
188 Beaumont Street (FTAA-2604-1205)

From [REDACTED]
Date Mon 3/08/2026 8:03 PM
To FastTrack Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>
Cc ContactFastTrack <contact@fasttrack.govt.nz>

 1 attachment (81 KB)

;

Feedback on Fast-track application for 188 Beaumont Street, Auckland Central / Wynyard Quarter for 210 residential apartments

The Expert Panel Secretariat, Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)

Application Reference: 188 Beaumont Street (FTAA-2604-1205)

Date: 3rd August 2026

Submitter Details: Peter Gordon

Property Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Contact: [REDACTED]

Firstly I apologise for this submission arriving late. I and most residents in our building had based the closing date for comments from the following on your website

<https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/188-beaumont-street/comments-from-invited-parties>

Where it states:

Invitation for comments

17 July 2026

The expert panel issued Minute 3 clarifying an administrative error that occurred during the invitation to comment process.

The closing date for comments under this Minute is 13 August 2026.

Feedback on Fast-track application for 188 Beaumont Street, Auckland Central / Wynyard Quarter for 210 residential apartments

We have lived in our apartment since 10 March 2021 and I write to urge the Expert Panel to reject the Fast Track application related to the 188 Beaumont Street project. Instead I, and my neighbours, believe that it should be assessed under the established AUP / Wynyard Quarter Master Plan guidelines, which permits an apartment tower to a maximum height of only 62 metres above street level. And until recently the permissible height was 52m, raised to 62 metres by a non-notified consent decision which was a huge shock for us residents, so this further increase is even more shocking.

I see no reason why a significant height breach is being considered for the development at 188 Beaumont street, and I can't comprehend how adding 20 metres of height is of National Significance? What issue to the Nation is this increase addressing? It is simply adding a small number of housing stock to the luxury apartment sector.

These apartments are aimed for Super Yacht owners - who will hopefully get their ships serviced at Orams. As these owners tend to live offshore, these apartments will remain mostly vacant. The residents will therefore contribute very little to the local economy, but local housing prices will likely increase and this will not help to make housing in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland more affordable. There are also a large number of carparks included within the build of the 3 towers, yet Wynyard Quarter's appeal is surely that we have one of the best public transport hubs in the city (in the Quarter and also at the northern side of Victoria Park), so who will the car parks be used by? Will the developers sell or lease them to non-residents who will drive into our neighbourhood? I was also surprised to read that the development is being called mixed use – yet it seems there will be just two hospitality sites included. Is it legitimate to therefore call it mixed use? I was also surprised that land that is supposedly zoned to be used by the Marine Industry is in fact being used solely to build luxury apartments. If the only connection to the marine industry is that super yacht owners will possibly live in some of them from time to time, then can this really even be called Marine industry usage?

I live in the 30 Madden apartments and we moved here just over five years ago because we had faith in the Unitary Plan for Wynyard Quarter, where taller buildings would run down the spine of the neighbourhood with lower buildings closer to the water's edge. I oppose 188 Beaumont because at a proposed 80+ metres (and to be honest we still don't know how the top will be finished) near the water's edge it is considerably taller than anything in the neighbourhood, let alone the water edges.

Fast Track seems to be being used in this case to simply bulldoze approval to add another 6-12 luxury apartments to the building, while at the same time causing shading, wind issues and extra traffic and congestion to our neighbourhood. I sit on the Body Corporate of 30 Madden and have been instrumental the past 10 months in looking at getting solar installed on our roofs, well before this issue arose. The extra height will have an impact on solar, at a time when we are doing our best to be more environmentally sustainable and resilient in an uncertain global environment.

Personally I welcome and embrace development at 188 Beaumont Street. The precinct will, as it should, benefit once this vacant lot (currently a car park) is transformed into a genuine mixed-use complex. But I urge the Expert Panel to reject this development as a legitimate Fast Track proposition. I would hope the Expert Panel will honour and safeguard the provisions of the Act by denying the application's worthiness against the Section 22 criteria — as the Ministry's own reviewers did when they recommended that it be declined.

To support my position in opposition to this Fast Track application, I refer the Expert Panel to the commentaries submitted by my fellow 30 Madden owners Rob and Robyn Pryor at [REDACTED] and Richard Greissman at [REDACTED]. I have read and endorse the arguments contained in both of their submissions.

Ngā mihi nui

Peter Gordon

