

188 Beaumont Street Fast-track

Auckland Council Memo

Annexure 22:

Response to Minute 2 Expert Panel Questions

Russell Butchers

28 July 2026

IN THE MATTER of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (“FTAA”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application for approvals by Westhaven Residential Limited Partnership for a residential-led mixed-use urban development at 188 Beaumont Street, Auckland Central, comprising three buildings containing 210 residential apartments, ground-floor retail activities, associated car parking, earthworks, infrastructure works, landscaping, public-realm improvements, and subdivision (boundary adjustment and unit title) – Project FTAA-2604-1205 – 188 Beaumont Street.

Annexure 22

Auckland Council Response to Expert Panel Minute 2 Questions

Dated: 28 July 2026

1. This memorandum is provided on behalf of Auckland Council in response to Minute 2 of the Expert Consenting Panel dated 29 June 2026 for Project FTAA-2604-1205 – 188 Beaumont Street, issued pursuant to section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA). The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to the questions directed to Auckland Council in Appendix 6 of Minute 2.
2. The responses contained within this memorandum have been prepared by the relevant Council specialists and business units identified in Minute 2, including Planning, Urban Design, Landscape Architecture, Transport and Auckland Urban Development Office (AUDO), as applicable. These responses should be read in conjunction with Auckland Council's Planning Memorandum and supporting specialist assessments submitted to the Expert Panel in response to the substantive application.
3. For ease of reference, this memorandum addresses the Panel's questions in the order in which they appear in Appendix 6 of Minute 2. Where appropriate, responses refer to the conclusions reached in Council's specialist assessments previously provided to the Panel.

Question 12: What is the timing for Te Aratukutuku to be completed?

4. The enabling works associated with Te Ara Tukutuku are currently underway. Auckland Council understands that the bulk of the physical capping works are expected to be completed by December 2026. Following completion of the capping works, the site will require stabilisation, which is anticipated to occur through either topsoil and grassing or the placement of metal/crushed concrete. Subject to programme requirements, crushed concrete surfacing may be utilised from early 2027.

5. Once the capped surface has been stabilised, the remaining works will include the infilling of sediment ponds, completion of associated resource consent obligations, and final site establishment works. Auckland Council currently anticipates that these enabling works will be substantially completed by June 2027.
6. The wider Te Ara Tukutuku redevelopment programme, including future development and construction phases, is anticipated to be delivered over a period of approximately 10 to 15 years.

Question 13: Please provide a copy of the Orams office development resource consent decision (and Plans) that is currently under construction to the south of the subject site.

7. Auckland Council will provide the Expert Panel with copies of the relevant consent decisions and approved plans relating to the Orams Marine Village development at 164 Beaumont Street. Those documents include the original resource consent granted in 2019 for the redevelopment and expansion of the Orams Marine Village and associated marine servicing facilities, together with subsequent section 127 approvals granted in 2020 and 2024.
8. By way of summary, the original consent authorised the redevelopment and expansion of the Orams Marine Village, including new marine industry buildings, superyacht maintenance facilities, travel lift infrastructure, marine workshops, marine-related office activities, washwater and stormwater treatment systems, seawall rehabilitation, dredging activities and associated marine servicing infrastructure. The development was approved as a non-complying activity and was assessed as providing significant benefits to the marine and fishing industry functioning of the Wynyard Precinct.
9. Subsequent section 127 approvals amended aspects of the consented development. In 2020, amendments were approved relating to building design refinements, seawall construction methodology and associated infrastructure changes. In 2024, a further variation was approved to enable certain upper-level office floorspace to be occupied by general office activities rather than being restricted to offices ancillary to marine industry activities. That approval was granted on the basis that the marine workshop floorspace and marine servicing functions at ground and mezzanine levels would remain in place and continue to support the marine industry role of the site.
10. The full consent decisions and approved plans are attached separately for the Panel's consideration.

Question 14: For AUDO – please confirm the current status of development arrangements in place or currently under negotiation for the vacant sites in proximity to the Project Site that are owned by Auckland Council. This information can be provided on a confidential basis if necessary.

11. Auckland Council, through Auckland Urban Development Office (AUDO), advises that a number of development sites within the Wynyard Quarter precinct remain under Council control and are at varying stages of planning and development.

12. The current status of those sites is as follows:

- 1 Jellicoe Street (North Wharf) – subject to a conditional Development Agreement.
- 28 Madden Street – subject to a conditional Development Agreement.
- 143 Beaumont Street – identified as a future development site, with no Development Agreement currently in place.
- 37–55 Madden Street (Jellicoe Street Car Park) – identified as a future development site, with no Development Agreement currently in place.
- 65–75 Jellicoe Street / 77–81 Jellicoe Street – identified as future development sites, with no Development Agreement currently in place.
- Council's current planning for Wynyard Quarter also identifies approximately 15,000m² of future development land located to the south-west of the proposed Te Ara Tukutuku parkland area.

