

188 Beaumont Street Fast Track Application

Advice to Consenting Panel

Peer Reviewer:	Rebecca Skidmore, RA Skidmore Urban Design Ltd.
Area of Expertise:	Urban Design Landscape (including Visual) Effects
Date:	25 August 2026
Application Details:	An application by Westhaven Residential Limited Partnership for a comprehensive development at 188 Beaumont Street, Wynyard Quarter
Peer Reviewers Reference:	26016

1 Introduction and Area of Expertise

- 1.1 My name is Rebecca Anne Skidmore. I am an Urban Designer and Landscape Architect. I am a director of the consultancy RA Skidmore Urban Design Limited and have held this position for approximately twenty-three years.
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Science degree from Canterbury University (1987), a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Hons) degree from Lincoln University (1990), and a Master of Built Environment (Urban Design) degree from Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane (1995).
- 1.3 I have approximately 31 years' professional experience, practising in both local government and the private sector. In these positions, I have assisted with district plan preparation and I have assessed and reviewed a wide range of resource consent applications throughout the country. These assessments relate to a range of rural, residential, and commercial proposals. I have also reviewed a broad range of transport-related notices of requirement.
- 1.4 I regularly assist councils with policy and district plan development in relation to growth management, urban design, landscape, character, and amenity matters. I have considerable familiarity with planning in the Wynyard Quarter having assisted the former Auckland Waterfront Advisory Group ("AWAG") and Auckland City Council with urban design and landscape advice to inform strategic planning for the Quarter, and subsequently reported on the plan change that established the initial Precinct provisions. I have also provided design review advice on a number of development proposal within the Wynyard Quarter as part of the former Eke Panuku Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"). I note that none of these reviews related to the subject site (the "Site") or immediately surrounding sites.
- 1.5 I am an accredited independent hearing commissioner. I also have extensive experience providing expert evidence in the Environment Court and I have appeared as the Court's witness in the past.

Purpose and Scope of Report

- 1.6 I have been requested by the Expert Consenting Panel to provide advice on the lodged Urban Design and Landscape Assessment and subsequent information provided (including responses to the comments received) and the relevant comments received, including reports from the Council's specialists (urban design, landscape (including visual), and parks) and comments received from residents of 30 Madden Street.
- 1.7 In Appendix 1 I set out the documents I have reviewed.
- 1.8 The Panel has set out a series of questions that they seek comment on. These are addressed in Section 7 below.

- 1.9 While I am familiar with the immediate and wider context of the Site, in carrying out the review, I visited the Site and its environs on the 16th August 2026.

2 Boffa Miskell Urban Design and Landscape Assessment Methodology and Conclusions

- 2.1 The Urban Design and Landscape Assessment report (Appendix 15 of the application) by Boffa Miskell (the “BM report”) assesses the scheme information contained in:
- the Design Statement by Warren and Mahoney (Appendix 5 of the Application);
 - Landscape report for Western Waterfront and Streetscape Interfaces by Boffa Miskell (Appendix 6 of the Application); and
 - Landscape Drawings for the Podium and Tower Entrance by Warren and Mahoney (Appendix 7 of the Application).
- 2.2 The methodology used for carrying out the assessment is set out in Section 5 of the report. In terms of the Landscape Effects Assessment I agree that the methodology used is consistent with the guidance set out in Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines.
- 2.3 The landscape assessment is informed by a series of visual simulations from public representative viewpoints (contained in the graphic supplement in Appendix 1 of the report). In my opinion, these images follow an appropriate methodology and are helpful to inform the assessment.
- 2.4 There is no equivalent clear guidance for the methodology to be used in relation to urban design and assessing associated effects. The methodology used is set out in Section 5.2 of the report. The topics assessed in Section 13 include:
- Neighbourhood character;
 - Public realm interfaces;
 - Residential Amenity;
 - Relationship to Neighbouring Properties; and
 - Shading.
- 2.5 In my opinion, it would be helpful to include an assessment of the proposed activity mix for the Site, particularly given the departure from the marine focus and resulting RMA non-complying

activity status of the activity. While this is addressed in the Economic Assessment, it is also a relevant urban design consideration.

