

ORDINARY MEETING

OF

STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Time: 9:30 am
Date: Thursday, 25 June 2020
Venue: Ngake (16.09)
Level 16, Tahiwī
113 The Terrace
Wellington

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor Foster
Councillor Calvert (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Condie
Councillor Day (Chair)
Councillor Fitzsimons
Councillor Foon
Councillor Free
Councillor Matthews
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Paul
Councillor Rush
Councillor Sparrow
Councillor Woolf
Councillor Young

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 04-803-8334, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz or writing to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number, and the issue you would like to talk about. All Council and committee meetings are livestreamed on our YouTube page. This includes any public participation at the meeting.

AREA OF FOCUS

The role of the Strategy and Policy Committee is to set the broad vision and direction of the city, determine specific outcomes that need to be met to deliver on that vision, and set in place the strategies and policies, bylaws and regulations, and work programmes to achieve those goals.

In determining and shaping the strategies, policies, regulations, and work programme of the Council, the Committee takes a holistic approach to ensure there is strong alignment between the objectives and work programmes of the seven strategic areas covered in the Long-Term Plan (Governance, Environment, Economic Development, Cultural Wellbeing, Social and Recreation, Urban Development and Transport) with particular focus on the priority areas of Council.

The Strategy and Policy Committee works closely with the Annual Plan/Long-Term Plan Committee to achieve its objective.

To read the full delegations of this Committee, please visit wellington.govt.nz/meetings.

Quorum: 8 members

TABLE OF CONTENTS
25 JUNE 2020

Business	Page No.
1. Meeting Conduct	5
1.1 Karakia	5
1.2 Apologies	5
1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
1.4 Confirmation of Minutes	5
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	5
1.6 Public Participation	6
2. General Business	7
2.1 Parking Policy Hearings	7

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson will open the meeting with a karakia.

Whakataka te hau ki te uru,	Cease oh winds of the west
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga.	and of the south
Kia mākinakina ki uta,	Let the bracing breezes flow,
Kia mātaratara ki tai.	over the land and the sea.
E hī ake ana te atākura.	Let the red-tipped dawn come
He tio, he huka, he hauhū.	with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost,
Tihei Mauri Ora!	a promise of a glorious day

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the meeting.

Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui	Draw on, draw on
Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana,	Draw on the supreme sacredness
te wairua	To clear, to free the heart, the body
I te ara takatū	and the spirit of mankind
Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga	Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace)
Kia wātea, kia wātea	Let this all be done in unity
Āe rā, kua wātea!	

1.2 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 will be put to the Strategy and Policy Committee for confirmation.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows.

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Strategy and Policy Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting:

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Strategy and Policy Committee.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Strategy and Policy Committee.

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting that the item will be discussed, but no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Strategy and Policy Committee for further discussion.

1.6 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under standing order 31.3, no request for public participation for this meeting will be accepted as this meeting has been scheduled for the purpose of oral hearings only.

2. General Business

PARKING POLICY HEARINGS

Purpose

1. This report asks the Strategy and Policy Committee to recognise the speakers who will be speaking to their submissions regarding the Parking Policy consultation.

Recommendation/s

That the Strategy and Policy Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Hear the oral submitters and thank them for speaking to their submissions.

Background

2. Wellington City Council began consulting on the Draft Parking Policy 2020 proposal on Monday 16 March 2020 and the consultation closed at 5:00 pm on Monday 8 June 2020.
3. During the consultation, every submitter is being provided with the opportunity to speak to their submission.
4. A first tranche of submitters who had wished to speak to their submissions were heard at the Strategy and Policy Committee meeting of 26 May 2020.

Discussion

5. The second and final batch of submitters who wished to speak have been scheduled for this meeting. Attachment 1 includes the full submission documents of those oral submitters.

Options

6. The committee only has one option, which is hearing the oral submitters.

Next Actions

7. Following the hearings, the Strategy and Policy Committee will consider information received on the parking policy consultation and make recommendations to Council.

AttachmentsAttachment 1. Oral Submitters' full submissions (batch 2 and final) [↓](#)

Page 10

Author	Cyrus Frear, Senior Democracy Advisor
Authoriser	Jennifer Parker, Democracy Services Manager Stephen McArthur, Chief Strategy and Governance Officer

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Engagement and Consultation

This report provides for a key stage of the consultation process – the opportunity for the public to speak to their written submission.

Treaty of Waitangi considerations

N/A

Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have financial implications.

Policy and legislative implications

There are no policy implications arising from this report. Submitters may speak to matters that have policy implications.

Risks / legal

N/A

Climate Change impact and considerations

N/A

Communications Plan

N/A

Health and Safety Impact considered

In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the decision was made to postpone the original hearing dates from 23 April 2020. Under the current alert level (level 1 at time of writing) Council and committee meetings will no longer be conducted via audiovisual link. Democracy Services will however provide the attendance via audiovisual link to elected members and members of public as an alternative mode of participation.

Contents

Jane Loughnan Individual submitter.....	3
Valerie Handley Individual submitter.....	8
Ben Carter on behalf of Cityhop.....	13
Paul Bruce on behalf of Sustainable Solutions Wellington.....	18
Maggie Roe-Shaw Individual submitter.....	23
Regan Dooley Individual submitter.....	28
Victoria Carter Individual submitter.....	34
Melanie Vautier Individual submitter.....	40
Lawrence Collingbourne Individual submitter.....	46
Paula Warren Individual submitter.....	53
Kerry Lippiatt Individual submitter.....	61
James Clarke Individual submitter.....	67
Payal Ramritu Individual submitter.....	72
Greg Harford on behalf of RetailNZ.....	77
Sara Clarke on behalf of the Creswick Valley Residents' Association.....	82
Martin K Individual submitter.....	85
William Guest Individual submitter.....	90
Sam Donald Individual submitter.....	95
Liz Springford Individual submitter.....	100
Tony Randle on behalf of the Johnsonville Residents Association.....	107
Peter Skrzynski Individual submitter.....	112
Erik Zydervelt on behalf of Mevo.....	116
Rabeea Inayatulla on behalf of The National Council for Women New Zealand Wellington Branch.....	122
Rhona Carson, President on behalf of the Newtown Residents' Association.....	125
Angela Rothwell, President on behalf of the Mt Victoria Residents' Association Inc.....	129
Geordie Cassin Chairman on behalf of the Wellington District Council of the New Zealand Automobile Association (AA).....	134
Alicia Hall on behalf of Millions of Mothers.....	135
Alicia Hall on behalf of Connect Wellington.....	145
John Milford on behalf of the Wellington Chamber of Commerce.....	156
Keven Snelgrove on behalf of Transit Group.....	166
Jackie Pope/Ann Mallinson, co-Presidents on behalf of the Oriental Bay Residents Association.....	172
Isabella Cawthorn Individual submitter.....	173
Michelle Rush, Transport Portfolio Leader on behalf of the Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group.....	182
Angela Stewart Individual submitter.....	195
Hari Sundaram Individual submitter.....	210
Mike Mellor Individual Submitter.....	217
Bernard O'Shaughnessy Individual submitter.....	223
Brad Olsen on behalf of the Youth Council.....	228

