

## Memo

---

**To:** Jono Payne, Campbell Brown

---

**CC:** Kirsten Andrews, Mischa Gildenhuys, Michael Campbell, Madeline Sharpe

---

**Date:** 10 June 2022

---

**Reference:** DILWORTH PROJECT STELLAR – COVID FAST TRACK REQUEST – URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE REVIEW

---

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 RA Skidmore Urban Design Ltd. has been requested by the Dilworth Trust Board to provide urban design, landscape, and visual effects advice in relation to a proposal to re-develop the sites at 76 and 80 Great South Road, Epsom, to establish a 'build to rent' comprehensive mixed-use (predominantly residential) development (the "Proposal").
- 1.2 It is proposed to progress the project through the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020 process and the purpose of this report is to accompany the request to the Minister for the Environment to use this process.
- 1.3 I have visited the subject property (the "Site") and surrounding area on a number of occasions.

## 2 Overview – Design Process

- 2.1 The proposed scheme has been through an iterative and robust multi-disciplinary design process. I have provided feedback as the scheme has progressed and various design options have been tested. The project has also been assisted by feedback from the Council's Urban Design Unit and detailed review by the Council's Urban Design Panel (see Attachment 1 for meeting minutes). This feedback prompted various design testing of different options relating to key aspects of the project design.
- 2.2 The Design Statement by Jasmx (dated 9<sup>th</sup> June 2022) demonstrates the thought and analysis that has resulted in the scheme proposed. A clear vision for the project is expressed as:

*To create a place that fosters and nourishes its community, embedding a new standard of living for Tāmaki Makaurau.*

- 2.3 This vision underpins and flows on to a clearly expressed set of objectives, principles and outcomes. The report sets out a detailed Site and context analysis that has informed the design response and I agree with that analysis.
- 2.4 Section 3 of the report clearly demonstrates the various elements that have informed the detailed design response. These design concepts are translated into the detailed design drawings for the overall scheme, with the outcomes depicted in a number of renders from surrounding locations.
- 2.5 In my opinion, the iterative design and robust review process has resulted in an exemplary scheme that will make a positive contribution to the supply of good quality rental housing and the creation of a well-functioning urban environment.

### 3 Planning Context

- 3.1 The Site is located in the Business: Mixed Use (“B:MU”) zone as identified in the Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”). The zone is typically located around centres and along corridors served by public transport. As noted in the zone description, it acts as a transition area, in terms of scale and activity between residential areas and other Business zones.
- 3.2 The general objectives for the Business zones seek to ensure development positively contributes towards planned future form and quality, creating a sense of place (Obj. H13.2(3)). The supporting policies seek to enable an increase in the density, diversity, and quality of housing in the B:MU zone (Policy H13.3(2)). They also provide detail about expectations of the design quality and the way development relates to the adjacent public realm. In particular, they require development to be of a quality and design that positively contributes to the visual quality and interest of streets and other public open spaces, and their pedestrian amenity (Policy H13.3(3)). At-grade parking is to be located and designed in such a manner as to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on pedestrian amenity and the streetscape (H13.3(7)).
- 3.3 For the B:MU zone, the Objectives seek a high level of amenity (Obj. H13.2(9)). Policy H13.3(18) seeks to enable development of intensive residential activities, while Policy H13.3(20) promotes the management of development to avoid significant adverse effects on residents.
- 3.4 The Site forms part of a neighbourhood that is urban in character. However, the area’s character is also influenced by the underlying volcanic landscape. Much of Newmarket and its surrounding hinterland is impacted by a series of Volcanic Viewshafts and Height Sensitive Areas Overlays. The Site falls in a limited area that is not subject to these restrictions.