- 2.6 I also consider an assessment of effects on urban structure and the broader Cityscape would be helpful. While this is touched on in various sections of the report, I consider a specific analysis would be helpful with reference to the various documents that have led to the existing structure of the Quarter and the identified structuring elements of the Precinct.
- 2.7 I note that one of the key structuring elements that was determined very early in the vision for the Quarter¹ (and depicted in the 2014 UDF) was the identification of the three axes – waterfront; park; and wharf. These are described in the report. I note that the diagram on p.17 of the Design Statement incorrectly locates the Park axis and Wharf axis in relation to the Site. The Park Axis follows Daldy Street (with its linear park connecting through to Victoria Park) rather than Beaumont Street and the wharf axis is located further east to align with the wharf along the eastern side of the headland. This is important as it demonstrates the value of the ‘marker building’ annotation for the Site as reinforcing the waterfront axis, together with other buildings along that alignment, but not forming the nexus of the Park and Wharf Axes.
- 2.8 Both the Design Statement and the BM report place considerable emphasis on the role of the Site as defining the gateway to Te Ara Tukutuku. I don’t agree. In my opinion, the entrance to this yet to be developed headland area is located to the north of the open space and gantry. Future development on parcels within Te Ara Tututuku will provide the gateway to this area and the headland park at the end of the reclaimed headland. The Site is separated from this open space threshold by the Site 12 development site (currently occupied by the ‘6 pack silos’).
- 2.9 The conclusions of the assessment are set out in Section 15 of the BM report. I agree that the Proposal will continue urban regeneration of the Wynard Quarter in a key location within the Precinct. The Proposal will introduce a primarily residential development with some F&B activity at key corners that will serve to activate the public realm. While the Site is attractive to residential use, the activity mix proposed will, in my opinion, result in some weakening of the marine industry focus along the western edge of the Quarter.
- 2.10 I agree that the Proposal is of a high quality and in many respects will enhance the urban amenity and vitality of the Precinct. However, I do not agree with the conclusion that, overall, the landscape effects will be beneficial/positive. I consider the Beaumont building and Marina building components of the Project are of a scale and form that can be suitably integrated with their context. While acknowledging the identification of the Site as suitable to accommodate a ‘marker’ building, I consider the overall mass of the Tower building is out of scale with the Wynyard Quarter area of the Cityscape and will erode the establishing character of the Quarter and its distinction from the core of the City centre. In my opinion, the BM report places too

¹ Shown in the 2005 Ports of Auckland ‘Blue Book’

much emphasis on the verticality of the building and its role in providing a 'marker' rather than the overall mass and profile the building will create. In relation to this key matter further comments are set out in the following sections.

