

# AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL



## RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>Project:</b>	Mission Bay Central - 6 Patteson Avenue, 8-10 Patteson Avenue, 12 Patteson Avenue, 14 Patteson Avenue, 26 Marau Crescent, 28 Marau Crescent, 30 Marau Crescent, 81-87 Tamaki Drive and 89 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay.
<b>Location:</b>	135 Albert Street – Level 14, Room 8
<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 14 December 2017
<b>Time:</b>	1:30pm – 5:00pm
<b>Members:</b>	Dr Lee Beattie (Chair), Alistair Ray, Richard Naish & Stuart Houghton
<b>Planner:</b>	Ben Cunningham
<b>Urban Designer:</b>	Yu-Ning Liu / Gabriel Seo

- Support subject to some changes (stated below)
- ✓ Support subject to fundamental changes (stated below)
- Cannot support for the following reasons

### Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for their presentation and supports the general proposition of a variable height mixed-use scheme however we have the following concerns that would need to be addressed.

### Height, Bulk and Massing – Visual Impact

As a prominent corner site in the heart of the centre and fronting the expansive Mission Bay Reserve, the Panel agrees with the approach to vary the height across the site to avoid a uniform mass over such a large site in a prominent location. The principle of additional height at the Tamaki Drive and Patteson Avenue corner to enable this is supported by the Panel, however the exact height will still need to be determined by the contextual analysis as well as responding to the points raised below.

Further modelling of the proposed height and massing in its planned future context, as well as the visual simulations from representative viewpoints will be important to gauge the appropriateness of the proposal in this context.

The Panel has concerns about the extent of height and massing on both the Patteson Avenue and eastern elevations, and questions whether this is consistent with the stated massing strategy of providing a variation in height and expressing a landmark

building on the corner of Patteson Avenue and Tamaki Drive. A reduction in height along these two elevations will help to give primacy to the corner and to Tamaki Drive.

Additionally, the Panel considers that there is a missed opportunity in the south west corner of the site and that a more positive corner treatment should be provided on this important corner.

The Panel questions the viability of retail on the Marau Crescent and suggests consideration of level entry townhouses in this location to reinforce the residential nature of the street.

### **Podium and carparking**

The Panel has fundamental concerns over the height difference of the podium and the street and questions the public private interface of the podium. There are difficulties in successfully activating this level relative to the lost opportunity of greater activation at street level. The Panel would like some consideration of a ground level laneway over at least part of the podium footprint closest to the Tamaki Drive corner.

Reconsideration of carparking at ground floor may enable an enhanced solution that addresses the comment above.

The Panel also has concerns about the apartments facing the cinema in the southern part of the site in terms of restricted outlook and amenity.

### **Architectural response – strong Art Deco element**

The Panel questions the validity of the Art Deco style for this site. Whilst some cues may be taken from the Art Deco style including proportions, scale and colour, the Panel would encourage a more progressive approach to the site linked to the wider context of Mission Bay.

### **Conclusion**

The Panel looks forward to further reviews as the design develops.

# AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL



## RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>Project:</b>	Mission Bay Central - 6 Patteson Avenue, 8-10 Patteson Avenue, 12 Patteson Avenue, 14 Patteson Avenue, 26 Marau Crescent, 28 Marau Crescent, 30 Marau Crescent, 81-87 Tamaki Drive and 89 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay.
<b>Location:</b>	135 Albert Street – Level 29, Room 1
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday 10 April 2018
<b>Time:</b>	9:30am – 1:30pm
<b>Members:</b>	Alistair Ray (Chair), Richard Naish, Stuart Houghton & Michael Campbell
<b>Planner:</b>	Ben Cunningham
<b>Urban Designer:</b>	Yu-Ning Liu

- Support subject to some changes (stated below)
- Support subject to fundamental changes (stated below)
- Cannot support for the following reasons

### Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for their presentation and is still in a position of general support for the proposal recognising the breach of unitary plan height limits.

The Panel supports the following aspects of the proposal:

- The relationship of buildings to Marau Crescent;
- Resolution of the residential units in the southern block;
- Relationship of the buildings to the eastern boundary;
- Relationship of buildings to Tamaki Drive and the corner with Patteson Avenue; and
- General modulation, proportion and breaking down of the mass (notwithstanding comments below).

However, the Panel notes that it has not been presented with any elevations or perspective views from the south to help fully evaluate the proposal with the elevated residential catchment to the south and would expect that these aspects will inform further design development.

## **Fundamental Issues**

The Panel considers that there are still fundamental issues with the following elements:

### Podium Entrance to Cinema and Apartments

The Panel does not support the current proposed arrangement of the upper level entrance to the cinema. It considers that there are still issues with respect to the public-private interface and the vertical separation of the public areas from street level. The Panel considers that the proposal lends itself to a ground floor laneway which would address these issues and offer the opportunity to achieve a better urban design outcome with greater integration with the public realm. It is recognised this may impact on the ground floor car parking but this should be outweighed by overall urban design outcomes that can be achieved with a ground level laneway. The Panel considers that this has still not been adequately investigated.