Pim Borren on behalf of the Bus & Coach Association (New Zealand) Incorporated	5
Jill Ford Individual Submitter	9
Callum McMenamin Individual submitter	14
Melissa Clark-Reynolds Individual Submitter	19
Ellen Blake on behalf of Wellington Living Streets	25
Karl Hewlett Individual submitter	30
Linda Beatson Individual submitter	35

Jane Loughnan Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

not answered

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Somewhat helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Neutral
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Neutral
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Neutral

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes? Agree</p>
<p>Central City High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City? Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts) High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres? Disagree</p>
<p>City Fringe High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe? Agree</p>

<p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Disagree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Agree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Neutral</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Not answered

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

No

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

I agree with supply and demand type pricing, but if there are going to be residents exempt schemes all over the city - eg Miramar - they all need to be priced the same

17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Other (please specify) - Houses that have a kerb crossing should also pay a permit - they have taken away a parking space so they should pay for that too. If a residence requires more than one permit it is an increasing scale - eg double the first permit, third permit 3 times the first permit etc

18. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Residents with kerb crossings should pay a permit fee too

19. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Mobility permit holders
4. Businesses located with the zone

5. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
6. Second permits
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify) - Too much traffic and no separate cycle lanes.

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

I think a scheme needs to be equitable for all - especially for residents parking. There needs to be more enforcement of the scheme and regular out of hours patrols and not relying on residents to call infringements to WCC

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Valerie Handley Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very unimportant
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Very important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Neutral
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

We need to keep the traffic flowing through the city, to make it a vibrant and attractive place to be. Being retired and living away from a bus stop I need to be able to drive into the city, park my car easily and do my shopping, have lunch and feel connected to the city. I have no desire to visit a Mall or shop online using my antiquated computer.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Please don't remove the number of car parks, and please don't make it difficult to drive around the city. I would like to keep my independence and enjoy the city and what it has to offer, galleries, the library, cafes and restaurants.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very unhelpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very unhelpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Neutral
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very unhelpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat unhelpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Common sense !!

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Less waffle, more parks and more road access. There is nothing wrong with the status quo.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes? Disagree</p>
<p>Central City High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City? Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts) High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres? Agree</p>
<p>City Fringe High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks,</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe? Strongly disagree</p>

<p>loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Neutral</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Neutral</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Didn't answer</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

I wish I could, but these questions do not make sense

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Not answered

17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

18. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

20. Allocation of residents parking permits

Not answered

21. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

22. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

23. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

- I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances
- I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle
- Multiple people come with me on this journey
- I don't have a bike or want to purchase one
- I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

24. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Please don't make changes to our city parking and traffic plans. Use our money towards infrastructure.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Ben Carter on behalf of Cityhop**1. How important are these objectives to you?**

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Very important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

The objective of striving to develop an equitable parking framework

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Fantastic to see public, active and car share modes supported

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat unhelpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

<p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Neutral</p>

<p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

"Mobility Hubs" or "Mobihubs" <https://mobihubs.eu/> are transport hubs on a neighborhood level, where different sustainable and shared transport modes are linked with each other. Community Facilities can be a fantastic opportunity for car share locations/mobility hubs.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Pricing is a useful tool to increase hurdles around private car ownership. Madrid has a Restricted Access Zone (from 2018) for vehicles. Car share vehicles can be parked for free in this zone. Pricing has to be equitable across the modes ie. expensive for those you want to reduce, and subsidised for the modes you want to promote. i.e. bike parking, and car share

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
 Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone
If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. *Mobility permit holders*
2. *Businesses located with the zone*
3. *Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking*
4. *All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space*
5. *Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking*
6. *New dwellings/homes built after 2020*
7. *Second permits*
8. *EV owners with no off-street parking*

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Helping people park privately owned vehicles (both EV and non EV) does not help achieve the objectives of mode shift.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Not answered

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify) - No local or nearby car share locations

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Station-based Car share is the only tool that will; (1) increase modal shift, reduce congestion and reduce car ownership. <https://www.greaterauckland.org.nz/2019/07/31/how-round-trip-carshare-can-drive-change-in-cities/>

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Paul Bruce on behalf of Sustainable Solutions Wellington

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Ease of access to active transport modes

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Roads are there for transit, not for storage of private vehicles

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Neutral
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Neutral
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Pricing of parking should not be used as a way of raising income, substituting for rates

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

<p>then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Puzzled why you don't have bicycle/micro-mobility parks ranking higher on the list, as they have the potential to enable access to the greatest number of people after public transport

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

No

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

It is not a good idea to ration with price. That discriminates against low income people. The pricing of a resource also provides a disincentive for council to remove that resource, as it will lose revenue. So if private parking is to be allowed, there should be one price set which relates to the land value.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive
Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
3. EV owners with no off-street parking
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Maggie Roe-Shaw Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Somewhat unimportant
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat unimportant
Support access for all	Somewhat important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Neutral
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Neutral

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

The objective of striving to develop an equitable parking framework

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Neutral
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Neutral

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>
--	--

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Not answered

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Not answered

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

- Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking
- Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits
- Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)
- Introduce online application and permitting system
- Other (please specify) - The residents parking should only be for people who LIVE in the street. Thompson Street, Te Aro many cars arrive in the morning and use residents parking (they have Te Aro residents stickers) and park all day when I come home from work I cannot get a park

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
2. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
3. Second permits
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
6. EV owners with no off-street parking
7. Mobility permit holders
8. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of

Not answered

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule
Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination
When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle
I need my vehicle for work

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Regan Dooley Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Promote better land use and define what that is i.e. through concepts like healthy streets and the 20 min city De-politicise parking decisions. Encourage a medium to long term view in decision-making about parking that discourages ad-hoc political interference Improve public understanding of strategic parking policy and its place in transport and urban policy development in order to increase public acceptance of individual parking changes

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Decisions about parking should be as apolitical as possible Parking should support mode shift and sustainable travel goals

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Parking must allow different modes to compete on an equal footing. At the moment privately owned motor vehicles have a significant advantage Local area based parking plans sound like a good way to de-politicise parking decisions but they must be developed within clear parameters, based on robust data and evidence and with excellent facilitation. They must not be a vehicle for noisy community groups to keep parking management rooted in status quo bias

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones,</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

<p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Loading zones and other parking for deliveries should prioritise the most efficient vehicles i.e. smaller vans, EVs and cargo bikes. Parking for larger delivery vehicles should be restricted to hours when there are no people around i.e. very late or very early It would be good if you could define 'key transport routes'. At an absolute minimum this must include all bus routes Car share and micromobility parking should be higher up in the priority list on the city fringe Mobility parking should be a higher priority than residents' parking in outer residential

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Agree in principle with pricing parking to meet demand but it should be tied more strongly to landuse. Council should also be able to charge for the opportunity cost of on-street parking It should also be noted that pricing is only one tool in the toolbox. There will be many places where there the price cannot be set high enough to justify having parking that prevents other uses

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their

visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12 months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
6. Businesses located with the zone
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Provide more residents parking for carshare and micro-mobility

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport route has too many transfers

Other (please specify) - I mostly prefer to bike but would like to see much more safe, comfortable

cycling infrastructure such as separated cycleways. One of the biggest dangers on the road is actually public transport

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Overall, the parking policy is a very solid piece of work and a big step forward. Prioritising the safe and efficient movement of people and goods above all parking is absolutely the right thing to do. However, implementation will be key. Thanks for the opportunity to submit

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Victoria Carter Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Encourage reduced reliance on individual car ownership. Too much parking or parking that is too cheap are known to be levers that encourage car ownership.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Removing cars from city centers has been proven in so many international examples to improve the economic wellbeing and prosperity of cities as well as improve the quality of life for all residents. I feel there is not a lot of encouragement of enabling Wellington people to 'get moving' by getting out of their personal car!