3 Council Assessment Reports

Urban Design Review

- 3.1 The Council Urban Design Review (the "UDR") notes the positive aspects of the proposed Site layout, considering this to positively respond to the characteristics of the Site and the surrounding public realm. I generally agree with this observation. However, I note that the four-level carpark is not completed sleeved, as described in the Boffa Miskell report. Solid carpark walls are located either side of the Tower building recessed lobby on Jellicoe Street. 'Green Wall' planting is proposed in association with these walls (shown in Appendix 7 drawings). However, little detail is provided to confirm how this feature treatment will be established and successfully maintained.
- 3.2 In terms of building height and bulk, the UDR notes that the distribution and transition of heights generally aligns with the AUP's anticipated height changes across the site. However, the proposed height and bulk are significantly greater than enabled. The report finds that the scale and architectural expression of the Marina and Beaumont buildings are an appropriate fit with the surrounding context and sets out the reasoning for this opinion. I agree with that conclusion, with the qualification regarding uncertainty regarding the outcomes sought by the green wall treatment along Jellicoe Street as set out above.
- 3.3 The key issue identified in the UDR relates to the effects resulting from the proposed height, scale and massing of the Tower building. The report finds that the Tower form and appearance significantly deviates from the established scale and character of the Wynard Precinct, and the built form outcomes anticipated within the City Centre zone. The report appears to consider the overall height of the building to be appropriate, but considers the massing of the building form lacks a cohesive three dimensional design resolution. While the angled facades are considered to be successful in breaking up the tower's mass from northern vantage points, the absence of corresponding design techniques is described as resulting in a bulky, visually dominant form when viewed from the south and west. The rectilinear form is described as offering limited visual relief and this is reinforced by the flat roof form.
- 3.4 The UDR concludes that the Tower building's height and massing requires further design refinement to appropriately respond to the Site's prominent location, mitigate adverse visual dominance effects and achieve built form outcomes anticipated by AUP objectives and policies. In relation to the wider skyline of the City Centre, the UDR considers there is a risk that the Tower building will compete with rather than complement the City Centre core, the wider skyline

and established city views. The report recommends design modification to resolve the adverse effects identified.

- 3.5 I agree that the overall scale of the building creates an incongruous built form element in relation to the surrounding context and outcomes sought both for the Precinct, and the broader City centre as set out in the AUP. In my opinion, the height of the building cannot be considered in isolation. The effects associated with the building result from a combination of the height, mass, proportion, and architectural expression. This opinion is aligned with the UDR comment. However, I consider more than design refinement is required to avoid these adverse effects.
- 3.6 The UDR addresses shading effects and effects on access to daylight. The UDR considers that while the effects on apartments at 30 Madden Street may be low (in terms of duration) when considered in isolation, consideration should also be given to the cumulative effects experienced due to the dense built environment.
- 3.7 In terms of the shading effects, an updated assessment was provided in response to comments received. Further comment is made in Section 5 below.
- 3.8 In terms of the mix of activities proposed, the UDR finds that the proposed tenancy mix will successfully support the wider mixed-use character of the area. It notes that a critical outcome is that the spatial configuration successfully embeds long-term design flexibility with the ground floor tenancies able to accommodate a diverse range of commercial uses over time. In my opinion once the predominant residential use of the Site is established it is unlikely that the ground floor tenancies would evolve to accommodate a broad range of activities, particularly marine related uses.

Landscape Review

- 3.9 The Landscape Review (the "LR") concludes that the additional scale and height of the Marina building and Beaumont building have been appropriately managed as experienced from local and wider viewpoint locations. As set out above, I agree with that conclusion.
- 3.10 The key issue identified in the LR relates to the scale and form of the Tower building and the associated landscape character and visual effects, particularly as experienced from the local and wider urban landscape from the south-west, south and south-east (Viewpoints 3, 4, and 5 of the visual simulations). The report concludes that the proposed Tower will not make a positive contribution to the skyline of the city, achieve a transition in height down to the coastal edge and is not of a design quality that is commensurate with the prominence and visual effects of the development.
- 3.11 I agree with the observations that the overall massing and appearance of the Tower building is incongruous with the established character of the Wynard Quarter and the outcomes sought as it evolves and develops in the future. While the AUP identifies the Site as suitable to accommodate a building with additional verticality, I consider the overall mass and architectural

form contribute to an overly bulky form that visually competes with rather than integrates with and complements the wider Cityscape, particularly when viewed from the west and south (see visual simulations from Viewpoints 1 – 5).

Parks Review

- 3.12 The Parks Review (the “PR”) notes the Site’s location adjacent to Silo Park and highlight’s its role as a key destination open space within the Wynyard Quarter.
- 3.13 The report identifies positive aspects of the Proposal, including active ground floor uses that will enhance the interface with Silo Park. The key adverse effect of concern raised in the review relates to shading effects on Silo Park, particularly those experienced in the late afternoon and early evening. The report also considers the increased building height will contribute to a greater perception of enclosure along the park interface, reducing the amenity values experienced.
- 3.14 In terms of the shading effects, an updated assessment was provided in response to comments received. Further comment is made in Section 5 below.

