-facing, sunny location.
Information Services Building

As space becomes available elsewhere it is proposed that the ground and first floor levels of the ISB be opened up for informal study and student focused activity by relocating service and other administrative functions.

New covered walkway and courtyard

A new urban garden court is proposed to be created south of the Castle Lecture Theatres to add to the amenity provided by the existing grassed area, together with a new covered pedestrian link from the ISB and Link Building to the Arts Building as the first stage of a new pedestrian spine that will extend to the Wickliffe Press site to the east.

New Teaching and Learning Centre at Leith Bend

An arrangement of new buildings is proposed for the Leith bend site forming an extension to the historic core of the campus, allowed by the demolition of the Archway Lecture Theatres, Gregory Building, ITS Building and removal and relocation of the villas and temporary buildings located between them. This new complex of buildings is intended to create an extension to the sequence of asymmetrical spaces that forms the central axis of the historic quarter. A new quad is formed in front of the original arched gateway to the University, framed on either side by the Home Science Building and, on its eastern side adjacent to Leith Walk, by a new building of matching scale and form.

The southern side of this new quad is enclosed by a new building containing shared lecture theatres, arranged either side of a covered hall containing break-out space, informal meeting and seating areas supported by catering. The space will function in a similar way to the break-out space in the St David lecture theatre, but on a larger scale. The hall opens to the south onto a small triangular garden space, facing onto the bend of the Water of Leith. The garden is planted with native New Zealand tree species to create a rich natural habitat for native birds next to the river. The complex is proposed as a new architectural landmark of the campus, marking this as an important location where the extended historic axis of the campus intersects with the river bend.

The entire complex is intended as a centre for teaching for the University, with a rich diversity of teaching spaces, including experimental spaces, teaching laboratories, project rooms, advanced technology centre and exhibition and demonstration spaces, providing for structured teaching what the ISB provides for informal study and collaboration. This site, located as it is in the geographic heart of the campus and juxtaposed with the historic core, is considered particularly appropriate for this function.

Water of Leith flood mitigation works

Design work is understood to have already been completed by the ORC for flood mitigation works proposed for the Water of Leith as it passes through this part of the Campus. That design is understood to be based on the need to increase the height of the existing concrete retaining wall on the western side of the watercourse. While this may be effective in terms of flood-scenario hydrology, it also exacerbates the current situation of “containing” the river and denies the opportunity to give the riverscape a more natural appearance. It is contended that the proposed demolition of the ITS building, as is proposed under the Master Plan, will yield opportunities to simplify flood mitigation construction in this section of river, and also potentially change the flood hydrology. While a re-assessment of the design may result in aborted design work, it is contended that the potential cost savings from simplified construction could potentially offset the cost of redesign.

The Master Plan proposes that rather than vertically extending the current concrete walls, the western bank for the river should be modified to incorporate a stepped profile of landscaped terraces that provide better visual and physical access to the water and a more natural profile.
Arts Building

The Arts Building suffers from deterioration of its exterior but its basic internal configuration is sound with simple, column-free floors and a logical services and vertical access configuration. Accordingly, it is proposed that the repair of its external skin be extended to a complete re-cladding, incorporating the external balconies to yield more floor space. In addition, it is proposed that the ground floor be opened up and extended to provide break-out and informal study space for the Burns Lecture Theatres and that the building be extended to the east over the existing car park to provide additional floor space. This extension will require the demolition of the small brick villa located there but is configured to preserve the more substantial brick building on Albany Street in order to retain the character of the streetscape.

An important component of this extension will be the provision of ground level public spaces facing the river and of an undercover walkway or colonnade integrated into the building to provide a weather protected pedestrian link to the Precincts to the east.

Leith Walk Bridge

It is understood that the flood mitigation works require the demolition and re-building of the pedestrian bridge over the Leith at Leith Walk. It is recommended that the new bridge be designed to accommodate not only foot traffic but also motor vehicles, to enable controlled car access on a “shared zone” basis in this part of the campus, supporting permeability and access.

