

PUBLIC HEARING UNDER the Local Government Act 2002
IN RESPECT OF the Selwyn District Parking Strategy.

Hearing Panel Report

1 March 2019

INTRODUCTION

1. The draft Parking Strategy was out for public consultation from the 9th November 2018 to 7th December 2018 (under the Local Government Act 2002). Fifteen submissions were received. A public hearing was held on the 1 March 2019 by Councillors N. Reid (chair), M. Alexander, and J. Bland (the Panel). Three submitters and their representatives attended the hearing.
2. It is noted that a Background Parking Study was also made publicly available, which provides context and additional information informing the Draft Parking Strategy however was not subject to public consultation.
3. The following documents are included as Appendices to this report:

Appendix 1: Officer's Hearing Report

Appendix 2: Summary of Submissions and Deliberations

Appendix 3: Submitters Written Evidence Provided at Hearing

Appendix 4: Hearing Minutes

OFFICERS REPORT

4. The Council officers Hearing Summary Report was pre-circulated, and a copy is attached as Appendix 1.
5. Mr B. Rhodes, Team Leader Strategy and Policy and Ms. L. Williams, Consultant Transport Engineer (Novo Group), attended the hearing as the Council Officers. Ms Williams provided an over-view of the purpose of and need for a Parking Strategy, the overall direction, vision and structure of the Strategy (Strategic Outcomes, Principles and Actions).
6. Ms. Williams outlined that the Strategy is district wide as parking occurs in all areas, but the focus is on centres where the greatest parking demand occurs. Ms Williams also referred specifically to the progress on provision of parking in Lincoln and Rolleston set out in Appendix 2 of the Hearing Summary Report.

SUBMISSIONS

7. Fifteen submissions were received, a summary of submissions are provided in the Table in Appendix 2. The following submitters spoke in support of their submission:
 - Foodstuffs South Island Limited
 - Ms. R. Parish, Property Development Manager
 - Mr. A. Carr, Transport Engineer, Carriageway Consulting Ltd
 - Mr. L. Clausen, Leeston Community Committee
 - Rolleston Square
 - Mr. L. Bathurst, Director
 - Mr. A. Metherell, Traffic Engineer, Stantec
8. A copy of the written evidence of submitters is attached as Appendix 3. The hearing minutes detail the key points of each submission and the Panels questions (refer to Appendix 4).

DELIBERATIONS

9. Following the submissions and close of hearing, the panel deliberated on each of the 15 submissions. Deliberations in respect of each submission are attached in Appendix 2. The deliberations identified a number of recommended changes, the reasoning for which is summarised below. The suggested changes are shown in the following section.
10. The Panel agreed with the officers recommendation to include an additional “Supporting Principle” to “Strategic Outcome 1” (District wide) and note that this was in response to submissions relating to loading, needs of businesses and mobility parking.
11. Following the discussion amongst submitters at the hearing, the Panel also considered that an additional “Supporting Principle” should be added to “Strategic Outcome 1” in respect to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) noting car park design should include consideration of safety and security.
12. The table in Appendix 5 of the Strategy should also be updated to include these additional “Supporting Principles”.

13. The Panel agreed with the suggested wording of the footnote describing Mobility Parking in the submission by the CDHB (*"Mobility parking spaces are to be used only by those who display a valid Mobility Parking Permit issued by CCS Disability Action. Eligibility requires a statement from a doctor that the person cannot walk long distances and requires parking close to destinations"*).
14. The Panel considered the risks and merits of including maps within the Strategy noting it would provide clarity as requested by the Foodstuffs and Rolleston Square submissions but that these maps are from another Strategic Document (District Plan a and Town Centre Plans) which if updated in those documents may also need to be updated in the Strategy (with associated time and costs of the process to do this). On balance, the Panel agreed that maps should be added. To provide further clarity they also agreed that the wording of the Recommendations, and Actions 2b and 2c, should be amended to state that they relate to "private parking" for "activities". This is intended to clarify that public parking and on-street parking would still be anticipated in and around these areas to provide for parking demand. The Panel noted this wording should also be carried through to any other references in the rest of the Strategy.
15. The Panel also noted the concerns presented by Mr. A. Metherell and Mr A. Carr relating to the proposed approach of "No Parking" for parts of Lincoln and Rolleston. The concerns related to possibilities of under and over supply of car parking, costs of providing shared / public parking, delays in providing car parking relative to increased demand occurring, and potential flow over effects of demand into private parking. The Panel however noted that the various other recommendations for these areas were included to reduce such risks but that the wording should be amended to clarify that these operated as a package of approaches by inclusion of the word "and" between each point in the Recommendations.
16. The Panel agreed with the proposed change to the Officer's Recommendations for the parking threshold (to reduce rather than specify what number of spaces) and that this was best assessed further through the District Plan review. They noted the agreement at the hearing by Foodstuffs with this approach.
17. The Panel also considered that additional wording should be added to Actions 4 a., c. and d. to clarify that the monitoring of parking in Lincoln and Rolleston would be "on-going", a process should be "established" for requesting changes to on-street parking, and that consideration of parking management through Area / Town Centre Plans should

include both on and off-street public parking. The later particularly relates to the submission by Lloyd Clausen.

18. All other deliberations, and consideration of all submissions are detailed in response to each submission in Appendix 2.

PROPOSED CHANGES

19. Based on the deliberations the following changes to the Strategy are recommended by the Panel:

20. Add the following “Supporting Principles” to “Strategic Outcome 1”:

g. manage parking resources to provide for the needs of the surrounding landuse activities including: mobility, loading, drop-off, customer, and residents.

h. Ensure CPTED¹ Principles are considered in car park design.

21. Update Table in Appendix 5 to include the two additional principles.
22. Amend footnote 6 (previously 5 due to consequential renumbering) as follows.

~~⁵ These spaces are restricted for the use of persons with a medical condition whom have a mobility parking permit. Mobility parking spaces are to be used only by those who display a valid Mobility Parking Permit issued by CCS Disability Action. Eligibility requires a statement from a doctor that the person cannot walk long distances and requires parking close to destinations~~

23. Amend Section 7 Recommendations

Activity Centres

Lincoln KAC Precinct 1 (east)² and parts of³ the Rolleston Key Activity Centre, Precincts 1 and 8, west of Tennyson Street:

- No **private** parking permitted for activities / developments; **and**

¹ Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

² Refer to Appendix 6

³ Refer to Appendix 6

- Shared public off-street parking areas provided in and around these locations; **and**
- Regular monitoring of growth, and parking demand, including the accessibility and availability of loading spaces; **and**
- Parking restrictions and enforcement used to maximise efficient use of on-street resources; **and**
- Development contributions applied for activities to partially fund the establishment and operation of public parks.

Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's (except above) and Darfield, Leeston, Southbridge, Dunsandel, Prebbleton, West Melton, and Coalgate / Castle Hill activity Centres
and:

Reduce the existing 20 space maximum threshold and consider enabling assessment of ~~Maximum threshold of 10 spaces per site. Exceeding this enables consideration of~~ actual demand versus urban design and built density outcomes to reduce the risk of adverse effects associated with parking over-supply.

24. Amend Action 2 as follows:

2. District Plan Review.

Review and amend:

- Parking objectives and policies for consistency with the Parking Strategy.
- No **private** parking permitted for **activities in** Lincoln KAC (precinct 1 east)⁴
- No **private** parking permitted for **activities in** Rolleston KAC (parts of precinct 1 and 8 west of Tennyson Street)⁵

25. Amend Action 4 as follows:

4. Monitoring and Management

- Establish timing and method for parking surveys, **and ongoing** analysis and reporting of parking capacity for Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's and any other centres where no minimum **on-site** parking rates apply.

⁴ Refer to Appendix 6

⁵ Refer to Appendix 6

- b. Accessibility study to ensure public mobility parking provision and distribution appropriate in Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's.*
 - c. **Establish ~~P~~rocesses** for requesting new / review of mobility, loading, and time restricted parking (for example when a new activity is established)*
 - d. **On and Off-street public ~~P~~arking** management reviewed during town centre plan / area plan processes **followed by on-going monitoring of parking.***
26. Add maps showing the parts of Rolleston KAC Precincts 8 and 1 West of Tennyson Street and Lincoln KAC Precinct 1 East, as Appendix 6 to the Strategy.
 27. Amendments through-out the report to include “private” and “activities” where relevant for consistency with the changes to Section 7.

CONCLUSIONS

28. Subject to the changes recommended above the Panel recommend that the Selwyn Parking Strategy be adopted.

Cr Nicole Reid

Hearing Panel Chair

Cr Jeff Bland

Hearing Panel Member

Cr Mark Alexander

Hearing Panel Member

Appendix 1: Officer's Hearing Report

PUBLIC HEARING UNDER the Local Government Act 2002

IN RESPECT OF the Selwyn District Parking Strategy.

Hearing Summary Report

Prepared by, Lisa Williams, Consultant Transport Engineer.

21 February 2019

INTRODUCTION

1. The draft Parking Strategy was out for public consultation from the 9th November 2018- 7th December 2018 (under the Local Government Act 2002). 15 Submissions were received. This report provides a summary and response to submissions and details proposed changes to the draft Strategy for the public hearing on the 1 March 2019. The consultation encouraged feedback on the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles for the District generally, and for Rural, Centres, and Residential areas, as well as on possible management approaches, and further / general comments.
2. It is noted that a Background Parking Study was also made publicly available, this provides context and additional information informing the Draft Parking Strategy however is not in itself subject to public consultation.

SUBMISSIONS

3. 15 Submissions were received, a summary of submissions and response on specific points is provided as Appendix 1. The following submitters wish to speak in support of their submission:
 - Foodstuffs South Island Limited
 - Rolleston Square
 - Lloyd Clausen
4. The questions raised by Alex Ward-Smith (parking in Lincoln) and Lloyd Clausen (parking in Leeston) have also been responded to / resolved directly with the submitters. Further clarification has also been provided by NZTA¹ and Orion².

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

5. The key matters raised in the submissions are addressed in turn below under the same headings as the consultation document.

¹ Clarifying that they consider the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles are well aligned with the Vision.

² Advising that Orion do not wish to speak to their submission on the Draft Parking Strategy but want to reiterate the need for 24/h and particularly emergency access to their infrastructure.

District Wide

6. A number of submissions were received on the District Wide Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles. The submissions have been addressed in turn below, similar submissions have been grouped.
7. There was agreement with the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles from four submitters (#4 Ross Mitchell; #6 Stuart Douce; #10 NZTA #13 Lloyd Clausen).
 - Questions around methods / implementation (#5 Graeme Gardiner; #7 Food Stuffs South Island Ltd)
8. The Strategy is considered to provide high level guidance for managing parking in Selwyn District and there are a number of different processes by which this will occur which are set out in the proposed Actions in Section 8 of the Strategy. The more detailed comments regarding methods are addressed in the discussion below on Approaches to Managing Parking.
 - Agreement except that cycleways should not compromise car parking (#11 Lynn Townsend)
9. It is noted that relative priorities for use of road space including parking, cycleways and other uses and functions require consideration on a case by case basis, Principle 1c is providing some overarching direction for considering these sometimes competing demands. Road safety for walking and cycling is considered paramount, Principle 1c is also consistent with the walking and cycling strategy. For these reasons no changes are proposed in this respect.
 - Agreement but wants to see inclusion of parking for commercial / heavy vehicles (#12 Warren Sargent). Agreement but seeking additional supporting principle related to people with disabilities (#8 CDHB)
 - Consider additional emphasis should be given to in the Principles to meeting community, business and visitor needs (#14 Rolleston Square)
10. Noting the submissions on the different types of parking demand (#8, and #12) it is considered that an additional principle could be added that relates to managing parking resources to provide for the varying needs of the surrounding activities including mobility, loading, drop-off, and time restricted parking.

11. The recommended change also provides additional reference to meeting the needs of land use activities (i.e., community, business and visitor needs - #14). In this respect it is also noted that the Supporting Principles should be read in addition to / as providing additional guidance for the Strategic Outcome. Strategic Outcome 1 specifically refers to meeting community, business and visitor needs therefore these considerations are clearly stated already.

Rural

12. Five submissions³ agreed with the rural Outcome and Supporting Principles. The other submissions are addressed in turn below.

- How (the status quo) would be managed and better achieved (#5 Graeme Gardiner; #8 CDHB).

13. Parking in rural areas is largely controlled through the District Plan (required to be provided on-site). Additional management around existing areas of high demand such as community / recreational areas should be considered on a case by case basis through the existing processes for managing the road network.

- The focus should be on urban areas (#11 Lynn Townsend).

14. The Strategy covers the whole of Selwyn District and as such it is appropriate to consider the Rural areas. It is noted that urban areas can also impact on adjoining rural areas and the strategy largely formalises the status quo in respect to parking management in rural areas.

- Seeks provision for truck parking (#12 Warren Sargent)

15. A suggested change to the District Wide principles specifically considers loading demand.

Centres

16. Submissions on the Centres Strategic Outcome and Supporting Principles included⁴ five in agreement⁵. The other submissions are addressed in turn below.

³ #4 Ross Mitchell; #6 Stuart Douce; #10 NZTA; #13 Lloyd Clausen; #15 Gwynn Thomson

⁴ Submissions #5 Graeme Gardiner and #11 Lynn Townsend in respect of priorities of parking and pedestrians and cyclists have already been addressed above.

