

188 Beaumont Street Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure 4:

Landscape

Gabrielle Howdle

7 July 2026

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name: 188 Beaumont Street

Fast-Track application number: EPA: FTAA- 2604-1205
Council: BUN60464683

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Landscape

To: Lewis So– Lead Planner
Russell Butchers – Principal Project Lead

From: Gabrielle Howdle – Principal Landscape Architect

Qualifications & Relevant Experience: I hold the qualification of Bachelor of Landscape Architecture and have more than nine years of experience in landscape architecture. I am a member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects. I have prepared expert evidence and technical assessments for resource consent applications, plan changes, notices of requirement for designation and fast-track applications and have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities (council hearings) on multiple occasions.

Preparation in Accordance with the Code of Conduct: I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)) and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Signature: 

Date: 07.07.2026

3.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

- 3.1 Landscape concerns are predominantly associated with the proposed scale, design, and quality of the Tower Building, especially as experienced from the local and wider urban landscape from the south-west, south and south-east (e.g., Viewpoints 3, 4 and 5 and similar views).
- 3.2 The proposed floor area ratio and height, combined with the form, design and appearance of the Tower Building results in a perceptible deviation from the expression of form and appearance anticipated within the city centre. The building appears bulky and visually dominant within views seen alongside the city centre.
- 3.3 Further design of the Tower Building is warranted to appropriately mitigate the adverse landscape (visual and dominance) effects arising from the proposal, reflect the 'marker building' status, as well as respond to the provisions of the Wynyard Quarter Precinct and City Centre zone.
- 3.4 It is considered that the design of the Tower Building has not appropriately addressed the adverse visual amenity and visual dominance effects and is not congruent with the outcomes anticipated within the City Centre Zone and Wynyard Precinct area; particularly positive contribution to the skyline of the city, achieving a transition in height down to the coastal edge and being a design quality that is commensurate with the prominence and visual effects of the development.

4.0 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed in preparing this memorandum:

- Assessment of Environmental Effects and Statutory Analysis prepared by Barkers & Associates, dated 09.04.2026.
- Architectural Drawings Part 1 – 7 prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated 17.03.2026.
- Urban Design and Landscape Assessment (including the Graphic Supplement dated March 2026) prepared by Boffa Miskell, dated 09.04.2026.
- Landscape Design Report prepared by Boffa Miskell, dated 19.12.2025.
- Landscape Architecture – Podium & Tower Entrance prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated March 2026.
- Landscape Architecture – Podium & Tower Entrance Appendix I Drawings prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated March 2026.
- Proposed Consent Conditions.
- Section 67 Request – Response to Council prepared by Barkers & Associates, dated 03.07.2026.
- Concept Material Palette prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated 24.06.2026.
- Pedestrian Experience and Amenity Package prepared by Warren and Mahoney, dated 24.06.2026.

5.0 Specialist Assessment

Methodology

- 5.1 I was involved in pre-lodgement meetings and design panel reviews as part of this proposal. My latest feedback from the pre application 05.02.2026 noted the changes to the proposal but outlined my remaining concern – replicated below.

It is recognised that southern facing balconies may not be preferable, however from visualisations and renders shown in the pre app meeting, the southern façade is visible from aspects of Beaumont Street, as well as from New Street (viewpoint 3) and the southern building elevation reads bulky, blocky and flat, potentially due to the horizontal elements being those most readable, and having no modulation such as applied to the northern (‘twist’) or western (inset, varied balconies/glazing treatment). GH remains of the view that further exploration into presenting a slender appearing building (vertical expression, visual relief to the width of the building, playing with the perceived portions or proportion of the elevation) to be in keeping with and achieve what is anticipated within the city centre – built context and skyline.

- 5.2 I am comfortable that the Urban Design and Landscape Assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell (09.04.2026) has been undertaken consistently with the methodology detailed in Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines. I have utilised the same 7-point rating scale utilised within the Boffa Miskell Report.

- 5.3 I can confirm that I have visited the site and site surrounds as part of my review of the proposal.

Existing Environment

- 5.4 I concur with the site description as provided within the Boffa Miskell Report (11.0 The Subject Site) and local area and statutory context provided within parts 7.0 Maunga Viewshafts, 8.0 AUP 1214. Wynyard Precinct and 10.0 Te Ara Tukutuku.

