

19 May 2026

Bianca Hurrell

RCP

via email: [REDACTED]

Downtown Carpark Site Development – Response to M-Social structural consultant Structus final memorandum contained in the Fast Track Application Act (FTAA) submission.

Dear Bianca

Discussions were held and information shared between Structus/ MCK and Holmes / Precinct in March and April 2026. A written response dated 28 April 2026 was provided by Holmes to Structus/ MCK to provide clarification and address the outstanding issues raised. MCK provided its structural engineering comments on the application under s53 of the FTAA, dated 5 May 2025 (and the Holmes 28 April 2026 response was attached to MCK's comments).

The discussions between Holmes and Structus to clarify aspects of the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development scheme have been collaborative. Holmes has previously clarified some items that were unclear to Structus in the Holmes letter of 28 April 2026 titled "*Downtown Carpark Site Development – Response to M-Social structural consultant Structus items*". Some additional material requested by Structus was attached as appendices to that letter.

This current letter responds to the Structus memorandum titled "*196-200 Quay Street (MSocial Hotel) - Downtown West Development FTAA Review - Structural Engineering Memorandum*", dated 5 May 2026 contained in the Fast Track Application Act (FTAA) comments.

The Structus memorandum of 5 May 2026 discusses the Structus scope of work, desktop study, a description of the M-Social building structure, and makes some comments on the Downtown Carpark Site Development structure, prior to providing an assessment of effects. There are observations of geotechnical matters raised by Structus which Tonkin + Taylor have addressed in the responses and correspondence with CMW. Holmes limit responses primarily to structural matters. Much of the material raised in the 5 May 2026 Structus memorandum has already been addressed by the previous Holmes 28 April response (which addressed outstanding issues/ queries from Structus based on earlier memorandum and discussions between the parties).

The primary comments in this letter relate to the key items that Structus have proposed might be addressed as resource consent conditions. These key items are contained in the bullet points on pages 2 and 3 of the 5 May 2026 Structus memorandum, and are paraphrased with the responses in the following section.

Areas proposed for potential Resource Consent Conditions in the 5 May 2026 Structus memorandum.

- Demolition and Construction of scale adjacent to M-Social is such that a full structural condition assessment be made of the M-Social Hotel building prior to demolition.

Holmes agree that a pre-condition building survey should be completed for the property – this is proposed under resource consent conditions 41 and 114. A full structural condition assessment, if desired, would be the responsibility of the existing building owner, as compliance with the current proposed resource consent conditions should mitigate damage to an existing property. Proposed resource consent 90 already covers boundary stability issues. Allowable deflections and settlement levels at the boundary for the new diaphragm retaining wall are already included in proposed resource consent conditions 160-166. These proposed alert and alarm levels are standard, have been agreed with Auckland Council, and set at levels to mitigate damage to adjacent properties. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.

- Temporary support of the M-Social ground level along the northern boundary, including ensuring the diaphragm wall is constructed to the underside of the ground floor level.

The diaphragm wall will be constructed to the underside of the ground floor level as recommended. The design of the support of the adjacent property by the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development will be covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent. Proposed resource consent condition 90 already covers boundary stability issues. Allowable deflections and settlement levels at the boundary for the new diaphragm retaining wall are already included in proposed resource consent conditions 160-166. These proposed alert and alarm levels are standard, have been agreed with Auckland Council, and set at levels to mitigate damage to adjacent properties. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.

- Detailed information regarding demolition of the existing car park structure locally along Grids J-N 26 in the north-eastern corner of the site, where existing M-Social structures are built immediately adjacent the existing Downtown carpark.

Holmes agrees that the demolition in the north-eastern corner of the existing Downtown car park immediately adjacent to the existing M-Social structures will require careful consideration because of the close proximity, to mitigate risk of localised damage. Accordingly a further specific resource consent condition (90B) is proposed to cover this:

"90B The consent holder must provide detailed information to MCK on demolition of the existing carpark structure at proposed Gridlines J-N/26 where the existing MSocial building is on the boundary and pile foundations are on the boundary, founded at a higher level than the diaphragm wall. This must be provided to MCK at least 20 working days prior to commencement of localised demolition in this area."

- Detailed information regarding loading from the existing M-Social property onto the proposed new diaphragm wall.

The design of the support of the adjacent property by the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development retaining wall for the appropriate loadings from the surrounding material, including any necessary surcharge from the existing M-Social structures, will be covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.

- Support of the proposed superstructure along the northern boundary.
Support of the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development superstructure by the new diaphragm retaining wall will allow for any offset in alignment between the superstructure and the retaining wall. This will be covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent. As such no further specific resource consent condition is required.
- Proposed impact of the base shear of the new development on deflections of the proposed new diaphragm wall.
Impacts of the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development loads on the new diaphragm wall will be considered in achieving the allowable deflections. This will be covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent. Allowable deflections and settlement levels at the boundary for the new diaphragm retaining wall are already included in proposed resource consent conditions 160-166. These proposed alert and alarm levels are standard, have been agreed with Auckland Council, and set at levels to mitigate damage to adjacent properties. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.
- Detailed information regarding the proposed new diaphragm wall impacts on some localised existing M-Social structures founded on shallow foundations, and the ground floor slab of the northern extension of the existing M-Social structure on the Quay St side of the main M-Social building.
Impacts of the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development new diaphragm retaining wall on the immediately adjacent existing M-Social structures will be considered in the design. Holmes note the area of shallow foundations to the northern portion of the M-Social site is remote from the Downtown Carpark Site Development (approximately 18m from the boundary) and should not be impacted by the development. The impacts of the proposed Downtown Carpark Site Development will be covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent. In addition, allowable deflections and settlement levels at the boundary for the new diaphragm retaining wall are already included in proposed resource consent conditions 160-166. These proposed alert and alarm levels are standard, have been agreed with Auckland Council, and set at levels to mitigate damage to adjacent properties. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.
- Downtown Carpark Site Development not to limit the M-Social building future development.
We understand that this would not be a resource consent requirement as it covers a future as yet to be determined potential development. As such no further specific resource consent condition should be required.

Conclusion

There are several conditions already proposed in the resource consent conditions (including 41, 90, 114, 160 through 166 inclusive) that will provide the necessary protections to the existing M-Social structures. The majority of the items proposed by Structus for additional specific resource consent conditions are matters covered by the normal processes of peer review and Building Consent, and as such should not require further specific resource consent conditions.

Holmes propose one additional one further specific consent condition (90B) be included to cover an area of specific risk, occurring due to the demolition of the existing Downtown carpark in close proximity to the existing M-Social structures, as outlined above



Holmes trust this further information supplied in this response address the proposed resource consent conditions noted in the 5 May 2026 Structus memorandum.

Holmes would be happy to clarify any matters in this letter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Mackenzie", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Chris Mackenzie
PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TEAM LEADER
Holmes NZ LP

Copies to:

145828.10LE1905.docx