13. The timing, form and intensity of future development on these sites will be subject to future planning, procurement, commercial negotiations, detailed design and consenting processes. Accordingly, while these sites form part of the wider long-term regeneration programme for Wynyard Quarter, no conclusions should be drawn at this stage regarding the final nature or timing of their development.

Urban Design / Landscape Architecture

Question 15: Please comment on the impact of the infringements of tower maximum dimension controls and GFA on the overall bulk of the building(s) – including the impact on their appearance as per viewpoints within UDLA report, particularly those from the west (i.e. within Westhaven).

14. Council's urban design and landscape specialists consider that the infringements of the maximum tower dimensions and gross floor area controls materially contribute to the perceived bulk and massing of the Tower Building. While a marker building is anticipated on the site, the proposed development significantly exceeds the built form anticipated by the Wynyard Precinct framework. The additional floor area and larger floorplates contribute to a building that appears broader and more visually dominant than would otherwise be anticipated.

15. These effects are particularly evident in views from the west, including from Westhaven Marina and the coastal marine area, where the Tower Building presents as a large and visually dominant built form. Both the urban design and landscape assessments concluded that the western and southern elevations lack sufficient modulation and architectural relief to adequately mitigate the building's scale. Consequently, Council's specialists considered the resulting urban design, landscape and visual effects to be moderate to moderate-high.

Question 16: Please comment on the impact of the building's height on shading to public places as provided within Appendix 5, Part 7 and discussed within Boffa Miskell's report, particularly given that the proposed building is nearly 20m over the new maximum height limit.

16. Council's urban design, landscape and parks specialists consider that the proposed height contributes to increased shading effects on public spaces, most notably Silo Park and surrounding pedestrian areas. While some level of shading is anticipated within a city-centre environment, the proposed development is approximately 20 metres higher than the recently established planning framework and therefore generates shading effects beyond those anticipated by the Wynyard Precinct provisions.
17. Council's specialists have identified the absence of a comprehensive comparative assessment demonstrating the difference between the proposed development and an AUP-enabled development scenario. In the absence of that analysis, the extent to which the additional height contributes to shading effects has not been fully quantified. Council therefore considers that further sunlight and shading analysis would assist the Panel in understanding the significance of these effects.

Question 17: Confirm whether the current design adequately addresses the earlier comments regarding a top to the building.

18. No, this has not been addressed. While amendments have been made to the design through the pre-application and application process, Council's urban design and landscape specialists remain concerned that the building does not exhibit the level of architectural resolution expected of a prominent marker building within the Wynyard Precinct.
19. In particular, concerns remain regarding the termination of the tower, the relatively flat roof profile, and the absence of a more distinctive or refined architectural treatment that would assist in reducing the perceived bulk of the building and improving its contribution to the skyline. Accordingly, Council's specialists remain of the view that further design refinement is required.

Question 18: Given the development is proposing 210 residential units of varying sizes, do you expect the two proposed retail/F&B units to adequately activate Jellicoe Street or could more be expected?

20. Council's urban design specialists acknowledge that the proposed food and beverage activities will contribute positively to activation along the Jellicoe Street frontage and will assist in creating pedestrian activity at ground level. However, given the overall scale of the development, including 210 residential units and a substantial built form, Council considers that the level of active frontages is relatively limited.
21. While the proposed activation is beneficial and preferable to inactive frontages, it does not fully offset the concerns identified regarding the scale and dominance of the Tower Building.

Question 19: Is the description of this development as mixed-use accurate or overstated?

22. Council considers it is technically accurate to describe the proposal as a mixed-use development as it incorporates residential and commercial activities. However, the development is overwhelmingly residential in character, with the commercial component

limited to a relatively small amount of ground-floor food and beverage activity.

23. Council's Policy Planner also notes that the proposal does not include marine or port-related activities anticipated by the Wynyard Precinct provisions and therefore differs from the broader mixed-use and marine industry outcomes anticipated for this part of Wynyard Quarter.

Question 20: Please comment on the legibility of the referencing within the design of the marine industrial context including, but not limited to, the Silo Park six-pack silos, and also the orientation to the waterfront and Te Ara Tukutuku axes.

24. Council acknowledges that aspects of the architectural language draw inspiration from the area's maritime and industrial heritage and that the proposal references elements of the surrounding marine environment and waterfront context. However, Council's specialists consider that these references do not overcome the more fundamental concerns regarding the scale, bulk and visual dominance of the Tower Building.
25. While the proposal responds to aspects of the surrounding context, Council does not consider that the references to marine and industrial character are sufficiently strong to justify the extent of the departures sought from the Wynyard Precinct built form framework.

Question 21: Please comment on the proposed southern elevation. Does this address concerns raised at previous pre-application meetings?

26. Council's urban design and landscape specialists remain concerned about the southern elevation. While refinements have occurred through the design process, the southern elevation continues to be identified as one of the least successful aspects of the proposal.
27. In particular, Council's urban design specialists consider that the elevation lacks sufficient articulation, modulation and architectural depth and therefore contributes to the perception of excessive bulk and dominance when viewed from the south. Accordingly, Council does not consider that earlier concerns regarding the southern elevation have been fully resolved.