⁵ #4 Ross Mitchell; #6 Stuart Douce; #10 NZTA; #13 Lloyd Clausen; #15 Gwynn Thomson

- Supports recommendations for public parking for parts of Rolleston and Lincoln as long as appropriate mobility parking is available and supports enforcement of parking restrictions (#8 CDHB)
17. Accessible parking is specifically covered in Principle 3. e. An accessibility study and enforcement are included in the Actions in Section 8 of the Strategy.
- Agrees but wants to see more loading spaces and considers provisional parking estimates for Rolleston may be too low noting reliance on cars (#12 Warren Sargent).
18. Loading is specifically covered in Principle 3. E.
19. Whilst beyond the detail covered in the strategy, it is noted that initial estimates of future parking demand for Rolleston have been undertaken using surveyed parking demand in Rolleston and reflect local trends including levels of vehicle use / reliance.
- Questions how parking can be provided in ways that do not impact on amenity and vibrancy (#11 Lynn Townsend).
20. Active frontages for Rolleston and Lincoln have been identified through the Town Centre Planning process (and are shown in Appendix 29C of the District Plan). People provide vibrancy, parking can support this by providing access for people. The intention is to provide parking in ways such that it does not compromise interaction of buildings with the street, result in dispersal of the town centre, and has minimal impact on the ability to walk between destinations within the town centre. This allows parking to support rather than compromise vibrancy.
- Concern about Council maintaining and retaining car parks noting value of land (#7 Foodstuffs South Island Ltd); and
 - Risk (particularly with principles b and e) that with changes in parking controls, sites developed with insufficient parking supply will transfer excess demand to existing private sites. Risk that existing developments will not be able to increase the scale of activity if increased pressure is placed on parking; inconsistent with the Vision of equitable and coherent provision and management, and vibrant centres. Considered the principles need to more clearly protect the existing private development parking resources. The reference to active frontages in the Principles be carefully restricted to some streets (#14 Rolleston Square).

21. The recommended actions⁶ include construction of public parking in Rolleston, feasibility studies for additional public parking (ahead of this demand) and ongoing monitoring of parking demand and supply to enable on-going planning (ahead of demand). These are specifically included to reduce the risk associated with insufficient parking.
22. Action 4 details the parking provision currently proposed, any changes to the strategy or provision of public car parking in the future would be subject to the relevant statutory considerations and public participation.
23. There is no increased risk for increasing the scale of development. The status quo places restrictions on increasing development through the need to be able to provide additional parking on-site to meet the minimum requirements.

Residential

24. Seven submitters⁷ agreed with the Residential Outcome and Supporting Principles. Other submissions on this section are addressed in turn below.
 - Disagrees as residents of quiet streets did not expect / shouldn't have to deal with crowded streets due to lots of parking (#11 Lynn Townsend).
 - Suggests designating parking areas as it is easier to regulate when specifically provided, harder when there is little choice (#12 Warren Sargent); And
 - Parking at schools should include a limited number of drop-off spaces to encourage walking (#8 CDHB)
25. The Strategy seeks to minimise on-street parking associated with non-residential activities however recognises that there are some situations where on-street parking may be appropriate. This makes efficient use of parking resources particularly where there may be high, but short duration, demand that would otherwise result in large car parks that are not used for the majority of the time, for example schools. The strategy direction seeks to reduce effects on residents by ensuring that in situations that are not for short periods of time, or occasional, the parking demand is met on-site.
 - Streets should accommodate parking on both sides (#13 Lloyd Clausen).

⁶ Actions 1, 3, and 4.

⁷ #Diana Emett; #4 Ross Mitchell; #5 Graeme Gardiner; #6 Stuart Douce; #8 CDHB; #10 NZTA; #15 Gwynn Thomson

26. Consideration of marking (designating) parking lanes / spaces on residential streets may be helpful in areas of higher demand however the provision of on-street parking lanes (and road width) is best considered through other processes and on a case by case basis depending on the role of the road (it's classification and function).

Management Approaches

27. The submissions on the proposed Management Approaches included⁸ two in agreement⁹ and some that agree with specific components:
- no parking requirements for other centres, Off-street parking in Lincoln, and parking restrictions and enforcement (11 Lynn Townsend)
 - Parking enforcement in Lincoln (#5 Graeme Gardiner)
 - Reduction Factors for Business 2/3 and Residential (#8 CDHB).
 - Development Contributions as main contributors to parking construction. Accept practical fees to maintain, if costs reflect value (#12 Warren Sargent).
28. The other submissions are discussed in turn below.
- On street parking must be maintained in Lincoln commercial area for elderly and young families who don't walk long distances (#5 Graeme Gardiner).
29. Action 4b includes an accessibility study for Lincoln and Rolleston to consider provision and location of parking for those with restricted mobility.
- Removing parking would harm businesses (#4 Ross Mitchell; #5 Graeme Gardiner).
30. The strategy does not direct removal of any parking instead it focuses on how this can be most efficiently provided across a Centre.
- To be effective it imposes large costs on the Council for regularly monitoring parking demand across all centres (and other costs). No assessment has been made of these costs nor of the ability/commitment of the Council to fund this

⁸ Submissions related to relative priorities of parking and cycling have been addressed above.

⁹ #6 Stuart Douce; #10 NZTA

work. The 10-space maximum threshold requires further consideration / justification (#7 Foodstuffs South Island Ltd)

31. The Strategy includes monitoring of parking supply and demand as Action 4a, once the strategy is approved the relevant planning and funding (for example Long Term and Annual Plans) processes will be implemented.
32. The maximum threshold of 10 spaces was recommended noting this is half the existing threshold (20 spaces) and would represent an improvement towards addressing the concerns identified in the Parking Background Report. That said it is agreed that this level of detail requires further consideration and it is proposed to change the wording in the strategy to “reduce” rather than specify a number. The number and detail of the assessment would be appropriately considered through the District Plan process.
 - Nil parking in Rolleston / Lincoln may have merit but unsure in which area it would make sense. Agrees partly with Development Contributions, believes the lack of parking and the requirement of shops to provide parking is deterring potential developers (Lincoln). Funding has to come from other sources (#11 Lynn Townsend); and
 - Nil parking has to be carefully considered, due to vehicle reliance and lack of viable alternatives (balance availability). Do not want parking regulation as a means to limit parking access (#12 Warren Sargent).
33. Nil parking has been considered appropriate for parts of Lincoln and Rolleston. This is the eastern part of Precinct 1 in Lincoln (the existing town centre area) and parts of Precinct 1 and 8 in Rolleston shown in Figure 5 of the Background Study (Rolleston). These are the areas where the town centre plans identify active frontages, there are likely to be high pedestrian volumes and higher levels of amenity are anticipated. These areas are also in close proximity to existing and planned off-street car parks to cater for the parking demand. This demand is based on current mode splits (rather than assuming a shift from vehicles to walking or cycling) and simply seeks to cater for demand in a coherent / collective way.
34. Amongst those who commented there was general support / acceptance of the use of Development Contributions as a mechanism for funding public car parking provision.
35. There were a small number of comments on parking enforcement with some support and some disagreeing with restrictions.

Further Comments

36. A variety of further comments were received, many have already been addressed in the discussion above. It is noted that comments on the Parking Background Study, have only been considered as they relate to the Strategy. A number of site-specific matters are also outside of the scope of the Strategy and have been passed to the Councils Transport team for consideration. Park and Ride related parking was not specifically considered in the Strategy and is best considered as part of the public transport planning processes.
37. A specific change sought by #8 CDHB to the explanation of mobility parking is included in the recommended changes.
38. Several submissions noted the benefits of the Strategy particularly in respect of prioritising urban design and creation of urban areas that are more conducive for physical activity (#8 CDHB), alignment with NZTA's objectives (#10 NZTA), and supporting cycling in the District (#6 Stuart Douce).
39. Other further comments have been grouped into key topic areas and are discussed below.
 - Risks / implementation of no on-site parking / shared public car parking (#7 Foodstuffs South Island Ltd; #14 Rolleston Square)
40. Both submitters raised a number of questions around the risk of Council not being able to implement, manage or fund the proposed management approaches including a variety of questions around timing, cost considerations for each option and level of detail considered.
41. From the outset it is important to note that the Background Parking Study sought to consider at a high level: what options are available, the existing situation, and overall advantages and disadvantages of these options. In order for the Strategy to provide useful guidance on the direction for parking management some high-level consideration of these aspects is useful. The Strategy is however the first step towards the overall management of parking and sets the basis for which more detailed considerations around methods, timing and costs occur. These considerations will occur through a variety of processes as outlined in the Actions. The inclusion of the actions within the Strategy is intended to provide some accountability and assurance to the public that

these measures are being considered and will be implemented. It appears the underlying concern is how and when these will be undertaken.

42. It is noted that Action 4a (monitoring of parking in Rolleston / Lincoln) includes developing a methodology. This could include monitoring of future demand based on building consents for developments and would assist with avoiding a lag in supply. It is also noted that future growth (to 2033 i.e., current forward planning timeframes) for these areas and the associated volume of car parking has been considered such that there is already an indicative understanding of the volume of shared public parking that may be needed over the foreseeable future. The monitoring will then seek to guide the rate and timing of developing of additional shared public car parking.
43. In order to address these concerns a summary table of current progress towards the more immediate actions has been included in Appendix 2. This shows that many of the key aspects that are questioned are indeed well progressed through the planning, funding and in some cases scheduled for implementation. Accordingly, the recommended options and actions is considered to be feasible and the processes for achieving these well set out.
 - Structure of Vision, Strategic Outcomes, Supporting Principles and Actions (#7 Foodstuffs South Island Ltd, #10 NZTA, #14 Rolleston Square).
44. Rolleston Square questioned the broadness of the vision noting that there was then a lot of reliance on the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles to understand the vision and a need for consistency of wording. The submission by NZTA considered the Supporting Principles and Strategic Outcomes and Vision were well aligned and supported the objectives of NZTA.
45. The vision is deliberately broad and sets the overall direction. The Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles are intended to provide the more directive components of this Strategy. The Strategic Outcomes echo the wording of the vision as it relates to the District or specific areas. The Supporting Principles are intended to cover a range of more specific components related to each Strategic Outcome and by necessity include additional detail and wording.
46. The Foodstuffs submission supported the vision but questioned the ability of the strategic outcomes and management methods to achieve this vision. In part this appears to relate to the aspects of the vision that Foodstuffs consider of primacy (access to sites and provision of parking for business and visitor needs). The recommended change to

include an additional supporting principle to Outcome 1 does add additional emphasis to the needs of landuse activities, in response to this submission (and others as outlined above). The other comments relate more specifically to the details of parking management options and have been addressed above.

- Actions (Content and Timing) (#8 CDHB; #14 Rolleston Square)

47. The CDHB seeks that the timing of action 4b (accessibility study for Lincoln and Rolleston) be brought forward (from 2022) to align with Lincoln and Rolleston Parking Management Plan / updates (by 2019/2020). Whilst this makes some sense it is noted that the Management Plans are simply consolidating the parking changes which have already occurred / are planned. This is to provide information to the public around the location of parking within the Centres.
48. The accessibility study is intended to inform the next stage of changes and particularly to ensure that adequate mobility parking is available prior to no on-site parking / shared public parking management coming into effect (post District Plan Review). This is to ensure that such management methods do not compromise accessibility to the activities within these parts of the town centre i.e., that there are sufficient number and appropriately located mobility spaces available in the event that none are provided on-site. Accordingly, whilst an accessibility study occurring sooner would always be beneficial, the timing is considered to be appropriate for the intent of this action.
49. Rolleston Square provided a number of comments on the Actions (refer to Appendix 1). It is noted that:
 - A key component of Action 1b is to determine opportunities in north-east part of the Rolleston KAC this includes appropriate areas and locations for parking therefore it is not possible to define areas at this stage.
 - The detailed aspects for the District Plan Review are best considered through that process. It is agreed that public parking sites need to be identified to support this and this is why Actions 1a and 1b and 3 are included and their timeframes are set to inform and support the District Plan Review process.
 - Action 4a is intended to occur post any District Plan changes to ensure changes in supply and demand are monitored to inform pro-active management of parking availability. It is noted that there are a variety of existing surveys regarding the existing parking situation in Lincoln and Rolleston and these are from a range of

sources and are well aligned, this level of local survey data is rarely available and supports considerations of parking demand which would otherwise be made based solely on generic survey data (From NZ, Australia and America).

50. For the above reasons, no changes are considered necessary to the timing of Actions.

PROPOSED CHANGES

51. Based on the discussions above three changes to the Strategy are recommended.

52. Add the following supporting principle to Strategic Outcome 1:

g. manage parking resources to provide for the needs of the surrounding landuse activities including: mobility, loading, drop-off, customer, and residents.

53. Amend footnote 5 as follows.

⁵ ~~These spaces are restricted for the use of persons with a medical condition whom have a mobility parking permit.~~ **Mobility parking spaces are to be used only by those who display a valid Mobility Parking Permit issued by CCS Disability Action. Eligibility requires a statement from a doctor that the person cannot walk long distances and requires parking close to destinations**

54. Amend the recommendation (page 22) for: *Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's (except above) and Darfield, Leeston, Southbridge, Dunsandel, Prebbleton, West Melton, and Coalgate / Castle Hill activity Centres and:*

Reduce the existing 20 space maximum threshold and consider enabling assessment of Maximum threshold of 10 spaces per site. Exceeding this enables consideration of *actual demand versus urban design and built density outcomes to reduce the risk of adverse effects associated with parking over-supply.*

SUMMARY

55. In summary 15 submissions were received on the Draft Parking Strategy, these were supportive of the overall vision. Three submitters wish to be heard and these relate to a number of points primarily in respect to parking in Centres.
56. A number of specific or detailed matters were raised by various submitters which are best addressed through other processes (refer to Appendix 1).

