

20 May 2026

To: Bianca Hurrell, RCP

Subject: Independent Peer Review
Proposed Downtown Hotel Porte Cochere / PUDO, Customs Street West

Issued via: [REDACTED]

1. Introduction and scope

I have been engaged by Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited (the applicant) to provide an independent peer review of the proposed hotel porte cochere / pick-up and drop-off facility ("PUDO") associated with the Downtown Carpark Site Development at 2 Lower Hobson Street, Auckland Central.

Although I have been appointed by the applicant, I have undertaken this peer review independently and impartially. In preparing this memorandum, I have had regard to the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, the Engineering New Zealand Code of Ethical Conduct, and the good-practice principles for peer review set out in Engineering New Zealand Practice Note 2: Peer Review. My opinions are based on my independent professional judgement, within my area of expertise, and have not been directed by the applicant. On that basis, I consider that the opinions expressed in this memorandum can be relied upon as independent and impartial transport engineering advice. My qualifications and experience are set out at the back of this memorandum.

My review is limited to the transport planning and traffic engineering matters associated with the proposed hotel PUDO on Customs Street West ("CSW"). I have not undertaken a wider review of the full mixed-use development, construction traffic effects, basement parking, servicing, loading, or other transport matters except where those matters are directly relevant to the operation of the proposed PUDO.

The proposal forms part of a Fast-track Approvals Act process. I understand that the PUDO has become one of the principal unresolved operational transport matters between the applicant, Auckland Transport ("AT") and Auckland Council.

In forming my opinion I have reviewed the material provided to me, including the Operational Integrated Transport Assessment prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists ("Flow"), the Draft Hotel Pick-Up and Drop-Off Management Plan ("HPUDOMP"), Flow's Transport Addendum / s67 response, the AT memorandum prepared by Nicholas Simpson, the Progressive Transport Solutions Ltd ("PTSL") traffic

review prepared by Martin Peake for AT, the Auckland Council Planning Memorandum, and the Stantec traffic engineering memo prepared by Trevor Lee-Joe for the Council.

2. Summary of the case

The development involves the demolition of the existing Downtown Carpark and its replacement with a mixed-use precinct including commercial, residential, retail, food and beverage, civic uses and a 200-room hotel. Flow's ITA identifies that the hotel would be served by a dedicated PUDO on the CSW frontage. The PUDO would have two formal stopping spaces, a bypass lane, and separate inbound and outbound vehicle crossings. The inbound crossing would be to the west and the outbound crossing to the east, both with left-in / left-out operation.

The proposed PUDO is located in broadly the same frontage environment as the existing Downtown Carpark accesses. The existing Downtown Carpark access on CSW comprises two separate crossings, with both providing two lanes. A bus lane currently runs along the CSW frontage.

The surveyed existing Downtown Carpark CSW vehicle crossings carried 380 vehicles per hour (vph) in the AM peak and 197vph in the PM peak. These figures exclude vehicles exiting the carpark via the Fanshawe Street ramp. In comparison, Flow's adopted seasonally adjusted hotel PUDO demands are substantially lower. The key transport comparison is therefore not between the proposed PUDO and a no-access frontage, but between the proposed PUDO and the existing, much higher intensity Downtown Carpark access environment.

Flow's position is that the proposed PUDO can be safely and efficiently managed through a dedicated management plan, hotel only use, staff control, short dwell times and the ability for vehicles to pass through if the two formal PUDO spaces are occupied. The draft HPUDOMP states that active management is required because of the high pedestrian and bus volumes on CSW and because the PUDO has capacity for two vehicles, or one larger vehicle up to a 7.4m passenger transporter with trailer.

AT's concern is that the PUDO is constrained, that it relies heavily on active management, and that if the facility is full vehicles may stop in the road reserve, queue across the footpath, obstruct the CSW bus lane, or circulate through the surrounding network. AT also raises concerns with pedestrian safety, the width and angle of the vehicle crossings, the proximity to the CSW / Lower Hobson Street ("LHS") / Sturdee Street priority arrangement, and the way the facility would operate under future CSW network changes.