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Neutral
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing	Very helpful

parking supply	
Provide parking space availability information	Neutral
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	
	Neutral

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Too much parking or parking that is too cheap are known to be levers that encourage car ownership. At the recent global Car Share awards there were five planks recognised as policies which will accelerate a reduced reliance on individual car ownership. Increasing the hurdles to personal car ownership (increasing road pricing for resident's cars); 2. equitable parking framework; ensuring car share parking privileges are affordable or free and encourage operators to go to transit deserts so people have more choices. Make car share part of the larger transport eco-system (Lisbon actively promotes car share) and introduce mobility management for employees.

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Incorporate car share into the transport and parking policy actively; Once a city says this is the kind of city we want - ie fewer cars, more walking/cycling and public transit options then go about actively working with operators to achieve it. This has been proven to work all over the world. Back to base Carshare is one of the few mobility initiatives that is proven to have economic, social, health and environmental benefits when implemented well.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

<p>charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

<p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>No answer</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

The reason I have disagreed with the priority placed on car share is that it the policy has concluded that bikes and micromobility a high priority but car share isn't. All the cities with good movement of people combine car share and mobility hubs. When residents see this priority it encourages them to reduce their car ownership thereby freeing up more money that can be spent locally. If residents can use road space for their private car instead of their garage on a regular basis it is a private benefit that other ratepayers are paying for. Council as a 'mode manager' can do a lot to support initiatives that encourage residents to reduce their reliance on cars.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Governments try to influence journeys by car by time and place with tolls or higher charges at certain times of day. Councils influence demand through mode shift. Residents' cars add to the congestion for kerb space and when it is harder to park on them overnight streets are safer for walkers/cyclists, families. Car share is a proven way of generating and supporting significant mode shift - more so than public transit and requires no capital from Government. And only a small percentage of kerbside space needs to be set aside for car share for a city to get the benefits.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Other (please specify) - Determine a ratio of car share for streets where residents parking exemption exists. International examples suggest if carshare is in these places households are more likely to give up one or more of their cars. It makes economic sense! Incentivise operators to go to these 'deserts' and do what other cities do, actively promote car share like you do walking/cycling/public transit so residents become aware of their choices.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Mobility permit holders

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

I think the policy is a great start but It seems unfair to me that council would give a permit to someone in the city fringe (probably still quite affordable) whereas someone living in the city has to pay \$70k to buy a carpark or rent one. The Council needs to consider measures to reduce the size of the resident vehicle fleet parked onstreet! Like rubbish - just because you can afford to pay shouldn't be the reason you can put out more than one rubbish bag; Roads are not for car storage. 'By modifying the operation of the street network, balancing parking demand and developing community infrastructure initiatives' councils exercise control over car share. If carshare was as widely accepted as biking Wellington could well end up leading New Zealand with this policy. Please just include car share in these mobility hubs and also at major public transit nodes.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule
Public transport seems unreliable to me

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Again, really impressed at the quality of thinking that has gone into this policy framework and consideration for making Wellington potentially be the first city to encourage reduced levels of car ownership. I would encourage the council to look at cities like Vancouver and Calgary or Europe, see Ghent or Bergen to see how giving more priority to car share has made residents love living in their cities so much more, improved their economic outcomes, and much more ! The cities with great PT, walking/cycling, carshare all have strong political commitment from officers and elected officials. Car parks undermine the quality of life in our cities and streets. More car share will cut vehicle congestion, reduce public transit overcrowding, improve health and reduce obesity levels, decrease pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and the money saved from not owning a car will get spent in the local economy. Kia Kaha Wellington city. thank you for this chance to korero

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Melanie Vautier Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Localism- allow businesses to use the carpark space outside their businesses how they want, eg parklets, extra seating

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Really great objectives- I didn't see them translate as much as I would have liked to the rest of the proposal

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

I have a concern with the first principle in the full document: "The changes also need to consider the broader context of the Council's funding, and the effect any changes could have on ratepayers." As council receives revenue from parks, this is somewhat of a conflict of interest in regard to the above objectives. Considering what could be used with the space instead and how it could benefit everyone; it is concerning to see how the funds directed to council might subtract from that.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

I don't think short stay, residents, or commuter parking should ever be 'high priority' - this doesn't incentivize the other transport options which would better reflect the principles. Higher prioritization of bicycle parks would be good to see- I live (like many Wellingtonians) up a lot of stairs which is a barrier to bicycle use. Especially for electric bicycles- that has definitely been a barrier to getting one; they are much too heavy to carry up a lot of stairs, but with safe places to keep on the road they would be ideal!!

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

It is good but also unclear how it will really work towards the principles and reducing parking- if parks are not well-used the space could be used for something else, rather than made cheaper.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

None of the above

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Public transport is too expensive

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Other (please specify) - just adding to the "too expensive" box- I am a student, and I think the fares would be fine if I had an income but I feel quite resistant to using buses when I am not earning anything. I have REALLY appreciated the free public transport at the moment. I didn't realize how much I resisted visiting friends across town until the buses were free and I suddenly felt a lot freer myself, too, to go and see them! If others' experience is similar to mine, the social and mental health benefits to free public transport are really fantastic and I would love to see it continue for students and other people with no / low income.

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

It all looks great - though I would love to see in the near future some really bold reimagining of parking spaces in the CBD. So many ways that space could be used so much better!!

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Lawrence Collingbourne

Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very unimportant
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very unimportant
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Ensure that you meet resident's needs. Enable residents to access their own town centre easily, quickly and dependably.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

You have not reflected that your parking approach needs to meet a wide variety of transport needs at different times and you have placed too much emphasis on a growth projection that is clearly false now.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very unhelpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very unhelpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very unhelpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very unhelpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Penalties are not incentives, only better transport is the only incentive.

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

There have been no improvements to Wellington's transport system. You cannot prioritise transport or parking statically, it depends on purpose. Parking pricing is not an incentive, it is a tax. You MUST focus on increasing parking supply to replace lost parking and support new needs.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

<p>charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

<p>parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

You CANNOT prioritise parking with this kind of static priority. Your priority is to provide an access service for residents to their own communities and town centre, not to prevent access. You have not designated or designed effective key transport routes, they either interfere with access to the harbour to the shops/community built around them. First write a transport strategy, then you can work out the parking service requirement.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

No

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

This is for Uber and private sector only. Such a pricing approach is great for the rich, but tells those who aren't to get lost.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

None of the above

Other (please specify) - Allocate residential parking by resident's needs and ensure it is balanced with parking available to access the businesses in the area.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Not answered

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Yes, car share should not be provided on street anywhere in Wellington. Private companies that provide this service should provide the parking. Your studies from much larger cities are not relevant. You cannot prioritise one residents need over another except by ballot.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

Other (please specify) - Public transport takes more than twice as long to reach the destination even if it is immediately available, which it isn't.