Auckland Council Response to Expert Panel Minute 2 Questions

- 3.15 The Council memo (Annexure 22) addresses a number of questions from the Panel that are relevant to the urban design and landscape assessments provided.
- 3.16 I agree with the response to Question 15 that the increases above the permitted standards relating to maximum tower dimension (above 31m) and gross floor area controls ‘materially contribute to the perceived bulk and massing of the Tower building’. I note that, while considered appropriate in relation to their context, the adjacent Beaumont building and Marina building exceed the permitted height standard for the Site. In my opinion, this also contributes to the visual bulkiness of the Tower building and the imperative for a considerably higher tower form to create a proportion that relates to the lower building forms and the large floorplate of the tower.
- 3.17 The memo addresses Question 16 relating to shading of public places. The response notes that the additional scale of development proposed on the Site will result in shading of public realm spaces, principally Silo Park and surrounding pedestrian areas, that is beyond that anticipated by the Wynard Precinct provisions. I provide further comment on the additional shading analysis provided by the Applicant below.
- 3.18 In response to Question 17, the memo notes concerns that 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. I share those concerns.

- 3.19 In terms of the response to Question 18 regarding the extent of F&B at ground level along Jellicoe Street, I agree that the level of activation along the street frontage is limited. While the design of the frontage cleverly balances access with accommodating resilience to sea level rise, the frontage will create a strong residential focus. I have highlighted above queries about the success of the 'green wall' strategy to screen the carpark walls along this frontage.
- 3.20 In response to Question 19, the memo notes the Proposal can technically be described as a mixed-use development. However, it is described as overwhelmingly residential in character. In my opinion, this is a residential project with supporting F&B components, rather than a mixed-use development in the true sense of the word.
- 3.21 In relation to Question 20, I have set out my opinion above, regarding the relationship of the Stie to the three key axes.
- 3.22 While Question 21 relates to pre-application discussions with the Applicant, I note that I share the Council's concerns about the southern elevation. However, I note that, in my opinion, the adverse effects resulting from the overall scale, bulk and form of the Tower building cannot be addressed through further articulation of the southern façade alone.
- 3.23 In response to Question 22, the Council notes support for the setbacks proposed. I agree that the street setbacks have been carefully considered to enable outdoor dining and provide for access to raised floor levels to provide resilience to future sea level rise. While I agree that the setback from the western edge with public access available is beneficial, in the context of the publicly accessible waterfront in the wider Precinct, this benefit is limited, particularly as it does not provide access to a continued connection along the western edge to the south.

4 30 Madden Street Resident Comments

- 4.1 A number of comments were received from residents of 30 Madden Street. In some respects, these reiterate matters raised in the Council reviews. The comments received from Rob and Robyn Pryor set out a comprehensive analysis of landscape and amenity effects, noting that Mr Pryor is an experienced landscape architect. The comments consider the Proposal (Tower building) is out of scale with the surrounding built environment and undermines the original intent of the Urban Design framework, which sought to maintain a balanced and legible skyline. The comments make the observation that the scale of the proposed Tower will diminish the landmark qualities of other 'marker buildings' and will challenge the primacy of the CBD high-rise core.
- 4.2 As set out above, I generally agree with these observations. In addition, I agree with the observation that the increased bulk of the proposed building as a marker of the waterfront axis, diminishes the roll of other marker buildings, including the ASB building at the other end of the Wynyard Quarter portion of the axis. In terms of the commentary provided relating to specific

visual simulation viewpoints, I agree with the observations relating to Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3. In relation to the comments about Viewpoints 6 and 7, I agree that the overall scale of the Tower building will result in adverse visual effects. However, when considered in relation to the two flanking buildings and the design approach of cranking the building form to create a more dynamic interface, I consider the apparent visual bulk will be reduced.