57. Having considered the submissions, one additional Supporting Principle is recommended as well as a change to the mobility parking reference and rewording of the recommendation related to parking thresholds.
58. For the reasons outlined in the respective discussions above, no other changes are recommended at this time.

Appendix 1: Summary of submissions and response

Subm- ission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
1	Alex Ward-Smith	FC (further Comments)	Querying whether SDC has bought land in Lincoln at 11 Gerald Street and on the corner of Birchs and Tancreds Roads and whether this is to provide parking. Approved of parking on the South side of Gerald Street but believed that the footpath on the North side of the street should be pedestrian/cyclist focussed.	A response has been provided separately.
2	Smiley (Diana Emett)	Q4	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
2	Smiley (Diana Emett)	FC	Commented that instead of a double row of parallel parks outside Darfield Bakery there should be a row of angle parks to improve safety and ease of use.	Issue noted but detail is beyond the scope of this submission. Note also SH
3	Jan12 ('Jan Hann)	FC	Concern over Castle Hill Village and the lack of parking at the village hall which is a concern as the village continues to grow, queries whether provisions will be made to expand parking.	Issue noted but detail is beyond the scope of this submission
4	Ross (Ross Mitchell)	Q1	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross (Ross Mitchell)	Q2	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross (Ross Mitchell)	Q3	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross (Ross Mitchell)	Q4a	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross (Ross Mitchell)	Q4b (5??)	Disagreed, as easy parking is the lifeblood of businesses e.g. dairies where people only park for a few minutes; removing parking near these businesses would harm business health. Believes cyclists do have to be safely catered for but this should not be at the expense of convenient parking.	This related to reduced on-site parking requirements recognising that some people may cycle (or bus) to the site. Outside of Lincoln / Rolleston this is giving businesses the option to provide less parking on site. There would still be on-street parking / public parking available in close proximity.
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	Q1	Agreed with the principles but was concerned over how they would be delivered.	Addressed through Town Centre Plans, LTP, Annual Plan and District Plan (refer to actions at the end of the strategy)
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	Q2	Agreed with this but was concerned about how this would be managed, and the costs involved in policing it.	This is essentially status quo. Largely administered through the District Plan

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	Q3	Disagrees because he believes there is potential for the council to create cycle facilities to the detriment of motor vehicle users who wish to access commercial centres.	The wording acknowledges the need to provide for access to destinations (for all modes). The wording is reflecting the balancing of priorities between modes that already takes place in Town Centres and is consistent with the Town Centre strategies and the Walking and Cycling Strategy
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	Q4a	Agrees with this.	
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	Q4b (5???)	Disagrees and believes on street parking must be maintained in Lincoln commercial area for elderly and young families who don't walk long distances, removal of parking will potentially damage the trade of a business.	Mis-understanding? This relates to nil on-site parking not nil on-street parking. Accessibility study has been recommended in actions table (Action 4b).
5	James (Graeme Gardiner)	FC	Creation of cycle lanes to the detriment of vehicle parking does not benefit town centres. 120 minute parking in Lincoln could be reduced to 60 minutes, needs better policing people park all day. If the council removes parking on one side of Gerald Street it will penalise customers and businesses themselves, any cycle lanes/routes should be developed outside of the commercial centre.	The strategy provides guidance for how future decisions will balance the competing demands of cyclists against also providing access for all modes. Parking enforcement is recommended in the Action Table (Action 7a).
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	Q1	Agreed with this.	
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	Q2	Agreed with this.	
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	Q3	Agreed with this.	
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	Q4a	Agreed with this.	
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	Q4b	Agreed with this.	
6	'Cyclingisthefuture' (Stuart Douce)	FC	Believes parking enforcement needs to be employed to correct persistent incorrect parking e.g. on Lowes Road and Boundary Road.	Parking enforcement is recommended in the Action Table (Action 7a).

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q1	It relies upon the Council reacting quickly to provide additional public parking in response to increases in demand. The processes needed require an extended period of time, meaning this will not be possible to achieve a timely manner	Action 4a is specifically to manage this risk. There have also been indicative estimates of demand based on projected growth and the monitoring will ensure that the rate and timing of provision is appropriate and can stay ahead of demand. Note future demand can also be monitored at building consent stage.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q3	It relies on the Council maintaining large off-street public car parks, in locations where land development is more valuable. For the strategy to work, the Council would have to commit to retaining this land in perpetuity and forego financial returns of selling it.	The Council have already purchased and programmed car parks. Any future plans to change the use of public car parks would go through the relevant statutory processes and public consultation.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q4b	To be effective it imposes large costs on the Council for regularly monitoring parking demand across all centres (not to mention other costs). No assessment has been made of these costs nor of the ability/commitment of the Council to fund this work.	The strategy sets the direction from which funding and programming will be achieved. They have been considered indicatively and are considered feasible.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	FC	Could lead to short-term or long-term parking shortfalls. Existing off-street car parks will become de facto public parking. Compromising those retailers because they will have insufficient parking for their needs. Will require resource consents to be sought for small car parks, with no evaluation of adverse effects. Consents will also involve an assessment of whether the developers' evaluation of the car parking provision effectively matches the Council's opinion, and in such cases, it is the developer who is taking the financial risk and is therefore better placed to understand their own needs.	See discussion in hearing report regarding risks. Suggest Strategy should be less prescriptive with reference to reducing the existing threshold rather than specifying 10 space (or any other number). This allows detail of the number to be considered in more detail through the DP.
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	CDHB pleased policy prioritises active transport options. Support prioritisation of urban design objectives over general parking provisions because the elements implemented to make urban environments viable are the same as those needed to improve peoples health. Urban areas conducive for physical activity improve health.	Noted

Subm- ission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	Believe mobility parking should be prioritised as demand is increasing. Support off-street parking, believe some on street mobility parking should be maintained for ease of access. Believe mobility parking time restrictions should be minimum 120 minutes to ensure disabled people have the time they need to travel to and from shops/parking.	Noted
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	Want change in definition of mobility parking space. Recommend proposed action 4.b. be initiated before 2022. Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan is not referenced in the strategic context section. The draft CRPT Plan states any future public transport provision beyond the Greater Christchurch will rely on demonstrable demand. Supports interventions that provide better linkages to key activity centres, encourage prioritisation of parking management to encourage use of public transport. May have higher demand for park and ride services in some key centres. Should integrate public transport/park and ride services in parking management plans. Support education and awareness.	Agree re change of wording for Foot note 5. Also re timing of accessibility study addressed in hearing report. Park and Ride parking is outside of scope and will be considered in a future public transport strategy / plan
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q1	Supports the principles. Questions, how some will be provided for outside of KAC's. Recommended options only focus on KACs, business 2 /3, medium density residential zones. Recommends adding 7th supporting principle; "Provide well located parking that enables community participation for people with disabilities" . The plan could include a commitment to utilising technical advice, when making parking design decisions affecting disabled people. Supports adopting parking management technology as it becomes available.	Additional principle could be added. Barrier Free NZ Trust should be consulted during accessibility study.
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q2	Supports principles, agrees the status quo creates both safety and environmental hazards. No changes have been recommended for the rural area (page 12), recommends consideration be given to implementing parking management practices in rural areas to enable these proposed principles to be actioned.	Already administered through the District Plan. Parking enforcement might also assist.

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q3	Supports managing parking in the KACs that improve amenity, urban design outcomes, improve connections, and provide safe/walkable localities. Supports recommendations for not allowing parking in parts of areas of Rolleston and Lincoln KACs, instead off-street parking areas provided. Appropriate mobility parking is prioritised and available. Supports enforcement of parking restrictions, this can improve safety, as well as provide incentive for choosing more active travel modes.	Noted
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q4	Supports proposed principles for managing parking. Supports recommendations for Business 2/3 and Residential Zones to have reduction factors for public transport access and cycle facilities. Supports review of allocation of parking in streets less than 7 metres wide. Access for emergency vehicles and provision of footpaths on both sides of the road should be prioritised. Recommends that parking at schools in residential areas include a limited number of "drop-off" (P5 or 10 parking) areas. May encourage parents to walk their child to school or use active mode = health outcomes.	Noted but this level of detail needs to be addressed through other processes.
9	Orion NZ Limited.	FC	Orion wish to note, that consideration needs to be given to ensuring as part of the implementation of the strategy, that adequate access and parking is maintained to Orion assets. Orion have faced some significant issues in other locations which has resulted in access to Orion's assets being compromised. It is important that Orion has direct access maintained.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q1	Agree with the principles of this section and consequently support the district wide outcome and its supporting principles to manage parking across Selwyn.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q2	Agree with and support the principles/ideas in this section.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q3	Agree with and support this section as it promotes a safe and sustainable transport system. Therefore, NZTA endorse the supporting principles that aim to manage parking to enable walking and other modes of transport.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q4a	Agree with these principles and suggest that they will contribute to a safe and efficient transport system.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q4b	Agree with this section as it encourages use of multi modes of transport leading to sustainable management of the transport system.	Support min parking with reduction factors noted

Subm- ission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
10	NZ Transport Agency	FC	Encouraged by SDC's intention to create a parking strategy that will guide management of parking. Suggests the 4 strategic outcomes and supporting principles are aligned with the councils parking vision. Like the consideration of reducing parking demand through travel demand management and the consideration of users of a multi modal transport system. Of the view that draft parking strategy is aligned with/will contribute to the NZTA's objectives.	Subsequent email has clarified that they consider the four strategic outcomes and supporting principles are well aligned with the vision.
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	Q1	Agree, except that vehicle parking arrangements should not be compromised because of a cycleway.	Safety of all road users is paramount
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	Q2	Disagree. Council should concentrate their parking strategy on the urban areas of the district. The rural roads are not a major issue in respect of parking.	Strategy is largely formalising status quo i/addressing existing concerns in rural areas.
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	Q3	Agree with points A, B, C, E. Disagrees with point D because car parking comes before cycling. Unsure what is meant by point F as a town can only be vibrant if it has adequate parking that allows for people to come to the town centre.	D is consistent with the Town Centre Master Plans and walking and cycling strategy. Reducing impact recognises the balancing of these aspects. The relative priority would be considered on a case by case basis (though other processes).
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	Q4a	Disagree, concerned over the fact that people who purchased homes in quiet residential streets did not expect nor should they have to deal with over crowded streets hard to manoeuvre in due to parking.	That is what this policy is trying to avoid. I.e., it directs that most parking in residential areas would be on-site rather than on-street.
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	Q4b	Point 1 may have merit but unsure in which area it would make sense. Agrees with point 2 believes it's essential in Lincoln. Agrees with point 3 and 6. Unsure of meaning of point 4, expresses view that parking takes priority over cycling. Agrees partly with point 5, believes the lack of parking and the requirement of shops to provide parking is deterring potential developers (Lincoln). Funding has to come from other sources.	Point 1 refer to considerations in study but also note that this level of detail requires consideration at DP and project level.
11	LRT46 (Lynn Townsend)	FC	Lack of parking major issue limiting development of Lincoln business centre. Urgent and needs to be addressed or it will be a smaller scale of the issue Christchurch has.	The recommendations of the strategy include #1 public parking feasibility study for Lincoln. #3 provision of off-street parking for Precinct 1, update parking management plan, #4 ongoing monitoring of supply.

Subm- ission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	Q1	Generally, agrees, Selwyn Business Group interested in parking especially in Rolleston, as population grows they want commuters supported e.g. park and ride services, public transport. Number and ease of parking is a concern. Understand the connection to rural areas so would like to see inclusion of parking for small business vehicles, trailers and larger truck parking.	Noted. Park and Ride is outside of the scope of this strategy and best considered through public transport planning / processes.
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	Q2	Strongly agree, to maintain traffic flow on high speed roads off street parking and rest area placement is critical. Want to see designated, well surfaced and signposted off road parking also able to take heavier vehicles and provisions for overnight parking for heavy vehicles.	Additional principle could be added that includes specific reference to loading.
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	Q3	Agree but see the need to assess type of parking needed e.g. trailer/larger rural vehicles. E.g. outside Harcourts. Areas could be separate and accessible, easy access to retail etc but away from pedestrian traffic. Believe provisional numbers of parking may be too low considering the rural setting of Rolleston and reliance on cars.	Parking demand has been surveyed in Rolleston and this survey data includes inherent trends such as servicing rural catchments.
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	Q4a	Like to see designated parking areas. Suggest it is easier to regulate parking if designated parking is available. It is hard to regulate when there is little to no choice.	as above
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	Q4b	Nil parking has to be carefully considered, the nature of life in Rolleston requires vehicles. Cannot regulate parking until you offer viable alternatives. Ask that you balance regulation alongside availability of viable mixed parking capability. Do not want parking regulation as a means to limit parking access. Acknowledge development fees must be the main contributors to parking construction. Accept practical fees to maintain, if costs reflect value.	Agree and the timing of actions proposed reflects this
12	Warren T (Warren Sargent)	FC	Encourage the Council to maintain contact already started, invite council representative to set meetings, our members come with comments. Our aim is to be a collective voice of business needs. Purposely ask to be considered early in any process as we want to be contributors.	Noted
13	Hayseed (Lloyd Clausen)	Q1	Agrees.	Noted
13	Hayseed (Lloyd Clausen)	Q2	Agrees.	Noted
13	Hayseed (Lloyd Clausen)	Q3	Agrees.	Noted

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
13	Hayseed (Lloyd Clausen)	Q4a	The streets should be wide enough for a vehicle to pass through when there are vehicles parked on both sides.	Noted for other parts of District Plan Review
13	Hayseed (Lloyd Clausen)	FC	Additional parking on D'Arcy St Leeston adjacent to Leeston Consolidated School between Selwyn St and Pultney St needs to be investigated.	Noted but too detailed to address through Strategy
14	Rolleston Square	Q1	Consider important: "to meet the community, business and visitor needs". Should be key consideration throughout. District Wide principles make no reference to satisfying the demand for parking at level that meets needs. Selwyn District centres (most parking demand is generated) located to service a wide rural area; private car likely primary mode of travel for foreseeable future this generates the need for businesses to rely on availability of parking to meet needs. Principles must recognise need to maintain an appropriate provision of parking. Private developments should have a reasonable level of control in balancing management of parking on their sites.	additional principle could be added (see proposed changes in hearing report)
14	Rolleston Square	Q3	Risk (particularly with principles b and e) that with changes in parking controls, sites developed with insufficient parking supply will transfer excess demand to existing private sites. Also a risk that existing developments will not be able to increase the scale of activity if increased pressure is placed on parking; inconsistent with the Vision of equitable and coherent provision and management, and vibrant centres. Considered the principles need to more clearly protect the existing private development parking resources. The reference to active frontages in the Principles be carefully restricted to some streets.	Agree, Actions 1, 3 and 4 directly relate to managing / reducing this risk by ensuring adequate parking for the whole town centre. The Strategy supports the overall direction for reducing on-site parking requirements in Rolleston such that increased development would not be constrained. Action 4 specifically seeks to achieve ongoing monitoring of parking demand and supply and reduce risks. Private parking owners have the ability to manage use of their parking spaces. Agree areas with active frontages should be identified through more detailed plans and town centre level documents
14	Rolleston Square	FC	Vision is broad, provides flexibility to be interpreted in a variety of ways. Probably necessary, however reduces the value of the vision. Means there is reliance on the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles to better understand the Vision. To assist, the Strategy could better articulate some of the meaning in the vision, and ensure they are well aligned with the wording adopted in the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles.	The vision is intended to be aspirational and set the overall scene. It is intended that the outcomes and principles give the direction.