In my opinion, the proposed PUDO is supportable from a transport perspective, subject to targeted refinements to the HPUDOMP and confirmation of certain design / operational details. I consider that the transport effects of the proposed arrangement

are likely to be significantly less than the existing Downtown Carpark access activity. The proposal should therefore be assessed in that real-world context, rather than against an idealised unconstrained hotel forecourt.

3. Summary of positions of the key reviewers

3.1 Flow / applicant

Flow supports the PUDO and considers the arrangement appropriate for the constrained city centre site. The proposed facility provides two formal PUDO spaces, a bypass lane, and separate entry and exit crossings on CSW. Flow considers the vehicle crossings to be an improvement over the existing Downtown Carpark crossings, noting that the existing carpark crossings are being removed or replaced with smaller crossings associated with the hotel PUDO.

Flow's draft HPUDOMP proposes hotel only use, active management, short dwell times, valet parking and procedures to prevent queuing onto the road network. The draft plan identifies an estimated hotel drop-off demand of 18-23 vehicles/hour during weekdays.

Flow's Transport Addendum records that Stantec and Commute did not raise notable transport concerns, and states that the addendum primarily responds to AT's concerns.

3.2 Auckland Transport / PTSL

AT's position, relying materially on the PTSL review, is that the PUDO remains unresolved. The key concerns are the limited two-space formal capacity, reliance on active management, risk of vehicles queuing across the footpath or into the carriageway, potential bus lane obstruction, pedestrian safety risks at the crossings, and uncertainty over the future CSW layout.

PTSL acknowledge the functional need for a hotel PUDO in a CBD environment and agree that without such a facility guests would need to be picked up or dropped off elsewhere, with potential effects on the adjacent road network. However, PTSL considers the proposed facility has deficiencies that could affect the safe and efficient operation of the adjacent network.

PTSL supports in principle the applicant's revised LHS / CSW arrangement involving a single give-way approach, subject to further refinement and tracking in accordance with AT's Transport Design Manual.

3.3 Auckland Council

Auckland Council records that most remaining operational transport matters can be resolved through conditions, but that the PUDO design, operation and management remain unresolved. Council recommends that the Panel seek further information on

the design, capacity and operational constraints of the PUDO, including further HPUDOMP measures.

Council also records that its Traffic Engineer focused on on-site arrangements, with network effects being addressed by AT. Council's Traffic Engineer supports the proposal subject to conditions, while AT maintains concerns regarding the PUDO.

3.4 Stantec / Council Traffic Engineer

The Stantec traffic engineering memo prepared by Trevor Lee-Joe focuses on the internal traffic arrangements and operation. It accepts the trip generation assumptions, vehicle manoeuvring, parking provision and vehicle crossing locations. In relation to the hotel porte cochere, Stantec notes that two of the CSW crossings cater for one-way inbound and outbound hotel porte cochere traffic, and considers those crossings acceptable. Stantec also accepts the increased crossing widths because they are required to accommodate the tracking of the largest anticipated vehicles.

3.5 Commute / M Social

Flow records that Commute, acting for M Social, did not raise notable transport concerns. Council notes that the M Social assessments were not provided to Council or AT and anticipates they relate to matters of direct relevance to M Social, rather than the broader operation of CSW.

4. Assessment of key topics

4.1 Existing versus proposed access intensity

The most important contextual point is that the PUDO would replace a much more intensive carpark access environment. **Figure 1** below shows a comparison between a photograph of the existing street layout and an illustration of the proposed layout.



Figure 1: Existing and Proposed Layouts (Source: Flow Reports)

The existing situation is not a low-activity pedestrian frontage. It is already a significant vehicle access environment, with multiple traffic lanes entering and exiting the Downtown Carpark. The proposed PUDO would retain vehicle access in this frontage but at a materially lower traffic intensity and with a more actively managed operating regime.