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Multiple people come with me on this journey

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Other (please specify) - I need to carry bulky loads - why isn't that on the list?

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

There is no overarching transport strategy therefore this policy is invalid. This is not a parking policy it is a parking control document. We don't need this policy now because of COVID and until we understand the working from home impact this policy should be shelved to save expenditure.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Additional comments from Lawrence Collingbourne, Khandallah

I have the following concerns about the Parking Policy:

A. As a resident I want the Council to look at parking facilities in the City as a service to its people, not merely a road space resource to be controlled. Wellington is my town centre, I have no other, and I need vehicular access to it. As it currently reads, this policy comes across as controlling ordinary residents out of the City. I want Council policy to prioritise giving residents, tourists,

visitors and business people personal choice to enable us to travel to our destinations and park our transport there. Surely that is what parking is for?

B. The parking policy has not identified the needs of transport users or their drivers. It does not characterise them nor does it set out policies to provide the services required by them. According to the policy document, the transport strategy is not written yet and nor is there an agreed plan to get Wellington moving. That means there is little context to judge whether this parking control policy will be effective.

C. COVID-19 has disturbed transport needs significantly and reduced demand for parking. We won't know for some time what the shift to home working will be. In the webinar it was noted that nothing will change now anyway. So I suggest there is no imperative for this parking policy. The Council can save expense by setting it aside until we have completed the wider context.

D. I disagree strongly with the graphic that sets transport by plane or private vehicles as the lowest priority transport types. Nor do I want to go back to the 19th century and walk everywhere. To prioritise transport types, the Council has to consider the specific transport needs of different types of people at different times of day. For example, if we want to go to Auckland for work, then aircraft are the highest priority transport type. If we want to commute to work, then ideally we would have shared transport that is quick, cheap, easy to use and dependable - both ways. I suggest that this will almost certainly be achieved by a combination of transport types. So we conclude that parking can only be prioritised by looking at resident and visitor's transport needs, which requires a transport strategy to be developed first.

E. The Parking Policy rightly identifies that it can easily kill the City of Wellington by driving people out of the City or away to other towns and cities. It is my submission that by being a control document that sets our preferred choices at the lowest priority, that is precisely what it will do.

F. I submit that the key driver for the policy - lack of parking - arises largely because the parking destroyed by earthquake or displaced to support new transport types has not been replaced. This is compounded by the Council approving new developments without parking spaces. There is a simple fix for this: the Council must provide more parking, either directly, or by working with private sector partners or requiring it of new developments. I could not find a policy for how much parking the Council will provide in the document; it is only a control document.

G. The policy is introducing two new forms of parking restriction. The first is called demand pricing, i.e. putting up the parking price when demand exceeds supply, presumably like Uber does with its taxi charges? I suggest that such a mechanism has no place in a public sector policy. That is because it discriminates in favour of the rich, who will just pay up, over the poor and vulnerable, who will be driven away. Neither will be happy. We suggest that to win the support of the people who receive the service, pricing needs to be driven by purpose and need.

H. The second form of parking restriction is to further control the types of parking space provided. In addition to general parking for everyone, the Council aspires to provide up to ten other types of parking space that exclude ordinary people. All that does is increase the number of empty spaces or spaces used by parking cheats and unused vehicles. It also multiplies Council costs.

I. I disagree with any policy to push parking into residential streets or to control this parking with either additional charges or P120s. We already have too much “park and ride” in our streets and our visitors come at any time of day and stay for more than two hours.

J. The policy is prescriptive about organising the parking, with many tables included in the document. In fact a computer programme could be written to implement it. We need a simpler document that emphasises and provides space for proper consultation with, and in response to, local residents’ needs. Priorities depend on needs and differ from time to time and place to place.

K. I suggest that what is required is to differentiate and address different transport needs, e.g. commuters, tourists, event goers, shoppers and people meeting people. Each of these requires a different balance of transport and parking services. This means the Council must have an integrated, unified transport policy that begins with the needs of residents, businesses, the people we want to attract to our City and to provide for in our City.

L. Such a policy would lead to a connected and integrated system that joins up all the forms of transport and the destinations the people want to get to at the times they need it with the accessibility and dependability they have a right to expect. It would not leave them all independent as they are now.

M. Such a policy would separate out travel across the city, access to shops and offices, and commuting. This could alleviate the pressure on “parking”. I suggest that it requires a motorway all the way through to the south. I suggest we need “car ports” (park and ride at scale) in the south and north, to compliment the sea port, the airport and the rail “port”. They need connecting together and with the CBD with frequent mass public transport. This way the City can provide an integrated, low-emission, dependable and affordable transport system that people love to use. This would empower not penalise. As it stands this policy only presents parking control by penalty, so I suggest it can only alienate the Council from the majority of its residents, businesses and visitors.

Paula Warren Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Very important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

These are all important objectives. There are two problems with how they are presented in the document. One is that they seem to assume that amenity is related to how parking spaces are designed, and ignore how much land is allocated to cars overall. There is no objective that clearly looks at cutting the footprint of the car and providing more space for biodiversity and people. Nor is there anything here about equitable allocation. I believe the current residential parking zone system is totally unfair to people like me who do not own a car.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

There's nothing in the objectives section of the document to indicate how they will be prioritised if you can't deliver all.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat unhelpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat helpful

Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Consistently apply the objectives. The council has a long history of listening to squeaky wheels and being afraid to reallocate parking spaces to better uses if anyone at all makes a fuss.

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

In theory I love the idea of doing place plans. I've pushed for years for the council to do what I have called "precinct plans" so all council units and local restoration groups are working towards a common vision, not working against each other. But I have put local area-based parking plans as probably unhelpful is because it always turns into a way to stop reallocation of parking to other uses, not a useful process of doing rational space planning. And biodiversity, amenity and pedestrians always seem to be on the bottom of the pile. You need to focus on how you do local planning and how you develop a spine before we will get good outcomes. I've been less enthusiastic about the first principle because while it is important to ensure alternatives are available, waiting for better PT for example becomes just an excuse for not discouraging car use. And then WCC conveniently blames GW for poor PT, despite WCC failing to do things like shelters and bus priority, and nothing happens, and in the meantime the sense of entitlement to parking spaces grows.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Strongly disagree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