- 3.5 Of particular note, the Proposal exceeds the height standard<sup>1</sup> for the B:MU zone by a considerable margin. The purpose for this standard is described as:
- Manage the effects of building height;
  - Manage shadowing effects of building height on public open space, excluding streets;
  - Manage visual dominance effects;
  - Allow an occupiable height component to the height limit, and an additional height for roof forms that enables design flexibility, to provide variation and interest in building form when viewed from the street;
  - Enable greater height in areas identified for intensification; and
  - Provide for variations to the standard zone height through the Height Variation Control, to recognise the character and amenity of particular areas and provide a transition in building scale to lower density zones.
- 3.6 Exceeding this standard requires consideration as a restricted discretionary activity.

## 4 Urban Design Assessment

### Proposed Activity and Location

- 4.1 The Proposal represents an efficient use of a limited land resource that is strategically located in relation to both the metropolitan centre of Newmarket and a range of services and amenities in the wider urban area. In my opinion, the Site is well located to accommodate a compact form of housing, with a range of employment, services, and amenities within easy walking distance. This is indicated in the context analysis contained in the Design Statement (p.12). The Site also has good connectivity to a range of public transport services. The suitability of the Site to accommodate intensive residential activity is reflected in the B:MU zone policy framework and the permitted activity status for residential activity.
- 4.2 The 'build to rent' model results in a comprehensive and tailored design approach that seeks to create robust building typologies and accompanying open space and other communal spaces that can be well-maintained and meet the long-term needs of residents, creating a sense of community. Delivering this model of rental accommodation will make a positive contribution to housing choice in the area.

<sup>1</sup> Rule H13.6.1, 16m + 2m for roof form, total height 18m

## Site Layout

- 4.3 The proposed site layout has been determined through a detailed and thorough site and context analysis. This has been informed by consultation with Council reviewers and thoroughly tested through the Council's UDP review process.
- 4.4 The diagrams in Sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 of the Design Statement demonstrate how the various elements have been configured to:
- Relate to and engage with the adjacent streets;
  - Provide direct and legible access into and through the Site;
  - Provide a clear hierarchy of public, semi-public and shared amenity spaces; and
  - Provide efficient and discreet servicing.
- 4.5 In my opinion, the site configuration is well-considered and will integrate well with its surrounding context while ensuring efficiency and legibility of movement and good amenity within the Site for both residents and visitors.

## Street Interface

- 4.6 The Site configuration locates the two buildings (the "Great South Road Building" and the "Mauranui Building") to align with and front the adjacent streets. Careful consideration has been given to the distribution of activities at ground level to maximise activation of the adjacent streets. The location and design of pedestrian entrances to the buildings are clearly identified, with the primary apartment entrance to the Great South Road Building via a covered laneway that creates a dramatic axis into the central area of the Site. The primary pedestrian entrance to the Mauranui Building is located adjacent to the lane at the northern end of the street frontage. A second entrance is provided from the southern leg of the street.
- 4.7 The placement of the Great South Road Building allows for a road widening designation, with planting of this area providing a vegetated edge in the short to medium term. In the longer term, if the widening of the street corridor occurs, a more urban edge will be created with the building directly interfacing with the street. Large areas of glazing providing views to retail and F&B activities will provide activation and a positive street engagement.
- 4.8 The Mauranui Building is built to the street edge. A commercial space and recessed building entrance fronts the southern leg of the street. As the building turns the corner to the eastern leg of the street, with the sloping topography a solid plinth to the building is created, with apartments elevated above the street level at the corner. At ground level along the eastern length of Mauranui Avenue, access is provided to bike storage. Vehicular access to a limited number of parking spaces behind this storage is provided at the northern end of the building. The location of the parking area ensures it is screened from view from the adjacent street.

- 4.9 At the upper levels, apartment balconies and ‘winter gardens’ accessed directly from internal living spaces will provide activation and passive surveillance over the adjacent streets.
- 4.10 Overall, I consider the Proposal responds well to the character and function of the adjacent streets; and the Site configuration and building designs are suitable to ensure a positive street edge is created. In my opinion, this will make a valuable contribution to the safety, comfort, and amenity of the adjacent public realm.

