
MINUTE 12 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Request for further information and questions arising out of the expert reports commissioned by the Panel and information provided in response to

Minute 7

188 Beaumont Street FTAA-2604-1205

2 September 2026

[1] In Minute 5 the Panel recorded its decision to appoint two expert advisors:

- (a) Tim Denne, Economist; and
- (b) Rebecca Skidmore, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect.

[2] This Minute sets out questions that the Panel wishes to raise with the Applicant following its review of the reports prepared by Mr Denne and Ms Skidmore appended to this Minute. It also sets out several questions from the Panel for the Applicant and Auckland Council arising out of the responses to Minute 7.

Review of Economic Assessment

[3] The Panel is aware of the different views between experts on the appropriate methodology for measuring benefits, and specifically whether to use an EIA to estimate impacts on macro-economic indicators (GDP and employment), as used by the Applicant's experts, or cost-benefit analysis (CBA) to estimate impacts on wellbeing, as suggested by the Council expert.

[4] Notwithstanding these differing views, the Panel considers Mr Denne's report raises some important questions that the Panel would like the Applicant to address (in particular, the information gaps and questions raised at section 2.5). The Panel requests the Applicant to consider and respond to the following questions:

- (a) **Counterfactual:** Is the Applicant able to provide the Panel with an

analysis of the counterfactual i.e. what would happen to the site if the proposed development did not proceed? In view of the information provided by the Applicant in relation to the Development Agreement obligations, the Panel considers that any counterfactual should consider the prospect of another developer gaining control of the site. While the consequences for the Applicant / Orams may be relevant to economic benefits, it is the economic benefit of an alternative development of the site that is of particular interest.

- (b) **Foreign ownership:** Given the high degree of foreign ownership, the Panel is interested in whether the EIA approach of the Applicant's experts has considered how much of the overall GDP/benefits will be expatriated overseas.
- (c) **Commercial viability of Orams Marine:** The information provided by the Applicant in response to Minute 7 has provided greater visibility of the contractual obligations under the Development Agreement. The Panel has the following questions after considering that information:
 - (i) In section 2.3.2 of his report Mr Denne refers to publicly available information regarding strong future growth and profitability projections for Orams Marine, including statements made by its majority owner Ariadne Australia Ltd, that suggest the risks to commercial viability are overstated. What response does the Applicant's economic expert Mr Akehurst have to this commentary?
 - (ii) Section 2.3.2 of Mr Denne's report concludes that "it is difficult to conclude that this business is at risk such that the benefits of the Orams Marine should be included as one of the benefits of the residential development." The summary of the Development Agreement demonstrates that Orams Marine has willingly assumed significant commercial risk by entering the Development Agreement on the terms that it did. Why should the assumption of that commercial risk (and the financial consequences should that risk be realised) translate into an economic benefit of the project that can be set against costs that will fall on the wider community?
- (d) **Regional significance:** Mr Denne estimates that the Project will deliver an additional 1% of consented residential dwellings across the Auckland region.

- (i) What evidence is there to indicate that the apartments at 188 Beaumont Street will be genuinely *additional* to Auckland's housing supply and not simply replacing housing that would be built elsewhere?
- (ii) Do the Applicant's economic experts accept that, while the number of apartments to be delivered may be significant in the Local Board area, it is not significant in the context of the Auckland Region?
- (e) **Methodology:** Mr Denne recommends that a CBA be produced. At the very least, the Panel requests that the Applicant endeavour to identify all costs and benefits associated with the proposal, quantify those that can be quantified, and acknowledge the existence of those that cannot, addressing at a minimum the matters listed at section 2.1.2 of Mr Denne's report.

Review of Urban Design and Landscape Assessment

[5] There is a divergence of expert opinion in relation to the nature and extent of adverse urban design, landscape and visual impacts arising from the proposal.

[6] The Applicant is requested to address the information gaps identified by Ms Skidmore at paragraph 6.1 of her report and answer the following questions:

- (a) Given the development is predominantly residential, how will marine industry character be maintained to respect the character qualities in this location in the long-term?
- (b) Ms Skidmore has identified that the park/wharf axes are incorrectly located in relation to the site on page 17 of the Applicant's Design Statement. Please correct this error and provide a reassessment of the Site as a marker building reinforcing the waterfront axis, rather than forming the nexus of the park/wharf axes.
- (c) Can the Applicant provide detail on how the proposed "green wall" screening of the blank carpark walls will be established and successfully maintained?
- (d) What is the Applicant's response to Ms Skidmore's view that the Project poses a risk of diminishing the role of other marker buildings across the Precinct and competing with the City Centre core, the wider skyline and established city views?

[7] In light of Ms Skidmore's concerns regarding the cumulative effect of over-height buildings in the Wynard Precinct, the Panel request that Auckland Council provide a list of all consented buildings in the precinct that are over the current height limit or were granted consent in respect of exceedance of the relevant height controls in place at the time.

Questions arising from the Applicant's response to Minute 7

[8] The summary of the Applicant's obligations under the Development Agreement has given rise to the following questions from the Panel:

- (a) What are the form, bulk and general height parameters of the residential development required to be developed under the Development Agreement?
- (b) Does the design modification process contemplate or make provision for modifications to be made during the course of a resource consent application process and/or conditions that may be imposed on the resource consent?
- (c) Which officer at Auckland Council has delegated authority to grant written approval to any proposed modifications as to height, bulk and external appearance?

Next steps

[9] In light of Minute 11, which granted the Applicant's suspension request, the Panel directs that the Applicant provide a comprehensive response to the questions in this minute, to the expert reports commissioned by the Panel, and the outputs from expert conferencing by **5pm Monday, 14 September 2026**. At this stage the Panel anticipates that the Applicant will have sought an end to the suspension by that date, but if more time is required to prepare the response, the suspension can continue for an additional few days or such other period as the Applicant requires.



Jennifer Caldwell
188 Beaumont Street Expert Panel Chair