Memo

To:	Emma Fahey, Application Lead, Fast Track, EPA
Date:	10 November 2026
Reference:	188 Beaumont Street Fast Track application – urban design and landscape feedback to Panel

1 Introduction

1.1 The Applicant has provided updated material responding to Minute 9 and 12 and the JWS following expert conferencing by the urban design and landscape expert witnesses (and assisted by the Applicant project Architect) on 11 September 2026.

1.2 The material provided is set out and summarised in the memorandum of Counsel, dated 30 October 2026. I have reviewed the material provided and in particular:

- The architectural drawings (Attachment C);
- The Urban Design, Visual and Landscape memorandum (proposed design) (Attachment D); and
- The Urban Design, Visual and Landscape memorandum (Panel expert report and Minute 12) (Attachment E).

1.3 The purpose of this memorandum is to confirm my opinion in relation to the amended Proposal now before the Panel.

2 Response to updated material

Previously identified Information gaps

2.1 In my memorandum setting out advice to the Panel (dated August 2026) I identified a number of information gaps (Section 6). A detailed and robust response has been provided in the updated material. The further analysis set out in the Boffa Miskell memorandum (Attachment E) provides improved clarity on the design rationale for the Proposal and potential associated effects.

2.2 I note that no additional detail has been provided regarding the implementation and maintenance of the green walls proposed at the lower level of the Tower building. Instead an amendment to Condition 33 is proposed to require this additional detail to be provided along with the finalised landscape design drawings.

2.3 Should consent be granted, I recommend this amendment is included in the suite of conditions.

Tower Building Design Amendments

2.4 As set out in the JWS, the potential for design amendments to the tower building, to reduce the visual bulk of the building, was explored during expert conferencing. The Proposal now put forward to the Panel is consistent with the 'Option 5 – Backpack and Integrated Crown' amendment referred to the JWS.

2.5 In my opinion, the design amendment proposed is effective in reducing the visual bulk of the building, particularly as viewed from the west to south west. The solidity of the 'backpack' element serves to visually contain the overall building form and its vertical emphasis provides a complementary contrast to the more horizontal articulation of the main building form. The 'backpack' element creates a continuation of the industrial aesthetic to the upper portion of the building with the 'integrated crown' providing an improved vertical termination and containment to the building form.

2.6 While I remain of the opinion that the scale and form of the Tower Building will continue to result in adverse landscape effects, particularly in relation to the established and evolving character of the Wynyard Quarter and its relationship to the surrounding environment, including as viewed from long range views from the north, west and south, and from closer and mid-range views to the west and south west, as a coastal foreground to the core of the City Centre, I consider the effects previously identified have been reduced by the design amendments now proposed. In my opinion, the adverse effects identified will no longer be significant.

2.7 While there will be some changes to the shading experienced from the amended Proposal, in my opinion these will be of a very small extent and the shading effects will remain low.



Rebecca Skidmore
Urban Designer/Landscape Architect
10 November 2026