



17 August 2021

Arif Hassan  
Fast Track Consenting  
Ministry for the Environment | Manatū Mō Te Taiao

Email: s 9(2)(a)

Dear Arif

## **THE STRAND, TAKAPUNA PROJECT**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Thank you for your time on the phone with me last week discussing the status of The Strand, Takapuna project application to the Ministry for the Environment for referral.
- 1.2 Further to that conversation, we would like to provide the Ministry with the updated architectural designs for the project, following recommendations made by the Urban Design Panel following the last meeting on 15 July 2021.
- 1.3 We set these out in further detail below, but the key points are that:
  - (a) We have addressed your points of clarification in section 2 below;
  - (b) We explain the design changes at paragraph 3.5 below;
  - (c) We identify which documents in the package of material filed with MfE have been superseded at paragraphs 3.10 and 3.11 below.
- 1.4 The amended drawings and new design report can be located in the following Dropbox link. There are two documents:
  - (a) An updated architectural package prepared by Moller Architects titled "MfE Fast Track Response / The North Shore Project".
  - (b) An initial Landscape Design prepared by Boffa Miskell titled "North Shore Project Landscape Preliminary Design Report".
  - (c) The link is here:

s 9(2)(a)

## 2. **CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE OF PROJECT**

2.1 We can confirm that the development does not need resource consent for height under the zone provisions (see page 13 of the Fast Track Application) as the height is permitted by rule H9.6.3 and H9.6.4.1:

- (a) This is because the zone height provisions are very permissive, in terms of the specific rules referred to:
  - (i) The permitted height is 72.5m (rule H9.6.1);
  - (ii) The standard in rule H9.6.4(1) is "the maximum plan dimension of that part of the building above 32.5m must not exceed 55m"; and
  - (iii) The permitted standard in H9.6.3 imposes a 6m setback which only applies to that part of the building above 32.5m high.
- (b) However, resource consent is required for exceedance of the height control in the Precinct Overlay (see Rules I540.6.1 and I540.6.2, at page 14 of the Fast Track Application). So, we agree that height is an important aspect of the application, but the relevant rule comes through the precinct provisions not the zone provisions.
- (c) For the avoidance of doubt, I note that building height in the architectural plans (43.5m and 43.6m) is measured from the respective roads and the total height of the building is specified in the RL's in the architectural plan sheet A00-100 (page 16).

2.2 The Moller Drawing A00-100 (Site Plan) has been updated to confirm that the height of the buildings are 43.50m (above Hurstmere Road) and 43.60m (above Channel View Road) with RL's provided for each building (60.6m and 57.9m respectively). This drawing is page 16 of the architecture package.

## 3. **DESIGN CHANGES FOLLOWING FEEDBACK FROM SECOND URBAN DESIGN PANEL PRESENTATION**

3.1 As noted above, the applicant appeared before the Auckland Urban Design Panel for a second time on 15 July 2021 (the day after the fast-track application was filed on 14 July 2021).

3.2 We provided an update to the Ministry in our letter of 23 July 2021, which set out the Urban Design Panel's minutes and recommendations.

3.3 The applicant's design team has since undertaken design amendments to are intended to positively respond to and address the Panel's recommendations.

3.4 These design amendments are provided in the following design sets and reports prepared by the Applicant's expert team, included in the link provided in paragraph 1.4 of this letter:

- (a) Amended architectural design set, dated 11 August 2021, prepared by Moller Architects; and
- (b) Preliminary Design Report dated 12 August 2021, prepared by Boffa Miskell.

### **Summary of changes**

- 3.5 The design changes since the development was first submitted to the UDP are set out on page 6 of the MfE Fast Track Response, prepared by Moller Architects (contained in the Dropbox link at paragraph 1.4).
- 3.6 The changes made by the design team to specifically address the feedback from the second UDP presentation, broadly include (but are not limited to) the following:
- (a) Design at the southern end of the pedestrian link has been amended to provide wider and more generous access from The Strand.
  - (b) The carpark access has shifted further down The Strand, to allow car park egress to be at grade rather than a ramp, with better visibility.
  - (c) Key design change to Channel View Road frontage is to articulate the balconies above the setback with those below through use of shutters and blinds.
  - (d) The southern elevation of Hurstmere Road/Lake Road view has been amended to express zones of balconies, hotel rooms, circulation corridors, stair tower and apartments.
- 3.7 In response to a key issue around pedestrian access in light of the pedestrian easement across the site, Moller Architects have provided new pedestrian easement cross sections, to provide a visual representation of the pedestrian easement and its integration within the proposed building design.
- 3.8 The applicant and design team consider that these changes are appropriate to respond to the concerns raised by the Urban Design Panel. These updated plans will be submitted to the Urban Design Panel and council officers on 17 August 2021.

### **Plans superseded**

- 3.9 A number of the architectural plans and shading diagrams in the architectural design set that was submitted with the application on 14 July 2021 are now superseded by the updated package dated 11 August 2021.
- 3.10 However, as far as the package of material provided to MfE with the Fast-Tracking application, the only appendices that need to be supplemented are explained below:
- (a) The architectural plans included in Appendix E, which were superseded by Appendix E2, are now both superseded by the plans in the architectural set of 11 August 2021 (pages 15 – 51).
  - (b) The architectural reports prepared for the Urban Design Panel were included as Appendices G1 and G2 respectively. These are now both superseded by the architectural set of 11 August 2021 (pages 1 – 14).
  - (c) The shading diagrams prepared and included as Appendix H is now superseded by the architectural set of 11 August 2021 (pages 60 – 66).

3.11 In addition, that report is supplemented by a design package from Boffa Miskell, dated 10 August 2021. It is noted that this is a preliminary design report, and contains concepts that are a work in progress, but are nevertheless sufficient to give an informed idea about the design intentions at an appropriate level of detail for the current stage in the fast-tracking process. We address the details of the Boffa-Miskell design package in more detail at paragraphs 3.14 – 3.16 below.

3.1 Of specific note, the updated MfE architectural design set includes new drawings as follows:

- (a) Exterior elevations easement (Drawings A20-005 – A20-006, pages 37 and 38);
- (b) Exterior elevations private link (Drawings A20-007-A20-008, pages 39 and 40);
- (c) Exterior elevations buildings 2, 3 and 4 (Drawings A20-009 – A20-012, pages 41-44);
- (d) Atrium/link elevations (Drawings A20-013 – A20-014, pages 45 and 46).

**Boffa Miskell preliminary design report**

3.2 To supplement the updated architectural design set, Boffa Miskell have also produced a Preliminary Design Report dated 12 August 2021.

3.3 This provides a series of landscape concepts and designs to demonstrate how the proposed development will integrate within the surrounding environment. Boffa Miskell has also designed a public realm strategy, showing the relationship of people and the means by which they will access not only the proposed development, but the surrounding public spaces.

3.4 Boffa Miskell has also prepared a materials strategy, identifying proposed intended materials for both hard and soft landscaping.

**4. CONCLUSION**

4.1 We hope the amended designs and explanation of the changes between the plans submitted to the Ministry in the original application, and following the second Urban Design Panel meeting, are of assistance in the Minister's review of this application.

4.2 Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely



**Andrew Braggins | Olivia Manning**  
Partner | Solicitor

DDI: § 9(2)(a)

Mobile: § 9(2)(a)

Email: § 9(2)(a)