<p>charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Disagree</p>

<p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

You have totally under cooked the importance of loading zones and pick-up/drop-off spaces. As usual. Throughout the city there need to be places for courier vans etc to park to do their jobs. Otherwise they end up on the footpath. When I confront them and ask them to get off the footpath they not unreasonably point out that there is no alternative for them. I've had courier vans, scaffolding trucks and similar drive at me down the footpath, tell me to get out of their way and generally behave aggressively. And that's partly because they feel they are not provided with a safe and legal option that will work. And partly because a lot of them are unsafe idiots. But we should at least get rid of the legitimate issue. It's also difficult for people to do quick drop-offs of things to

friends and relatives, caregivers to call in, and so on. One of our highest priorities in every part of the city is to provide space that can be used for a short period - up to 10 minutes - to do quick jobs. And then enforce the no parking on footpaths rule absolutely. Your priorities will mean that most of the city will still lack these essential allocations. Where I've said agree instead of strongly agree it's because I think you are mostly there but have not got it quite right. Usually because you provide too low a priority for loading/short stay and too high a priority for longer term parking. On key transport routes you've completely missed the boat. Or maybe you have used poor examples of what you think are key transport routes. And by the way, why can't I put comments under each one when choosing a score? It's very tedious to have to scroll up again to look at your list. Lambton Quay should have no cars, and loading/disabled zones in side streets. There should be no EV, no short term parks, and lots of urban design features. In Thorndon Quay we recognised that the shopping centre should not be treated as a high traffic volume place, but rather a destination. Cars have alternatives - the motorway, Aotea. Treating it as a high traffic route is killing it. The inner city bypass and motorway were supposed to save the rest of the city (not that I ever believed that), but they can't if you then go on treating every other road cars like using as somewhere that should cater for them. Same goes for Whitmore, where pedestrians are being seriously disadvantaged because council officers believe it's an important traffic route. And the Quays. And so on. How much of our city do we want to blight? Every area except the motorway should feel like a piece of city, not like another motorway. But at least you got the commuter parking at the bottom where it belongs. In the Thorndon Quay work it was clear that far too many parking spaces are for long periods (10 hours) and used by commuters who aren't contributing at all to the local businesses. Whereas in council recreation areas etc you provide for commuter parking ahead of some other things, which should not be there at all. I live next to the Bot gardens and the parks around there should be for people using the gardens, not for commuters who should be taking the train.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Put the price up to a very high level, and provide discounts for people with genuine disabilities/need, and hand out a few free vouchers with the rates bill that people can save up and use for outings or give to friends. Charge for all storage of cars for long periods, including "residential". Make all short stops (under 15 minutes in shopping centres and under 2 hours in residential areas) free. In the Thorndon work we looked at allowing people to book parks through businesses, for example for taking someone in for an eye operation. So when you book the appointment you can book a park at the same time. But we were advised that all that fancy and expensive electronic stuff didn't support doing bookings. That seemed very odd, and very retrograde. If that's the case, we need to find another way of ensuring that parks that we provide to support local businesses are actually used for that. When I talked to Tinakori Road business people one year about a placemaking proposal, they admitted that a lot of the parks that should be used by customers are being used by staff of businesses.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their

visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Other (please specify) - I've ticked some of the above even where I don't think they are optimal. but I don't think you are going far enough in introducing equity and encouraging car-less households. I live by a residential zone. I don't have a car. So I don't have a permit. I have an encroachment and make that available to tradespeople for our apartment block and the neighbours to get them off the footpaths and allow them to do their work. If it wasn't for my space, there would be nowhere for them, as the residential spaces are all full of people parking cars, often because they have a lot of cars or are using their garage for something else. What we need in residential areas are: 1) a lot of short stop parks, to allow for visitors and quick tradespeople jobs and deliveries. 2) a few parks that you have to book, to be used by overnight visitors, tradespeople, jumbo bins, etc. Or your own car if you are having a garage repaired or driveway re-surfaced. So require them to give a reason for needing the park. Even if they then lie, they have at least been reminded of what these are intended for. I suggest that each household has a set number of free bookings and after that pay. If they are using it a lot, investigate whether they are lying. 3) a number of parks that can be used to store cars if you have no driveway, broadly as suggested in the document. Allow people to pay for those on a daily basis. If they have to pay for the whole year as if they are permanently storing a car there's no incentive for them to only use it sometimes, when they have borrowed a car or hired a car. We need to actively push people towards the car-less household. 4) EV charging station that can also be used for 5 minute parking by others. 5) car share car parks that can also be used for 5 minute parking by others. I support making these zones small and relating them to the level of reasonable need. I also suggest that in some locations off-street provision is considered, freeing up space for street amenity, kerb extensions, bus movements, etc. Even though I have an encroachment that improves the value of my apartment, I would like to see most encroachments taken off people and used for community rather than individual benefit.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

In relation to the priorities in 18, there is an issue about businesses. I would give them a higher priority if they have no off-street access and the park is used by the primary operator only when working there. I would probably make that sub-group a 3. Overall, I'd like to see on-street parking used as an exception by all residents, not be seen as an entitlement. One of my neighbours stores his second car in another location (carparking building in town I think). Cars that are seldom used shouldn't be cluttering up the streets. People need to be pushed into sharing cars, hiring cars, walking, using PT, getting things delivered. The way we allocate road space says a lot about what we expect, and our current residential parking approaches is saying loud and clear that every house needs a car and has a right to have a car and has a right to have their car at home. But equally, we need district plan provisions that ensure that we don't just end up with every street full of ugly driveways and garages. We need to get the footprint of the car fleet down by reducing car ownership, not just shifting it around.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Other (please specify) - I have trouble using public transport when I have large items to move. I have been asking GW to look at bus interior design to ensure there is a standing area that can be used when I get on with a large suitcase, or a person with a pushchair gets on. With no seats so you can be sure there won't be someone in it who won't move to one side for you. We also need some more affordable delivery systems for the car-less household. For example with Parking Day I have to design my installations to get them into a taxi or carry them, as WCC/Sculpture Trust provide no transport support. There seems to be an assumption in everything WCC does that everyone has access to a car.

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Other (please specify) - I use a mix of walking, public transport and rare use of taxis. Again, a key

impediment to my walking is carrying things. I live up a hill and have arthritis so there are limits to what I will do. I use the cable car to get up and wheel a wheelie bag with groceries etc down the hill to home. When the cable car is not working I am much more limited in what I can do. I won't bike in Wellington. I gave up when I moved here because it is not safe for a slow cyclist, and I have no storage space for a bike. I won't use micro-mobility things for safety reasons and because I refuse to use unsafe things on footpaths. Until we have the "third lane" for those and nervous cyclists, they are not acceptable. What puts me off doing a lot of walking trips is how unpleasant it is. Slow road crossings, cars on footpaths, lack of footpaths, traffic, no seats, few toilets, hard walking surfaces, poor wayfinding. So I do trips if I have to.