Landscape Effects

- 5.5 The zoning and precinct anticipate a level of intensification, with height controls at 31m, 62m and 18m (east-west). However, the AUP(OP) still requires and encourages development to be of a form, scale and design quality that reinforces the centre and contributes positively to a well-functioning urban environment and sense of place. Therefore, while additional height could potentially be accommodated within the Wynyard Quarter area from a landscape perspective if the height and form are designed appropriately to manage landscape character, visual amenity, and visual dominance effects. The design and appearance of large-scale buildings is particularly important in this location due to the site being within the city centre and being a premium destination within the city and along the harbour edge.
- 5.6 In my opinion, the proposed additional scale and height of the Marina Building and Beaumont Street Building have been appropriately managed as experienced from local and wider viewpoint locations, through the following techniques.

- Overall scale and form are in keeping with the built character of the Wynyard Quarter area.
- Modulation of upper half of the building through rotation of the building axis.
- Vertical expression to reduce building bulk (e.g., western elevation Marina Building).
- Balance and proportion between solid and glazed elements, with variation to fenestration.
- Use of residential vernacular, e.g., recessed balconies.
- Visual interest and relief created through proposed materiality, colour and detailing (e.g., change in brick rainscreen detailing on the northern elevation of the Marina Building (levels 1-4) and Beaumont Street Building (levels 1-3).
- Introduction of planting at the fourth level to provide softening.

5.7 In my opinion, the combined height and scale of the Tower Building, while referencing the axis to Te Ara Tukutuku to the north through the split and twist of the building form and referencing the marine use through the proposed cladding material (light-weight concrete rainscreen or similar) has been adequately managed as experienced from the east of the building (e.g. Viewpoints 6 and 7), this, in my opinion is due to a combination of distance viewed at, the integration of scale with the Marina and Beaumont Street Buildings in context and the orientation to the building – observing the split and twist to the northern elevation. From these viewpoints and similar, while the proposal would be visually prominent and result in a significant level of visual change, I consider that the effects on landscape character and visual amenity values would be managed resulting in low adverse landscape and visual amenity effects.

5.8 However, the city centre urban landscape character is influenced by the connection to significant features, such as viewshafts to maunga as well as visual and physical connections to the harbour / coastal edge. These features have influenced the form of the city centre including the transition of height from the city to the coastal edge, encouragement of narrower slender buildings, and variation in roof form. These are supported by the outcomes in the AUP (OP), including but not limited to:

H8.3.30 (a) (City Form) - Manage adverse effects associated with building height and form by: transitioning building height and development densities down to neighbourhoods adjoining the city centre and to the harbour edge.

H8.3.30 (c) (City Form) - Manage adverse effects associated with building height and form by: requiring height, form, and design of new buildings to be complementary to existing and planned built form character of the zone and precincts; and

H8.3.30 (d) (City Form) - Manage adverse effects associated with building height and form by: managing the scale, form and design of buildings to (i) avoid adverse dominance and/or amenity effects on streets and public open space; and (ii) encourage well-designed, human scale podiums with slender towers above with adequate separation between towers; or on site where towers are not possible, encourage well-designed buildings which complement the streetscape and skyline.

I214.3 (3) (a) – Ensure that the maximum building height: is appropriate in scale to the street network and the prominent waterfront location.

I214.3 (3) (d) – Ensure that the maximum building height: provides a transition in height between the core central business district and the harbour.

I214.3 (5) – Promote excellence and diversity in architecture and urban design that enhances the relationship of buildings with public open space, and reflect the coastal, topographical, and historical qualities of the precinct.