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
14	Rolleston Square	FC	The Parking Strategy includes site specific recommendations, but supporting maps are not included and reference is required to other documents. It appears there is ambiguity between the areas referenced in the Background Study and those included in the Strategy. Refer to submission PDF for further detail.	Strategy refers to parts of Rolleston Precincts 1 and 8 west of Tennyson this aligns with the map in Figure 5 of the background study although it is noted that detailed consideration of boundaries and application would occur during following processes. It is noted that inherently the southern part of Precinct 1 west of Tennyson is unlikely to be incorporated noting the existing level of development.
14	Rolleston Square	FC	Implementation of shared public parking would be challenging. If other precincts are developed without adequate parking there is risk for existing developed sites to become de facto parks, harming existing businesses. Minimum parking seeks to provide developers with certainty, whilst also protecting nearby areas from overflow parking. Very careful consideration of the parking reduction factors would be necessary, applied to a Selwyn specific transport system.	Shared parking: Agree - Action 1 is a feasibility study to determine this. Minimums: agreed and rates would need to be considered in detail through District Plan Review

Submission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
14	Rolleston Square	FC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following comments are provided on the actions: <p>Action 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity is required on the area defined by Action 1b. <p>Action 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity is required regarding the area defined by Action 2c, as discussed earlier. The District Plan Review should include requirements/sites for public parking, to support "no Parking" provisions if they are included Maximum parking thresholds in centres and associated assessment criteria would need particularly careful consideration before being implemented; <p>Action 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The parking location map will be important in considering effects of rule changes through the District Plan Review. It should identify where Council provided parking is likely to be located, so developers can understand the potential level of parking to support businesses in the area. The monitoring surveys being initiated by 2022 appears to be late, noting the Parking Background Study notes the most recent study was in 2013. Some monitoring should ideally be undertaken to inform both the strategy, and District Plan Review. 	<p>#1: One of the key aspects of the feasibility study is to determine opportunities in that (NE) sector of the KAC i.e., to identify any locations available. #2: this level of detail is best considered through the DP Review agree public parking sites need to be identified to support this (hence action timeframes as specified). #3 Existing surveys available provide a good picture of existing parking demand to base decisions on. The monitoring is to manage impact of the public parking and other actions going forward to manage risks.</p>
14	Rolleston Square	FC	<p>Timing and content of the actions requires careful consideration. For example, sufficient background</p>	<p>Agree - this is underway.</p>
15	R.G.H (Gwynn) Thomson	Q2	Agree	
15	R.G.H (Gwynn) Thomson	Q3	Agree	
15	R.G.H (Gwynn) Thomson	Q4a	Agree	

Subm- ission	Submitter	Submission point / question	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
15	R.G.H (Gwynn) Thomson	Q4b	Disagree. Leeston needs to be included in considerations. Main street retail issues, premises changing uses results in needs for off-site parking. Lack of on-street parking is also disadvantageous. SDC assisting with public parking as space comes available would ease issues. Tenancies with areas suitable for parking should be required to provide it.	Existing situation does require them to provide parking (or get resource consent where this is not possible) Strategy recommends (refer to section 7 / pages 21 and 22) consideration of no parking or shared public parking or retention of status quo with some reduction factors. The more detailed consideration of which of these strategies is most suitable for each township (including Leeston) will occur through subsequent processes including the District Plan Review.
15	R.G.H (Gwynn) Thomson	FC	The draft strategy focusses mainly on Lincoln and Rolleston; should consider Leeston due to its "Main street" design and implications.	Leeston and the other KAC's (Dunsandel, Prebbleton, West Melton and Coalgate / Castel Hill) are considered, this is generally under the heading Centres or KAC's and specifically listed in the recommendations.

¹⁰ Reference to 'centres' refers to Key Activity Centres (KAC's), Service Activity Centres, Rural Activity Centres and Local and Neighbourhood centres.

¹⁰ Reference to 'centres' refers to Key Activity Centres (KAC's), Service Activity Centres, Rural Activity Centres and Local and Neighbourhood centres.

<p>c. Rolleston parking location map or Parking Management Plan (including integration with public transport / park 'n' ride).</p> <p>d. Update Lincoln Town Centre Parking Management Plan (including integration with public transport / park 'n' ride).</p>	<p>By mid-2019</p> <p>By mid-2020</p>	<p>Imminent</p> <p>Imminent</p>
<p>4. Monitoring and Management</p> <p>a. Establish timing and method for parking surveys, analysis and reporting of parking capacity for Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's and any other centres where no minimum parking rates apply.</p> <p>b. Accessibility study to ensure public mobility parking provision and distribution appropriate in Lincoln and Rolleston KAC's.</p> <p>c. Process for requesting new / review of mobility, loading, and time restricted parking (for example when a new activity is established)</p> <p>d. Parking management reviewed during town centre plan / area plan processes.</p>	<p>a.-c. Initiated by 2022</p> <p>d. As plans developed / reviewed.</p>	<p>To be progressed following Strategy</p>

Appendix 2: Summary of Submissions and Deliberations

General comments

- Councillor Alexander commented that rural parking is not addressed. State highways in particular. It is an area that submitters thought should be allowed.
- Ms Williams commented on section 7 of the Strategy. The five bullet points should be ANDs not ORs.
- Panel agreed to add maps to clarify areas of uncertainty.
- Addition of word 'onsite' page 23, 8 2(b)(c) – consistency when saying no 'onsite' parking, and to make consequential changes throughout document.
- Councillor Bland questioned how to future proof this strategy. Ms Williams responded that there is a reasonable idea of Lincoln and Rolleston growth numbers for 10years.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Sub point	Summary of Submission	Response to Submission
1	Alex Ward-Smith	FC (further Comments)	Querying whether SDC has bought land in Lincoln at 11 Gerald Street and on the corner of Birchs and Tancreds Roads and whether this is to provide parking. Approved of parking on the South side of Gerald Street but believed that the footpath on the North side of the street should be pedestrian/cyclist focussed.	<p>Issue noted but detail is beyond the scope of this strategy.</p> <p>A response has been provided separately via letter on the 28 November and 19 December 2018. This letter outlined that Council has purchased Flat 2 at 11 Gerald Street. This has been done with a strategic view to develop off street car parking for the Lincoln Town Centre in the future. This is in line with the Lincoln Town Centre Plan, which went through a public consultation process and was adopted in May 2016.</p> <p>Council has not purchased a property on the corner of Tancreds and Birches Road.</p> <p>.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Bland noted it was an amicable outcome. • Panel agreed that email response was sufficient. 				

2	Diana Emett (Smiley)	Q4	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
2	Diana Emett (Smiley)	FC	Commented that instead of a double row of parallel parks outside Darfield Bakery there should be a row of angle parks to improve safety and ease of use.	Issue noted but detail is beyond the scope of this strategy. Note also State Highway
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel agreed too specific to address in Strategy however acknowledged existing car parking issues in Darfield. CPTED issues and possible integration issues (work with NZTA ongoing). Understand that the Asset Manager is aware of this submission and concerns raised. 				
3	Jan Hann (Jan12)	FC	Concern over Castle Hill Village and the lack of parking at the village hall which is a concern as the village continues to grow, queries whether provisions will be made to expand parking.	Issue noted but detail is beyond the scope of this strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel commented that this is beyond the scope of the submission and could be better addressed by the DPR Committee. A list of points have been passed on to Andrew Mazey (Councils Asset Manager). 				
4	Ross Mitchell	Q1	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross Mitchell	Q2	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross Mitchell	Q3	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross Mitchell	Q4a	Agreed with the principles set out in this section	
4	Ross Mitchell	Q4b (5??)	Disagreed, as easy parking is the lifeblood of businesses e.g. dairies where people only park for a few minutes; removing parking near these businesses would harm business health. Believes cyclists do have to be safely catered for but this should not be at the expense of convenient parking.	This related to reduced on-site parking requirements recognising that some people may cycle (or bus) to the site. Outside of Lincoln / Rolleston this is giving businesses the option to provide less parking on site. There would still be on-street parking / public parking available in close proximity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Alexander commented on the provision for appropriate parental and disabled (accessibility parking). The Panel noted there is already an action around accessibility parking. 				
5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	Q1	Agreed with the principles but was concerned over how they would be delivered.	Addressed through Town Centre Plans, LTP, Annual Plan and District Plan (refer to actions at the end of the strategy)

5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	Q2	Agreed with this but was concerned about how this would be managed and the costs involved in policing it.	This is essentially status quo. Largely administered through the District Plan
5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	Q3	Disagrees because he believes there is potential for the council to create cycle facilities to the detriment of motor vehicle users who wish to access commercial centres.	The wording acknowledges the need to provide for access to destinations (for all modes). The wording is reflecting the balancing of priorities between modes that already takes place in Town Centres and is consistent with the Town Centre strategies and the Walking and Cycling Strategy
5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	Q4a	Agrees with this.	
5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	Q4b (5???)	Disagrees and believes on street parking must be maintained in Lincoln commercial area for elderly and young families who don't walk long distances, removal of parking will potentially damage the trade of a business.	This relates to nil on-site / private parking not nil on-street parking. Accessibility study has been recommended in actions table (Action 4b).
5	Graeme Gardiner (James)	FC	Creation of cycle lanes to the detriment of vehicle parking does not benefit town centres. 120 minute parking in Lincoln could be reduced to 60 minutes, needs better policing people park all day. If the council removes parking on one side of Gerald Street it will penalise customers and businesses themselves, any cycle lanes/routes should be developed outside of the commercial centre.	The strategy provides guidance for how future decisions will balance the competing demands of cyclists against also providing access for all modes. Parking enforcement is recommended in the Action Table (Action 7a).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel agreed with officers response and particularly: Councillor Alexander made reference to the Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan. Panel also noted that the Walking and Cycling strategy provides guidance. 				
6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	Q1	Agreed with this.	
6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	Q2	Agreed with this.	
6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	Q3	Agreed with this.	