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

My key point is that current settings are saying "it is normal to own a car, you have a right to use and park your car anywhere, you have a right to store your car by your house. If parking isn't available, you have a right to be annoyed about that". We need to be saying "Being car-less is good, and we love people who mostly use sustainable modes. You have a right to expect that the services you need such as buses and delivery vehicles will be given priority over your neighbour's private car. We will use allocation of road space to incentivise services that will help you be car-free, like car share companies" We are also currently saying "this is a good use of public space, because it's a road and roads are for cars". We should be saying "this is a public open space for people, and cars can use it but the priority is people not bits of metal, and storing things will cost you because it costs everyone else to have street space used inefficiently by vehicles that reduce amenity and safety". As the man at Walk 21 Sydney said, "streets are not small roads. Streets are the most ubiquitous public open space in our cities" And I would add "streets need to be designed the way we would design a public park, to encourage people to mix with other people, connect with their local environment, behave sensitively, and to optimise public benefits." We shouldn't fill the botanic gardens up with carparks just because people want to drive there, and we shouldn't fill Lambton Quay up with vehicles just because some people want to drive. We need to focus on what people need, not what they want. I was shocked in the Thorndon Quay discussions to have a councillor say that she used that road because she liked using it, and didn't feel like using the alternative arterial roads that the traffic planners designed for her trip, and she had a right to add her car to the traffic in a shopping centre because that's her choice. It's attitudes like that that mean we need to be sending much clearer signals about what is socially acceptable.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Kerry Lippiatt Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

The goal of land designated as roadways being used as transport corridors in the most efficient, healthy and eco-friendly way possible to move people. roadways to move from being vehicle parking areas, regardless of vehicle type. ie there should be no expectation of long term on-road parking, for residents, tradies or taxi type businesses.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

I'm presuming the "shift in type of transport" is away from single occupant petroleum product driven vehicle - this I support

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Neutral
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Bus & bike/scooter lanes must have priority over parking Parking should always leave space for walking, including e-scooter parking. If parking cannot allow safe walking parking should be discontinued

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

it should be easy to pay for time actually parked without returning to the vehicle

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>

<p>design features.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.</p> <p>Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.</p> <p>Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.</p> <p>Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

a proportion of Mobility parks should always be above resident parking, regardless of the area. Small passenger service vehicles should be prioritised over taxis where their passenger numbers are likely to be higher than single occupant taxis

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

I agree with the increase of price after a set time in busy areas.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
 Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits
 Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)
 Introduce online application and permitting system
 Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use
 If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive
 Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners
 Other (please specify) - Residents permits should not take into account the provision of off street parking on the property as this disincentives the provision of off street parking on a property as the expectation is that if parking is not provided off street, the council will provide some on street. I believe the long term approach should be that if parking is desired it should be a private matter to provide it. The roadways should be expected to be used by people to travel, not to park. The public transport system needs to be enabled to provide reliable, regular, frequent and accessible service.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Mobility permit holders

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

roadways are for transport, so if a property has no off street parking the resident should expect to use public transport, walk, bike or e-scooters

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Other (please specify) - the inaccuracy of the real time information system, especially where a bus is shown on the real time sign then doesn't turn up, or where the bus is late, disappears from the real time sign, then does turn up

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify) - The glaring gaps in the cycleway connectivity The need to walk further so that cars get a direct route The lack of pedestrian crossing facilities on main roads such as Coham Drive and Calabar Rd The time it takes for pedestrian crossings to change to green for pedestrians

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

E-scooters should be parked on roadways, not take up footpath space. Bike parking should be prioritised over car parking eg a couple of double storey bike parks near Lambton Quay have been full the times I've been past them so there should be more built, considering that there must be about 10 bikes parked per carparking space. Tradies should be restricted to loading times, there's no need for them to park on the road for the whole day in the city. They should off-load tools then park in a parking building which should be part of the project cost. There should be bus lanes BOTH ways at least morning and evening, if not the whole day, on the route past the hospital.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

James Clarke Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Somewhat important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Not answered

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Neutral
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Somewhat helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Neutral
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Neutral
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

The transport hierarchy should be explicit in the principles.

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

I find these principles a bit generic so I worry that they will not actually help make difficult decisions.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Agree</p>

<p>Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Strongly Agree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Strongly agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

I feel resident's parking is provided too cheaply, and there is often too much of it in areas where most homes with either no car or off-street parking. I am worried that the relatively high priority in the hierarchy will continue the entitlement people feel to have very cheap on-street parking which clogs streets and footpaths. We should be discouraging multiple cars per household and the storage of private vehicles on the street.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

I would like to see prices rise consistently over time, in addition to demand pricing. This will gradually discourage private vehicle use, which aligns with the overall objectives (e.g. shifting transport mode and climate goals).

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
3. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. EV owners with no off-street parking
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Permits should only be available to households with no off-street parking - other households and second permits should not be accommodated in the allocation of space. Pricing should be high (with exemptions for mobility permits) to better reflect the value of the space (including amenity and safety for pedestrians).

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

I support the policy overall. I strongly support the transport hierarchy and would like to see it applied vigorously to reduce private vehicle use in Wellington. I believe increasing prices will be much more effective than time limits or fine-grained entitlement rules. I support greater investment in public and active transport to complement this.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Payal Ramritu Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used Very important

Support safe movement Very important

Support business wellbeing Somewhat unimportant

Support city amenity and safety Somewhat important

Support access for all Very important

Support move to becoming an eco-city Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Not answered

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system Somewhat helpful

Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed Somewhat helpful

Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it Somewhat helpful

Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent Somewhat helpful

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support Somewhat helpful

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply Somewhat helpful

Provide parking space availability information Somewhat helpful

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks,</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Agree</p>

commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.	
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Unhappy about micro-mobility parks being so high up!

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Wary about saying yes because unsure what this looks like in reality

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
3. Second permits
4. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
5. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. EV owners with no off-street parking
8. Businesses located with the zone

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

There are equity issues here, hence why i've ranked EV so low

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport route has too many transfers

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

Other (please specify) - I used to be a regular public transport user but now it's fkn frustrating trying to get around! Also, routes that would really help me don't exist!

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Greg Harford on behalf of RetailNZ

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very unimportant
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Very important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Neutral
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very unimportant
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Neutral

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

A key objective should be the provision of adequate carparking to service customer and retail business needs.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not Answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Neutral
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Neutral
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very unhelpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very unhelpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Neutral
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very unhelpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very unhelpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

A core principle should be that Council needs to make available parking to meet business and customer needs.

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes? Strongly disagree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City? Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres? Disagree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe? Strongly disagree</p>

<p>Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Strongly Disagree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Not answered</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Disagree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Short stay carparking should be a high priority in all areas. It should not be treated as secondary.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Not answered

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Not answered

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Not answered

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Not answered

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Not Answer

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Not answered

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Retail NZ is a not-for-profit membership organisation representing the interests of the retail sector. Our membership accounts for about two-thirds of total retail turnover.

We have serious concerns about the Statement of Proposal and the consultation process, which appears to completely neglect the need for a strong economy, and a business environment, particularly in the downtown, that is accessible for customers.

The Statement of Proposal, combined with other proposals being considered (e.g. so-called temporary street changes on Featherston and Victoria Streets) will have the effect, over time, of fundamentally reshaping the downtown environment, and driving both shoppers and businesses away. The risk is that decisions about parking are being made in isolation from a broader conversation about the downtown, even the impacts of the parking decisions will have a huge impact on the shape and viability of businesses. In general, retail customers want and need access to cost-effective and readily-available parking.

We are concerned that the Council seems intent on reducing the number of carparks, and generally trying to discourage car use in the central city. Doing so will simply make it harder for customers to access retail premises in the CBD, and encourage them to shop elsewhere - where parking is readily available, and mostly free. Customers may be willing to travel via public transport to the CBD, but in most cases, they will not make large purchases because they are difficult to carry.

Although Wellington's public transport is very good, it is not an effective substitute for cars - because the geography of the city, and the public transport network itself do not make it easy (or cost-effective) for quick trips.

