

To: Karl Cook – Barker & Associates Limited

From: Cam Wallace – Barker & Associates Limited

Date: 21 May 2026

Re: Downtown Carpark Site Development Project - CPTED Review of Auckland Council Comments

1.0 Introduction

I have undertaken a review of the Urban Design and Universal Design Memos prepared by Mr Mustafa Demiralp and Ms Nidhi Nautiyal respectively on behalf of Auckland Council. The purpose of this memo is to respond to further information requests or recommended conditions of relevance to CPTED matters raised by Auckland Council. I undertook a CPTED review of the design, as lodged, as part of the substantive application.

2.0 Auckland Council Comments

I note that Mr Demiralp, on page 11 of his Memo, considers that the proposal achieves “good CPTED outcomes” and “present a positive CPTED response [*that*] does not raise any material concerns”. I also observe that Ms Nautiyal generally concurs with the CPTED assessment I prepared in support of the application.

Despite the above conclusions, Ms Nautiyal has recommended pedestrian traffic modelling studies are undertaken to understand potential pedestrian traffic movement through the site, the urban room and surrounding streets at different times of the day and that it should also factor in maximum and minimum occupancy of lower levels of buildings on site. In turn, this modelling is proposed to form part of a proposed condition around an “Active Surveillance Management Plan.” I provide comment on each of these matters below.

3.0 Assessment

3.1 Pedestrian Traffic Modelling

While raised in the Universal Design Memo in the context of a proposed “Active Surveillance Management Plan” condition, the purpose of the suggested detailed pedestrian traffic modelling exercise is unclear.

Based on my experience, a detailed pedestrian traffic modelling exercise of the type suggested would be heavily assumption-dependant and disproportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal. Further, it would be disproportionate to the absence of adverse pedestrian / CPTED effects identified through the supporting Urban Design and CPTED assessments prepared to date as well as Council’s own urban design review of the application material. In this regard, I note that there is general agreement amongst all relevant experts that the proposal will result in a material enhancement of CPTED / pedestrian safety related effects. As such, an assessment of the nature requested by Ms Nautiyal is unlikely to provide a materially more reliable assessment than has been provided to date.

Further, I am unaware of any resource consent application for a commercial building in the City Centre having ever been required to undertake a similar assessment – including the neighbouring Commercial Bay development which provides for through site laneways to assist with the interchange of public transport users from the area. I am familiar with such assessments from my experience working with Transport for London where such studies were routinely undertaken to inform London Underground station design and / or understand impacts on pedestrian station congestion during major events (e.g. a Premier League Football fixture). I was personally involved in reviewing and managing inputs into such assessments to understand the impact of West Ham United's move to the London Olympic Stadium on surrounding Docklands Light Rail, London Overground and London Underground stations. Under this scenario, pedestrian modelling is relatively straight forward (utilising specialist software) as pedestrian demand, peak surges in demand, route choice, route capacity (e.g. escalator widths / speeds) are all well-defined and within a highly controlled environment. In contrast, the Downtown Carpark Site Development involves the redevelopment of most of a city block and incorporates a wide range of activities, including commercial, retail, hotel and residential uses. Pedestrian movement through and around the site will ultimately be influenced by a wide range of variables, including tenancy mix, trading hours, building occupancy, visitor behaviour, weather, public transport patterns and wider city-centre activity. Many of these variables are currently unknown and / or can be expected to change over the life of the development.

In summary, I consider that a detailed pedestrian traffic modelling exercise is both unnecessary and impractical.

3.2 Proposed Conditions

Ms Nautiyal has recommended two new conditions relating to the provision of a "Active Surveillance Management Plan" (ASMP). Part of the ASMP proposed involves undertaking the pedestrian modelling as discussed above.

Whilst I acknowledge the importance of ensuring safe and efficient pedestrian circulation through the site and its interface with the surrounding public realm, in my opinion, the proposed conditions are disproportionate to any adverse effect and raise challenges with ongoing compliance given the likely long-term operational characteristics of such as development (e.g. changes of tenants, opening hours etc).

To provide some further certainty as to pedestrian safety outcomes on the site, I would recommend adopting the approach that was utilised for the Commercial Bay Development. This would provide a consistent approach to managing potential effects across the downtown area and be better aligned with more detailed design consideration undertaken during the building consent stage of development. The condition would read:

Prior to the occupation of the building, the consent holder shall provide to the satisfaction of the Council (Team Leader, Monitoring and Compliance Central) details of the building operation, confirming:

- a. hours of operation for all publicly accessible spaces;*
- b. security measures/monitoring of the above spaces, as well as spaces able to be accessed by the public; and*
- c. details of retractable security screens or other security measures.*

4.0 Summary

Overall, comments received from Auckland Council on CPTED related matters confirm that the proposal is well aligned to CPTED requirements. The conditions requiring pedestrian modelling and the preparation of the ASMP are unnecessary and disproportionate to any actual or potential adverse effects of the proposal. To provide greater certainty as to safety outcomes, I have recommended a condition requiring submission of security measures prior to the occupation of the buildings.