## Building Scale and Form

- 4.11 The proposed distribution of building mass on the Site has resulted from detailed design testing and has been thoroughly interrogated by the UDP. Careful consideration has also been given to the relationship of the Proposal to a wider long-term development pattern, including possible redevelopment of 82 Great South Road (on the corner of Great South Road and Mauranui Avenue). This site is also owned by the Dilworth Trust Board. However, the Proposal does not rely on redevelopment of this site to ensure a suitable urban outcome is achieved.
- 4.12 The design strategy locates two building forms configured to engage with and frame the adjacent streets, enabling a generous area of open space towards the centre of the Site. The buildings will provide a buffer from adjacent streets, particularly the busy street environment of Great South Road, creating a vegetated ‘oasis’ for residents and visitors at the heart of the Site.
- 4.13 The proposed buildings will exceed the height standard for the Business: Mixed Use zone by a considerable margin and will be prominent when viewed from surrounding locations. As noted by the UDP “occasional exceptions to zone heights can contribute to the city’s interest and life, but that such exceptions depend on context and exceptional design”<sup>2</sup>. I agree with the locational factors identified by the UDP that lend support for additional building height in this location, including: proximity to public transport (including rail and three high-frequency bus routes); separation from residential zones; the Site having three street frontages; the Site’s position beside a motorway and railway line corridor; not being subject to any Volcanic Viewshaft overlays; and the location of the Dilworth playing fields opposite.<sup>3</sup>
- 4.14 In my opinion, careful consideration has been given to create a cohesive and enduring architectural character that will make a positive contribution to the evolving urban environment (see Sections 3.6 and 3.7 of the Design Statement). A restrained architectural language is proposed with a cohesive language across the Site. A dark and solid landscape base to the open spaces and building forms responds to the underlying volcanic landform. The light brick cladding of the primary building forms rises from this. The primary use of brick as a cladding material establishes continuity

<sup>2</sup> P. 2, UDP recommendations, meeting on 10/02/22

<sup>3</sup> P. 2, UDP recommendations, meeting on 10/02/22

across the Site, provides an enduring aesthetic that reflects other established Dilworth buildings, and is a robust and low-maintenance material.

- 4.15 Careful consideration has been given to the modulation and articulation of the building forms to break down their overall mass. Particular consideration has been given to the offsetting of the end wall planes, and the modulation of the rooflines. The dark finish of the rooftop amenity spaces provides a distinctive termination to the building forms and utilises an architectural language that differentiates communal spaces from private apartments. The rooftop spaces also assist to indicate activity and habitation of the buildings when viewed from the surrounding public realm. External stairwells are encased by the primary building form, creating a visual balance to the detailed patterning and layering of the building form they provide. The darker finish of these vertical cores further assists to break down the visual form of the buildings.
- 4.16 For these reasons, I consider the additional height proposed can be readily accommodated in this location and provides an exemplary architectural response that will contribute positively to the urban environment.

## On-Site Amenity

- 4.17 Build to rent housing seeks to better meet the needs of residents than traditional rental accommodation. Key aspects include: tenure certainty, flexibility, offering a high level of service maintenance, and creating a sense of community. The model reinforces the owner incentive to invest in good quality materials and fitting to reduce long-term maintenance burdens and provide an attractive product to the market.
- 4.18 The project includes a range of unit typologies with differing aspects and outlooks. Units range in scale from studio to three-bedroom apartments. This will contribute choice to meet differing needs and preferences of residents.
- 4.19 The creation of an on-site community is an important aspect of the Proposal. Providing a critical mass of units enables the provision of a range of resident services and amenity spaces.
- 4.20 As set out above, the proposed site layout has been carefully considered to create a generous open space area at the heart of the Site (see Section 3.12 of the Design Statement). The open space design seeks to enable both incidental connections through 'bump' spaces as well as providing play, rest, and edible garden spaces (see Sections 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 of the Design Statement). A clear differentiation between public, communal, and private spaces will be provided.
- 4.21 The ground-level outdoor amenity spaces will be complemented with rooftop indoor and outdoor amenity spaces on both the Mauranui Building and the Great South Road building (outlined in Section 3.15, 3.16 and 3.17 of the Design Statement). With a different character and function between the spaces, both will be accessible to all residents. These communal spaces are an important aspect of the Proposal that will provide valuable amenity for residents and contribute positively to fostering a resident community.

