



Memorandum

Auckland

Level 3
82 Wyndham Street
Auckland 1010
PO Box 91250
Auckland 1142

+649 358 2526

Whangarei

15 Porowini Avenue, Morningside, Whangarei 0110

+649 358 2526

Hamilton

PO Box 1094, Hamilton 3240

+647 960 0006

Tauranga

PO Box 13373, Tauranga 3141

+647 571 5511

Wellington

PO Box 11340, Wellington 6142

+644 385 9315

Nelson

27 Vanguard Street, Nelson 7010

+643 548 8551

Christchurch

PO Box 110, Christchurch 8140

+643 366 8891

Queenstown

PO Box 1028, Queenstown 9348

+643 441 1670

Dunedin

49 Water Street, Dunedin 9016

+643 470 0460

Attention: Andrew Lamont

Company: Westhaven Residential Limited Partnership

Date: 04 August 2026

From: Rachel de Lambert

Message Ref: 188 Beaumont Street Urban Design and Landscape Response to Comments from Invited Parties

Project No: BM240891

I have reviewed the comments of Auckland Council's Urban Design, Landscape and Parks technical experts and the comments received from the nine residents / owners of apartments at of 30 Madden Street, being John Dennehy, Tino Management Limited, J M Courtney Trustees Limited, Tim and Jenny Ellis, Anthony Quirk, The Martin Kunz Living Trust, Sandra Cameron and Hamish Caithness, Rob and Robyn Pryor, and Richard Greissman, all of whom raise comments in relation to Urban Design and Landscape matters in relation to the 188 Beaumont Street Project ("**Project**").

This memorandum provides a response to comments from the invited parties on:

- a) The built form and design of the Project;
- b) The extent of verandah coverage to be provided;
- c) Effects on daylight, sunlight and shading;
- d) The provision of outlook space from the Project; and
- e) The provision of public open space adjacent to the Waitematā Harbour.

In addition, Auckland Council considered there is an information gap, suggesting that no viewpoint render has been provided from Wynyard Point. This is incorrect, the visual simulation VS8 included in the Graphic Supplement to the Urban Design and Landscape Assessment ("**UDLA**"), Appendix 1, illustrates this viewpoint. Accordingly, I do not address this point any further.

Built form and design of the Project:

Auckland Council and some of the residents of 30 Madden¹ have provided comments on the built form and design of the Project, this includes:

- the proposed height, scale and massing of the Project;
- the visual dominance of the Project, primarily the Tower building component of the Project, in relation to the surrounding local context; and
- an alleged lack of an expressed top / clear architectural termination to the Tower building.

Height, scale and massing:

Richard Greissman raises concerns about the Marina and Beaumont Buildings 'breaching their permissible heights' with reference to a table of the Auckland Unitary Plan ("**AUP**") Wynyard Precinct Height standards for all three components of the Site, the Project's proposed heights at these locations and a percentage variance. In my opinion (and this is also addressed from a legal perspective in the accompanying memorandum of counsel) it is the effects of the Project (as a standalone proposal on its merits) that need to

¹ Comments from John Dennehy, Tino Management Limited, J M Courtney Trustees Limited, Tim and Jenny Ellis, Anthony Quirk, The Martin Kunz Living Trust, Sandra Cameron and Hamish Caithness, Rob and Robyn Pryor, and Richard Greissman.

be assessed not the percentage of variance from the AUP permitted height standards. All three buildings which form the Project have been carefully designed relative to their context and the Precinct provisions.

In particular, the Beaumont and Marina buildings respond on their north elevation to the angled façade of the Tower, with the upper levels angling back above a four (Beaumont) and five (Marina) storey podium base reducing the massing of the upper levels to the street and tying the architectural design together with a unified aesthetic. The open podium at the Jellicoe Street frontage also brings the landscaped podium to the street making a connection with the planting of Jellicoe Street and Silo Park. The base of all street elevations comprise a brick materiality that is well articulated and finely detailed with solid and void massing. On the Beaumont Street façade, the upper portion of the building (above the 4 level base) has a visually lighter composition and materiality supporting the human scale of the street.

Auckland Council's urban designer and landscape designer both consider that the design of the Beaumont and Marina buildings successfully mitigates the overall bulk of the buildings.² I agree with this due to the design features described above.