- 4.3 The comments of the Pryors and a number of other residents of 30 Madden Street also address visual dominance effects experienced from apartments at 30 Madded Street. A response, including further modelling was provided by the Applicant, and I make further comment in Section 5 below.
- 4.4 Similarly, a number of comments raise concerns about shading effects. Further comment is provided in Section 5 below.
- 4.5 In conclusion, the comments from the Pryor's note that the concerns raised 'highlight the tension between the desire for a landmark building and the need to respect established urban design principles, streetscape and public amenity, residential amenity and the character of the Wynyard Precinct.
- 4.6 I agree with this observation. I note that from the outset, development of the planning framework for the Wynyard Quarter has been a 'design-led' process. While the world has changed and various aspects of the Quarter's built environment has evolved and changed over time, the underlying structuring design principles remain intact. In my opinion, the overall scale, bulk and architectural expression of the Tower building challenges the balance sought for enabling additional building height in key locations within the Precinct and contributing positively to the Quarter's distinctive character and its place in the wider central City.
- 4.7 The comments provided by the J M Courtney Trustees Ltd. considers the Proposal provides excessive carparking, which is inconsistent with celebrating a transit-oriented, walkable catchment near the CBD.
- 4.8 While the proposed carparking is above ground level, there is a single entry point from Beaumont Street, reducing the adverse amenity effects resulting from multiple crossings. A large proportion of the carpark structure is sleeved. However, as noted above there are portion of the structure that will interface with the Jellicoe Street frontage.

5 Applicant Response to Comments

- 5.1 The legal response to a number of issues raised in comments is set out in the memorandum of counsel. The package of material provided by the Applicant also includes response to queries raised by the Panel in Minute 2. The responses provided by Barker and Associates is contained in Attachment B and is accompanied by a number of specialist responses. This includes:

- Attachment B1- Public Area Markup;
 - Attachment B2- Beaumont Street View Analysis;
 - Attachment B3 – Boffa Miskell Graphic Supplement (additional visual simulations).
- 5.2 The response provided includes an Urban Design and Landscape Response (Boffa Miskell, Attachment F) that also references a number of additional attachments:
- Attachment F.C – 30 Madden and Wynard Central View Analysis;
 - Attachment F.D – architectural plans, elevations and cross sections showing amended verhandah;
 - Attachment F.E – updated shading analysis.
- 5.3 In my opinion the response set out in the Boffa Miskell memo reinforces the emphasis placed in the original assessment on the role of the Tower building in providing a distinctive ‘marker building’ in this location. I have set out my differing opinion in this regard. In my opinion the scale (including but not limited to height), bulk and architectural character need to be considered in relation how they contribute to the evolving Precinct in way that contributes to a varied skyline, reinforces the waterfront axis, but also respects the character qualities of the Precinct and its place as part of the City Centre.
- 5.4 As noted in the Boffa Miskell memo, the Precinct is part of the City Centre and a greater scale of development can be anticipated as it continues to evolve. However, that change needs to be considered in the context of the planned framework for the City centre and the outcomes sought.
- 5.5 The Boffa Miskell memo notes that the majority of development in the Precinct has exceeded the permitted height standards and has resulted in a varied and interesting skyline. I accept this variation has occurred. However, the proposed Tower scale (both in terms of floorplates and height) represents a clear, and I would say, incongruous step-change in the built environment.
- 5.6 In response to the Council’s UDR and LR comments about the flat termination to the Tower form, the Boffa Miskell memo sets out the design rationale for the expressed frame as a continuation of the architectural design logic and integrity of the overall Tower design. I note that while the building design references the industrial heritage of the area, I would say quite successfully at the lower portion of the building, it becomes more problematic for the upper form of the building which has a strong verticality and residential nature that does not reflect the industrial forms references. In my opinion, the architectural response exacerbates the prominence of the building viewed from surrounding locations, particularly to the west (see Viewpoints 1-3) and south (from elevated locations outside the Precinct, see Viewpoint 4 and 5).