Union Street landscaping

With the development of the University Plaza, the importance of Union Street as a pedestrian connector between the campus core and its eastern Precincts has been considerably increased. It is considered that the current landscaping of the Union Street mall between Castle Walk and Leith Walk belies the importance of this link. As the paving on the Union Street Bridge is degrading and given that the Master Plan proposes the demolition of the Archway Lecture Theatres and their replacement with a new quadrangle, it is appropriate to consider re-landscaping the Union Street mall in a way that reinforces its importance as a pedestrian link and opens it up as an important civic space in the heart of the campus. This would suggest the removal of the existing raised garden beds and the provision of new contemporary paving that acts as a counterpoint to the historic structures that surround it.

Cumberland Street pedestrian zone

The current crossing at Cumberland Street channels pedestrians from the Museum Reserve into the Link Building. While there is nothing inherently wrong with this, it belies the importance of the connection from the western and southern parts of the campus to the Union Lawn. Accordingly, it is recommended that this pedestrian crossing be expanded to strengthen that connection.

Albany Street

Albany Street is an important University Precinct, albeit controlled by the University only on one side and even then, for only part of its length. It forms the transition between the city and the University, it provides a primary link to Anzac Avenue and the University Plaza, and it fronts the University’s most significant development sites. It is important that it be vibrant and contributes to the campus experience. It is therefore recommended that the University and the City work together to upgrade the streetscape, imposing traffic calming at intersections, planting street trees and extending / reinstating 90° parking to increase parking capacity and slow traffic flows. It is also recommended that the commercial development on its southern side be encouraged to expand the cafes and restaurants already located there and provide opportunities for start-up and incubator businesses and other organisations seeking a close but independent relationship with the University.
Design guidelines – Leith Bend

The historic core includes the original buildings of the University campus together with new buildings on the Leith Bend site set in a garden landscape of botanical planting and lawns. The Clocktower is widely recognised as being the central icon of the University.

Buildings in this area should be scaled to respect the scale and mass of their historic neighbours. The proposed building forming a pair with the Home Science Building on Leith Bend should be of a matching footprint and scale.

Buildings should be of a solid masonry appearance. Close to the historic buildings blue-stone should be used. Elsewhere other stone and concrete finishes may be used.

Buildings of the highest architectural quality are required in this area, reflecting its historic and cultural significance for the campus. The architectural language to be selected should seek to express the contemporary culture of the campus while finding harmonious connections with the historic landmarks, in calm dignified buildings and places that are built to last.

Design guidelines – Union Lawn

The Union Lawn is the social heart of the campus. The Master Plan intention is to promote social and interactive uses at the ground level of all buildings, around a new central landscape designed to accommodate pedestrian movement at this central crossroads of the campus.

Buildings around the Union Lawn should be of a low scale to allow sunlight into the public areas - no more than three storeys. The new base to the Richardson Building should conform to this massing guideline to maintain a uniform physical boundary to the Lawn, thus providing a human scale to the space.

Buildings surrounding the Lawn should be light and transparent, promoting interaction and visibility between the Lawn and the activity within the buildings. The use of
colour to express the vitality and life of this part of the campus should be considered in the form of coloured glass, metal panelling and the use of awnings and other lighter, fabric materials.

The focus of this location should be the landscape lawn and the mature trees that fill the space. The architectural language should be simple and neutral, expressing the flexible nature of the space accommodated.

The new base to the Richardson Building should be designed to provide a more open and public aspect to the ground level areas, including the provision of informal seating and space for interaction and meetings. The design should open up views from the Union Lawn under the building to the Leith. The architecture here should be a clear response to the strong architectural massing and form of the Richardson Building. In particular the new extension should respond to the scale of the base, possibly extending up to cover the mass concrete elevations that form the base of the tower. The form of the extension should also respond to the vertical disaggregation of the Richardson in order to retain the strong vertical emphasis of the composition.

**Design guidelines – Arts Building**

The proposed re-cladding and extension of the Arts Building provides an opportunity to re-make its identity. Its height and bulk and the proximity to the ISB suggest a contemporary architectural expression, incorporating advanced sustainability measures to provide protection from the western sun. As a visual composition it is suggested that it should act as a counterpoint to, rather than a copy of the “slick modernism” of the ISB.
Property that would need to be acquired by the University in order to allow the full implementation of the Master Plan proposal.