Auckland Council and residents of 30 Madden³ have also commented on the height, scale and massing of the Tower building. While the Tower exceeds the 62m permitted height standard in the Wynyard Precinct provisions for this portion of the Site, the design of the Tower is a site specific response to the building's location within the Precinct. It makes explicit the 'wharf axis' in the location where this axis intersects with the 'waterfront axis'. The wharf axis is also reflected in what has now become known as Te Ara Tukutuku, the future location of a regionally scaled headland open space / park along with further urban development. The Tower assists in supporting the legibility of the headland within the wider cityscape. The modulation of the Tower into its three components, angling back to align with the axis and reducing in floor plate at each step is designed to reduce the scale of the building as it increases in height, particularly on its most public north and east façades. This reduction in height also responds to the Tower's height with the top component of the building – levels 17 to 21 reduced to 874m² Gross Floor Area ("GFA") and level 22 at 698m² GFA. The point at which the building steps is traced around to all four facades with an indented balcony on the west and south façades. The building's expressed frame is a reference to the industrial heritage of the Precinct with the Tower's base reinforcing the connection through reference to the adjacent silos.

The visual dominance of the Tower in relation to the surrounding local context:

Some of the 30 Madden residents and Auckland Council have raised concerns with the visual dominance of the Project in relation to the surrounding local context at Wynyard Quarter.⁴

The Wynyard Quarter is one of the precincts of the City Centre. Along with the Central City (the core of which is not subject to a numerical maximum building height) and the precincts to the east are intended to support the most intensive urban development in Auckland, including mid and high rise development as part of the efficient use of city centre land. The high-rise landscape of the city centre precincts will continue to change over and may reasonably be expected to include buildings of increasing height.

The majority of development that has been consented and built in the Wynyard Quarter to date, including 30 Madden, has also exceeded the permitted heights of the Precinct. This in part reflects the aspiration for a 'quality compact city' and has resulted in a varied and interesting skyline in the Precinct.

The Site of the proposed Tower is one of the identified 'marker building' sites of the Precinct, being one of four such sites on the waterfront axis. Two further marker sites are located on the vacant site to the immediate east. In this respect, the Site is one that is anticipated to create a landmark as part of the western City Centre precinct.

Mr Pryor considers the Project "challenges the primacy of the Central City core, presenting a competing element, in isolation from the CBD⁵." However, and perhaps to explain why Mr Pryor and I come to such different conclusions in respect of the nature and scale of adverse effects of the Project, I consider the Project including the Tower to form a complimentary component of the city centre. The number, density and varied forms of towers that comprise the central core of the city centre will in my opinion maintain the clear

² Annexure 3: Urban Design 23 July 2026 para 5.8.

³ Comments from Tim and Jenny Ellis, Anthony Quirk, the Martin Kunz Living Trust, Richard Greissman, Tino Management Limited, John Dennehy, Sandra Cameron and Hamish Caithness, John Courtney and Rob and Robyn Pryor.

⁴ Comments from Tim and Jenny Ellis, the Martin Kunz Living trust, Sandra Cameron and Hamish Caithness, John Courtney, Rob and Robyn Pryor, Anthony Quirk, Richard Greissman, and John Dennehy.

⁵ Comments from Rob and Robyn Pryor, section 3 bullet point 3.

primacy of that part of the city centre. The Project will link the Precinct more clearly to the city centre but the overall stepped nature of planned height within the Precinct, including within the Project, will provide for the differentiation of the Wynyard Precinct from the City Centre, reinforce the distinction between the precincts and will not undermine the role of the City Centre.

I do not agree with Auckland Council's and the residents of 30 Madden's comments in respect of the visual dominance of the Tower and in particular the comments of the Council Urban Design and Landscape peer reviewers in respect of the Tower's component elevations. Whilst the façade of the building is not the same on all elevations it is clearly designed 'in the round' and in my opinion relates well to the way in which the Tower will actually be experienced by people in the urban landscape.

The building responds directly to its most public elevations being to the east and north, to the harbour and the immediate public realm of Silo Park, Jellicoe Street and Te Ara Tukutuku.



Figure 1: WAM view from the north-east.

These responses are to the Waterfront and Wharf axes of the Urban Design Framework which underpins the framework for the built form of the Wynyard Precinct. I do not agree with Mr Pryor that the adverse effects of the Project in views from the east would be "significant" (in respect of VS6C – Te Wero East) and "moderate to high" (in respect of VS7C – North Wharf) or with his suggestion that the 'height and bulk are excessive and lack integration with the surrounding landscape context'⁶. As described above in relation to height, scale and massing, the form of the Project is in direct reference to its landscape context, with the modulation of all three buildings designed to reduce the apparent bulk of the Site's footprint to Jellicoe Street and relate the landscaped podium to the street and Silo Park.