The existing Downtown Carpark CSW crossings carries 380 vehicles/hour in the AM peak and 197 vehicles/hour in the PM peak, excluding the Fanshawe Street exit ramp.

The proposed hotel PUDO traffic generation is significantly lower. Flow's adopted seasonally adjusted PUDO demand is 28 two-way vehicle movements/hour in the AM peak and 22 two-way vehicle movements/hour in the PM peak. As a one-way loop, those figures equate to approximately 14 arrivals/hour in the AM peak and 11 arrivals/hour in the PM peak.

This represents an approximate 90% reduction in AM and PM peak vehicle movements across the relevant CSW frontage, before accounting for the existing Fanshawe Street ramp movements that are excluded from the CSW driveway count.

Conclusion: The proposed PUDO would substantially reduce the intensity of vehicle movements across the CSW frontage when compared with the existing Downtown Carpark access. This is a highly relevant and favourable transport consideration, particularly from a pedestrian safety and amenity perspective.

4.2 Functional need for a hotel PUDO

A dedicated PUDO is beneficial for a hotel of this nature in a dense city centre environment. Without a dedicated facility, pick-up and drop-off activity would be displaced to CSW, LHS, Quay Street, nearby kerbside spaces or informal stopping areas. That outcome would likely be less predictable and less manageable than a dedicated, staff-managed facility.

AT also acknowledges the general issue. PTSL state that without such a facility, guests would need to be dropped off or picked up somewhere, which would affect the adjacent road network. The PTSL concern is not with the concept of a PUDO, rather the design and operation of this particular facility.

Conclusion: The provision of a dedicated hotel PUDO is preferable to relying on informal on-street pick-up and drop-off activity. The issue is therefore whether the proposed facility can be appropriately managed, rather than whether a PUDO is needed.

4.3 Capacity and probability of the PUDO becoming full

The PUDO has two formal stopping spaces. However, that is not the full operational capacity of the facility. The design also includes a bypass lane, and in practical

operation that bypass lane can provide short-term internal storage / resilience, provided it is actively managed and not used for passenger loading or unattended waiting.

For occupancy assessment, the relevant demand is the arrival rate, not the total two-way movement rate. Flow's seasonally adjusted AM and PM peak demand is 28 and 22 two-way vehicles per hour respectively, therefore the approximate arrival rate is 14 and 11 arrivals per hour respectively.

Using a simple Erlang style probability test, with 14 arrivals/hour and a conservative five minute average dwell time (I consider that 2-4 minutes dwell time is more realistic, but prefer to conduct a worst-case test), the probability of an arriving vehicle finding all four effective internal positions occupied is approximately 2.4% per arrival. If one controlled entry hold position is also available, the probability of a sixth vehicle arriving when all five positions are occupied is approximately 0.56% per arrival. This is a deliberately conservative stress test, as it assumes the seasonally adjusted AM peak arrival rate and the highest dwell time assumption.

The probability analysis does not mean the PUDO can be unmanaged. It confirms that active management is necessary to ensure that the bypass lane and any entry hold position operate as short-term resilience, rather than as uncontrolled queue storage. The test indicates that the probability of the facility being unable to accommodate an arriving vehicle is very low, even under reasonable conservative assumptions.

Conclusion: The two formal PUDO spaces should not be assessed in isolation. When the bypass lane is included as a managed short-term storage area, and when one controlled entry-hold position is available, the probability of on-street double stacking is very low. As discussed below, the HPUDOMP can be strengthened to ensure that the operational capacity is actively managed and that double stacking on the street is prohibited.

4.4 Vehicle crossing design and pedestrian safety

The proposed PUDO crossings are narrower and less intensive than the existing Downtown Carpark crossings. Flow's ITA records that the western crossing would be 4.1m wide and the eastern crossing 4.6m wide at the property boundary, separated by approximately 12.3m and a physical island. The PUDO also includes a physical island separating the PUDO from the footpath.