From an overall retail point of view this may not matter - customers will simply spend elsewhere in the region. However, it does impact the shape of the CBD. Retailers operate on wafer-thin margins, and it does not take much of a drop in business to flip a store from being profitable to unprofitable. In the long-run, this will lead to the closure of stores and to a gutting of CBD retail. There may be some who argue that customers will make their purchases online. This may be true - and online sales are increasing rapidly. However, this will not support a vibrant downtown retail environment: online sales are typically fulfilled from an industrial warehouse or similar - not from expensive downtown real estate.

Respectfully, we suggest that the City Council should make a decision on the kinds of businesses it wants to see in the central business district and in suburban retail environments before determining its parking policy. The parking policy should serve the Council's broader economic goals - not be seen as independent. We would suggest that the City Council should be wanting to see a vibrant and sustainable retail environment that creates jobs, and allows customers to buy a broad range of retail goods. If the City Council wishes to see most retail leave the downtown environment, it should make that decision explicitly - not see it happen accidentally as the result of poorly designed parking policies.

To that end, we recommend that:

- short-stay affordable and accessible parking for shoppers be treated as a high priority by the Council in the "parking space hierarchy";
- the Council make provision for increasing the supply of parking, particularly off-street parking.

I would appreciate the opportunity to present this submission in-person at the oral hearings.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Sara Clarke on behalf of the Creswick Valley Residents' Association

CVRA represents the residents of, primarily, Northland, extending north to Wilton and along both sides of the Kaiwharawhara Stream valley beside Curtis Street. This area, as a city fringe suburb, has a number parking issues. It is noticeable that they have become more evident in the last couple of years. These issues include:

- An increase in week day parking by commuters, who either walk to the city or catch buses in the area centred around the Northland and Karori tunnels. Streets particularly affected are Northland Road, Northland Tunnel Road and the southern part of Curtis Street. This has been particularly noticeable since the changes to the bus network were introduced.
- Some narrow winding roads that have many houses with no off-street parking – resulting in them being reduced to single lane. It is already a problem in some streets in Northland for collection or delivery trucks or large vans to transit, and there is a persistent concern that an emergency vehicle could be impeded.
- High demand/short turnover for parking at Northland Village, which is also a key bus route and where the bus stop is in the centre of the Village. Northland has 5+ food takeaway outlets and high demand times are particularly Friday and Saturday evenings, for direct users as well as delivery cars (given the increase in meal delivery usage).

Garden Road is a particular example where a number of these issues coalesce. It is narrow and winding, with little off-street parking, high parking demand for tenanted properties, and is used in the evening as a "short-cut home" particularly by those trying to avoid the tailback at Glenmore/Kelburn Viaduct. About three years ago CVRA representatives walked the road, accompanied by Councillors and Council Officers, pointing out pinch points where no-parking lines were required. Only some of those were implemented, and we now have cars parking on corners where there are no dotted lines, forcing ascending vehicles into the oncoming lane at blind corners. It will need further intervention, but should have been done all together at the time.

We agree broadly with the priority city fringe areas and we agree broadly with the objectives of the proposed Policy. The submission is made under the respective headings within the Statement of Proposal.

Submission

4.4 Proposed area-based approach

1. CVRA welcomes an integrated approach (area-based plan) for the management of parking, as it has already had need to engage with Council officers around issues of unsafe or illegal parking on Northland streets. The commitment to development of area-based plans in discussion with local communities is strongly supported, as this will offer the Council both local knowledge of issues and greater local buy-in of the solution.

CVRA would be concerned if the timing for developing and implementing each area-based plan was wholly reactionary, however, as any piece-meal roll-out of enhanced parking management will generate a bow-wave of new parking problems in adjacent areas. Northland already has experience of such spill-over from more restrictive parking nearer to the city centre. Therefore, the plan needs to look at the whole area – considering parking and speed limits, as these are often connected.

4.5.2 Proposed parking management tools for key transport routes

2. While CVRA supports a parking management approach that ensures that on-street parking does not impede vehicle movement on key transport routes, care is needed to avoid displacing on-street

parking from wider corridors onto narrower residential streets, to generate conflict with residents and impede vehicle movement there. An example is the increase in commuter parking on Curtis Street, and the roads on the Karori-side of Northland tunnel. This impedes the buses and reduces visibility for other road users making negotiation of already challenging intersections more difficult. CVRA could not support an approach that treated the parking space hierarchy simply as a cascade, clearing key transport routes and choking the side streets; any area-based plan must assess the impact on the wider network and seek to avoid creating a parking issue where it does not yet exist.

4.5.3 Proposed parking management tools for the central city

Although it is not a Northland specific problem, proposed parking management tools for the central city will directly affect Northland residents seeking to shop, meet or attend functions in the city centre, or just to clear their post office box. We make the following general points.

3. CVRA supports any approach to management of demand for parking in the central city that would be agile to respond both in price and parking restrictions to enable people to access parking when and where it is needed. It is uncertain that the metrics and interventions being proposed deliver that agility. There are profound distinctions between occupancy, turnover and duration that are insufficiently distinguished in considering the parking management issues for existing pay-by-space parking for four-wheeled vehicles.

4. High occupancy with high turnover and short duration would be meeting the need of a large number of people to access parking when and where it is needed; high occupancy with low turnover and long duration would be meeting the need of a relatively smaller number of people to access parking. High occupancy is, therefore, a less critical metric than turnover and duration of stay. For much of the existing pay-by-space parking for four-wheeled vehicles in the central city, the duration of stay is already restricted to two hours, ensuring that any proposed parking management tool based on introducing exponential pricing after the first three hours would be generally irrelevant.

5. If the object is to meet the parking needs of the largest number of people while encouraging a shift to active modes or public transport, parking management should seek high occupancy with high turnover and short duration. To achieve this, exponential pricing would be an effective tool only if applied from the outset of parking, and from a relatively cheaper rate for the first tranche rising on an increasing scale for each subsequent tranche.

4.5.4 Proposed parking management tools for suburban centres

6. CVRA supports improved management of parking within suburban centres but considers that, particularly in the case of Northland, proposed parking management tools should be developed as an integral component of an area-based plan.

7. For Creswick/Northland Village, which is an active local retail destination and important community hub for services, active mode routes to and from the central city and public transport connections, demand for parking is high at specific times (usually lunch time and early evenings), but turnover is high and duration of occupancy is low. The principal parking management issue is non-compliance in the form of double-parking or parking on footpaths or across entrances. Time limit restrictions and active enforcement are likely to remain the appropriate management tools.

4.5.5 Proposed parking management tools for city fringe and inner-city suburbs

8. CVRA has a direct and immediate interest in proposed parking management tools for city fringe and inner-city suburbs. The parking policy proposes a two-stage approach, with changes based on the severity of the parking situation, where the initial response is to manage demand by making changes to any existing residents' parking scheme or coupon parking scheme. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street, and generally result in high occupancy, low

turnover and long duration parking behaviour. Coupon parking schemes allow commuters to park close to the city relatively cheaply and are inherently incompatible with the proposed new Transport Strategy 2020–2050, currently in development, which aims to move more people with fewer vehicles by prioritising walking, cycling and public transport over other forms of transport.

9. The initial response of the proposed parking policy would involve reducing or removing coupon parking in zones where it conflicts with residents and applying the parking space hierarchy priorities for the city fringe to reallocate the parking spaces for active transport and low carbon vehicles. CVRA supports the removal of commuter/coupon parking schemes in this situation, but submits that residents need must also be considered in any reallocation of parking space, as set out in the hierarchy.