In the wider context views from the west, which from land are across the water / St Mary's Bay, the Tower's modulation into its three components (as described above) is legibly expressed through the horizontal recess. The vertically aligned recessed balconies reflect the residential character of the building and slim the building's overall proportions. The corner balconies legibly express the frame and reduce the building's mass and there is a clear relationship in the architectural expression of the Marina and Tower buildings.

⁶ Comments from Rob and Robyn Pryor, section 3 page 3 VS7C - North Wharf.



Figure 2: WAM view from the west.

From the south, in elevated views from St Mary's Bay, the building lies in the middle-ground with foreground industrial marine buildings that have a long horizontal massing and unrelieved, blank, industrial façades. Experienced in this context, the vertical massing of the Tower is clearly modulated to reflect the points at which the north and east façades angle, the corners are expressed and read vertically and the top is modulated. In my opinion, the scale of the building is not dominant or out of proportion with its horizontally massed foreground.



Figure31: WAM view from the south, representative of the outlook from the northern end of the Jacobs Ladder bridge walkway.

Council's peer reviewers have previously advocated for south facing balconies through the earlier urban design discussions on this southern elevation to 'break up' the façade and give a stronger residential 'reading' to the building. However, in my opinion, these are not preferred from an urban design perspective or considered viable as south facing balconies will provide poor amenity for residents, due to their south elevation / southern exposure to the prevailing south-westerly winds and have little functional purpose.

The other location in which south views to the Tower are experienced by the public is along Beaumont Street. WAM and Boffa Miskell have undertaken further work in response to Panel Minute 2 to illustrate street based views experienced along Beaumont Street, refer **Attachments A and B**, WAM Serial Views and Boffa Miskell 188 Beaumont Street, Graphic Supplement – Response to FTAA Initial Panel Questions: Question 6D. Live 3D model views were used by the design team during the design process to evaluate the

Project. These views demonstrate that the Tower (whilst seen in part above adjacent development) is not overly dominant.

Views from apartments in 30 Madden towards the Project are to the south and west façades. The height of the Tower removes sky view from some of the apartments which look towards the Project but the views from 30 Madden retain openness in a way that limits any change to enclosure. WAM has prepared a series of representative 3D model views (Fast Track Approval –30 Madden and Wynyard Central View Analysis) **Attachment C** which illustrate what in my opinion remain very open and high quality views from established residential apartments in the locality including 30 Madden. The reduction in sky view due to the height of the building will in my opinion have very little impact on the nature and quality of these northwesterly views or the nature of enclosure experienced by residents. With the benefit of these fully framed 3D model views I consider my earlier assessment of moderate adverse visual effects in respect of views from 30 Madden apartments to be conservative. I consider a more accurate assessment of the scale of effects would be low-moderate due to; the unaffected nature of westerly views; the extent of openness of views; and the distance between the Project and these neighbouring apartments. Low-moderate, in respect of the scaling identified in Te Tangi a te Manu⁷ equates to minor effects, as illustrated below.

					SIGNIFICANT	
LESS THAN MINOR		MINOR		MORE THAN MINOR		
VERY LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD	MODERATE	MOD-HIGH	HIGH	VERY HIGH

The serial views and visual simulations in my opinion further demonstrate that the Tower is not visually dominant as experienced by people in views from the south in a way that is unacceptable or generates moderate to moderate-high adverse landscape and visual amenity effects as suggested by Ms Howdle⁸. Further, in closer proximity to the Project, such as from the corner of Madden and Beaumont Streets (refer WAM Viewpoint 5 and Boffa Miskell VS10) where Mibo café has its busy outdoor seating, the Tower is largely screened, and the finishing of the building's open top crown is clearly able to be observed.

In my opinion, no further changes are required to the design of the Tower in response to the comments of Council's Urban Design and Landscape peer reviewers.

Lack of an expressed top / clear architectural termination:

Auckland Council considers that the Tower lacks a clear architectural termination.⁹ I disagree with this as the rooftop frame is legible as a top to the building, particularly in closer views where the expressed frame is daylighted as a crown to the building reinforcing the way in which the frame is expressed as an element of the façade.