- 5.7 The Beaumont Street View Analysis provided in Attachment B2 is helpful to understand how the Tower building will be experienced from this street corridor. As evident in the images, the building will be prominent. However, in the context of the other buildings that enclose the street corridor, I consider the building will not appear as overly dominant for those travelling along the corridor.
- 5.8 With the additional view analysis modelling contained in Attachment F.C, the Boffa Miskell memo revises the visual effects rating downwards from moderate adverse to low-moderate adverse. In my opinion, the separation distance and intervening development reduces the dominance effects associated with the Tower building to some extent. However, due to the overall proportion and form of the building, I consider adverse visual effects experienced will be moderate. I note that when the adjacent property at 37-55 Madden Street is developed effects experienced from apartments in the Daldy building would be reduced.
- 5.9 In relation to the Council's UDR recommendation to extend the verandah cover, where verandah's are proposed these have been extended (as shown in Attachment F.D) to provide better weather protection. The Boffa Miskell memo notes that it is intentional that no verandah is proposed along the Tower building frontage. I agree with that rationale.
- 5.10 Attachment F.E provides an updated shading assessment that is consistent with the methodology provided in the UDIA Practise Note 2 – Shading Assessment Method (S-SAM). The guidance is helpful to put some clear parameters around shading effects assessment. I note that the assessed area for Silo Park (shown on sheet 3) includes the Site 12 development site opposite the Site on Jellicoe Street.
- 5.11 I agree that shading effects on Silo Park will be low. In terms of shading of apartments at 30 Madden Street, I note that some residents will particularly value access to sunlight in the middle of the day (when shading at the Winter solstice will occur). However, due to the limited time of shading (1.25 hours for a limited number of apartments), I agree that the assessment that, overall the adverse shading effect resulting from the Proposal is low.

6 Information Gaps

- 6.1 As set out in the sections above, I consider the following information gaps exist:
- An urban design analysis of the urban structure and Cityscape effects resulting from the Proposal;
 - An urban design analysis of the proposed activity mix in relation to the outcomes sought for the Precinct;

- Additional detail demonstrating how the proposed green walls will be established and maintained.
- Additional annotated architectural plans identifying permitted height standards and footprint dimension above 31m standard.

7 Specific Panel Questions

- 7.1 The Panel has asked me to respond to a series of specific questions. My response to each is set out below.

Question

What is your opinion on the meaning of “marker” building?

Response

- 7.2 I note that ‘marker building’ is not a term used in the AUP. It is a reference to early planning and structuring work that led to the first Plan Change for the Wynyard Quarter. This term is also used in the 2014 UDF which also identified a number of ‘marker building’ sites with greater height enabled to reinforce the waterfront, wharf and park axes. In my opinion, the purpose of the marker buildings is to assist wayfinding within the Precinct, particularly in relation to these three structuring axes and to contribute to a varied skyline in a way that also reinforces these key structuring axes. While additional permitted height standards is the way this concept has been reflected in the current AUP provisions, I note that height is not the only way to achieve a marker within the urban framework. The ASB building at the eastern end of the Quarter’s portion of the waterfront axis takes a different approach of creating a distinctive building form and roof feature to provide a marker (with only the roof feature extending to the 52m permitted standard).

Question

What is the relevance and importance of the Wynyard Quarter masterplan to any UD/L&V assessment?

Response

- 7.3 There have been various iterations of masterplans for the Wynyard Quarter dating back to the early 2000’s. These include the masterplan contained in the Wynyard Quarter Urban Design Framework (2007), the Auckland Waterfront Masterplan (2009), the masterplan contained in the Waterfront Plan (2012) and the updated Wynyard Precinct: Urban Design Framework (2014). These documents have provided variations and updated concepts. However, they are

all structured around the three key axes through the precinct: the waterfront, wharf and park axes. The various plans are helpful to understand the design rationale for the existing environment in the Precinct and the background to the AUP precinct provisions. However, all these documents were prepared some time ago. There have been various changes to urban environments and the way growth is accommodated. This is reflected in the changes in permitted height standards that now apply within the Precinct, including the latest changes introduced through PC78. However, the underlying structuring rationale and the key outcomes sought for the Precinct and its relationship to the wider waterfront and City centre remain relevant.