## 5 Conclusion

- 5.1 The Site is strategically located in relation to both the Newmarket metropolitan centre and the range of services, amenities, and transport options in the wider environment.
- 5.2 In my opinion, the Proposal has been developed through a robust analysis and understanding of the Site's characteristics and its relationship to its surrounding context.
- 5.3 The Proposal has been developed through an iterative design process that has been assisted by thorough interrogation by both the multi-disciplinary project team, the Council's review staff, and the Council's UDP.
- 5.4 Overall, I consider this process has resulted in an exemplary scheme that will make a positive contribution to the supply of good-quality rental housing and the creation of a well-functioning urban environment.



**Rebecca Skidmore**

Urban Designer/Landscape Architect

10 June 2022

## Attachment 1:

# Auckland Council Urban Design Panel Recommendations

# AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL

## RECOMMENDATIONS



<b>Project:</b>	76 & 80 Great South Road (Project Stellar)
<b>Location:</b>	Online via MS Teams
<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 10 <sup>th</sup> February
<b>Time:</b>	1:30PM – 6:00pm
<b>Members:</b>	Matt Riley (Chair), Andrew Lamb, Ngata Tapsell, Gavin Lister
<b>Planner:</b>	Angelika Vaze & Paul Venter (Premium planner prior to panel)
<b>Urban Designer:</b>	Georgia Fear (Prior to panel)
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	Ainsley Verstraeten

- Support for the following reasons
- Some changes are needed (stated below)
- Fundamental changes are needed (stated below)
- Cannot support for the following reasons

### Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for coming at an early stage in development of the proposed 'Build to Rent' apartment development. The Panel supports the proposal overall, subject to the comments made in these recommendations.

### Masterplanning

The Panel considers a greater understanding of how the corner site (82 Great South Road) might be developed as being critical to informing the design response on 76 and 80 Great South Road.

The Panel supports the perimeter block form of the two proposed buildings and understands that the intention is that 82 Great South Road would also be

developed in a perimeter manner. The appropriateness of the height and scale of the two proposed buildings is dependent, however, on an integrated approach to building modelling and form across all three sites.

The Panel considers it important that masterplanning be undertaken of the three sites together to understand the appropriate height, bulk, form and appearance of the two proposed buildings in the context of a future building on the corner given the consistent ownership of all three sites.

## **Height**

The development's most significant issue is the height of the proposed buildings. The Panel supports, in principle, height above the zone standard on the site, subject to design. The Panel considers occasional exceptions to zone heights can contribute to the city's interest and life, but that such exceptions depend on context and exceptional design. The site has locational factors that mean it could accommodate additional height. These include proximity to public transport (rail and three high frequency bus routes); separation from residential zones; three street frontages; position beside a motorway and railway line corridor, the open space of the Dilworth School playing fields opposite; and not being subject to any Unitary Plan sightlines to maunga. These factors, in the Panel's view, distinguish the site from others along Great South Road where increased height may be less appropriate.

Given that it would be an exception, the Panel considers the proposal should have the appearance of a coherent project, and therefore supports a common architectural language as proposed.