Minimum impact option showing precinct delivery without acquiring additional property.
6.3 North Central Precinct

Role in the campus

The Water of Leith divides the North Central Precinct into two contrasting areas. To the west the waterside gardens and landscape provide a busy north-south pedestrian route along the line of Castle Street. The space is enclosed on its western side by the Sciences buildings.

On the eastern river bank the lawns and gardens provide a memorable setting for the picturesque, gothic composition of the University’s historic core, comprising the Clocktower, Geology and Archway Buildings, Marama Hall, and the St David Street professorial houses.

The two sides are linked by the St David pedestrian bridge to the north and the Union Street pedestrian bridge to the south. The Staff Club, housed in the original School of Dentistry building, sits adjacent to the Union Street bridge on what is arguably one of the busiest, yet most picturesque sites on the campus.

While the west side of the Leith provides functional, hard-working academic spaces, the eastern side expresses tradition and a reverence for memory.

Precinct Analysis

There are issues and opportunities with each of the different zones of this Precinct.

1. The landscape spaces along the Leith will be remodelled as a consequence of the flood mitigation measures, which will see changes made to the river embankment and surrounding green space to increase the flooding capacity of the river. These works are discussed in more detail in the landscape section of the report.

2. The historic Precinct provides the defining iconic image of the University, particularly the Clocktower Building, with the sight of graduands and their families being photographed in front of this historic structure being a time-honoured tradition that spans the generations. Yet these buildings are largely inaccessible to the public and to many of the student body as well, except when on official business. It is considered a lost opportunity that these buildings are not more readily accessible. Another issue with this building is the administrative space located in its basement. This space is sub-optimal as a work environment and a number of the functions located there do not need to be in this building.

3. The Geology and Archway Buildings are being actively used for teaching and departmental space, which means they, too, are somewhat inaccessible to the wider public community. Marama Hall and the Allen Theatre are historic performance spaces located in and adjacent to the Archway Building that could benefit from refurbishment and wider public use, with both currently being primarily occupied by Music and Theatre Studies, respectively.
The buildings on the western side of the river accommodate departments from the Sciences and Health Sciences Divisions, with significant emphasis on laboratory and research space. This complex of laboratory-intensive buildings was constructed prior to the closure of Castle Street, and is serviced by loading docks that were once serviced from that street. Its closure to through traffic has resulted in the need to allow service vehicles, including some large trucks, to traverse what is now a closed pedestrian zone, which is problematic from the perspective of pedestrian safety and noise as well as being unsightly in what is otherwise a highly picturesque setting in the heart of the University. In this same area fronting the former Castle Street is also the University’s main plant rooms.

The Science buildings are all from an architectural period that was not renowned for the subtlety of its aesthetic and with the benefit of hindsight it would have been preferable that they not be so prominent in this part of the University. However the deterioration of their facades has and continues to yield opportunities to re-clad them to in part address this issue, as has already happened with the Microbiology Tower.

Of the five buildings (Science I, Science II, Biochemistry, Microbiology and Science III), the one that is the most problematic is Science II. The tallest and most visually prominent of the group, the building suffers from small and narrow floorplates and an unusual structure comprising an internal vertical concrete shear wall that bisects the floor plates. This has the dual effect of breaking the building down into small compartments and significantly limiting flexibility which is considered sub-optimal for contemporary science facilities.

Another issue with these buildings is that despite their close proximity, they are relatively disconnected from each other. While this is not necessarily a problem, it does represent a lost opportunity in terms of the interaction and collaboration that could result from a more meaningful connection. Another lost opportunity is the open spaces between Science I and Biochemistry and in front of the Microbiology Tower. These have an uneasy juxtaposition of open landscaped space and hardstand for the car parking and service deliveries that occur in both.

Reference has been made in the preceding Central Precinct Plan to the Union Street Bridge and the need for it to be re-landscaped. The Master Plan team also reviewed the role and nature of the St David Street pedestrian bridge. It is understood that this historic structure is proposed to be removed and then modified and reinstalled as part of the Leith flood mitigation works. The Master Plan team noted that its replacement with a bridge wide enough to take vehicles would provide a significantly more direct and appropriate form of access to the eastern bank of the Leith and the University’s historic core than is currently afforded by the circuitous route via Dundas Street. However, it was also noted during consultation that this issue has been canvassed previously and rigorously opposed by members of the University community on heritage grounds. Given this seeming lack of “appetite for change” on the issue, the proposal for a replacement bridge has not been included in the Master Plan, notwithstanding its seeming merit.
Key projects and initiatives

The following projects are proposed in this precinct.