### Height to Patteson Avenue

The Panel still has concerns about the extent of height and massing on Patteson Avenue and questions whether this is consistent with the stated massing strategy of providing a variation in height and expressing a landmark building on the corner of Patteson Avenue and Tamaki Drive. A reduction in height along the Patteson Avenue elevation will help to give primacy to the corner with Tamaki Drive. This will also help to provide a more suitable transition to the neighbouring residential zone.

### Architectural Approach – Character and Context

The Panel remains unconvinced of the overtly art deco generated design for such a large proposal that will have a significant impact on the future built character of Mission Bay. The Panel would encourage a wider contextual and character analysis (built form and natural coastal environment) which should be used to inform and justify the design approach. The Panel commends the architectural response along the Marau Crescent frontage which could help inform a revised approach to the balance of the proposal.

## **Further Issues**

The Panel acknowledges that further design development is still to occur and in doing so needs to address the following issues:

*To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.*

- Reconciling internal apartment planning with the external façade including resolution of balcony sizes.
- Integration with adjoining public realm including further development of streetscape enhancement proposals and the ability to achieve street trees. This will inform further development of how the buildings relate to the street and pedestrian movement, including canopies and outdoor dining.
- Engagement with Mana Whenua and response to Te Aranga design principles.

## **Conclusion**

The Panel looks forward to the third review as the design develops.

# AUCKLAND URBAN DESIGN PANEL



## RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>Project:</b>	Mission Bay Central (Panel 3)
<b>Location:</b>	135 Albert Street, Level 14, Meeting Room 2
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday 05 June 2018
<b>Time:</b>	9.30am to 1.30pm
<b>Members:</b>	Dr Lee Beattie (Chair), Stuart Houghton, Richard Naish, Michael Campbell
<b>Planner:</b>	Ben Cunningham
<b>Urban Designer:</b>	Yu-Ning Liu

- Support subject to some changes (stated below)
- Support subject to fundamental changes (stated below)
- Cannot support for the following reasons

### Introduction

The Panel thanks the applicant for their presentation and will concentrate our comments on the issues raised from the second urban design panel which was held on 10 April 2018.

### 1. Architectural character and context

- The Panel still has fundamental issues with the overall architectural character and context. Given the significance of the site and its gateway location, the architectural expression needs to be of a strength to justify the increased height proposed, particularly on the corner of Patteson Avenue and Tamaki Drive. The Panel believes in this case that additional height needs to be earned by exemplary design.
- It appears to the Panel that the applicant is looking for a sense of identity without meaningful reference to the connection with NZ coastal location and vernacular. This could include a meaningful reference back to the Te Aranga Design Principles, local vernacular building forms and potentially coastal land forms. This could develop into a proposal that expresses itself with more architectural variety.

## 2. Height

- The Panel acknowledges the reduction in height along Patteson Avenue in terms of the comments made from Panel 2 (10 April 2018).
- The Panel has not been presented with any perspective views from the south to help fully evaluate the proposal from the elevated residential catchment to the south and would expect that these aspects will inform further design development including roof forms and plant.

## 3. Podium entrance

- The Panel thinks the public / private interface remains fundamentally unresolved and needs further work to provide a generous and welcoming space for all users. This includes (but is not limited to):
  - Successful public / private interface
  - Lobby entry and exit directly off plaza
  - Adequate public space and flow
  - Kitchen and service circulation locations
  - Entrance to apartments on both sides
  - Maximising public area
  - Viability of landscaping
  - Entrance to cinema
  - Exit of lift
  - Bedroom privacy issues
  - Extent of weather protection cover
  - Transparency of views to the water
  - Wayfinding

## 4. Te Aranga Maori Design Principles

- The Panel is disappointed that this appears not to have been an integral part of the design philosophy.
- A review of the Te Aranga Design Principles could contribute to addressing point 1 above.

*To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.*

## 5. Public Realm / Streetscape

- Further streetscape design work is needed to successfully integrate the project with the surrounding local centre, including paving design, street furniture, lighting, canopies and planting, as well as demonstrating how the project will achieve the high level of pedestrian safety and amenity appropriate to a local centre context.

## Conclusion

- The Panel is willing to reassess this proposal again should that be requested by the applicant, subject to the above issues being addressed.

*To the extent permissible by law, the Council expressly disclaims any liability to the applicant (under any theory of law including negligence) in relation to any pre-application process. The applicant also recognises that any information it provides to the Council may be required to be disclosed under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (unless there is a good reason to withhold the information under that Act). However, the Council is able to withhold information for certain reasons including to prevent unreasonable prejudice to someone's commercial position. All resource consent applications become public information once lodged with council.*