The Panel notes, however, that the proposed height exceeds the zone's permitted maximum by some margin. The Panel's support for the level of proposed height is dependent on both a greater understanding of how the two buildings may relate to any future development on the corner (as discussed above) and demonstration of an exceptional design response. The applicant should also give careful consideration to the quality of outlook achieved internally on the site given the perimeter approach to massing, noting that the design of 82 Great South Road will be critical to an overall understanding of the quality of outlook.

The overall design direction of the proposal is supported, however, the Panel considers – as discussed in the comments below – that further work is needed to reach the threshold of ‘exceptional.’

### **Façade Strategy - Materiality / Modulation**

The Panel supports the use of a light coloured brick, and floor to ceiling glass, as design elements that assist in avoiding an otherwise potential heaviness. While acknowledging some inherent constraints in a perimeter block typology, further work is required to break up the overt rectangular expression of the buildings. This should include:

- Increased modulation and articulation of the top floors of the buildings, with (for example) the breaking of parapet lines. This is positively suggested by the approach to the courtyard-facing elevation of the Great South Road building shown on the render at page 39 of the package, but is not currently demonstrated on the Great South Road and Mauranui Road elevations of the respective buildings. This may be assisted by varying the apartment types at upper floors from those at lower floors, contributing to a different façade expression.
- Increased depth to the facades to soften the overall bulk of the development and to add a level of refinement to the overall façade composition.
- Further consideration of the vertical articulation of the buildings. The render at page 39 of the package for the eastern (motorway facing) elevation of the Mauranui building shows a uniform patterning, while the render for the same façade at page 40 shows an off-set patterning. The approach to the latter, while requiring further development, is considered more successful.

The Panel encourages roof top plant rooms to be fully integrated, at the concept design stage, into the architectural strategy.

### **Sense Of Place**

The Panel supports the proposed use of brick cladding as a response to the Dilworth school building opposite the site.

It is not yet clear how the design responds to geological (volcanic) and cultural influences.

The Panel is encouraged by the applicant's early engagement with mana whenua on the project and encourages further consultation. Development of a clear framework for determining how and what narratives to express that may emerge through this engagement will be important, as well as ensuring these narratives have a meaningful expression in the project form and programme – rather than, for instance, being limited to an applied pattern. The Panel recommends that the applicant engages appropriate expertise when negotiating this process, if not available in-house.

### **End Walls**

Further design development needs to be undertaken on the end walls to each building. This is particularly so due to the height (and therefore visibility) of these end walls, the length of time they may remain visible until adjoining sites redevelop, and their influence on the apparent bulk of the buildings.

The northern end wall to the Mauranui building is the most successful, with the eastern half sliding up past the western half, and at the same time having an offset footprint. This has the effect of breaking the building's bulk into more slender elements. The Panel is less convinced with the approach to both the northern and southern end walls of the Great South Road building. The Panel considers that the fire stairs external to the northern end wall of the Great South Road building risk an 'institutional' appearance and would merit being fully wrapped in a fine-scale screen, adding visual richness to the building.

### **Ground Floor Interfaces And Building Entrances**

At the current concept stage of the proposal, sufficient information was not available for the Panel to form a clear view on the success of building entrances and ground floor entrances. However, the following is noted:

- The Panel supports the through-site laneway as a shared space but considers its success will very much depend on quality materials and design detailing (including the treatment of the soffit) to convey that it is principally a pedestrian space, and on how its use by servicing vehicles is

managed. The success of the laneway as a pedestrian space is critical, given its relationship to the site entrances.

- The Panel supports the co-location of building main entrances with the through-site laneway subject to the comments above. A generous height and scale where the laneway passes through the buildings is critical to convey a sense of manaakitanga and welcome to the development. The Panel questions whether the entrances as illustrated are sufficiently generous.
- Active uses such as retail and food and beverage are supported along the Great South Road frontage. High levels of glazing and permeability will be needed to this façade.
- Placing bike storage at ground floor along the Mauranui Road frontage is supported, subject to design development meeting both security and visual interest imperatives (including glazing of the bike storage area as illustrated).
- Further design work is needed in regard to how the development is future-proofed for the 2.5m wide road widening designation along Great South Road. Currently, the majority of street-frontage landscaping is shown within a 'sacrificial strip' along this frontage. Consideration is needed as to how to achieve a high-quality interface should the road widening be taken, including whether deeper areas of setback are needed.