1. Providing more public access to the Clocktower by creating an interpretive centre / museum / archive in the basement.
2. Relocating the Geology Department to allow the “Geology Building” to be restored and made available for general teaching use, enabling all students to experience it.
3. Reviewing the use of the two Professorial Houses on St. David Street to seek a more appropriate function that reflects their heritage significance.
4. Creation of new performance venues elsewhere on campus (see the “East” Precinct Plan) to enable Marama Hall to be released for more general University and public use and the restoration of the Allen Theatre as a “Great Hall” for functions and events that are more in keeping with its original design.
5. Review of the other uses of the Archway Building to enable it to be restored and made more publicly accessible.
7. Replacement of the Science II Building with a new building fronting Castle Walk and linking Science I, Biochemistry, Science III and the St David Lecture Theatre, including the creation of a new Hub for the northern campus.
8. Creation of two new landscaped quads in the existing interstitial Science courtyards.

These projects are described in more detail as follows.

1. Clocktower

The Clocktower Building has an important symbolic and ceremonial function, and it is appropriate that the University Executive be located there. However the entire building is given over to administrative functions which means that students and the public rarely have the opportunity to experience it. Furthermore, parts of the building, notably the basement, are not particularly appropriate for workspace given the limited natural light and somewhat cramped conditions. On upper levels, the building is highly compartmentalised. A facility with more open, flexible space could be more appropriate as an administrative workplace.

It is therefore recommended that the University consider a strategy to open up more of the building to public functions. One such use could be the provision of an interpretive and exhibition centre located in the basement, which is open to the public on a daily basis and which visitors could visit to understand the history of the University. This facility could also be used for rotating exhibitions, of which this Master Plan could be an example. It could also be used for archive purposes, be it for the University, or alumni, or both.

2. Geology Building

Apart from the historic Quad lecture theatres and the Geology Museum, this building is largely given over to the Geology Department and is therefore inaccessible to anyone other than students from that department. The “building” is actually a series of buildings that were originally separate, but which have been internally joined and modified over the years to the point where the internal layout is difficult and confusing to navigate. There are also significant access issues for Geology material (rocks, boulders and the like) which have to be manhandled up and down stairs to get them into the building. Despite the fact that it is understood to be much loved by the Geology staff, it is not a particularly functional environment for such a department.

For these reasons, it is proposed that new, purpose designed accommodation be provided elsewhere on the campus, preferably with good loading dock access, and the building be restored to its original configuration and adapted for use as general teaching and learning space, blending the heritage lecture theatres with contemporary seminar and study space. In this way, all students studying at the University can have the experience of undertaking classes in this historically significant facility.
3 St. David Street Professorial Houses
These four houses are accommodating functions that ideally would be consolidated elsewhere within their administrative and academic groupings. This would enable their restoration and use for more historically significant and/or publicly accessible purposes.

4 Marama Hall and the Allen Theatre
These two historic performance venues are currently dedicated to music and drama activities, respectively. While they are sometimes available for public use, they are dominated by the two groups to which they are allocated. It is a Master Plan recommendation that a new purpose-built performing arts facility be constructed (see East Precinct Plan) that would allow these venues to be released for more general access. It should also be noted that while the Allen Theatre has been substantially modified for its current use as a Drama Studio, the original interiors, notably the magnificent ceiling, are still intact. It is recommended that the modifications be removed and the interiors restored. This would provide the University with a small "great hall" for functions and events, which is something the University lacks outside the University Council Chamber and the dining rooms of the residential colleges.

5 Archway Building
The Archway Building, like Geology, has been substantially modified internally over the years to the point where the integrity and authenticity of the building has been lost. It is recommended that as new space becomes available elsewhere to house its current functions, this building be progressively restored to its original configuration.

