



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: FTAA Expert Panel for The Point Mission Bay [FTAA-2511-1133]
 Date: 10 March 2026
 From: Rachel de Lambert and Matt Riley
 Message Ref: The Point Mission Bay: Minute 3: Supplementary Statement Urban Design and Landscape Visual Effects
 Project No: BM240301

1. In response to Minute 3 of the Expert Panel for The Point Mission Bay [FTAA-2511-1133] the following provides a response from a landscape and visual perspective to the matters set out at [7], [8] and [9] of the Minute.
2. These matters are also addressed in the response of project planner, Mr McGarr of Bentley & Co, with a planning focus.
3. For clarity these matters are set out below:

[7] These questions arose from the Panel's initial review of the application material and its identification that it was not entirely clear to the Panel how the experts had considered intensification of the surrounding environment (either which has been occurring to date, or which might occur in the future) in the landscape visual, urban design and planning assessments.

[8] The explanation provided by the planning and landscape experts at the Conference highlighted to the Panel that it would be assisted if the respective planning and landscape experts provide this further explanation in writing to the Panel. The Panel requests that this is provided in the form of a supplementary statement which clearly explains how, and to what extent, the following matters have informed their assessment(s):

- (a) *The pattern of intensification that has occurred recently in the area.*
- (b) *Intensification of the surrounding area currently enabled by permitted activities; and*
- (c) *Intensification of the surrounding area enabled as restricted discretionary activities; and*
- (d) *Proposed intensification identified in Plan Change 120.*

[9] The above explanation should include appropriate reference to the relevant objectives and policies of the THAB zone, and to the extent relevant the objectives and policies of the adjacent Mixed Housing Suburban zone.

4. In respect of [8] (a) the Urban Design and Landscape Visual Effects Assessment (UDLEA) has been informed by a site context analysis of the existing environment involving field observation and analysis of digital mapping resources including Auckland Council's GeoMaps aerial photography and planning zones and overlays, Google Earth and Google Streetview.

5. The result of this analysis (and observation) is that there is an existing, established and emerging (recently increasing) presence of four and five storey apartment development on the Terrace House and Apartment Buildings (THAB) zoned sites in the wider context of the Site, including along the ridgeline to the south on Kepa Road as well as on Coates Ave on the next ridge to the west. Boffa Miskell has had involvement in at least one of the consented and built apartment projects on Kepa Road. Mission Bay also has an established pattern of three and four storey apartment buildings in the Residential Mixed Housing – Urban (MH-U) zone surrounding the Business Local Centre (BLC) and Business Mixed Use (BMU) zoned centre.
6. Closer to the Site, built intensification that has occurred along Kupe Street comprises terrace housing at two and three storeys. Residential re-development / intensification in the suburban area to the south of the Site comprises some attached as well as standalone dwellings, many of which step to three storeys in height relative to contour and comprise larger homes than those they replace. The replacement of a single dwelling with multiple dwellings on a site is also commonplace in the locality.
7. The existing environment against which the Proposal has been assessed in respect of landscape and visual effects comprises the established urban context described above.
8. The design of the Proposal has also involved careful consideration of the layout and orientation of the adjoining residential neighbours on MH-U and Residential Mixed Housing – Suburban (MH-S) zoned land to the immediate south of the Site including the location of dwellings and their private outdoor living space.
9. In respect of [8] (b), to my knowledge there are no unimplemented permitted activities that have occurred recently in the immediate area, hence these have not informed the assessment. The landscape and visual assessment has also not had regard to the form or intensity of development that could occur on neighbouring sites (or the area generally) as a permitted activity, both to be conservative and also given the likelihood that most future proposals would likely attract at least some minor consenting requirements.
10. In respect of [8] (c), no reliance has been placed on what could be developed by way of a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity on neighboring land or the surrounding area in undertaking the landscape and visual assessment of the proposal.
11. In respect of [8] (d), the set of visual simulations that show views from the immediate residential catchment to the south – Viewpoints 3B, 4B, 5B and 6B – illustrate ‘PC120 22m THAB height’ for information only, given PC120 had been recently notified¹.
12. However, PC120’s proposed zoning and zone standard (height) changes were not relied on for the purpose of the landscape and visual assessment².
13. The design of the Proposal has carefully addressed the existing condition in respect of all neighbours. The assessment has been undertaken only in respect of the existing, established, environment, rather than any future state.
14. In respect of [9] as noted above, the policy framework for assessment is addressed in detail by Mr McGarr.

