

Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – Substantive Application


Specialist Response – Landscape Architecture

1.0 Application description

Application and property details

Fast-track project name:	The Point – Mission Bay
Fast-track application number:	FTAA-2511-1133
Application proposal:	Application by Ngāti Whatua Ōrakei Whai Rawa Limited and Generus Living Group Limited to construct and operate an integrated retirement village and associated infrastructure across Aotea Street, Te Arawa Street, Rukutai Street and Kupe Street in Mission Bay, Auckland

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Landscape Architecture

To:	Angelika Vaze (Lead Planner) and Warwick Pascoe (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:	25 February 2026

3.0 Documents reviewed

I have reviewed all of the application material in preparing this memorandum, including the AEE (Assessment of Environmental Effects), noting that the following documents have particular relevance to my area of expertise:

- Attachment 12 – Urban Design and Landscape Assessment, with graphic supplement (Boffa Miskell)
- Attachment 17 – Architecture Drawings (Warren and Mahoney)
- Attachment 18 – Architectural Design Report (Warren and Mahoney)
- Attachment 19 – Landscape Concept Plans (Boffa Miskell)
- Attachment 20 – Draft Landscape Management Plan (Boffa Miskell)
- Attachment 21 – Urban Design and Landscape Assessment Peer-review (R A Skidmore)
- Attachment 23 – Proposed Conditions of Consent
- Attachment 32 – Design Report (Moller Architects)
- Attachment 33 – CPTED Assessment (Boffa Miskell)

I understand that the proposal comprises:

- a. five interconnected buildings of between five to eight levels, inclusive of a one to three storey podium;
- b. 252 new independent living units within the five new buildings;
- c. refurbishment of an existing building on Kupe Street containing 90 care suites and integration of this part of the project site with new development;
- d. a variety of communal amenity facilities for residents and visitors; and
- e. incorporation of two pedestrian accessways through the project site.

I am aware of the site's zoning under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (**AUP(OP)**) and the relevant provisions of this statutory document which 'frame' an assessment of landscape and visual effects of the proposal.

I confirm that I have visited the site and surrounding area during January 2026 including viewing the site from the various representative public viewpoints that informed the Boffa Miskell landscape assessment of the proposal.

I also confirm that I have been involved (for the council) in pre-application discussions between the applicant and the council during 2025 to confirm locations for these representative public viewpoints and the relevant issues. I have also read the specialist urban design review prepared by Wayne Bredemeijer for the council.

4.0 Specialist assessment

My specialist review concurs fully with that of the applicant's landscape architect (Rachel de Lambert) and peer reviewer (Rebecca Skidmore) in relation to an assessment of landscape and visual effects of the proposal. I have not identified any areas of assessment where I disagree and/or require further information to understand effects.

I agree with the applicant that the project has been designed to be of high quality and that it will be appropriate for this particular site and location, which has important values for the applicant and the wider community.

While the proposed buildings exceed the relevant AUP(OP) building height standard and will be visually prominent built elements within the localised landscape, the design, layout, orientation and materiality of the proposal will assist mitigate potential adverse landscape and visual effects from the overall development scale, bulk and massing of built form on the site and it is my opinion that the proposal will integrate well within its localised context.

I also agree with the applicant that the proposal will interface successfully with Takaparawhau and the provision of relocated public walkways through the site will be appropriate from a landscape design perspective.

While the proposal does not comply with the relevant building height standard, importantly for the consideration of effects on the amenity value of people within adjacent properties located to the south of the site, compliance with the relevant height in relation to boundary standards has been achieved. In addition, the design and layout of the proposed buildings on the site (with shorter building edges at this interface and gaps between the buildings) will further assist in mitigating potential adverse effects on these amenity values, including visual dominance. The proposed landscape design response on the site, as it relates to these neighbouring properties, is well-considered and will also assist in mitigating potential adverse effects on the amenity values of immediate neighbours.

I support the application overall from a landscape and visual effects perspective.

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 conditions of consent that have been suggested by the applicant (at Attachment 23 of the application material). In my opinion, the proposed conditions relevant to landscape architecture matters are appropriate; however, I offer the following suggestions to improve the relevance of these specific conditions:

Condition 30 – the title of this condition does not need to include “maintenance” as this is covered by condition 28. I recommend that the title be amended to state “Finalised Landscape Design Drawings and Specifications”.

Condition 28 – I recommend that this condition (Landscape Management Plan) should be moved so that it is after the current condition 30 (relating to landscape design certification). I also note that there is currently no condition that requires implementation of the certified landscape design (relative to the staging of the works) by the consent holder; and there is currently no condition that requires the consent holder to implement the certified landscape management plan. Additional conditions (or additions to conditions 28 and 30) could capture these requirements.

Condition 28 – I recommend that this condition should explicitly refer to the maintenance that will be required for the implemented landscape design (relative to the relevant stage of works) to be certified under condition 30.

Condition 28(f) – I suggest that the procurement strategy for trees would be better located under condition 30 with the reference within condition 28 being more related to the ongoing maintenance of these trees.

Advice notes for conditions 29, 30 and 67 currently refer to the council’s “Design Review Unit”. My understanding is that the terminology should be “Tāmaki Makaurau Design Ope” but the current reference may well be fine.

Peter Kensington

Consultant Specialist – Landscape Architect

Registered NZILA and MNZPI



Registered