6 Water of Leith
Considerable design work has been done by the University and the Otago Regional Council on flood mitigation works for the Leith in this part of the campus. The proposals that have resulted significantly improve the appearance and accessibility of the river. However the Master Plan recommends that this design work be revisited, for four reasons:
• The scope for the previous design work was for only a section of the river, whereas the Master Plan now identifies the need for the Leith to be considered as an important connector for the entire campus;
• The recommendation that the University develop a cultural strategy could add a new and important dimension to the landscaping and configuration, especially since the current proposal for a riverside promenade is particularly European in its derivation;
• The Master Plan objective of re-introducing native fauna to the river may affect the landscape strategy that was previously adopted; and
• The Master Plan team is concerned about the visual and physical proximity of the re-profiled west embankment to the Castle Street walk and the impact this will have on this important pedestrian space.

7 Science II

Of all the proposals made in the Master Plan, the concept of replacing the existing Science II building is one of the most significant in terms of the size of the building proposed to be demolished and the impact that the replacement building will have on the campus. The reasons for this proposal are three-fold:

1. The building is highly compartmentalised and inflexible in how it can be used internally, neither of which is appropriate for contemporary science facilities;
2. Its replacement would yield significant benefits for the academic departments located in this Precinct; and
3. Its replacement would yield significant benefits for the campus as a whole and this Precinct in particular.

The first consideration is not in itself grounds for demolition. While it does not function as well as it should, it does still function. Rather, the case for its replacement lies in the benefits that such a proposition would bring.

In terms of academic benefit, it is proposed that the replacement building act to link all the other buildings in this Precinct: Science I, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Science III and the St David complex. Its primary purpose would be informal and formal teaching and learning spaces on the lower levels and academic departments on the upper levels. Co-locating the academic departments would have the benefit of enabling greater collaboration and interaction, particularly across research activities. It
would also allow the academic space currently located in the buildings it connects to be vacated to enable their laboratory spaces to be expanded and upgraded. The end result would be the transformation of a group of disconnected, self-contained buildings into a cohesive, flexible and thoroughly “connected” teaching and research centre.

From a campus benefit perspective, the replacement of Science II will provide an opportunity to re-make the Castle Street pedestrian mall, with transparent, active frontages and a weather-protected colonnade providing shelter for pedestrians from North Dunedin and a new more appropriate architectural aesthetic fronting the river and the Clocktower Building beyond. By extending it across the eastern end of Science III and connecting to the St David complex this would enable the latter to be expanded into a full Precinct Hub for the northern parts of the campus.

It should be noted, however, that the building should not be continuous at all levels. Particularly important is the need to preserve the view of the Clocktower from Cumberland Street between Microbiology and Science III. Hence a connection here should be made on only one level, and through a transparent link. It is also important that the views through to the new courtyards in front of Microbiology and between Science I and Biochemistry be preserved as well.

8 New landscaped quadrangles

The replacement of Science II will create two new courtyards. These should be configured as quadrangles and landscaped to provide both outlook and amenity to the Precinct. The car parking and service access currently located in each will need to be removed to enable this to happen. Any building works associated with the buildings that surround them, be it through façade repairs and remediation, or through internal reconfiguration, should include as much transparency and access into these spaces as possible, providing opportunities for protected outdoor teaching, informal study and events.

9 New Loading Dock

The replacement of Science II will also provide an opportunity to recreate ground level functions that currently have loading access off the Castle Street pedestrian Mall to a new consolidated facility on Cumberland Street, between Science I and Biochemistry. This loading dock and storage area should be set up to serve the entire Precinct. It is recommended that floors be constructed above it to provide additional research floor space and linkages between the two buildings it connects.

It is noted that there is a vehicular ramp to the basement of Science III which would be affected by the Master Plan proposals. Initial study indicates that this access may be re-made through the basement car park of the St David Lecture Theatre complex. This needs to be further investigated.

Design guidelines - Historic core

The restoration of this fine group of neo-gothic buildings should focus on stripping away later accretions to the interiors to reveal the original spaces, architecture and ornament.

Design guidelines – Sciences buildings

The Sciences area is characterised by a group of large concrete faced buildings dating from the 1970s. The central tower has recently been re-clad in metal panelling to improve weathering performance. To the north the new St David Lecture Theatre is a modern composition in stone, concrete and glass. The area faces onto the Water of Leith and the iconic prospect of the campus historic core.