Question 22: Please provide comment on the ground floor setbacks from the street edges.

28. Council's urban design and landscape specialists generally support the proposed ground-floor setbacks and acknowledge that they contribute positively to pedestrian amenity, public realm outcomes, and activation of the waterfront edge. In particular, the proposed publicly accessible western waterfront space and associated setbacks are considered positive elements of the design.
29. However, while these setbacks improve the pedestrian experience and assist with public realm outcomes, Council does not consider that they materially reduce the adverse effects associated with the overall scale, height and bulk of the Tower Building. Those effects remain the primary urban design and landscape concern identified by Council's specialists.

Planning

Question 23: Please confirm the Council's understanding of adjustments and refinements made to the design in response to pre-application feedback.

30. Council understands that the proposal has undergone a number of refinements through the pre-application process and subsequent engagement with Council officers and specialists. These refinements include changes to architectural detailing, façade treatment, landscape design, wind mitigation measures, loading arrangements, bicycle parking provision, and the public realm interface, including the western waterfront plaza and pedestrian areas.
31. Council's specialists acknowledge that these refinements have improved several aspects of the proposal. Notwithstanding these changes, concerns remain regarding the overall scale, height and bulk of the Tower Building, the adequacy of the proposed architectural response, the effects on Silo Park and adjoining public realm areas, and the absence of a comprehensive comparative daylight and sunlight assessment. Council's urban design, landscape and parks specialists therefore do not support the proposal in its current form.

Question 24: Was there any pre-application discussion between the Applicant and the Council regarding the proposed height of the Tower Building and its potential impact on the surrounding area?

32. Yes. Building height, bulk and massing were key topics throughout the pre-application process. Council officers and specialists consistently identified the scale of the Tower Building and its relationship with the Wynyard Precinct built form framework as significant matters requiring careful consideration. Discussions focussed on the role of the site as a marker building location, the degree to which additional height could be accommodated, and the potential effects on skyline outcomes, visual amenity, public spaces and surrounding development.
33. While the design evolved during the pre-application process, Council's urban design, landscape and policy specialists remain concerned that the proposal significantly exceeds the scale anticipated by the Wynyard Precinct provisions. Those concerns are reflected in the Council's specialist assessments and the planning assessment filed with the Panel.

Question 25: Are there any concerns about reverse sensitivity between the apartment complex and Orams marine industry yard to the south of the premium apartments? Can this be adequately managed via conditions or a no complaints covenant requirement?

34. Council considers reverse sensitivity to be a relevant consideration given the proximity of the proposed residential activities to the established marine industrial activities undertaken by Orams Marine. The site forms part of a wider marine precinct where marine industry activities have historically been anticipated and protected through the planning framework.
35. However, Council's acoustic and hazardous facilities specialists have reviewed the proposal and are satisfied that the development can appropriately manage the potential effects arising from surrounding industrial activities through the proposed building design, acoustic mitigation measures and recommended consent conditions.

36. While a no-complaints covenant may provide additional recognition of the established marine industrial environment, Council does not consider that such a covenant would remove the need to appropriately manage reverse sensitivity effects through design and mitigation measures. Subject to implementation of the recommended conditions, Council considers that reverse sensitivity effects can be appropriately managed.

Transport

Question 26: Please comment on the provision of 261 car parks across four levels in this location, particularly in light of the desire to create a more transit-oriented city centre.

37. Auckland Transport notes that the proposal includes 261 car parking spaces across four levels to serve 210 residential units. The site is located within the Wynyard Quarter and benefits from excellent access to walking, cycling and public transport networks, together with close proximity to the Auckland city centre. Existing travel patterns within Wynyard Quarter demonstrate comparatively high levels of walking, public transport use and working from home relative to the wider Auckland region.
38. While Auckland Transport acknowledges that residential developments require an appropriate level of parking provision, it considers the proposed quantity of parking to be relatively high given the site's highly accessible location, the availability of alternative transport options, the objectives of the proposed Travel Management Plan, and the broader policy direction seeking to reduce reliance on private vehicle travel and support a more transit-oriented urban environment.
39. Auckland Transport considers that the provision of parking substantially in excess of one space per dwelling has the potential to encourage higher levels of private vehicle ownership and use than would otherwise be expected in this location. In AT's view, network capacity alone should not determine parking supply, and consideration should also be given to whether the level of parking provision appropriately reflects the strategic transport outcomes sought for Wynyard Quarter and the city centre.
40. Accordingly, Auckland Transport considers that the Applicant should either provide further justification for the proposed quantity of parking or reduce the number of spaces proposed. Notwithstanding this concern, AT's primary operational concerns remain the matters identified elsewhere in its assessment, including pedestrian safety, access design, construction traffic effects and the implementation of an effective Travel Management Plan.



Russell Butchers
Principal Project Lead
Auckland Council