While some city centre buildings have distinctive articulated tops as part of their identity, the majority do not. In my opinion, there is a clear architectural design logic and integrity in the overall design of the Tower in completing the top of the building with the expression of its frame as an open crown. Further modulation by way of some form of distinctive, added, articulation is unnecessary.

Verandah Coverage

Council's Urban Design peer review addresses the extent of proposed verandah cover¹⁰. I agree that where verandahs are proposed to be provided these should be widened to ensure good coverage of the footpath. In response to the Council's comments, the Applicant has agreed to make this change and WAM has provided updated drawings at **Attachment D** to show the verandah extending to the line of planting on Jellicoe Street with a similar dimension to cover the footpath on Beaumont Street.

It has been an intentional design decision to not provide continuous verandah coverage at base of the Tower building. There is a clear tension in respect of the Tower frontage to Jellicoe Street which is designed to

⁷ Te Tangi a te Manu Aotearoa Landscape Assessment Guidelines Tuia Pito Ora New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, July 2022 page 151

⁸ Annexure 4: Landscape 7 July 2026 paras 5.13 and 7.1

⁹ Annexure 3: Urban Design 23 July 2026 para 5.19 and 7.3.

¹⁰ Annexure 3: Urban Design 23 July 2026 para 5.26 and 5.27.

expressly relate to the desired marine industrial context and history of the Wynyard Precinct. As described above in relation to the Tower's design, the Tower comes to the ground with expressed double height concrete columns and arched colonnade referencing the adjacent silos, with the lobby entrance set back and two symmetrical reflective pools relating the site to its water edge location whilst also accommodating the accessible access route to meet the raised, resilient, lobby floor level. Weather protection is provided by the building overhang with verandah cover to the footpath immediately adjacent to both sides. In my opinion, given the purposeful industrial reference of the Tower's design aesthetic landing to the street, it is inappropriate and unnecessary to provide additional verandah cover to this portion of Jellicoe Street. The building sits in an open space context with a prevailing character of openness and lack of cover, the development will in fact provide a significant refuge of cover for pedestrians in the locality.

Daylight, sunlight and shading

Provision of comparative shading diagrams:

Auckland Council considers there is an information gap in the provision of comparative daylight and shading analysis. A response to this is provided in the accompanying memorandum of counsel.

Effects of shading:

Auckland Council and some residents of 30 Madden¹¹ have raised concerns in relation to the shading effects of the Project.

WAM Appendix III Shading Analysis provided with the substantive application clearly illustrates in 2D plan and 3D model views the nature of shading generated by the Project as a whole in the context of the existing environment. Shading effects in respect of Silo Park and 30 Madden are comprehensively addressed in the UDLA.¹²

Since preparation of the UDLA, the Urban Design Institute Aotearoa (UDIA) has prepared Practice Note 1 – Shading Diagram Methodology and Practice Note 2 – Shading Assessment Method (S-SAM). For completeness, Boffa Miskell urban designers (Stuart Houghton and Nicole Bitossi) have undertaken an assessment using S-SAM which is included in **Attachment E**. This assessment confirms low shading effects are generated in respect of both Silo Park and 30 Madden (being the "most sensitive" sites on the sensitivity scale). It is also noted that there are no shading effects in winter when sun, rather than shade, is most valued in open space locations such as Silo Park.

On the basis of the WAM Shading Analysis and UDLA assessment provided with the substantive application I am unclear why parties, including Council's Parks reviewer, consider shading effects on Silo Park to be greater than a low effect and unacceptable in the context of this urban open space which retains substantial sun alongside shade in the late afternoon.

The Council Urban Design peer reviewers identify an information gap in respect of the analysis of shading effects on the wider public realm streets / pedestrian amenity, including the Daldy Linear Park.

I do not consider this to be an information gap. The WAM shading Analysis illustrates the shading on these areas from the Project and the following provides a narrative. The location of the Site (being to the south of Jellicoe Street with water to the west and the Orams Marine Industrial yard to the south) means that rather than generating morning and afternoon shading of the street based public realm typical of centrally located sites in the Wynyard Quarter, the Project only results in public realm shading in the afternoon throughout the year.

