

22 May 2026

Jennifer Caldwell
Associate Panel Convener
Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

Dear Ms Caldwell,

Re: FTAA-2604-1205 - 188 Beaumont Street – Response to Minute 1 (Schedule 1 Matters)

Auckland Council provides the following response to Minute 1 of the Panel Convener, dated 15 May 2026, in relation to the above Fast-track application. The response addresses the matters set out in Schedule 1 of the Minute.

1. Approvals

The application seeks a comprehensive suite of approvals, comprising all resource consents required under the Resource Management Act 1991 to enable the construction and operation of the proposed development. These include land use, subdivision, and regional consents (including earthworks, groundwater take/diversion, discharges, and contamination-related approvals). The application is assessed overall as a non-complying activity due to the combined consent framework. The breadth and range of approvals is consistent with a large-scale city centre development of this nature.

2. Complexity

The application involves a moderate level of complexity across legal, evidentiary, and factual matters. From a legal perspective, the proposal requires integration across the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, the Resource Management Act 1991, National Environmental Standards, and multiple national and regional policy instruments. While this does not raise novel legal issues, the multi-statutory interface contributes to overall complexity.

From an evidentiary perspective, the application is supported by extensive technical reporting covering geotechnical, contamination, natural hazards, transport, infrastructure capacity, urban design, acoustics, and wind effects. Some matters remain subject to refinement through detailed design or further investigation, including wastewater capacity confirmation and aspects of contamination and acoustic mitigation.

From a factual perspective, the proposal is a large-scale, mixed-use urban development involving approximately 210 residential units, retail activities, and supporting infrastructure within a constrained waterfront environment. Site constraints include coastal hazards, contaminated land, and proximity to marine industrial activities. Overall, the level of complexity is considered typical of major central city redevelopment projects under the FTAA.

3. Issues

The applicant has undertaken a pre-lodgement process with Auckland Council and key infrastructure providers including Auckland Transport, Parks, Watercare, and Healthy Waters. The proposal has been refined in response to consultation feedback.

The principal issues identified to date include:

- Natural hazards, particularly coastal inundation and flooding, and the adequacy of the proposed mitigation and long-term adaptation response;

- Infrastructure capacity, with specific regard to wastewater servicing and the need to confirm network capacity;
- Construction-related effects, including noise, vibration and traffic, and the appropriateness of proposed management plans;
- Interface with adjacent marine and industrial activities, including the management of reverse sensitivity effects.
- Urban design and landscape, including building form, bulk and massing, façade articulation, skyline effects, and the quality and integration of the landscape and public realm interfaces.

In addition, Council has identified a key issue regarding the absence of marine and port-related activities (including marine retail) within the proposal. The Wynyard Precinct provisions place a clear policy emphasis on providing for and retaining marine and port activities within this part of the waterfront, particularly within sub-precinct C and at lower levels of development within sub-precinct E. The current proposal, which is predominantly residential-led and proposes general retail activity, does not specifically provide for marine-related uses and therefore appears inconsistent with the intended policy framework for this location, given its strategic interface with the Orams Marine precinct and the wider marine industry.

Urban design and landscape matters have also been discussed in detail through the pre-application process, where a number of areas for further refinement were identified, including building bulk and articulation, façade treatment, and the quality of public realm and landscape interfaces. While no fundamental concerns have been raised at this stage, Council considers that these matters will require further resolution through the application process to ensure an appropriate outcome within the Wynyard Precinct and wider city centre context.

Council notes that it has not previously received a resource consent application for the development of this site, and therefore no requests for further information under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 have been made in relation to a prior application. The current application is supported by a comprehensive AEE and technical reporting, indicating that typical information requirements have largely been addressed at lodgement. Relevant statutory processes are therefore confined to the Fast-track Approvals Act framework and associated technical review processes.

4. Panel Membership

The Council considers that the panel should include expertise in resource management planning, urban design and architecture, and could also include expertise in engineering (including geotechnical and infrastructure), environmental science (including contamination and coastal processes), and transport planning. A panel of three members is considered appropriate having regard to the scale and complexity of the proposal.

5. Mātauranga and Tikanga

Auckland Council does not provide comments on mātauranga or tikanga matters, as these are appropriately addressed by iwi authorities and Treaty settlement entities.

6. Procedural Requirements

Auckland Council confirms its willingness to engage directly with the panel through technical briefings, expert conferencing, and other processes as required to advance efficient consideration of the application. Expert conferencing may be particularly beneficial in relation to infrastructure, and urban design matters. At this stage, it is considered that a full hearing process may not be necessary if issues can be appropriately resolved through written evidence and conferencing. Draft consent conditions appear generally well-developed but are likely to require further refinement through the process.

7. Additional Matters Relevant to Timeframes

Council considers that a decision timeframe in the order of 60 working days would be appropriate. While the application is supported by a comprehensive AEE, it involves a moderate to high level of complexity, including a broad range of technical disciplines, multiple consent triggers, and key matters requiring further interrogation and potential refinement (including infrastructure capacity, natural hazard response, and precinct policy alignment).

A timeframe of approximately 60 working days would enable adequate technical review, targeted expert conferencing, and resolution of outstanding issues, while remaining consistent with the Fast-track Approvals Act principles of timely and efficient decision-making.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "R Butchers". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly informal style.

Russell Butchers
Principal Project Lead
Auckland Council