6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	Q4a	Agreed with this.	
6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	Q4b	Agreed with this.	
6	Stuart Douce (Cyclingisthefuture)	FC	Believes parking enforcement needs to be employed to correct persistent incorrect parking e.g. on Lowes Road and Boundary Road.	Parking enforcement is recommended in the Action Table (Action 7a).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General agreement from the Panel. • Councillor Reid commented that it was about education on enforcement. • Councillor Alexander highlighted other areas enforcement is needed. • Panel noted that the specific enforcement area mentioned should be passed on to Councils Enforcement Team for action (officers to action). 				
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q1	It relies upon the Council reacting quickly to provide additional public parking in response to increases in demand. The processes needed require an extended period of time, meaning this will not be possible to achieve a timely manner	Action 4a is specifically to manage this risk. There have also been indicative estimates of demand based on projected growth and the monitoring will ensure that the rate and timing of provision is appropriate and can stay ahead of demand. Note future demand can also be monitored at building consent stage.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q3	It relies on the Council maintaining large off-street public car parks, in locations where land development is more valuable. For the strategy to work, the Council would have to commit to retaining this land in perpetuity, and forego financial returns of selling it.	The Council have already purchased and programmed car parks. Any future plans to change the use of public car parks would go through the relevant statutory processes and public consultation.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	Q4b	To be effective it imposes large costs on the Council for regularly monitoring parking demand across all centres (not to mention other costs). No assessment has been made of these costs nor of the ability/commitment of the Council to fund this work.	The strategy sets the direction from which funding and programming will be achieved. Parking demand has been monitored at a high level through several surveys over the last 10 years. Monitoring is only recommended in the Strategy where no parking is permitted or no minimums are adopted (Lincoln and Rolleston – unless others adopted through DP Review) Monitoring could be undertaken in a number of ways from parking surveys, tracking of consented development

				and estimated growth, there are a few options which is why Action 4a is included to decide on how to do this (i.e., in an effective and efficient way).”.
7	Foodstuffs South Island Limited.	FC	Could lead to short-term or long-term parking shortfalls. Existing off-street car parks will become de facto public parking. Compromising those retailers because they will have insufficient parking for their needs. Will require resource consents to be sought for small car parks, with no evaluation of adverse effects. Consents will also involve an assessment of whether the developers' evaluation of the car parking provision effectively matches the Council's opinion, and in such cases it is the developer who is taking the financial risk and is therefore better placed to understand their own needs.	See discussion in hearing report regarding risks. Suggest Strategy should be less prescriptive with reference to reducing the existing threshold rather than specifying 10 space (or any other number). This allows detail of the number to be considered in more detail through the DP.
<p>Panel discussed merits / risks of including maps in a Strategy and determined that in this instance this would be useful to provide certainty and noted the maps related to existing areas of Identified Town Centres (Lower risk of maps becoming out of date quickly).</p> <p>Referred to progress already made (Appendix 2 of Hearing Summary Report) and low risk of this parking not being provided. Acknowledged that monitoring and management of parking resources already occurs and that there are a number of ways that this could occur and that Action 4a includes identifying the best approach.</p> <p>They noted that there is also the Parking Bylaw and enforcement methods.</p> <p>Agree any future changes to public car parks would be best addressed through relevant processes if / when / as needed.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledges that the Public Works Act may not be applicable for purchasing of land in some instances but notes that other mechanisms are available (and have been used) in such circumstances.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged the discussion around safety / security of car parks and recommend an additional principle to Strategic Outcome 1 be included that specifically addresses CPTED in car park design.</p> <p>It was noted that ongoing maintenance of car parks was dealt with through existing processes for Asset Management.</p>				
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	CDHB pleased policy prioritises active transport options. Support prioritisation of urban design objectives over general parking provisions because the elements implemented to make	Noted

			urban environments viable are the same as those needed to improve peoples health. Urban areas conducive for physical activity improve health.	
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	Believe mobility parking should be prioritised as demand is increasing. Support off-street parking, believe some on street mobility parking should be maintained for ease of access. Believe mobility parking time restrictions should be minimum 120 minutes to ensure disabled people have the time they need to travel to and from shops/parking.	Noted
8	Canterbury District Health Board	FC	Want change in definition of mobility parking space. Recommend proposed action 4.b. be initiated before 2022. Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan is not referenced in the strategic context section. The draft CRPT Plan states any future public transport provision beyond the Greater Christchurch will rely on demonstrable demand. Supports interventions that provide better linkages to key activity centres, encourage prioritisation of parking management to encourage use of public transport. May have higher demand for park and ride services in some key centres. Should integrate public transport/park and ride services in parking management plans. Support education and awareness.	Agree re change of wording for Foot note 5. Also re timing of accessibility study addressed in hearing report. Park and Ride parking is outside of scope and will be considered in a future public transport strategy / plan
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q1	Supports the principles. Questions, how some will be provided for outside of KAC's. Recommended options only focus on KACs, business 2 /3, medium density residential zones. Recommends adding 7 th supporting principle; "Provide well located parking that enables community participation for people with disabilities" . The plan could include a	Additional principle could be added. Barrier Free NZ Trust should be consulted during accessibility study.

			commitment to utilising technical advice, when making parking design decisions affecting disabled people. Supports adopting parking management technology as it becomes available.	
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q2	Supports principles, agrees the status quo creates both safety and environmental hazards. No changes have been recommended for the rural area (page 12), recommends consideration be given to implementing parking management practices in rural areas to enable these proposed principles to be actioned.	Already administered through the District Plan. Parking enforcement might also assist.
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q3	Supports managing parking in the KACs that improve amenity, urban design outcomes, improve connections, and provide safe/walkable localities. Supports recommendations for not allowing parking in parts of areas of Rolleston and Lincoln KACs, instead off-street parking areas provided. Appropriate mobility parking is prioritised and available. Supports enforcement of parking restrictions, this can improve safety, as well as provide incentive for choosing more active travel modes.	Noted
8	Canterbury District Health Board	Q4	Supports proposed principles for managing parking. Supports recommendations for Business 2/3 and Residential Zones to have reduction factors for public transport access and cycle facilities. Supports review of allocation of parking in streets less than 7 metres wide. Access for emergency vehicles and provision of footpaths on both sides of the road should be prioritised. Recommends that	Noted but this level of detail needs to be addressed through the District Plan Review. It is noted that on-street parking around schools is managed through the Parking Bylaw.

			parking at schools in residential areas include a limited number of “drop-off” (P5 or 10 parking) areas. May encourage parents to walk their child to school, or use active mode = health outcomes.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel agreed that this submission provided a good balance. • Councillor Reid commented it was along the lines where the Strategy was heading and. • Councillors Bland & Alexander agree with this submission. • The Panel agreed with the proposed change to the wording of mobility parking sought by the submitter (<i>Mobility parking spaces are to be used only by those who display a valid Mobility Parking Permit issued by CCS Disability Action. Eligibility requires a statement from a doctor that the person cannot walk long distances and requires parking close to destinations</i>) 				
9	Orion NZ Limited.	FC	Orion wish to note, that consideration needs to be given to ensuring as part of the implementation of the strategy, that adequate access and parking is maintained to Orion assets. Orion have faced some significant issues in other locations which has resulted in access to Orion’s assets being compromised. It is important that Orion has direct access maintained.	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel was made aware that Orion had provided subsequent advice that their concern related to experience in other areas where parking is unavailable straight outside a substation. This is an issue particularly in an emergency situation and noted that the matter has been brought to the attention of Councils Transport Team • Councillor Reid noted that for many historical utilities parking was on-street (most land areas were immediately surrounding the utility and did not provide space for on-site parking) • Councillor Bland commented on the yellow lines outside the transmission boxes and noted that awareness of emergency utility services was required. • Panel agreed Council should be aware of and consider this (for all utilities) however no changes were needed through this strategy. 				
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q1	Agree with the principles of this section and consequently support the district wide outcome and its supporting principles to manage parking across Selwyn.	Noted

10	NZ Transport Agency	Q2	Agree with and support the principles/ideas in this section. Support the avoidance of parking on high speed rural roads (reduced manoeuvring and pedestrian crossings).	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q3	Agree with and support this section as it promotes a safe and sustainable transport system. Therefore NZTA endorse the supporting principles that aim to manage parking to enable walking and other modes of transport.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q4a	Agree with these principles and suggest that they will contribute to a safe and efficient transport system.	Noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	Q4b	Agree with this section as it encourages use of multi modes of transport leading to sustainable management of the transport system.	Support min. parking with reduction factors noted
10	NZ Transport Agency	FC	Encouraged by SDC's intention to create a parking strategy that will guide management of parking. Suggests the 4 strategic outcomes and supporting principles are aligned with the councils parking vision. Like the consideration of reducing parking demand through travel demand management and the consideration of users of a multi modal transport system. Of the view that draft parking strategy is aligned with/will contribute to the NZTA's objectives.	Subsequent email (from Tony MacColl dated 290119) has clarified that they consider the four strategic outcomes and supporting principles are well aligned with the vision.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel noted this submission supported the principles and vision and appreciated the recognition of overall alignment with wider transport direction. The Panel agreed on the point made about rural parking and that they support the submission on this. 				
11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	Q1	Agree, except that vehicle parking arrangements should not be compromised because of a cycleway.	Safety of all road users is paramount

11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	Q2	Disagree. Council should concentrate their parking strategy on the urban areas of the district. The rural roads are not a major issue in respect of parking.	Strategy is largely formalising status quo in rural areas i.e., addressing existing concerns in rural areas.
11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	Q3	Agree with points A, B, C, E. Disagrees with point D because car parking comes before cycling. Unsure what is meant by point F as a town can only be vibrant if it has adequate parking that allows for people to come to the town centre.	D is consistent with the Town Centre Master Plans and walking and cycling strategy. Reducing impact recognises the balancing of these aspects. The relative priority would be considered on a case by case basis (through other processes).
11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	Q4a	Disagree, concerned over the fact that people who purchased homes in quiet residential streets did not expect nor should they have to deal with over crowded streets hard to manoeuvre in due to parking.	That is what this policy is trying to avoid. I.e., it directs that most parking in residential areas would be on-site rather than on-street.
11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	Q4b	Point 1 may have merit but unsure in which area it would make sense. Agrees with point 2 believes it's essential in Lincoln. Agrees with point 3 and 6. Unsure of meaning of point 4, expresses view that parking takes priority over cycling. Agrees partly with point 5, believes the lack of parking and the requirement of shops to provide parking is deterring potential developers (Lincoln). Funding has to come from other sources.	Point 1 refer to considerations in study but also note that this level of detail requires consideration at DP and project level.
11	Lynn Townsend LRT46	FC	Lack of parking major issue limiting development of Lincoln business centre. Urgent and needs to be addressed or it will be a smaller scale of the issue Christchurch has.	The recommendations of the strategy include #1 public parking feasibility study for Lincoln. #3 provision of off-street parking for Precinct 1, update parking management plan, #4 ongoing monitoring of supply,.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with minimum road widths and road design. If the vision is to reduce the carparking ratio, there will be an impact on residential parking. Councillor Reid commented on enforcement in a privately-owned carpark. Councillor Alexander noted that he agrees with rural parking submission. The Panel noted that the status quo for new activities in rural areas is to provide on-site parking. They note that centres parking could overflow into Rural areas and Rural areas are appropriately included in the Strategy. 				

- The Panel noted the Council has a Walking and Cycling Strategy.

12	Warren Sargent	Q1	Generally agrees, Selwyn Business Group interested in parking especially in Rolleston, as population grows they want commuters supported e.g. park and ride services, public transport. Number and ease of parking is a concern. Understand the connection to rural areas so would like to see inclusion of parking for small business vehicles, trailers and larger truck parking.	Noted. Park and Ride is outside of the scope of this strategy and best considered through public transport planning / processes.
12	Warren Sargent	Q2	Strongly agree, to maintain traffic flow on high speed roads off street parking and rest area placement is critical. Want to see designated, well surfaced and signposted off road parking also able to take heavier vehicles and provisions for overnight parking for heavy vehicles.	Additional principle could be added that includes specific reference to loading.
12	Warren Sargent	Q3	Agree but see the need to assess type of parking needed e.g. trailer/larger rural vehicles. E.g. outside Harcourts. Areas could be separate and accessible, easy access to retail etc but away from pedestrian traffic. Believe provisional numbers of parking may be too low considering the rural setting of Rolleston and reliance on cars.	Parking demand has been surveyed in Rolleston and this survey data includes inherent trends such as servicing rural catchments.
12	Warren Sargent	Q4a	Like to see designated parking areas. Suggest it is easier to regulate parking if designated parking is available. It is hard to regulate when there is little to no choice.	As above

12	Warren Sargent	Q4b	Nil parking has to be carefully considered, the nature of life in Rolleston requires vehicles. Cannot regulate parking until you offer viable alternatives. Ask that you balance regulation alongside availability of viable mixed parking capability. Do not want parking regulation as a means to limit parking access. Acknowledge development fees must be the main contributors to parking construction. Accept practical fees to maintain, if costs reflect value.	Agree and the timing of actions proposed reflects this
12	Warren Sargent	FC	Encourage the Council to maintain contact already started, invite council representative to set meetings, our members come with comments. Our aim is to be a collective voice of business needs. Purposely ask to be considered early in any process as we want to be contributors.	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Bland questioned whether loading zones were adequate. From personal experience, it is difficult to find truck and trailer unit parking. • Aware that truck and trailer parking has been raised as an issue with the enforcement team in the past. • Councillor Alexander commented on the opportunity for overnight parking and that it was not Council's task. • The issue should be raised with Councils Transport Team for further consideration / investigation of options. Noted that the Parking bylaw considers / manages use of heavy vehicle parking and additional controls / provisions can be addressed through this process. • Councillor Bland suggested consideration of "discouraging" parking of heavy motor vehicles. • The Panel agreed to add the principle relating to loading on Page 12 of the Hearing Summary Report • It was noted that some aspects of this discussion on HGV parking may also be addressed through the District Plan review. 				
13	Lloyd Clausen.	Q1	Agrees.	Noted
13	Lloyd Clausen.	Q2	Agrees.	Noted
13	Lloyd Clausen.	Q3	Agrees.	Noted
13	Lloyd Clausen.	Q4a	The streets should be wide enough for a vehicle to pass through when there a vehicles parked on both sides.	Noted for other parts of DP review

13	Lloyd Clausen.	FC	Additional parking on D'Arcy St Leeston adjacent to Leeston Consolidated School between Selwyn St and Pultney St needs to be investigated.	Noted but too detailed to address through Strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel recognised concerns and agreed that consideration of parking management for Leeston is important however understand there is sufficient parking for the current demand and this is primarily an issue of future / on-going management. • Noted there was tension between avoiding “missing teeth” and providing more parking to cater for future growth. • The Panel discussed that the recommendations included several options for consideration through the District Plan review and the most appropriate can be determined through that process. • Councillor Reid also noted that the Town Centre Planning processes are a good option for making decisions around public parking and asked if such a process is anticipated for Leeston going forward. • The Panel Agreed that this can be considered as part the Council’s future work programmes such as Leeston town centre studies/plans • The Panel agreed that Action 4d should include review of on and off-street public parking during town centre management plan processes to determine which might be most effective. Noted that the parking management should then be monitored in these centres (Leeston and others where town centre plans are envisaged it the future for example Darfield) 				
14	Rolleston Square	Q1	Consider important: “to meet the community, business and visitor needs”. Should be key consideration throughout. District Wide principles make no reference to satisfying the demand for parking at level that meets needs. Selwyn District centres (most parking demand is generated) located to service a wide rural area; private car likely primary mode of travel for foreseeable future this generates the need for businesses to rely on availability of parking to meet needs. Principles must recognise need to maintain an appropriate provision of parking. Private developments should have a reasonable level of control in balancing management of parking on their sites.	additional principle could be added (see proposed changes in hearing report)