Question

The AUP provisions (both WQ Precinct and City Centre) create objectives and policies around transition of height from the water to the CBD across WQ. What is your opinion as to the appropriateness of the height transition achieved by the proposed development? Is this what the AUP provisions envisage?

Response

- 7.4 While additional height above the general permitted height standards for the Precinct is enabled on the Site, the extent of building height that may be appropriate needs to be considered in combination with other building scale factors such as site intensity and building bulk and proportion, together with the architectural design approach. In my opinion, when considering these factors in combination, the Tower building component of the Proposal does not achieve a suitable transition from the core of the City centre. In my opinion, the Proposal introduces a bulky form that visually competes with the adjacent City centre core. Particularly, when viewed from the West, with the Site sitting in the foreground to the City centre core, the prominence of the Tower building is exacerbated (see visual simulations from Viewpoints 2 and 3).

Question

Given the divergence of opinion between the Applicant and Council's experts, what is your opinion of the significance of any adverse UD/L&V related impacts from the proposal - including dominance, shading/sunlight loss, integration with surrounding built form, responsiveness to context etc?

Response

- 7.5 In my opinion, the Proposal will result in the following magnitude of effects:
- 7.6 **Urban Structure** – while the Site is identified as suitable for accommodating an area of additional height, I consider the overall scale, associated bulk and architectural form of the Tower building creates a significant step change that goes beyond the building forms that are appropriate to create marker features to identify the waterfront axis. In this respect, I consider the adverse effect on the establishing urban structure of the Precinct will be moderate.

- 7.7 **Responsiveness to context / neighbourhood character** - aspects of the proposal are positive, including the site layout comprising three distinct building responses that relate to different aspects of the surrounding context. However, the limited extent of activation along Jellicoe Street results in some adverse effect (low). In my opinion, the overall bulk of the Tower building is incongruous with the scale and character of development within the Precinct and will result in a moderate-high adverse effect.
- 7.8 **Landscape Character – Cityscape** – in my opinion, the Tower building will have a prominence that challenges the scale relationship between the Precinct and the core of the City centre, and the anticipated transition in height between the core and the Harbour edge and will result in moderate-high adverse effects.
- 7.9 **Visual Effects** – In my opinion, the Beaumont building and Marina building, while exceeding the permitted height standard that applies to the Site, can be readily accommodated in relation to their surrounding context due to their configuration, scale, modulation and articulation and architectural expression. When viewed from close to mid-range views I consider this aspect of the Proposal will result in very low adverse to positive visual effects. These buildings will not be prominent from more distant views.
- 7.10 The Tower building component of the Project, viewed in combination with the other two buildings, will be more prominent from a range of viewpoints, both in the immediate context and from more distant viewpoints.
- 7.11 While the large scale and bulk of the building will be readily apparent from proximate views from the east and north (see visual simulations Viewpoint 6, 7 and 8) the modulation created by the cranking of the floorplate at different levels assists to break down the building form. From these locations I consider the adverse visual effects experienced will be moderate.
- 7.12 From locations to the south and west, the ‘visual notches’ created are, in my opinion, less success in visually breaking the bulky form of the building. In my opinion, adverse visual effects on long range views from the north (see visual simulation from Viewpoint 1), west (see visual simulation from Viewpoint 2) and south (see visual simulation from Viewpoint 5) will be moderate – high. From more proximate locations from the west (see visual simulation from Viewpoints 3 and 4) those effects will be high.
- 7.13 From locations within the Precinct to the south and east, due to other intervening development (see modelling along Beaumont corridor, and from 30 Madden and Wynyard Central apartments), I consider adverse visual effects will vary from moderate to low.
- 7.14 **Shading / loss of sunlight** – in a City centre environment that enables an intensive form of development some shading of both the public realm and residential living environments is to be expected. I agree with the updated shading analysis provided by the Applicant and the conclusion that adverse shading effects on Silo Park will be low and on some residents at 30 Madden Street will be low. I acknowledge that there will be some cumulative shading effect

experienced when the Proposal is considered in combination with other development in the surrounding area.