AT's concern is that the vehicle crossings exceed Unitary Plan standards, are angled, and could increase pedestrian exposure. Such considerations are legitimate because CSW is an important pedestrian route and pedestrian volumes are expected to be high. However, the relevant comparison is not with an idealised no-crossing frontage; it is with the existing large-format Downtown Carpark access. On that basis, the proposed arrangement improves the frontage condition.

The proposed operation also benefits from low vehicle speeds, active management, separate entry and exit movements, and improved intervisibility between drivers and pedestrians compared with the existing carpark environment. Stantec accepts the vehicle crossing locations and accepts the crossing widths on the basis that they are needed for the largest vehicles expected to use the facility.

Conclusion: Pedestrian safety requires careful treatment in the final design, particularly through surface treatment, delineation, signage and staff management. However, I consider the proposed PUDO crossings are supportable, and likely represent a clear improvement compared with the existing Downtown Carpark access environment.

4.5 Lower Hobson Street / Customs Street West give way arrangement

The existing LHS / CSW interface includes a double give-way arrangement. Flow has prepared an alternative layout that would remove the double give way and provide a single give way approach with kerbside hatching.

The layout indicates that the applicant has proposed a revised arrangement to the LHS / CSW intersection to facilitate the western PUDO crossing. PTSL supports that revised arrangement in principle – noting that only a single lane approach to the give way limit line is required once the Downtown Carpark is closed – and recommend further refinement and vehicle tracking in accordance with AT's Transport Design Manual.

My view is that either the existing double give-way arrangement or the revised single give-way / hatched layout can be made to operate safely, provided the final design is clearly documented and subject to the relevant AT Engineering Approval and Traffic Resolution processes.

Conclusion: The final application material should clarify whether the revised LHS / CSW single give way layout forms part of the proposal. If it is relied upon as mitigation, it should be included in the final design package and reflected in the HPUDOMP.

4.6 Bus lane and network effects

AT's concern is that if the PUDO becomes full, vehicles may stop within CSW, the CSW bus lane or LHS. This is a valid matter given the regional public transport function of the surrounding network.

However, I do not consider this risk requires rejection of the PUDO. The relevant question is whether the risk can be managed through design, staff control, arrival management and clear operating rules. The PUDO has a much lower traffic intensity than the existing Downtown Carpark crossings, and the internal bypass lane provides resilience before any vehicle needs to be held at the entry or redirected.

I agree with AT that a generic “circulate around the block” procedure can be improved. The surrounding network is complex. Lower Albert Street and Queen Street are constrained by access restrictions, and the Commerce Street loop involves multiple signalised intersections and a resulting longer travel time. The alternative service lane / M Social route between CSW and Quay Street may be shorter but requires clarification as to whether hotel guest vehicles are legally and practically authorised to use it, and whether existing / future signage would confuse drivers.

Conclusion: The PUDO should not rely on ad hoc block circulation. The HPUDOMP should identify a specific, approved overflow route and should prioritise arrival prevention and metering over circulating vehicles through the wider network.

4.7 Larger vehicles and coaches

The proposed PUDO can accommodate cars, vans and a 7.4m passenger transporter with trailer, but it does not accommodate coaches. Flow’s ITA records tracking for a B85 car, 6.4m van, 7.4m passenger transporter and trailer.

AT’s concern is that vans, airport shuttles or similar vehicles may occupy both formal PUDO spaces, reducing available capacity. That is a fair operational point. It does not make the proposal unacceptable, but it does support a requirement for larger vehicles to be pre-booked where possible and actively called forward only when suitable space is available.

I do not consider coach access to the PUDO is necessary for the proposal to be acceptable. Many high-quality city centre hotels do not provide coach access immediately at the hotel door. However, the HPUDOMP should explain how group arrivals, airport shuttles and larger vehicles are to be managed, and where coaches would stop if required.