### **Sense Of Community**

Draft concepts of community and communal spaces within the buildings and landscaped areas were presented, but require further design resolution. The Panel recognises this as an essential part of successful BTR projects and therefore careful consideration will be required of these spaces in order to ensure the project principles of community cohesion and long term tenure are achieved.

In order to serve the large number of apartments proposed, a wide range of communal spaces serving different community needs, from bike maintenance and multi-functional gathering rooms, will be needed in addition to the central courtyard and rooftop garden shown.

Further development of the courtyard landscape strategy will be needed to ensure it is not simply a transitional space, and to ensure a consistent quality between those parts on the podium roof and those parts in natural ground, and how the transition between podium roof and natural ground is made (including the triangular space between the podium and boundary).

The Panel supports the development of a rooftop space on the Great South Road building. It is not convinced, however, that this would be used by residents of the Mauranui building, and recommends the rooftop of that building is also developed for communal use purposes. This may result in a different configuration of the rooftop space for that building, with potential benefits in terms of façade strategy.

### **Residential Amenity**

Apartments are well proportioned and of a size that supports the project principle of long term tenure.

The Panel supports the internalising of parking beneath a landscaped podium and the use of stackers to rationalise parking. However, the Panel encourages a review of the proposed number of visitor parking spaces, with a suitable number to serve the needs of residents and convenient location of these on-site.

The Panel encourages natural daylight is let into both ends of building corridors and consideration as to how these corridors might be offset and modulated to address their length. This should extend to details such as avoiding apartment doors opening directly opposite each other and their recessing if deemed appropriate.

The use of winter gardens as a device to assist with noise attenuation through to the motorway and railway corridors is supported. The Panel supports the design direction shown at page 51 of the package as to how winter gardens can be developed in a manner which retains a good level of façade articulation, including the wrap around glass on corners. Techniques, including winter gardens, to appropriately address acoustic issues in this high noise environment will need careful consideration.

### **Servicing**

An approach to waste management which is future proofed for the potential needs of a building on 82 Great South Road is recommended. A comprehensive waste strategy is recommended for this, and – from an operational perspective – to address issues around rubbish truck movement along the pedestrian laneway.

### **Shading**

The Panel was not provided with shading analysis which will be required to consider effects on surrounding properties.

### **Conclusion**

The Panel looks forward to a further review as the design develops.

# AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL

## RECOMMENDATIONS



<b>Project:</b>	76 & 80 Great South Road (Project Stellar) Panel 2
<b>Location:</b>	Online via MS Teams
<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 24 <sup>th</sup> March
<b>Time:</b>	1:30PM – 5:30PM
<b>Members:</b>	Matt Riley (Chair), Andrew Lamb, Ngata Tapsell, Gavin Lister
<b>Planner:</b>	Angelika Vaze
<b>Urban Designer:</b>	Sommer Spiers
<b>Landscape Architect:</b>	Ainsley Verstraeten

- ~~Support for the following reasons~~
- Some changes are needed (stated below)
- ~~Fundamental changes are needed (stated below)~~
- ~~Cannot support for the following reasons~~

### Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for its comprehensive presentation and considers that the proposal has positively progressed in response to the previous recommendations. The recommendations below focus primarily on outstanding matters.

The Panel considers the key outstanding issue to be the appearance of end walls. Further resolution of these is needed in order for the Panel to support the proposed building height.

### Masterplanning

The massing studies of potential future building form on 82 Great South Road have been helpful to understand how the two proposed buildings might sit in relationship to redevelopment of that corner site. The Panel appreciates that these studies are conceptual only. The studies do, however, confirm the Panel's view that a lower height building would be appropriate on this corner.

