Beachlands South Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure G:

Landscape Architecture

Peter Kensington

21 October 2026

Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – Substantive Application

Specialist Response – Landscape Architecture

1.0 Application description

Application and property details

Fast-track project name:	Beachlands South
Fast-track application number:	FTAA-2606-1256
Application proposal:	Application by Beachlands South Limited Partnership at 110 Jack Lachlan Drive, 620, 712, 758 and 770 Whitford-Maraetai Road, and the adjacent Coastal Marine Area, at Beachlands, Auckland, to: • develop a comprehensively planned, and public transport focussed, community, to achieve a well-functioning urban environment comprising: residential dwellings; community and commercial activities (including a local centre, offices, hotel/conference centre, light industrial and retail activities); protected ecological restoration areas; walking and cycling networks; and community facilities; and • enable the potential development of two schools; as well as all associated earthworks and all associated infrastructure including transport facilities, intersection upgrades and roading, telecommunications, power, and water supply, stormwater, and wastewater infrastructure. Noting that the application proposal includes provision for wastewater collection, conveyance, treatment, storage and disposal infrastructure, including with land located within the Future Urban Zone identified for wastewater management purposes.

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Landscape Architecture

To:	Brooke Dales (Lead Planner) and Adonica Giborees (Principal Project Lead)
From:	Peter Kensington, Consultant Specialist – Landscape Architect (KPLC Limited)
Qualifications and relevant experience:	I hold the qualifications of: Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Honours) and Bachelor of Regional Planning (Honours) and I have 30-years' experience in landscape architecture and planning. I am a Registered Member of Tuia Pito Ora, the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects and a Full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have prepared expert evidence and technical assessments for various applications for resource consent, requests for plan changes, notices of requirement for designations and fast-track applications. I have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities and the Environment Court.

Preparation in accordance with the Code of Conduct:	I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (**Code**), and I have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent application processes, such as expert conferencing, which is directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed in this memo are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.
Signature:	
Date:	21 October 2026

3.0 Documents reviewed

I have reviewed all of the application material in preparing this memorandum, noting that the documents within the following attachments have particular relevance to assisting with a review within my area of expertise:

- 0A Legal Considerations Memorandum dated 26 June 2026
- 0B Assessment of Environmental Effects and Statutory Analysis dated 26 June 2026
- 0C Draft Proposed Conditions dated 26 June 2026
- 1 Design Report (Revision C) dated 12 August 2026
- 2 Architectural Drawings (various)
- 3 Open Space Strategy dated 12 August 2026
- 4 Urban Design Assessment (Revision A) dated 12 August 2026
- 5 Sustainability Assessment dated 25 June 2026
- 6 Landscape and Natural Character Effects Assessment dated 20 August 2026

I am aware of the zoning and precinct provisions under the Auckland Unitary Plan (**AUP**) which apply to the site and which 'frame' an assessment of the proposal's effects on natural character and landscape character and values.

I confirm that I have visited the site and surrounding area during July 2026 including viewing the site from the various representative public viewpoints that informed the applicant's assessment of the proposal. I have viewed the photo simulations (dated 9 July 2026) of the proposal as well as copies of original photos from each viewpoint.

I also confirm that I have been involved (for the council) in pre-application discussions between the applicant and the council during 2026; and these discussions have been ongoing, with the aim of resolving relevant issues.

I have also read the specialist urban design review prepared by Mustafa Demiralp for the council. I am also aware that terrestrial ecology review comments are being provided for the council by Luke Stanley; and that Roja Tafaroji is providing parks planning comments on behalf of the council's Parks and Community Facilities Department. I confirm my support for the intent of the review comments being made by these specialists.

4.0 Specialist assessment

I acknowledge that the application proposal overall is mostly consistent with the operative AUP provisions for this site (including Precinct I458); and has been informed by very experienced and capable landscape, urban design and architectural professionals. The resulting design response is of a high quality and provides a positive response to the site's opportunities and constraints, within the 'frame' of the relevant statutory provisions.

There is a strong landscape restoration component of the proposal through establishing the Ecological Protected Area Network, which will be maintained by a future Residents Society. I am also conscious that the application is supported by Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki - including the provision of a Cultural Values Assessment (Attachment 20).

My specialist review mostly concurs with the assessment by the applicant's landscape architect (Stephen Brown)[1] in relation to the proposal's effects on natural character and landscape character and values. There is only one area of assessment where I disagree with Mr Brown's assessment findings, as I set out below.

My review has assessed the application proposal in the context of the relevant statutory provisions under the AUP, including those of the Beachlands South Precinct – in particular, objective I458.2.(16) and policy I468.3.(22). I have also included consideration of the statutory provisions under chapters E18 (Natural character of the coastal environment) and E19 (Natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment), in particular objectives E18.2.(1) and E19.2.(1) and policies E18.3.(3) and E19.3.(2). I note that the Brown NZ Assessment has not explicitly referenced the chapter E18 and E19 provisions.

In my opinion, the location, scale and design of proposed Building C1 (Apartment Type 4) - referenced by Mr Brown as the Western Apartment Building - will not achieve an appropriate integration within the existing and planned coastal environment of the site. I have assessed that this building will be at odds with Beachland's physical and visual integrity and sense of place. At 12-levels (40.1m), this building is 30m higher than the permitted building height standard of 11m for a building in the location proposed, which is a reasonably significant margin.