Conclusion: The inability to accommodate coaches within the PUDO is acceptable, provided the management plan addresses larger vehicles, pre-booked transfers and group arrivals.

4.8 Future road network environment

AT has identified future changes to CSW associated with the broader city centre network, including the potential future layout after removal of the LHS flyover. PTSL records that the future layout remains uncertain, but that the PUDO would need to operate safely in that environment.

I agree that the HPUDOMP should include an adaptive review mechanism before any material change to the surrounding road layout. It is not necessary, in my view, to resolve all details of a future unconfirmed network now. However, the consent framework should ensure that the PUDO operation is reviewed when the surrounding network materially changes.

Conclusion: The future network uncertainty can be managed by a condition requiring review and amendment of the HPUDOMP before any material change to the CSW / LHS layout affects PUDO access or operation.

4.9 Monitoring and adaptive management

AT recommends monitoring within 3 months of hotel opening and annually thereafter. AT's recommended monitoring parameters include queuing across the footpath or into the carriageway, instances where staff send vehicles away because the PUDO is full, dwell times, vehicle numbers and types, pick-ups/drop-offs within the road reserve, near misses and non-hotel use of the PUDO.

I support monitoring, but recommend a more structured early review programme: 3 months, 6 months, 12 months and annually thereafter. This provides a stronger establishment period check than Flow's original annual review, but is more proportionate than an open-ended assumption that the PUDO may need to be closed.

Conclusion: Monitoring should be evidence based, time bound and targeted to actual operational risks. A 3-month, 6-month and 12-month establishment review would assist by demonstrating that any unforeseen issues can be identified and addressed promptly.

4.10 Overall opinion on key transport matters

Having considered the competing positions, I consider the proposed PUDO to be acceptable from a transport perspective, subject to strengthening of the HPUDOMP and confirmation of the final LHS / CSW operating arrangement.

The proposal would significantly reduce vehicle access intensity across the CSW frontage compared with the existing Downtown Carpark. It would also provide a managed off-street hotel PUDO where the alternative would likely be less controlled kerbside activity. AT's concerns are reasonable, particularly regarding pedestrian safety, overflow management and the risk of vehicles stopping within the road reserve. However, I consider those matters can be addressed through management plan refinements, arrival management, monitoring and final design clarification.

I consider the residual PUDO transport effects would be acceptable if the recommendations in this memorandum are adopted.

5. Recommended HPUDOMP amendments

I recommend that the HPUDOMP be amended to include the following matters.

- Avoid reliance on a generic "circulate around the block" instruction. The approved overflow process needs to be route specific.
- Prioritise arrival prevention over overflow circulation, using arrival logging for valet users, larger vehicles, hotel transfers and group arrivals (where practicable).

- Require valet users and pre-arranged transfers to book, or at least nominate, an arrival window where practicable. It is acknowledged that ad-hoc arrivals cannot be fully prevented, but even some proportion of booking would assist in arrival management.
- Treat the bypass lane as a managed short-term stacking / circulation area only, not as a primary loading, luggage handling or taxi/rideshare waiting area.
- Identify whether one vehicle can safely be held at the PUDO entry without obstructing the CSW footpath, bus lane, LHS approach or PUDO entry movement. A fifth vehicle may only be held in the approved entry-hold position if that position is clear and safe.
- Prohibit double stacking on-street. No vehicle should wait behind another vehicle outside the porte cochere entry.
- Replace “circulate around the block” with an approved PUDO overflow / recirculation route, shown on a plan.
- Ensure that the service lane / M Social route between CSW and Quay Street is available for PUDO recirculation and that “private driveway / authorised entry only” signage will not confuse or deter drivers.
- Include wayfinding measures for the approved route, including booking confirmation maps, rideshare pin placement, taxi instructions, concierge scripts and any driveway signage.
- Include a larger vehicle protocol. Vans, shuttles and any vehicle with a trailer should be pre-booked and called forward only when sufficient internal space is available.
- Include a clear “no informal drop-off” rule for the bus lane and footpaths.
- As part of the monitoring process, record each occasion when the bypass lane is used for stacking, the entry-hold position is used, a vehicle is redirected, or any vehicle stops outside the PUDO.
- As part of the monitoring process, monitor dwell times, vehicle types, peak arrival periods, complaints, near misses and any observed informal drop-offs.
- Review operation at 3 months, 6 months, 12 months and annually thereafter.
- Include adaptive management triggers for repeated entry-hold use, double stacking, informal drop-offs, footpath obstruction, bus lane obstruction, or driver confusion.
- At each monitoring check-in, re-review the plan before any material change to the surrounding road layout, including the future CSW / LHS arrangement.