The residential apartment buildings that have been developed to date in the Precinct tend to be predominantly aligned north/south along Beaumont, Daldy and Halsey Streets. The Project's Beaumont and Tower buildings have relatively short north/south length compared to other nearby developments which due to their mid-precinct location cast morning and afternoon shade to the public realm of the Precinct's streets. The WAM Shading Analysis shows the Project casting an extent of afternoon (only) shading to streets that is commensurate with established development, such as 30 Madden. As the shading analysis illustrates, 30 Madden casts its afternoon shade directly onto the Daldy Street Linear Park. Shading from the

¹¹ Comments from Tim and Jenny Ellis, the Martin Kunz Living trust, Tino Management Limited, Sandra Cameron and Hamish Caithness, and Rob and Robyn Pryor.

¹² Boffa Miskell UDLA section 13.1.5 Shading.

Project, cast over the open expanse of the car park to the east, does not reach the Daldy Street Linear Park in summer. In Spring / Autumn it reaches the Linear Park around 4pm and in winter from between 2.30pm and 3pm. Spring / Autumn late afternoon shade – around 5pm is cast on Jellicoe Street. In my opinion, the shading of the public realm to the west of the Site in the afternoon is commensurate with that expected in the City Centre where streets are aligned north/south with the noted benefit of no shading effects on the public realm in the morning.

Effects of daylight access to streets, public places and nearby sites:

Auckland Council considers there is an information gap in respect of a daylight assessment on the surrounding environment (relative to Assessment Criteria H8.8.2(1)(a) (iib) which provides:

the extent to which buildings are designed to ensure adequate sunlight and daylight access to streets, public places and nearby sites.

Some residents / owners of apartments at 30 Madden also comment in respect of sunlight / daylight effects.¹³

Shading and daylight effects are inter-related. The Site benefits from a high degree of openness, adjacency to non-sensitive water and marine industrial yard activities and wide street frontages to the north and east this means the apartments facing these areas will benefit from daylight. In terms of potentially sensitive environments, the open space of Silo Park lies to the north. The Project will have very limited effects on daylight to Silo Park, low level shading effects to the park in Summer will have negligible daylight effects in respect of the public realm of the park which will continue to receive high levels of sunlight and daylight. As discussed in the UDLA,¹⁴ the site is well separated from the closest adjacent residential development at 30 Madden being diagonally separated by some 70m, daylight effects in respect of this established residential catchment, as further illustrated in **Attachment E** will be low.

Shading and / or daylight effects to the surrounding streets are limited due to the westerly position of the Project site within the Precinct and its location to the south of Jellicoe Street. As a result, shading and daylight effects throughout the year are limited to the afternoon. The open context of the Project in terms of its streetscape environment and adjacent open space including Silo Park and the car park to the east mean that high levels of daylight will be maintained to the adjacent street network.

Outlook space from the Project

Auckland Council has commented on the proposed outlook spaces of the southern facing apartments over the adjoining site at 164 Beaumont Street. The response to question 0.7 in the Response to Panel Questions from the Applicant addressed this point and outlines the assessment of potential effects if the adjoining site at 164 Beaumont Street were developed in the future. In summary, the infringements relate to a relatively small proportion of bedrooms (approximately 6.8% of the 456 bedrooms and studies across the Project) and do not affect any principal living rooms or primary bedrooms. For the Marina Building, affected rooms are secondary bedrooms and studies which already have limited views, and for the Tower Building, the infringements relate only to a small corner (less than 1 square metre) of the required outlook space. Overall, the effects of not securing the outlook spaces in perpetuity are considered to be less than minor and acceptable.

Provision of public open space adjacent to the Waitemata Harbour

Mr Pryor suggests that the Project will result in 'the loss of openness and increased privatisation of the waterfront'¹⁵. I do not consider this to be the case. The Site is intended for development and under the Precinct provisions in the AUP the Project could be built to the western water edge as of right. The 7m setback offered is designed to comprise both freely accessible public space and west facing, publicly accessible, Food & Beverage retail. The Project therefore offers enhanced public access to the western waterfront, in a location where access is largely prevented due to marine industrial activities. The west facing, afternoon sun aspect of this location will be attractive to the public and will provide additional amenity and quality public realm as a complement to the Precinct.

¹³ Comments from Martin Kunz Living Trust and Tim and Jenny Ellis.

¹⁴ Boffa Miskell UDLA Section 11.0 The Subject Site pg18 para 1; 13.1.4 Relationship to Neighbouring Properties pg31

¹⁵ Comments of Rob and Robyn Pryor, section 3 page 4 Public Access and Amenity Concerns