- 5.9 The Tower Building while referencing the marine use through the concrete materiality (as indicated in the conceptual material, colour and finishes drawing set), is of an overall scale and form that does not achieve a step down in height to the coastal edge / harbour edge as anticipated by the plan, and due to its proportions, limited modulation (west, east and south elevations), flat roof line (exaggerated by the architectural building ‘frame’), presents a bulky block form, that is visually dominant, competes with and does not reflect the forms, appearance and skyline of the city centre. The proposed scale and form of the Tower Building also reduces the visual connection with the harbour from local viewpoints within the city centre and fringe, reducing the associative values of the city centre and Wynyard area. The establishment of such a collection of buildings could eventually result in the views between buildings to the coastal edge and harbour appreciated by residents, locals, and visitors to the city centre.
- 5.10 I consider that the Tower Building has not been designed in the round to manage the overall bulk and scale as appreciated from viewpoints and locations within the wider landscape. The application identifies the proposal as being a ‘marker building’ however in my view, from the south, south-west and south-east (e.g. Viewpoints 3 ,4 and 5 and similar), the Tower Building is bulky, visually dominant and is not commensurate with the prominence and visual effects of the development, and does not express the visual qualities of a ‘marker building’. I consider that the proposal is not of a form, scale and design quality that positively reinforces the centre and contributes to the urban environment and sense of place (H8.2 (2) (3) (9), H8.3 (3b) (5), I214.2 (2b) & I214.3 (3a) (5)). In my view, this is a result of the building not having been designed in the round, with significant design strategies employed for the northern elevation of the Tower Building, e.g., ‘twist’, with the western, eastern and particularly the southern elevations, absence of similar visually appreciable modulation and design emphasis.
- 5.11 While the proposal has introduced recesses and notched corners to levels 9 and 16 this is not of a depth (~1m along east and west elevations, and ~4.5m at the southern elevation corner balconies) at local, mid or distance views that is visually appreciable. This is due to the vertical ‘frame’ element introduced to the building, which reads more prominently across the whole building than the recess and notched corners proposed at the two levels. Furthermore while the top floor (level 23) is noted as having a reduced footprint and being setback, due to the façade ‘framing’ continuing vertically at the same elevational plane, it is not considered that the building bulk is visually reduced in order to successfully manage the overall bulk, recesses the building into the sky, or presents a visually interesting response (roofline) to the city skyline.
- 5.12 The Tower Building would benefit from greater modulation to the west and southern elevations in particular, reduced floor plate at higher levels to manage the visual dominance effects of the

proposal, as well as the introduction of a clearer residential vernacular (southern elevation especially), and variation in materiality, colour and finish to achieve a finer grain to the building.

- 5.13 In my opinion the increased building footprint, height and limited setback of upper floors, lack of strong and visually appreciable modulation/variation in appearance to the southern elevation, stronger emphasis on the horizontal over the vertical architectural elements, and repetitive treatment to fenestration from levels 9-21, means that the proposal reads visually dominant and will not appear in character with the more slender forms of the city skyline and will have adverse visual amenity effects to at least a moderate to moderate-high degree.

Visual Amenity Effects – Neighbours

- 5.14 It is recognised that the local Wynyard area has a mix of commercial, residential and port and marine industry uses, resulting in varied levels of amenity; but primarily amenity of local residents is influenced by the connected green spaces and routes, as well as views to the harbor, Westhaven marina, Harbour Bridge and the city skyline.
- 5.15 Noting 37-55 Madden Street is currently used as a car park and I am unaware of any unimplemented consent(s), the proposal will have the greatest effect on residents at 155 Beaumont Street.
- 5.16 I agree that due to the existing Orams marine yard and building within the immediate context that the residents to the west within the upper levels (e.g., 5-7 and levels 8 of the 13-storey block) of the apartment development at 155 Beaumont Street will experience low adverse visual amenity effects.
- 5.17 Due to the increased height, building coverage, and limited setbacks and visual relief and expression of the southern elevation of the Tower Building I consider that the residents with views to the west at levels 9-13 will experience at least moderate adverse effects (more than minor). This is due to proposed buildings' visual bulk and dominance particularly experienced along the southern elevation and the upper floors of the building with the lack of modulation, visual relief, emphasizing horizontal form, as well as the obscuring of key urban landscape features, such as the harbour, marina, and bridge.

Landscape Design

- 5.18 The provision of the western marina space is not required for under the AUP(OP) but will introduce a level of public benefit providing a physical and visual connection to the western edge of the marina.
- 5.19 Ground level landscape treatment is limited to garden beds on the corner of Beaumont and Jellicoe Street, pots and the privately owned but publicly accessible western marina open space area with low planting and trees. However given the urban nature of the area, it is considered that the planting is adequate combined with the pavement treatment to align with the quality and amenity of the streetscape.
- 5.20 Planting on levels 4, 5, 9 and 16 of the buildings is considered to provide for an improved amenity for future residents (compared to looking out over a membrane or metal roof) but will need ongoing

maintenance through a resident's society / body corporation or similar, for the planting to be retained and maintained.

Recommended Conditions

- 5.21 Changes to conditions offered by the applicant are provided below in this memo, as it relates to Condition 31 and 33.