¹ Refer Substantive application, Attachments 012B and 012C Urban Design and Landscape Visual Effects Assessment – Graphic Supplement.

² Refer Substantive application, Attachment 012A Urban Design and Landscape Visual Effects Assessment, Section 4.6 at pages 13 - 15.

15. The Statutory Context for the Proposal is set out in the UDLEA at Section 4 including THAB and MH-S zone provisions. This includes, amongst others, reference to THAB Objectives and Policies:

Obj. H6.2(2): Development is in keeping with the area's planned urban built character of predominantly five, six or seven storey buildings in identified areas, in a variety of forms.

Pol. H6.3(1): Enable a variety of housing types at high densities including terrace housing and apartments and integrated residential development such as retirement villages.

Pol. H6.3(2): Require the height, bulk, form and appearance of development and the provision of setbacks and landscaped areas to achieve a high-density urban built character of predominantly five, six or seven storey buildings in identified areas, in a variety of forms.

16. The relevant policies referred to in the THAB zone's assessment criteria for consideration of an infringement to the maximum height standard, as a restricted discretionary activity, are:

H6.3.(1) Enable a variety of housing types at high densities including terrace housing and apartments and integrated residential development such as retirement villages.

H6.3.(2) Require the height, bulk, form and appearance of development and the provision of setbacks and landscaped areas to achieve a high-density urban built character of predominantly five, six or seven storey buildings in identified areas, in a variety of forms.

H6.3.(5) Manage the height and bulk of development to maintain daylight access and a reasonable standard of privacy, and to minimise visual dominance effects to adjoining sites and developments

17. The analysis of the Proposal undertaken from a landscape and visual perspective has considered but not relied upon the height enabled on the Site by the THAB zone in a broad sense, relative to the scale of development that the THAB zone envisages and encourages. To assist with this assessment, visual simulations from closer viewpoints located to the south of the Site incorporate an outline of a building mass that would comply with the zone height standard of 16m as well as all development standards such as yards and height in relation to boundary. That outline is shown for information purposes.

18. In considering the urban design effects, the UDLEA states³:

'The suitability of the Proposal in respect of neighbourhood character is relative to whether the bulk, scale, form and appearance of the proposed buildings is an appropriate response to both the existing and planned future built character of the area, as anticipated by both its residential (THAB and MHS) zoning and position within the Ōrākei 1 Precinct'.

...

'The introduction onto the Site of large-scale buildings which are multi-residential in form is consistent with that planned character'.

...

'The manner in which the buildings are proposed to be accommodated on the Site positively assists their integration into the existing (and planned) character of the neighbourhood'.

19. In this regard, particular design emphasis has been given (in addressing Policy H6.3.(5)) to the careful consideration of the setback of the buildings (and intervening landscape area) to the south, relative to the Proposal's interface with southern neighbours. The height, bulk and form of the built development,

³ Refer Substantive application, Attachment 012A Urban Design and Landscape Visual Effects Assessment, Section 8.1 Neighbourhood character, pages 30 - 31.

comprising its podium base and north south aligned upper elements, has been carefully modulated to achieve the scale of development described in the THAB zone provisions whilst avoiding unacceptable adverse effects at the interface of those lower intensity residential neighbours.

R Skidmore Peer Review Comment

1. I have reviewed the comments by Ms de Lambert and Mr Riley set out above. The further explanation confirms my understanding of the original assessment carried out in the Urban Design and Landscape Assessment. In terms of a consideration of the surrounding environment, I consider the approach taken is conservative and appropriate. If the change anticipated in the surrounding area (particularly in the THAB zone) as enabled by restricted discretionary activities is considered as part of the surrounding context, the magnitude of effects identified in the assessment would lower.
2. In terms of the scale of development proposed and the resulting landscape character and visual effects, my review has been informed by the zone descriptions, policy framework and development standards set out for the relevant zones, particularly the THAB zone. In particular, the height standard and height in relation to boundary standard have contributed to an understanding of the change anticipated in the zone.