## **End Walls**

Building end walls will be highly visible and prominent in the surrounding environment until such time as adjoining sites might be redeveloped. The Panel encourages further exploration of how the visual bulk of these end walls could be broken down in a manner which positively responds to the range of distances they will be seen from.

The Panel's focus is on the south-eastern end wall of the Great South Road building and the south-eastern end wall of the Mauranui Ave building, noting (with reference to page 29 of the agenda material) that the two will be seen in the same view when travelling north-west along Great South Road, and on the north-western end wall of the Great South Road building. The Panel notes, however, that the remaining end wall, to the north-western end of the Mauranui Ave building, should complement the design language of the other end wall conditions.

In regard to the north-western end wall of the Great South Road building, the Panel remains unconvinced regarding the approach to the fire stairs and considers they are, as yet, not successfully integrated into that elevation. Further interrogation of this end wall, as a whole, is needed. This might canvas a range of options, including the introduction of greater permeability and how the stairs are positioned and physically integrated into the elevation. The Panel's view is that if proposed, patterning or graphic elements alone are unlikely to mitigate this issue.

The Panel supports the proposed off-setting of floor plan and glazed corridor ends to the south-eastern end wall of the Great South Road building, and the revised floor plan and glazed ends to the eastern wall of the Mauranui Ave building.

## **Ground Floor Interfaces and Building Entrances**

The Panel acknowledges the exploration of how the Great South Road ground floor frontage responds to potential future road widening. The Panel would support a return to a higher sill window for the food and beverage unit as a counterpoint to the adjacent fully open building entry.

Street verandahs would interrupt the strength of the brick façade from parapet to ground and are not considered necessary in this location.

Future proofing the design of the commercial unit on the eastern frontage of the Mauranui Ave building to positively address a potential laneway between it and a redevelopment of the 82 Great South Road site (for example, by glazing wrapping around the laneway frontage) is supported and considered important.

The Panel considers that the pedestrian entry into the eastern frontage of the Mauranui Ave building is likely to be frequently used. Further measures to give this entry a presence and 'sense of address' are encouraged.

### **Mauranui Ave Building Elevation**

The Panel supports the revised approach to the top floor of the Mauranui Ave building, which breaks the parapet of the building's northern and eastern elevations. It notes, however, that this will cause an increased level of shading on surrounding properties. The level of effects from this additional shading will be a matter for Council officers to determine through the consenting process, noting that the shading diagrams supplied in the agenda package were not of sufficient detail for the Panel to form a view on.

### **Sense Of Place**

The Panel notes the intention to embed a sense of place narrative throughout the landscape and architectural response and expects that this will be further developed and integrated in a manner which avoids applique.

### **Sense Of Community**

The Panel commends the introduction of roof top communal space into the Mauranui Ave building. Given this is the larger of the two buildings, the Panel would encourage the size of the space to be increased, extending through to the building's north-east corner, offering all residents the benefit of the view from this location.

The Panel supports the intention for a flexible suite of ground floor amenity spaces serving different community needs. Further consideration of permanent spaces such as bike maintenance areas is encouraged.

### **Residential Amenity**

As mentioned, the Panel supports the daylighting of the ends of circulation corridors. The position of the fire stairs on the northern end wall of the Great South Road building may however (assuming the fire doors are not glazed) limit daylight through this end of the corridor. Further development of corridor design is encouraged to address matters raised in the previous recommendations.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal has positively progressed since its last presentation to the Panel. In its previous recommendations, the Panel referred to the need to demonstrate an exceptional design response in order for the Panel to support the proposed building height. In this context, the Panel considers that the primary element requiring further resolution are the building end walls, noting that these will need to be refined in light of the overall built response. The Panel recommends that the applicant return to an Express Panel with a focus on this issue.