6 Section 67 Information Gap

- 6.1 At the time of writing this memo the Section 67 information gaps identified from a landscape perspective have been responded to and / or addressed within the Section 67 Request – Response to Council (Barkers & Associates, 03.07.2026) and attachments.
- 6.2 It is noted that the response with respect to the size of specimen trees to the west (1x 2000L and 1x 400L tree) will be adopted as part of a condition, I have included this within the recommended changes to conditions below as an updated condition was not received at time of writing this memo.

7 Recommendation

- 7.1 Overall I am not able to support the adverse landscape (visual amenity , visual dominance) effects resulting from the proposed scale, design and quality of the Tower Building, particularly as experienced from the south-west, south and south-east and consider the design of the building has not appropriately addressed these effects (compared to the northern and eastern viewpoint experience). I consider the proposal will result in moderate to moderate-high adverse landscape and visual amenity effects.
- 7.2 I consider the residents with westerly views at 155 Beaumont Street from levels 9-13 will experience moderate adverse visual amenity effects, with westerly facing units at lower levels experiencing low adverse effects on their amenity values.

8 Proposed Conditions

- 8.1 I am generally agreeable with the landscape condition offered (Condition 33), however recommend the following additions to ensure all information associated with the planting across the site and levels is implemented, and provides for information not provided at time of writing this memo.

Finalised Landscape Design Drawings – Specifications and Maintenance Requirements

33. At the time of Architectural Building Consent lodgement the consent holder must prepare and submit a finalised set of landscape design drawings and supporting written documentation prepared by a NZILA Registered Landscape Architect, or NZILA Registered Landscape Architecture Firm to Council for certification. The finalised set of landscape design drawings and supporting written documentation must be consistent with the Landscape Report prepared by Boffa Miskell dated 19 December 2025 and 'Landscape Architecture – Podium and Tower Entrance Fast-track Approval' and 'Landscape Architecture – Podium & Tower Entrance Appendix I Drawings' prepared by Warren and Mahoney dated March 2026 referenced in Condition 1. The final Landscape Plans must include:
- a. detailed landscape plan and specifications;
 - a.b. details indicating the location, number, dimensions of pots along Jellicoe Street and within the Marina deck, including plant species, number and plant size at time of planting, able to meet the wind assessment mitigation requirements.
 - c. planting schedule, detailing the specific planting species, the number of plants provided, locations, heights/pint bag sizes;
 - western trees must be planted as per the following: 1x 2000L tree with approximately 1500mm diameter wide root ball and approximate 4m height x 3m spread; and, 1x 400L tree with approximately 800mm diameter root ball and approximate 4m height and 2m spread.
 - b.e coastal mix and streetscape mix planting along Beaumont Street and Jellicoe Street must be planted no smaller than PB8 at time of planting.
 - c.d. irrigation details;
 - d.e. hard landscape plan and specifications, detailing materiality and colour for the external spaces;
 - e.f. annotated sections with key dimensions to illustrate that adequate widths and depths are provided for amenity planting beds;
 - f.g. A landscape maintenance plan and/or report for a minimum period of five years and related drawings and specifications for all aspects of the finalised landscape design, including in relation to the following requirements:
 - i. Irrigation and fertilisation;
 - ii. Weed control;
 - iii. Plant replacement;
 - iv. Inspection timeframes; and
 - v. Contractor responsibilities.

All works must be carried out in accordance with the finalised landscape design plans certified by Council.

Finalised Architectural Design Plans – Materials and Finishes

31. At the time of Architectural Building Consent lodgement, the consent holder must prepare and submit a finalised set of architectural detail drawings and materials specifications consistent with the approved architectural plans prepared by Warren and Mahoney and concept material palette referenced in Condition 1 and submit it to Council for certification. The information must include the following:
- a. Details of the building's façade treatment / architectural features;
 - b. Materials schedule and specification, sample palette of materials, surface finishes, and colour schemes (including colour swatches) referenced on the architectural elevations and building materials, colours and finishes;
 - c. Site services demonstrating how mechanical, electrical and communications equipment will be generally concealed from public view as far as practicable where this cannot be avoided for operational reasons (including external / rooftop services / plant, and visual / aural screening elements);
 - d. Final locations showing space identified for future electric vehicle supply equipment;
 - e. Confirmation that the development complies with Standard H8.6.29 (Glare) of the AUP(OP); and
 - f. Details of all building verandah along street frontages where any are proposed.