14	Rolleston Square	Q3	Risk (particularly with principles b and e) that with changes in parking controls, sites developed with insufficient parking supply will transfer excess demand to existing private sites. Also a risk that existing developments will not be able to increase the scale of activity if increased pressure is placed on parking; inconsistent with the Vision of equitable and coherent provision and management, and vibrant centres. Considered the principles need to more clearly protect the existing private development parking resources. The reference to active frontages in the Principles be carefully restricted to some streets.	Agree, Actions 1, 3 and 4 directly relate to managing / reducing this risk by ensuring adequate parking for the whole town centre. The Strategy supports the overall direction for reducing on-site parking requirements in Rolleston such that increased development would not be constrained. Action 4 specifically seeks to achieve ongoing monitoring of parking demand and supply and reduce risks. Private parking owners have the ability to manage use of their parking spaces. Agree areas with active frontages should be identified through more detailed plans and town centre level documents
14	Rolleston Square	FC	Vision is broad, provides flexibility to be interpreted in a variety of ways. Probably necessary, however reduces the value of the vision. Means there is reliance on the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles to better understand the Vision. To assist, the Strategy could better articulate some of the meaning in the vision, and ensure they are well aligned with the wording adopted in the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles.	The vision is intended to be aspirational and set the overall scene. It is intended that the outcomes and principles give the direction.
14	Rolleston Square	FC	The Parking Strategy includes site specific recommendations, but supporting maps are not included and reference is required to other documents. It appears there is ambiguity between the areas referenced in the Background Study and those included in the Strategy. Refer to submission PDF for further detail.	Strategy refers to parts of Rolleston Precincts 1 and 8 west of Tennyson this aligns with the map in Figure 5 of the background study although it is noted that detailed consideration of boundaries and application would occur during following processes. It is noted that inherently the southern part of Precinct 1 west of Tennyson is unlikely to be incorporated noting the existing level of development.

14	Rolleston Square	FC	Implementation of shared public parking would be challenging. If other precincts are developed without adequate parking there is risk for existing developed sites to become de facto parks, harming existing businesses. Minimum parking seeks to provide developers with certainty, whilst also protecting nearby areas from overflow parking. Very careful consideration of the parking reduction factors would be necessary, applied to a Selwyn specific transport system.	Shared parking: Agree - Action 1 is a feasibility study to determine this. Minimums: agreed and rates would need to be considered in detail through DP review
14	Rolleston Square	FC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following comments are provided on the actions: <p>Action 1: • Clarity is required on the area defined by</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action 1b.</p> <p>Action 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity is required regarding the area defined by Action 2c, as discussed earlier. The District Plan Review should include requirements/sites for public parking, to support “no Parking” provisions if they are included Maximum parking thresholds in centres and associated assessment criteria would need particularly careful consideration before being implemented; <p>Action 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The parking location map will be important in considering effects of rule changes through the District Plan review. It should identify where Council provided parking is likely to be located, so developers can understand the potential level of parking to support businesses in the area. The monitoring surveys being initiated by 2022 appears to be late, noting the Parking Background 	<p>#1: One of the key aspects of the feasibility study is to determine opportunities in that (NE) sector of the KAC i.e., to identify any locations available. #2: this level of detail is best considered through the DP review agree public parking sites need to be identified to support this (hence action timeframes as specified). #3 Existing surveys available provide a good picture of existing parking demand to base decisions on. The monitoring is to manage impact of the public parking and other actions going forward to manage risks.</p>

			Study notes the most recent study was in 2013. Some monitoring should ideally be undertaken to inform both the strategy, and District Plan Review.	
14	Rolleston Square	FC	Timing and content of the actions requires careful consideration. For example, sufficient background	Agree - this is underway.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In respect to concerns around pro-active management of parking supply and demand the panel noted the extent of work already underway in Rolleston (Appendix 2 of the Hearing Summary Report) and the inclusion of Actions 4a-c to address this concern. There was discussion around the timing of Actions 4a-c (monitoring, accessibility study and process for changes to public parking) and whether this should be brought forward. Referenced to the discussion in Paragraph 47 re the timing of 4b,. The Panel specifically noted the wording already said “initiated by “ which allowed flexibility for these to be undertaken earlier and encourage officers to undertake early consideration of these if possible. Consensus that 4a should include direction for “on-going analysis and reporting” and 4c should include wording “establish processes for requesting new / review of” To provide greater certainty. • Panel discussed merits / disbenefits of including maps in a Strategy and determined that in this instance this would be useful to provide certainty and noted the maps related to existing areas of Identified Town Centres (Lower risk of maps becoming out of date quickly). • The Panel noted the difference in views from a market / private development perspective however acknowledged that such a perspective does not include all relevant considerations for the wider community. Referred to Supporting Principle 3e which includes consideration of needs of all users and agreed with recommended Strategic Principle 1g which relates to needs of surrounding landuses. • Noted there have been surveys, town centre plans and the like which suggest there is sufficient parking available in Rolleston currently and there is reasonable understanding of the demand for the foreseeable future and a number of public parking sites underway. • Noted agreement that the change to wording of Maximum thresholds was supported and Panel agreed with this recommendation. • Noted that “private” should be added to Actions 2b and 2c (“No private parking permitted) to clarify that this doesn’t mean public car parks or on-street parking will not be available for activities in these areas. Noted this clarification should also be amended where it occurs in other parts of the Strategy. • The Panel noted that the recommendations for Lincoln and Rolleston in Section 7 should read as a package of approaches and suggest the word “and” be added to the end of each bullet point to clarify this. • The Panel also referred to the District Plan (and Town Centre Plans) which already identify specific locations of Active frontages in Lincoln and Rolleston. 				
15	R.G.H Thomson	(Gwynn)Q2	Agree	

15	R.G.H Thomson	(Gwynn)Q3	Agree	
15	R.G.H Thomson	(Gwynn)Q4a	Agree	
15	R.G.H Thomson	(Gwynn)Q4b	Disagree. Leeston needs to be included in considerations. Main street retail issues, premises changing uses results in needs for off-site parking. Lack of on-street parking is also disadvantageous. SDC assisting with public parking as space comes available would ease issues. Tenancies with areas suitable for parking should be required to provide it.	Existing situation does require them to provide parking (or get resource consent where this is not possible) Strategy recommends (refer to section 7 / pages 21 and 22) consideration of no parking or shared public parking or retention of status quo with some reduction factors. The more detailed consideration of which of these strategies is most suitable for each township (including Leeston) will occur through subsequent processes including the District Plan Review.
15	R.G.H Thomson	(Gwynn)FC	The draft strategy focusses mainly on Lincoln and Rolleston; should consider Leeston due to its "Main street" design and implications.	Leeston and the other KAC's (Dunsandel, Prebbleton, West Melton and Coalgate / Castel Hill) are considered, this is generally under the heading Centres or KAC's and specifically listed in the recommendations.

- Councillor Bland questioned current requirement for parking and Panel understands this is based on gross floor area.
- It was noted that there are two recommendations
 - 1. Continue with minimum rates, or 2. No parking requirements, so a minimum is not required.
- Councillor Alexander commented that Resource Consent assessment is needed as it depends on the nature of the business.
- The Panel agreed that the recommendations included several options for consideration through the District Plan review and the most appropriate can be determined through that process.
- The Panel agreed that this has been addressed and can be considered as part the Council's future work programmes such as Leeston town centre studies/plans

Appendix 3: Submitters Written Evidence Provided at Hearing

Foodstuffs (South Island) Limited

Submission #7

Rebecca Parish: Property Development Manager, Foodstuffs (South Island) Ltd

Andy Carr: Consultant Traffic Engineer, Carriageway Consulting Limited

Parking Strategy: Aspects of Concern

- *“Manage parking to meet needs while minimising adverse effects on community wellbeing, including economic, social, cultural, health, safety and environmental.”*
- *“Manage parking within centres to provide for access to destinations, and make efficient use of parking resources, without compromising urban design and amenity outcomes or travel by other modes”*
- In other words, balance parking supply and parking demand without creating adverse outcomes
 - Laudable aim
- Strategy has a focus on Council providing car parking to achieve this

Supply of Car Parking

- *“The actual built floor areas would need to be monitored, and planned parking supply adjusted according to growth”*
- Does demand lead supply or vice versa?
 - Providing more parking than needed encourages car travel and is costly
 - Providing less parking than required creates road safety and efficiency problems
- Developers have no certainty public car parks would be available when needed
 - Compromises the viability of their development
- Important to note that strategy proposes prohibiting on-site parking in some locations so developers can't provide their own spaces

Demand for Car Parking

- Assessment criteria of “*whether the parking provision is needed to meet the reasonable and typical demands of the activities*”
- Is Council best placed to determine this or the applicant?
 - Different opinions result in extra delays and costs for both sides

Balancing Supply and Demand

- Council to monitor demand for car parking and adjust the supply
 - Ongoing costs for surveys
- Long lead times for the creation of public car parks
 - Literally years
- Public car parks have to be maintained by Council in perpetuity and can't be disposed of
 - Council response *“Any future plans to change the use of public car parks would go through the relevant statutory processes and public consultation”*

Likely Outcomes (1)

- Parking supply will be out of step with parking demand
 - Oversupply of parking undermines efforts for sustainable travel
 - Undersupply of parking creates road safety and efficiency problems, and stifles new development
- Supply needs to be about 15% more than demand within any given area
 - As advised by the industry body 'Austroads'

Likely Outcomes (2)

- Where there is undersupply (eg where on-site parking is restricted or prohibited), people will park where they can
 - Demand for on-street parking (where available) will increase
 - So existing large private car parks will be used by the public for parking
 - Customers have more difficulty in finding vacant spaces
 - Landowners have more costs (enforcement, likely breach of resource consents)
 - Undermines economic viability of the development
- Little resilience or spare parking capacity in Activity Centres
 - Christmas peak?

Definite Outcomes!

- Council committed to new ongoing costs
 - Regular and frequent parking surveys (indicatively costed only)
 - Using land for parking which is more valuable if sold

Summary

- Compromises operation of those with large private car parks
- Council commits to new ongoing (uncosted) expenses

Example



Solution



In the Matter of:

Selwyn District Council
Draft Parking Strategy

Submission By:

Rolleston Square Ltd

**Statement of Evidence of
Andrew Metherell**

Stantec New Zealand
Telephone: +64 3 366 7449
E-Mail: andrew.metherell@stantec.com
Hazeldean Business Park, 6 Hazeldean Road, Addington
Christchurch 8024

16012 evi 190228 Selwyn Parking
1 March 2019

Statement of Evidence of Andrew Metherell, BE(Hons) CMEmgNZ CPEng IntPE(NZ) Assoc.NZPI

Introduction

1. My full name is Andrew Alan Metherell.
2. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer, a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand, and am included on the International Professional Engineer Register. I am also an Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, and have been a member of the New Zealand Urban Design Forum for several years. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Civil) with Honours degree from the University of Canterbury.
3. For the period of the last twenty years I have worked as a consulting transportation engineer, practising as a traffic engineering and transportation planning specialist. I am currently the Christchurch Traffic Engineering Team Leader at Stantec New Zealand, and am responsible for providing traffic engineering and transportation planning advice, assessment and design for a wide range of activities.
4. I have had extensive involvement with the transport aspects of public and private sector growth related development in the Selwyn District, including numerous large scale recreational, residential, commercial, and industrial facilities and developments. I have also been involved in a large number of suburban and town centre retail and commercial developments, and am experienced with various parking management methods in those environments.
5. I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the current (2014) Environment Court Practice Note. I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct in giving evidence to this hearing and have done so in preparing this written brief.

Summary of Evidence

6. In this matter I was requested by Rolleston Square Limited (Rolleston Square) to review the Draft Selwyn District Parking Strategy (Parking Strategy), and provide advice from a transportation planning perspective.
7. I prepared a letter that formed part of the submission by Rolleston Square, and have attached the letter to this evidence. The purpose of my evidence is to summarise the key points from the submission, and consider the responses made by the Council Officer.
8. The focus of the submission is on how the parking strategy will apply in Rolleston, although similar comment and consideration could apply within other centres.
9. Broadly, the concerns raised in the submission are:

- (i) The parking Strategy will be relied on in other processes, and needs to be sufficiently robust if it is using directive actions as an outcome of the strategy. In my opinion, directive language and outcomes are used, and I consider insufficient background assessment is available. Based on the response of the Council Officer, it appears the actions may be intended as investigative actions, which is not clear.
- (ii) The Parking Strategy does not clearly recognise the importance to existing businesses of managing supply for new developments, to ensure it is appropriate for the demand expected, and sufficiently located to manage the risk of overflow parking. By not addressing these matters there are risks it will impact other businesses that have appropriately matched supply with demand. In my opinion, further emphasis on addressing that risk could be included up front in the principles and parking management measures, rather than leaving it to monitoring.
- (iii) The Parking Strategy references various areas, and different types of streets (such as those with active frontages). The Parking Strategy can easily be taken out of context due to ambiguous wording describing these matters.