- 7.15 Overall, I consider the adverse effects resulting from the Tower building component of the Proposal on the Precinct's urban structure, character and its Cityscape relationship to the City centre core will, in combination, be significant.

Question

Is there a risk of an accumulation of effects from over-height development in the WQ?

Response

- 7.16 Yes, I consider there is. As noted in the Boffa Miskell report and subsequent response memo, there has been a gradual increase in the height of buildings across the Precinct with subsequent consents. As more higher and bulkier buildings establish in the Precinct, the distinctive character will gradually change. While some may view this change as positive, others will regard it as adverse. Establishing a considerably increased scale of building on one of the sites identified to act as a marker along the structuring axes, future buildings may seek to achieve similar prominence to achieve the marker quality. Effects associated with an increased concentration of taller buildings with larger floor plates include: a reduced sense of spaciousness; increased shading; and potential increased overlooking of residential units.

Question

How would you describe the built form of the proposal, in terms of articulation, finish, façade etc, particularly when viewed from the west and the south?

Response

- 7.17 I have addressed this topic in the sections above. In my opinion, the Beaumont building and Marina building relate well to their surrounding context. The modulation created by the stepping of the upper levels and the configuration of recessed balconies, together with the material palette and articulation of facades is suitable for the scale of buildings proposed.
- 7.18 As noted above, while I consider the reference to the industrial vernacular, and particularly the cement silos used for the Tower building is successful at the lower level of the building, it becomes more problematic for the scale of the upper component and in response its residential use. In particular, I consider the relatively flat and uniform façade treatments and the frame structure extending to terminate the building form exacerbates the overall bulkiness and prominence of the building when viewed from the west and south.



Rebecca Skidmore
Urban Designer/Landscape Architect
August 2026

APPENDIX 1

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Application

Appendix 5 – Design Statement (Warren and Mahoney, 17 March 2026)

Appendix 6 – Landscape Design Report (Boffa Miskell, 19 December 2025)

Appendix 7 – Landscape Architecture – Podium and Tower Entrance (Warren and Mahoney, March 2026)

Appendix 15 – Urban Design and Landscape Assessment (Boffa Miskell, 09 April 2026)

Panel Minute 2 – queries raised

Comments Received

Auckland Council

Annexure 3 - Urban Design Specialist memo (23 July 2026)

Annexure 4 - Landscape Specialist memo (07 July 2026)

Annexure 5 - Parks Planner Specialist memo (13 July 2026)

Annexure 22 – Response to Minute 2 Expert Panel Questions (28 July 2026)

Residents of 30 Madden Street

Applicant response to Comments Received and Panel's queries in Minute 2

Memorandum of Counsel (Russell McVeagh, 4 August 2026)

Attachment B.1 - Marina Public Area Mark-up plan

Attachment B.2 - Beaumont Street View Analysis (Warren and Mahoney, 30 July 2026)

Attachment B.3 – Graphic Supplement (additional visual simulations) (Boffa Miskell, 29 July 2026)

Attachment B.4 – Outlook Space Infringements (Warren and Mahoney, 03 August 2026)

Attachment F – Urban Design and Landscape Memorandum (Boffa Miskell, 04 August 2026)

Attachment F.C – 30 Madden and Wynyard Central View Analysis (Warren and Mahoney, 04 August 2026)

Attachment F.D – Verandah Extension (Warren and Mahoney, 29 July 2026)

Attachment F.E – Shading Analysis (Boffa Miskell, July 2026)