Both Science II and the Microbiology Tower exceed the 25m height constraint recommended by this Master Plan. It is proposed that the new building replacing Science II observe this limit. As a result, the Microbiology Tower will remain as a singular statement within the area.

It is likely that the remedial action taken for the Microbiology Tower may need to be extended to include the upgrade of the remaining parts of the science buildings so that, over time, the predominant cladding materials will be glass and metal panelling. For the new Science II replacement building, it is recommended that the palette of materials used in the St David Lecture Theatre be used to provide a unified expression to all the buildings facing the Leith.

The ground level of all buildings should, as far as possible, contain space focused on informal and formal meeting, interaction and pedestrian circulation. The buildings should be designed to promote strong visual connections between the interiors and the external and courtyard spaces. Clear views into the ground level spaces from the surrounding landscape areas should also be provided for.
Property to be demolished by the University in order to allow the implementation of the Master Plan proposal.

Fall back option showing precinct delivery without demolishing existing University property.
6.4 East Central Precinct

Role in the campus
The East Central Precinct is a unique asset for the University, being a location with land available to accommodate large-scale growth immediately adjacent to the centre, reinforcing the qualities of compactness and walkability that are the distinctive and highly valued characteristics of the campus. Furthermore, the Water of Leith bisects the Precinct, providing the opportunity to use the necessity of engineering alterations to control flooding to create a major new contemporary landscape space as the focus for this largely new quarter.

The Precinct also has renewed importance given that it will link the campus heart, the emerging East Precinct and the University Plaza beyond.

Precinct Analysis
1. The Precinct comprises four distinct quarters. The north west quarter is largely built out with the various buildings housing the Department of Psychology and the adjacent Commerce building. The Master Plan makes no specific initiatives in this area other than to commend the current proposals to open the Commerce Building atrium to both Union Street and the Leith Bank area and to suggest further works to soften and “humanise” its street and lower level frontages. It should also be noted that the cluster of small villas that comprise the Psychology “village” is a picturesque counterpoint to the large buildings that surround them.

2. The south west quarter comprises the University’s Property Services building surrounded by smaller structures and houses, some of which are owned by the University and others not. On the western side there is an adjoining on-grade car park. The Property Services building has been created by connecting a number of adjacent buildings. While is has good workshop access on two sides the space within it is disjointed and labyrinthine.

3. The south east quarter comprises the Wickliffe Press site. This is a decommissioned industrial facility wholly owned by the University. It is the largest readily-available development site in the University’s portfolio.

4. The north east quarter comprises the block bounded by Clyde Street, Union Street and Forth Street. As with the south west quarter, the University owns some but not all of the properties. The ones it does own house a number of small facilities which are essentially overflow space from other parts of the campus. The major structure on the block is the University’s Executive Residence, which is annexed to the Division of Commerce and provides high quality accommodation in a pleasant but curiously Tyrolean styled building.
Key projects and initiatives

1. Development of the Property Services site, including acquisition of the adjacent properties where possible;
2. Development of the Wickliffe Press site;
3. Development of the Executive Residence site, including acquisition of the adjacent properties where possible;
4. Landscaping of the Leith banks, including the creation of a new pedestrian mall; and
5. Albany Street upgrading.

These projects are described in more detail as follows.

1. **Property Services Site**

   The land occupied by the Property Services Building and the house immediately to its north which the University owns form a sufficiently large development site to enable a new academic building to be constructed. However the true potential of the site lies in the acquisition of adjoining properties and Trent Avenue which services them to permit a whole-block development. If this is achievable, the Master Plan envisages two buildings housing academic departments with an active public frontage to the Leith bank on the north. The location of these buildings on Albany Street provides excellent loading access, which would suggest potential use by departments that have need of such access – Geology, Geography, Anthropology, Surveying, Marine Science and Botany would be examples.

2. **Wickliffe Press Site**

   A similar approach is proposed for this site, with two large academic buildings opening onto a sunny north-facing plaza opening onto the river. Also proposed for this site is a new Precinct Hub serving the eastern part of the campus, with food and beverage facilities, student services, informal and group study space, seminar rooms and classrooms and departmental administration. Unlike other Precinct hubs, this one is not proposed to include library services, given the proximity of the Bill Robertson Library over the river.