The Strategy in Context

10. Of immediate concern is that the Parking Strategy will form a key background document for the District Plan Review process. The District Plan Review Transport Baseline Report (DW009)¹ at Section 4.4 notes the concern:

"There is currently no district wide Parking Strategy, this could be an issue for the District Plan when considering requirements to meet the desired outcomes of the Town Centre Plans and potentially Selwyn 2031"

11. The Parking Strategy that is now being developed would address that gap. However, in placing detailed actions within the Parking Strategy around inputs to the District Plan Review, I anticipate there will less opportunity for participants in the District Plan process to further address matters that are not consistent with the Parking Strategy.
12. This places a high level of importance in ensuring any matters of detail in the Parking Strategy are robustly considered and not ambiguous. I have some concerns in that respect, as in my view there are matters of detail in the actions being directed to the District Plan Review, and ambiguities around those actions.

Ambiguities in Management Measures and Actions

13. Ms Williams in her Officer Report (para 49) suggests detailed aspects for the District Plan Review are best considered through that process. However, the wording in the "recommended parking management measures" and "actions" sections are brief, and can

¹ <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-and-building/planning/strategies-and-plans/selwyn-district-plan/selwyn-district-plan-review/supporting-information/baseline-reports2>

lead to ambiguity as to whether the action is directive or investigative. I consider they read as though they are directive. From that position, my concerns include:

- (i) Issues with identifying the specific land areas being considered by the parking management areas. My understanding is that "*parts of the Rolleston Key Activity Centre, Precincts 1 and 8, west of Tennyson Street*" covers only the Council developed town centre area, but that is not at all clear. I recommend the use of maps inserted in the Parking Strategy.
- (ii) More clarification being required around what is meant by the shared parking measure. I suggest additional text to ensure that shared use demand is managed locally so that there is not de-facto reliance on more conveniently located nearby private sites that have not entered into a shared parking arrangement.
- (iii) More robust assessment that parking demand can still be met within the area with a public parking provision and "No Parking Permitted" proposal. I recommend that should be qualified to include reference that such an outcome needs to be supported by the updated parking surveys and demand assessment (which are yet to be carried out). Until that time "No Parking Permitted" should only be a consideration for investigation, not a direction.

Conclusion

14. In conclusion, I consider further revision of the parking strategy is required before it is adopted. That includes:

- (i) Further consideration of the potential risks and impacts to existing private parking utilisation.
- (ii) That the text is reviewed to avoid ambiguity, and maps are included to allow the document to be largely self-contained;
- (iii) Make it clearer that actions currently read as directive are actually investigative, if that is the intention.

Andrew Metherell
Stantec New Zealand

1 March 2019

Analysis: Seeing productivity like a state

Q.

Eric Crampton (/author/eric-crampton)
Sun, 24 Feb 2019



Even if they got every Trabant plants and suppliers running as efficiently as the most efficient East German plant, they would still have a Trabant at the end of the production line.

Some folks take the wrong lesson from intermediate microeconomics – or never took the course in the first place. I worry that too many of them staff Wellington's bureaus.

Every decent second-year university paper in microeconomics teaches students there are two equivalent ways of getting to efficient outcomes but one of them is much easier to implement.

Imagine an omniscient and benevolent central planner existed who knew our abilities, the productive capabilities of every firm in the market and exactly what each of us values. That benevolent planner could ensure efficient outcomes where no one could be made better off without making someone else worse off in the process. It is hard to do things that way because the knowledge the planner would need to make those decisions is impossible for the planner to obtain.

Fortunately, the welfare theorems in every intermediate microeconomics course show us that, if competitive markets are working well, we get there automatically. Prices coordinate individuals' plans, so we wind up at the same kind of solution that the benevolent planner would have chosen. There is no need for a bureaucracy to figure out which firms are the most efficient at teaching the others how to work better as the discipline of markets takes care of it.

All of that left me rather irritated during the Productivity Commission's "Productivity Hub" seminar last week on productivity in construction.

Housing New Zealand and BRANZ had commissioned work to review the literature on the productivity of housing construction before scoping future work on estimating the productivity of New Zealand's housing construction system to the NBR Radio Stream

It's a big topic that matters. There have been conflicting studies on whether construction productivity has been stagnant or improving, and whether there is a long tail of low-productivity firms in the sector. Housing New Zealand is set to embark on a substantial bit of house building and will want to build the most houses possible on its budget.

Economic modelling

The work proposed using New Zealand's administrative data to find the construction industry's productivity frontier. Firms producing the greatest output value for their combined sets of inputs define the frontier in this kind of stochastic frontier analysis work; firms using the same amount of inputs to produce less overall value are inside the frontier and are considered less productive.

The seminar focused on important technical issues like the merits of Cobb-Douglas as compared to translog functional forms and the merits of stochastic frontier analysis over conventional linear regression techniques in figuring out which firms are most productive.

But I was getting itchier and itchier over the course of the seminar – as were a few others. It was not the researcher's fault at all – she proposed taking the right approach to the question as defined. The problem rather was the framing of the question and its policy consequence.

Trabant efficiency

Imagine going back in time to 1982. You've been hired by the East German government to examine the productivity of the country's automobile construction sector. You've been asked to use the latest statistical techniques to figure out which of Trabant's suppliers are working efficiently and which are not. The government wishes to do this so it can send experts into the efficient plants to figure out what they are doing, so they can help the less efficient suppliers to get up to speed.

Stochastic frontier analysis was not really available then but that was hardly the main problem. Even if they got every one of the Trabant plants, and their suppliers and their suppliers' suppliers running as efficiently as the most efficient East German plant, they would have mis-specified the problem. They would still have a Trabant at the end of the production line, and the value of a Trabant was less than the value of all of the bits of plastic and metal and rubber and labour that went into producing those things – and it certainly ran less well than the Volkswagens produced across the border in West Germany.

Instead of commissioning a study that might figure out which plants are efficient, tearing down the Berlin Wall and allowing free trade would let markets figure it out. Efficient plants might survive; inefficient ones would put their machines and workers to better use elsewhere.

New Zealand reached a similar conclusion about its local automotive industry during the reforms of the 1980s and 1990s. Economist Steve Landsburg talks about the Iowa car crop. Growing corn, selling it to Japan, and getting cars back, is a more efficient way of building cars than a lot of ways America has tried. New Zealand's paddocks, forests and office towers provide our car crop more efficiently than did the Petone plant.

The construction productivity work specified the problem back to front but was hardly the first to do so. An academic study might point out which firms seem more productive than other firms but it can be easy to get those things wrong – especially when New Zealand's construction firms have operated within a system designed to stymie construction productivity.

Regulations nest

Zoning has never allowed building to any reasonable scale, so the industry developed for smaller scale developments and bespoke projects. A broken land use planning system has given us a construction industry that may be relatively efficient within that system but it is not the one needed for the scale of the task at hand.

A nest of regulations and perverse incentives in council consenting makes it difficult to use far less costly but higher-quality construction materials from trustworthy places like Vancouver or Seattle or Tokyo. Costs here are consequently much higher; productivity is the

[Watch the NBR TV Stream](#)

[Listen to the NBR Radio Stream](#)

ratio of the value of the outputs to the value of the inputs. Building houses costs (very roughly) twice as much here as it does in Texas, leaving land costs aside.

And competition from foreign suppliers is hampered not only by the Overseas Investment Act but also by the morass of local regulation that local firms have learned to navigate but foreign firms have not.

Seeing the productivity problem as one of finding the most efficient firms and cajoling the others to behave more like those Stakhanovites (Soviet Union workers who took pride in their ability to produce more than was required, by working harder and more efficiently) gets the problem back to front. It is trying to work the welfare theorem from intermediate microeconomics the wrong way around.

This is hardly to criticise either BRANZ or Housing New Zealand. It is commendable that they are interested in the overall problem and are willing to test it at an early stage. They very likely have other work in progress tackling the problem the right way around, and it would be hard to throw a dart in Wellington without hitting someone who views the problem through the looking glass.

Working it the right way around would have the bureaus figuring out what bits of regulation and practice stymie competition and prevent us from reaching productivity frontiers rather beyond what we might see in any current New Zealand practice.

Fixing those problems would not only let KiwiBuild work – it would also make KiwiBuild unnecessary. Hopefully, the final work will place New Zealand within the broader international context. Demonstrating how far New Zealand is from the international frontier could be very useful in sparking necessary change.

Dr Crampton is chief economist with The New Zealand Initiative.

All content copyright NBR. Do not reproduce in any form without permission, even if you have a paid subscription.



**Eric
Crampton**
(/author/eric-crampton)

RELATED

TAGS [HOUSING \(/tags/housing\)](/tags/housing) [KIWIBUILD \(/tags/kiwibuild\)](/tags/kiwibuild) [TRABANT \(/tags/trabant\)](/tags/trabant)

We don't know how lucky we are (/article/we- dont-know-how- lucky-we-are-ng- 134350)

The Economist's latest
Where-to-be-born index
shows some dramatic changes
since it began in 1988.
(/article/we-dont-know-how-
lucky-we-are-ng-134350)

Nevil Gibson (/author/nevil-gibson)
Fri, 04 Jan 2013

Post as:

Lloyd Bathurst
Change display name (/user/30314/edit)

Watch the NBR TV Stream

Listen to the NBR Radio Stream

2019-03-01 SDC Parking Strategy Lloyd Bathurst

Introduction

I am a Shareholder and Director of Rolleston Square Limited and Rolleston Retail Limited, we own some retail land and buildings in Eastern Rolleston Town Centre. We do not own the Countdown, The Warehouse, Noel Leeming, or Anytime Fitness buildings, nor any liquor outlets or pubs.

I am a member of the Property Council of New Zealand, have 34 years' experience as a commercial building developer and investor, I have studied Valuation and Property Management at Lincoln University, and have a national understanding of the industry. The Property Council's goal is "the creation and retention of well designed, functional and sustainable built environments which contribute to New Zealand's overall prosperity"

I will limit my comments to Rolleston Town Centre

The issues with the proposed parking strategy

The property industry and its bankers need certainty, or development and investment will go elsewhere. The present Council parking rules, with one exception which I will get to later, are working well, they are an efficient and effective means of utilising land for parking in the District Centre where the majority of shoppers must travel by private vehicle to shop. The proposed strategy would provide great uncertainty.

Retail centres nationally, work on the basis that there enough parks onsite for customers, other than Easter and December when some offsite parking is considered reasonable. In Selwyn, shoppers expect a park adjacent to their destination all year round.

There is an industry maxim "you don't do a weekly family shop on a bicycle", and while we encourage walking, cycling, and other means of transport, we expect private cars to dominate the access to the town centre for many years yet, and are making extensive provision for electric cars. Presently in Rolleston there are facilities for charging 6 electric cars, another 4 are due by the end of March, and there is provision for many more chargers to be installed as required.

The Proposed Parking Strategy is for Council to control the parking provision and I'm reminded of an article by Dr Eric Crampton, Chief Economist at The New Zealand Initiative which I have attached.

The basic problem is that the "Central Planning" is extremely inefficient as a provider, whereas when rules are set well, the competitive market works well, and is much more efficient. When I read "The overall vision of the Strategy" I can see that clear rules for onsite parking can provide this most efficiently. That could relate to larger blocks of Rolleston Town Centre which may be divided into smaller blocks in future

The one area that I see as problematic is the present parking requirement for food and beverage outlets. Typically, these require around three times the parking standard requirement for Rolleston Town Centre of 3.5 parks/100 sqm, unless there

is a great amount of diversity. Because we have a wide diversity of premises in our present blocks, and they have differing times of day for highest use, we can provide the required number of parks throughout the day, knowing that the car parks will regularly be at full capacity.

The rumour that Council is considering providing parking for the Rolleston Library in 2 rear lots on the other side of Tennyson Street is frightening because it will not be safe unless it is permanently manned at very high cost. On Saturday 23 February, a car was broken into at 7.00am in broad daylight in the centre of one of Rolleston's main car parks and a wallet and phone were stolen. Foodstuffs have a much more frightening story of a car park not visible from the road.

How this strategy could apply to Rolleston is challenging. To provide a mixed strategy of some sites providing onsite parking and some not providing onsite parking is fraught with difficulty because people naturally park in the closest park to their destination. The landowners providing parking would be forced to clamp or tow those people parking and going off site.

Town Centre parking in Rolleston is the equivalent of Suburban Centre parking in Christchurch, they are comparatively equal as "Key Activity Centres" One advantage that Rolleston has, is large sites with good neighbours and cross parking. For instance, shoppers can park at Countdown or The Warehouse and shop at the other or a myriad of smaller stores and services. The common advantage of public parks is where small retail titles with 100% site coverage cannot provide onsite parking, such as in old large cities; that does not apply here

The current planning horizon of 3033 could require totally different parking provisions, self-drive cars would require drop-offs but few parks, public transport may require different sized drop-offs, more online shopping may require less parks, so trying to plan for parking to that horizon is futile, other than knowing that we must plan with utmost flexibility and versatility.

The strategy seems to ignore the fact that parking undersupply has a large adverse economic and environmental effect when shoppers stop shopping at the most efficient place because the parking is too difficult, whereas parking oversupply is easily rectified.