In assessing the adverse effects on natural character and landscape character and values that arise from the Western Apartment Building, the visual simulations provided from Viewpoints 8-9 and 11-12 have been helpful, as has the assessment commentary within the Brown NZ Assessment for each of these viewpoints. It is my review assessment that the following adverse effects on natural character and landscape character and values arise:

Viewpoint 8 – Clifton Peninsula	Moderate (more than minor)
Viewpoint 9 – Pine Harbour-Auckland Ferry	Moderate-High (more than minor)
Viewpoints 11/12 – Beachfront 01/02	High (significant)

I note that the Brown NZ Assessment reaches similar findings for Viewpoints 9 and 11/12 but tempers these when including a ten-fifteen year 'settling in' period. I do not agree with this assessment approach, with such a lengthy timeframe to allow for mitigation being too great (three-five years is more appropriate). In other words, I do not agree that it is appropriate to factor a longer timeframe than five years when considering mitigation effectiveness.

It is therefore my assessment that the proposed Western Apartment Building is incongruent with the outcomes anticipated for this sensitive coastal location and will likely result in significant adverse effects on natural character and landscape character and values. The proposed form and mass of the building is relatively monolithic and is not mitigated through architectural modulation or elevational elements to reduce these effects. In my opinion, given the prominence of the proposed building, this structure should be redesigned and possibly reduced in height.

I acknowledge that the detailed architectural design of this particular building will include quality materials and that further refined articulation may occur during developed and detailed design. However, I am not convinced

[1] As set out in the *'Landscape and Natural Character Effects Assessment'* from Brown NZ Limited, dated 26 August 2026

that these measures will mitigate the overall building bulk and mass to an acceptable degree. The building, which is at a height that is not anticipated in this coastal location, will be a visually prominent anomaly, in my opinion.

Other than the above issue, I support the remainder of the application because it will result in an appropriate scale of adverse effects on natural character and landscape character and values. Significant positive effects will also result from the proposed works within the Ecological Protected Area Network; and the proposed architectural and landscape design response is of a high quality and responds appropriately to the AUP anticipated outcomes.

5.0 No further information required to understand landscape effects

I have not identified any information gaps in the application relevant to my area of expertise.

6.0 Proposed conditions

I have reviewed the proposed draft conditions of consent that have been suggested by the applicant (at Attachment 0C of the application material), specifically the district land use and subdivision consent conditions [93], [97]-[101], [190]-[191] and [207] which relate to: certification of building and landscape design/management; implementation of consented planting; and establishment of a Residents Society for long-term management. In my opinion, the proposed conditions relevant to landscape architecture matters are appropriate; however, I offer the following suggestions to improve the relevance of the specific conditions listed below:

Condition [100] Prior to the occupation of buildings in sub-precinct A, final landscape design, including drawings, specifications and related maintenance plan, ~~and landscape plans~~ for the Fairway Reserve area as indicated in the Beachlands South Open Space Strategy (referenced in condition 1) ~~shall~~ must be submitted to the Council for certification. The design of Fairway Reserve must comply with the following: ~~standards I458.6.8(2) to (5).~~

(a) A continuous safe walking and cycling connection must be provided within the Fairway Reserve connecting between the Village Centre and the Pine Harbour Ferry berths.

(b) The Fairway Reserve must be available for public use at all times unless written approval has been obtained from the council for an alternative. In all circumstances the Fairway Reserve must be available for public use between the hours of 7am and 11pm.

(c) The Fairway Reserve must be formed and vested in the Council; or maintained by way of an appropriate legal protection mechanism which must include the registration of an access easement on the title to which the Fairway Reserve applies is required to ensure preservation of the reserve and its ongoing maintenance by the owner(s) of the land concerned.

(d) Fences, or walls, or a combination of these structures, adjoining the Fairway Reserve must not exceed the heights specified below, measured from the ground level at the boundary:

(i) 1.2m in height; or

(ii) 1.8m in height if the fence is at least 50% visually open

Condition [101] Prior to the occupation of any building in the Sub-precinct A (Marina Point) and Sub-Precinct D (Coastal), the relevant section of the indicative coastal pathway as shown on AUP I458.10.5 Precinct Plan 5 must be formed to a minimum width of 3m to link the relevant stage of development with the Pine Harbour Ferry terminal. This coastal pathway must be maintained by way of an appropriate legal protection mechanism. For the purposes of this ~~standard~~ condition, 'occupation' means occupation and use for the purposes permitted by the resource consent but not including occupation by personnel, engaged in construction, fitting out or decoration.

7.0 Recommendation

While I support the majority of the application proposal and I mostly concur with the findings of the specialist assessment of Stephen Brown, it is my review assessment that the proposed Western Apartment Building (Building C1 (Apartment Type 4)) is incongruent with the outcomes anticipated for this sensitive coastal location and will result in significant adverse effects on natural character and landscape character and values. In my opinion, given the prominence of the proposed building in the coastal environment, this structure should be redesigned.

Peter Kensington
Consultant Specialist – Landscape Architect
Registered NZILA and MNZPI