3. **Executive Residence Site**

   As with the Property Services site, the potential for this site depends entirely on the acquisition of properties currently owned by others. Fortunately, the University owns all the blocks on the southern side of the site on Leith Bank Street, facing the river. Accordingly, even if not all the outstanding blocks are acquirable, the University could still expand its residential facilities in this precinct and/or build new academic accommodation on the blocks it does control. Also proposed for this block is a pedestrian bridge over the Leith with a pedestrian link through to Union Street to provide direct access to the Precinct Hub proposed on the Wickliffe Press site on the south bank of the river.

4. **Leith Bank landscaping**

   The treatment of the Leith is covered in the Landscape Framework outlined earlier in this report. However its interrelationship with the development in this Precinct is important and is worthy of reinforcement. The Master Plan intent is that the north bank of the Leith, which is in part overshadowed by buildings, be treated as the “passive” side, with considerable native riparian plantings to encourage native fauna to return to the campus, increase biodiversity and to make a cultural connection with the pre-European uses of the landscape. The southern side which receives the sun is proposed as the “active side” with grassed areas, hard landscaping, informal study and event space and indoor / outdoor activity.

   A singularly important proposal is the creation of a pedestrian mall extending from the ISB and Link building down to the Precinct Hub on the Wickliffe Press site. It is important that this be direct, with a clear line of sight, and
weather protected through the use of colonnades on the adjoining buildings, to encourage movement between the two centres.

However this plan is currently blocked by the playground of the Kelsey Yaralla Kindergarten, which extends out into the Leith reserve. Two possibilities exist here. The first would see the University negotiate a relocation of the entire Kindergarten, the second would be for the University to offer an adjacent site to enable the playground to be relocated. If neither option is achievable then the pedestrian mall would need to be diverted around the playground.

It should be noted that while the University does not own or control the blocks east of this Precinct (Cerebos Greggs and Otago Polytechnic School of Art), the continuation of this pedestrian mall and riverbank landscape treatment through to Anzac Avenue would yield an asset of city-wide significance, opening up the entire length of the river frontage to public access and use, and the University is encouraged to make representations to the City and the owners of those respective sites accordingly.

Albany Street upgrading

In addition to the landscape work on campus the Master Plan also describes landscape upgrades and street planting to the surrounding streets, to be carried out in collaboration with the City. These upgrades are recommended to include consideration of:

- Pedestrian crossings to improve walking amenity and safety
- Street paving and street furniture
- Street planting
- On-street parking
- Improved street lighting
- Rationalisation of services infrastructure
- Improvements to signage

Design guidelines

The Master Plan includes proposals for major changes along the banks of the Water of Leith. The intention is that the river be transformed from an engineered drainage channel into an area of new waterside landscape, as the setting for a major part of the University’s growth. The northern riverbank is proposed to be planted with New Zealand plant species. The sunny southern bank is proposed to be more open, with lawns and terraces to cater for leisure and recreation uses. Significant new academic buildings are intended to replace most of the existing buildings on either riverbank during the life of the plan. The setting provides the opportunity for new architecture that expresses the values of the 21st century University of Otago. The new architecture here will take forward the narrative of gradual change that is expressed through architecture in other parts of the campus.

In terms of scale and massing, it is recommended that the central riverbank landscape be framed by buildings of three storeys adjacent to the river, stepping up to five storeys behind.

Materials in this part of the campus should be high quality and durable, reflecting the values of a long-established high-quality organisation. Oamaru stone, metal and glass similar to that used on the St David Lecture Theatre building are recommended as the predominant material mix. Adjacent to the riverside landscape, smaller scale timber elements could also be considered appropriate to reinforce the connection with the natural landscape.

The architecture should be simple, flexible and not excessively expressive or articulated. The plan of the buildings should follow the rectilinear, orthogonal form of the underlying town planning grid. The architectural impact should be generated by the simple juxtaposition of primary elements of space, cores and structure etc., simply rendered. Wherever possible the ground level areas should be reserved for shared, more public uses with strong visual linkages between the interiors and surrounding landscape.
Property that would need to be acquired by the University in order to allow the full implementation of the Master Plan proposal.