I provided Flow with a copy of these recommendations prior to finalising this document, and understand that the HPUDOMP is being updated accordingly.

6. Conclusion

The proposed hotel PUDO is a constrained city centre facility, and I accept that it requires active management. However, I do not consider that constraint to be unusual or unacceptable in this location. The site is in a dense city centre environment where hotel pick-up and drop-off activity must be managed within a limited street network.

The existing CSW frontage currently accommodates high-intensity Downtown Carpark access activity. The proposed hotel PUDO would significantly reduce vehicle movements across that frontage and replace the current carpark access environment with a smaller, lower-speed and actively managed facility. Pedestrian safety and amenity are likely to be significantly improved compared to the existing situation.

The PUDO will sometimes operate with both formal spaces occupied. That is not, in itself, an adverse network effect. The more relevant issue is whether vehicles can be managed without blocking the footpath or the CSW bus lane. Based on the proposed layout, the presence of the bypass lane, the substantially lower traffic demands and the ability to strengthen the HPUDOMP, I consider that those effects can be appropriately managed.

My overall opinion is that the proposed hotel PUDO should be supported, subject to the management plan amendments and design clarifications recommended in this memorandum.

Yours sincerely,



Daryl Hughes

Beng (Hons) CEng MICE CEngNZ

Director

Hughes Traffic & Transportation

M [REDACTED]

Qualifications and experience

I have a Bachelor of Engineering (hons) in Civil Engineering from the University of Teesside, United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Engineer and a Chartered Member of the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand, and the Institution of Civil Engineers (UK).

During my career I have been engaged by private developers and local authorities, advising on urban and rural traffic and transportation issues covering safety, management and planning matters of many kinds. I have appeared before Council hearings, the Environment Court and Auckland Unitary Plan independent hearing panels. I have previously provided transportation assistance and expert witness statements at council hearings and in the Environment Court for several relevant projects, including:

- Ramada Hotels and Wyndham Residences: I have provided transport advice for hotel and visitor accommodation developments, including Ramada Albany, Ramada Victoria Street and Wyndham Residences in the Auckland CBD.
- Commercial Bay / Lower Albert Street and Customs Street West: I provided transport advice for Precinct's Commercial Bay development, which is directly relevant given its city centre location, constrained street environment and proximity to Lower Albert Street / Customs Street West.
- Smales Farm Plan Change: I prepared transport assessment and access design advice for the Smales Farm private plan change, enabling the evolution of an established commercial office precinct into a major business and residential transit-oriented development.
- Drury Town Centre / Drury East: I led transport planning and assessment work for Drury East plan changes, fast-track consents and resource consents, including master planning, traffic modelling, access design, integrated transport assessments, expert conferencing and expert evidence.
- Beachlands South: I provided transport master planning, design advice and integrated transport assessment input for the Beachlands South plan change, a large mixed-use growth area including residential, employment and education activities.
- Alexandra Park: I provided transport assessment advice for the Alexandra Park redevelopment, a high-density urban residential precinct within an established Auckland urban environment.
- Westfield shopping centres: I have provided transport advice for numerous Westfield centres, involving high-activity access, parking, servicing, pedestrian movement and traffic effects considerations.