Conclusion

We have heard from Mr Carr and Mr Metherell who are two of the most senior traffic engineers in Canterbury, of the problems with the proposed strategy, yet we have not heard of the advantages that central planning would bring. I am greatly concerned that a completely uncoded strategy (Page 7 point 30) is proposed. The cost of Council staff, consultants, and Councillors to establish, maintain and police a central parking regime is completely unnecessary and a burden on ratepayers that they would not appreciate. This seems like an Eastern European planning manoeuvre that would not sit well with Selwyn residents. In my view it would be much more effective and efficient to simply refine the existing rules where they have proved to be inadequate, and make provision for appropriately placed shared parks where larger sites are to be subdivided

Appendix 4: Hearing Minutes



PARKING STRATEGY HEARING MINUTES			
Date	Friday 1 March 2019	Time	Commenced at 9am
Location	Executive 1 Room, Rolleston HQ		
Present	Councillors N C Reid, M A Alexander, J B Bland, Messrs' A Carr, L Clausen, L Bathurst, A Metherell, Mesdames' L Williams, & R Parish		
Staff	B Rhodes, N Brown		

MINUTES	
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Reid welcomed everyone to the Hearing and outlined the proceeding process. A report will be prepared following the Hearing with a recommendation to Council.
Officer's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms Williams spoke to her report and outlined why a Parking Strategy is required. The purpose of the parking strategy is to provide the overarching strategic direction for the management of parking across the Selwyn District. Although the Strategy is district-wide, it focuses around townships and in particular 'key activity centres' (KACs). These areas typically experience the highest parking demand and result in the greatest need to manage public and private parking provision to meet this demand. There are expectations around the availability of car parks in town centres and a lack of safe and convenient connections through car parks to support active travel modes. The Strategy will guide the management of existing, and provision of new, Council owned parking, as well as controls on private parking. It will guide, and operate alongside other Council strategies, plans, policies and bylaws, providing direction on how parking will be balanced against other transport outcomes including safety, public transport, walking and cycling as well as urban design and amenity outcomes for various areas of the District. Ms Williams outlined the Strategy's vision and key strategic outcomes and principles to achieve the vision. The vision is: <i>"Parking resources in Selwyn District are provided and managed in an equitable and coherent way, contributing to the accessibility and vitality of the Selwyn District, particularly in town centres. Parking enables vehicle access to destinations for residents, staff and visitors without compromising safety, efficiency and amenity of roads, cycle ways, footpaths, public transport and adjoining land uses."</i> The strategy identifies strategic outcomes and supporting principles to achieve this vision and guide the management of parking across the District.

MINUTES

- The key directions and actions of the Strategy include:
 - Feasibility studies for future opportunities for public car parking locations
 - Recommended parking management options for the District Plan Review, including
 - Review minimum parking rates applicable to centres (reduce rates or remove minimum requirements)
 - Enable sharing and provision of off-site car parks
 - Provide off street car parking in Lincoln and Rolleston
 - Development contribution calculation included for sites Lincoln and Rolleston and other areas with defined parking projects.
- Ms Williams summarised the parking management options in section 6 of the Strategy.
- The 'Actions' section of the Strategy outlines how the strategy may be given effect to, and progress to date (particularly in Lincoln and Rolleston).
- 15 submissions were received, a summary of submissions is included as an Appendix of Ms William's report.

Foodstuffs (A Carr, R Parish)

- Mr Carr gave a presentation on behalf of Foodstuffs.
- The main points of the presentation centred on balancing the supply and demand of car parking. Mr Carr posed the question, "Does demand lead supply or vice versa?" Providing more parking than needed encourages car travel and is costly. Providing less parking than required creates road safety and efficiency problems.
- Developers have no certainty public car parks would be available when needed, which would compromise the viability of the development. Mr Carr noted that the strategy proposes prohibiting on-site parking in some locations so developers can't provide their own spaces.
- In terms of the demand for car parking, Foodstuffs question whether Council is best placed to determine the demand of activities, or whether the applicant is better placed to.
- Mr Carr noted the potential ongoing commitment required of Council staff to monitor demand for car parking and adjust the supply. There would be the ongoing costs of surveys, potentially long lead times for the creation of public car parks, and the public car parks would have to be maintained by Council in perpetuity and could not be disposed of. Council's response to this is "*Any future plans to change the use of public car parks would go through the relevant statutory processes and public consultation*".
- Potential outcomes were outlined. This included the following points:
 - Oversupply of parking may undermine efforts for sustainable travel
 - Undersupply of parking creates road safety and efficiency problems, and stifles new development
 - Where there is undersupply (i.e. where on-site parking is restricted or prohibited), people will park on the street where they can. Therefore, on-street parking will increase, large private car parks will be used by the public for parking, customers will have more difficulty in finding vacant spaces, landowners have more costs (enforcement, likely breach of resource consents), which may undermine economic viability of development.
 - There may be little resilience or spare parking capacity in activity centres (i.e. during Christmas peak season).
- Mr Carr wished to highlight the likely new, ongoing costs (such as regular and frequent parking surveys and using land for parking which is more valuable if sold) that Council will be committed to.

MINUTES

- Mr. Carr outlined that use of the Public Works Act would not be available for the benefit of the private sector development i.e., for a car park leased / created specifically for development / activity rather than being available for general public car parking.
- Mr Carr summarised that the draft Strategy compromises operation of those with large private parks and reiterated the ongoing (un-costed) expenses to Council.
- Ms Parish spoke to some of the operational requirements and that each business case included sufficient parking as a key component of the businesses viability.
- Ms Parish also spoke to the concerns regarding enforcement (fines, clamping) of people using private (Foodstuffs) car parks when not shopping (even though they may be customers on other days) and the risk that this would create a negative community perception for the business. Therefore, reiterated the need to avoid parking pressures that could encourage use of their car parks by those not shopping there.

DISCUSSION

- A shared view was held between private car park owners, that they are not agreeable with clamping cars, due to the negative impact on customers. There are merits and significant risks of the introduction of this.
- Mr Carr added that the aims of the Strategy are laudable – to balance parking supply and parking demand without creating adverse outcomes. It is the mechanism to achieve those aims that is critical.
- A discussion was held regarding the possible implications on sustainable transport options. Mr Carr gave an example of an 'Orbiter' style of sustainable transport that could be investigated further. Councillor Alexander asked why '15%' surplus parking capacity was used and whether this was how Foodstuffs provided car parking at all their sites. Mr Carr responded that supply needs to be about 15% more than demand within any given area so that vehicles do not have to circulate to look for a car park, as advised by the industry body 'Austroads'. The aim was for the parking space to be 85% full. Ms Parish added that it depends on the location of the supermarket, and in rural areas it may be more.
- Councillor Alexander questioned whether there were any solutions / changes sought to address their concerns. Mr Carr confirmed that the proposed change to the recommended minimum threshold went some way to addressing their concerns and agreed the threshold was best considered further through the District Plan process. He also considered that the developer should be relied upon to judge on-site parking provision (remove provisions related to parking controls in centres) and a mechanism to avoid "double counting" of public car parking for multiple businesses / uses. He also noted that greater certainty is required over where no parking is proposed (maps) and clarity of language where the strategy recommendations relate to District Plan Review processes.

Leeston Community Committee (L Clausen)

- Mr Clausen outlined the implications/struggles that smaller towns in the District have.
- A metaphor was used to describe the desire to have a 'full set of teeth'/compact array of shop frontage rather than having gaps for car parking.
- Mr Clausen urged Council not to 'forget' smaller towns, and that the one-size-fits-all approach should not apply.

DISCUSSION

- Councillor Bland agreed that the heart of Selwyn is the little towns and agreed that Council must be cognisant that one size does not fit all.
- General discussion amongst submitters centred around several options for addressing parking in Leeston, including central public parking, on-street parking management and location, private parking, recognising those sites which due to historical development couldn't provide parking.

MINUTES

**Rolleston Town
Centre**
**(A Metherell, L
Bathurst)**

- Mr Metherell spoke to his submission evidence and noted that he was requested by Rolleston Square Ltd to review the draft Parking Strategy and provide advice from a transportation planning perspective. The review specifically considered the aspects of the Parking Strategy relating to Rolleston Centre.
- A hardcopy of the 'Statement of Evidence of Andrew Metherell' and letter addressed to Selwyn District Council, dated 6 December 2018 was distributed to Hearing attendees.
- Mr Metherell noted that there is a high likelihood that the Strategy will become an important reference document in formulating future transport policy, planning rules, and Council investment in parking and enforcement.
- The submission summarised some matters of concern and items requiring clarification. It centred around three areas: the Strategy Vision, Strategic Outcomes and Principles, Parking Management Measures, and Actions. This is further outlined in Mr Metherell's evidence statement which was circulated.

VISION

- Mr Metherell commented that the Strategy could better articulate some of the meaning in the vision, and ensure they are well aligned with the wording adopted in the Strategic Outcomes and Supporting Principles. He added that the principles must recognise the need to maintain an appropriate provision of parking, and that private developments should have a reasonable level of control in balancing management of parking on their sites.

STRATEGIC OUTCOMES AND PRINCIPLES

- Mr Metherell noted that there is a risk (particularly within principles b and e) that with changes in how parking is provided and controlled, sites developed with insufficient parking supply will result in excess demand being transferred to existing private sites, reducing the availability of parking for those existing private site's needs. There is also a risk that existing developments will not be able to increase the scale of activity if increased pressure is placed on their parking. That would be inconsistent with the Vision of equitable and coherent provision and management and vibrant centres.
- Principles need to more clearly differentiate and protect the existing private development parking resources, so there is not an expectation that future development on other sites can rely on their parking. New sites would have to have adequate parking available. Mr Metherell added that the reference to active frontages in the principles should be restricted to some key streets (or types of streets).

PARKING MANAGEMENT

- Mr Metherell noted that parking management measure do not provide any clarification of the areas west of Tennyson Street, and the area shown on the District Plan Map is ambiguous.
- Mr Metherell noted concern about ability to secure sites for future public parking in a timely manner when demand arose and that well planned off-street parking sites would need to be identified and funding commitments given well in advance.

Mr Metherell generally noted that the minimum parking rates provided certainty and generally ensured appropriate parking provision. He also noted that reduction factor approaches in Christchurch would require careful consideration as they could be applied to the Selwyn Context (levels of PT etc).

ACTIONS

- Mr Metherell summarised that further revision of the Parking Strategy is required before it is adopted. This includes the following points:
 - Further consideration of the potential risks and impacts to existing private parking utilisation

MINUTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That the text is reviewed to avoid ambiguity, and maps are included to allow the document to be largely self-contained. ○ To make it clearer that actions currently read as directive are actually investigative, if that is the intention. • Mr Bathurst addressed the Hearing panel and added to Mr Metherell's address. He endorsed the information and views provided by Mr Carr and Mr Metherell (whom he acknowledged as two of the most senior traffic engineers in Canterbury). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The address was limited to Rolleston Town Centre. • Mr Bathurst commented on 'central planning'. It would be inefficient as a provider, mainly due to the potential cost of Council staff, consultants, and Councillors to establish, maintain and police a central parking regime. His view is that it would be more effective and efficient to simply refine the existing rules where they proved to be inadequate and make provision for appropriately placed shared parks where larger sites are to be subdivided. Mr Bathurst circulated a hardcopy of an article titled 'Analysis: Seeing productivity like a state' written by Dr Eric Crampton to Hearing attendees, to support this point.
Concluding Remarks & Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared view was held between Foodstuffs representatives and Rolleston Town Centre representatives on the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some certainty is required that adequate off-street parking opportunities exist in Centres to support management approaches being considered, such as "no parking requirement". No parking requirements and shared public parking (and development contributions): The Precinct 1 sites are largely established and support the parking demand of the activities. Opportunities for convenient shared public parking would appear to be particularly scarce, and effective implementation would be challenging. There is a risk that if other precincts do not provide parking, or have convenient public parking, the larger developed sites will be used as a de-facto parking resource. That will likely have adverse consequences for existing businesses. To implement this measure, it is considered appropriately planned off-street sites would need to have been identified, and funding commitments given. ○ Minimum parking rates with reduction factors: minimum parking seeks to provide developers with certainty, whilst also protecting nearby areas from overflow parking. Development costs generally manage the potential for oversupply, particularly in a town centre environment. The parking reduction factor approach is adopted in Christchurch where there are more facilities available for alternative transport modes. Careful consideration of the parking reduction factors would be necessary, applied to a Selwyn-specific transport system. ○ Comment was made on the timing and content of the actions, which require further consideration. It was suggested that survey information and certainty around off-street parking locations and funding would be necessary. ○ The location and scale of public parking also needs to consider protection of the availability of parking supply on existing sites. • The free market vs Council approach to managing the supply of parking was briefly discussed. A shared view between Foodstuffs and Rolleston Town Centre representatives that the free market is currently providing for parking effectively, and that they are finely tuned to how many carparks are required (suggested more so than Council). There was general agreement amongst the submitters present, that adjustments to the Strategy were required, but not a significant change in direction. • Convenience and availability of parking for Customers was discussed. As the Selwyn District centres (where most parking demand is generated) are located to service a wide rural area catchment with limited access to public transport, and small (in comparison to

MINUTES

cities) catchments for convenient walking, private car is likely to be a primary mode of travel for the foreseeable future. Therefore, generating the need for businesses to rely on the availability of reasonably convenient parking to meet the needs of the community.

- A discussion was held regarding a parking management measure, Mr Metherell mentioned that the Parking Strategy includes site specific recommendations, however supporting maps were not included. It does not provide any clarification of the areas west of Tennyson Street, and the area shown on the District Plan Map is unclear. There is therefore ambiguity between the areas referenced in the background study and those included in the Strategy. There was general agreement for maps to be included in the Strategy.
- A discussion also centred around parking design / layout and the need for safety / security and ability to see available car parks and the tension this can create with provision of parking at the rear of sites.

- Hearing concluded at 10.55am