11. The parking policy proposes, as its second-stage response, a new scheme based on a short stay (P120) approach with "resident exempt" permits for eligible residents to enable short-stay visits for tradespeople and visitors while discouraging commuter parking in conflict with residents. While we consider that there are a few streets in Northland that may require a residents parking scheme of some level, we are concerned that this scheme would be administratively complex.. Although CVRA supports priority being given to mobility permit holders and electric vehicles without off-street parking, the remaining criteria are very open to debate and likely to be very difficult to reconcile by a Council officer, who will be faced with making decisions that prioritise one applicant over another, and all of whom will be seeking an exemption

12. We would also note that the proposed scheme may need modification to provide reasonable access for tradespeople - more than the proposed maximum stay of two hours/ set number of one-day coupons per annum. This is unrealistic for any household undertaking anything other than minor maintenance. Any bathroom or kitchen renovation, for example, is likely to involve several vehicles for several days.

CVRA submits any sort of residents parking scheme needs to be developed within the area management scheme, and that effective design and more effective use of the already available parking management tools should ameliorate much of the conflict between users.

Martin K Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used Very important

Support safe movement Somewhat important

Support business wellbeing Neutral

Support city amenity and safety Somewhat important

Support access for all Very important

Support move to becoming an eco-city Very important

Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment Neutral

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Not answered

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not Answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system Very helpful

Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed Somewhat unhelpful

Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it Somewhat helpful

Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent Very helpful

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support Neutral

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply Very helpful

Provide parking space availability information Somewhat helpful

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance Neutral

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p> <p>Neutral</p>

<p>Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Neutral</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Agree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Neutral</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Not answered

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

I think it's of utmost importance to have prices reflect the true cost of owning a stationary vehicle. In order for this not to discriminate against the poor, alternatives have to exist. In short: it should be a no-brainer for everyone to use public transport, because it's e.g. free...

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Introduce online application and permitting system

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. EV owners with no off-street parking
2. Mobility permit holders
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
6. Businesses located with the zone
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

It would make so much sense to encourage neighbours to share their vehicles, which requires the insurance industry to permit this, and could also really benefit from a coordination platform where vehicles can be managed between households.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Other (please specify) - Tagging on and people buying tickets is a huge strain of patience. Free

transport would get rid of this entirely. Other options are trust-based with surprise controls and hefty fees.

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

This is all looking good. The proof will be in the pudding. Good luck!

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

William Guest **Individual submitter**

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Somewhat important
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very unimportant
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

1. Encourage the use of public transport by those who can choose to use it. 2. Recognise that many commercial activities cannot use public transport but must be able to park in the CBD and in the suburbs.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

The provision of commuter car parking in the suburbs (or at least beyond the fringe of the CBD) is desirable, and can be encouraged by having regular buses to and from them. It would be useful to have clearer definitions of the traffic types, and particularly a definition of "commuters".

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Parking needs for commercial activities should be specifically considered. This is more than some small "loading zones" and should consider the construction/demolition of major buildings, the delivery of items such as grocery items in 44 tonne rigs, space for tradespeople and other service providers, parking for leisure activities (The Stadium, Michael Fowler Centre, cinemas, etc).

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Disagree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>City Fringe</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?</p>

<p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Neutral</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Neutral</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Too much emphasis on EV charging parking. This should be a commercial activity pure and simple. Nothing should ever be done to encourage motor bikes except those 125cc and less because they need the same space on the road and in many parking spaces as cars. Mobility parks are an important element of social equity within the community.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Fine in principle, but I already do shopping for major items well out of the CBD because of parking availability and charges. Retailers know this and now you can buy very little in the grossly mis-named "Golden Mile" (which I refer to as the Verdigris Mile because the gold disappeared many years ago).

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
3. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
4. EV owners with no off-street parking
5. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
6. Businesses located with the zone

7. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

There are places (e.g. Raroa Rd) where Council could consider financial incentives for owners to construct off street parking to make space for bus and cycle lanes.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

I would like to have a clearer picture on the peak hour traffic flows around the city by the purpose of the journeys. I suspect that "commuters" are the only group who could also select public transport. What proportion of all traffic are they? Where do they park? What control does Council have on all parking spaces used by commuters?

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Sam Donald Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used Very important

Support safe movement Very important

Support business wellbeing Neutral

Support city amenity and safety Very important

Support access for all Very important

Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Support reduction in costs of housing

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Business wellbeing can be improved by improvements in walking, cycling and public transport and increased amenity of central areas for all.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system Very helpful

Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed Very helpful

Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it Very helpful

Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent Very helpful

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support Very helpful

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply Very helpful

Provide parking space availability information Very helpful

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance Very helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes? Strongly agree</p>
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City? Strongly agree</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres? Strongly agree</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe? Strongly agree</p>

<p>service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Strongly Agree</p>
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities? Strongly Agree</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking? Strongly agree</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?
Please don't differentiate between old and new housing developments as it will just encourage/force new developments to include parking, adding cost to housing

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?
Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

This is a good approach and should aim for max 85% occupancy so those who really need a park and are prepared to pay more for it can always find one close to where they need to be

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Businesses located with the zone
4. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
5. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
6. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

don't prioritise older dwellings as this will lead to increased housing costs for new dwellings with developers having to add on-site parking costing \$50k - \$100k per car park.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport seems unreliable to me

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Let's go even further, rather than catching up to Auckland, lets leap ahead using latest principles and technology.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Liz Springford Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Cutting transport carbon emissions by more than 7.6% annually till 2030. Support human hauroa/health by attractive safe physically active transport routes.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

"Global emissions ... need to fall by some 7.6% every year this decade – nearly 2,800MtCO₂ in 2020 – in order to limit warming to less than 1.5C above pre-industrial temperatures." from <https://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-coronavirus-set-to-cause-largest-ever-annual-fall-in-co2-emissions> Previous Ministry of Health data indicated that around half of adults do not get the minimum level of physical activity needed to keep healthy and well. A joint local government report from 8 February 2013 estimated the high cost of physical inactivity (in part due to sedentary transport and employment) at around one percent of GDP. Combining immediate human health and our climate emergency, 2014 research by Macmillan et al, demonstrated a return of about \$20 for every dollar spent on separated cycleways and slower streets. Car parking uses a disproportionate amount of Wellington streets, at the expense of safer walking, cycling, scooting and running.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

I would like WCC to urgently work with communities to develop area-based parking plans across our city - especially Newtown and Berhampore, to speed up safe cycling for South Wellington which I suspect has the greatest proportion of cyclists. Safe cycling is also a priority as we are likely to see deepening levels of poverty post-COVID-19, especially amongst younger people (who will also end up paying the most for increased WCC debt, and so, deserve smart WCC spending that saves our climate).

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Equity and inclusion is really important - looking at how people actually move, what barriers exist to accelerating climate-friendly shared and active transport uptake...and how best to remove those barriers, with both carrots and sticks, but always mindful of equity and inclusion. There's a crucial dynamic with car ownership that I feel has been ignored in national and local transport planning. There are simply some situations where driving a car is valuable, where good shared and/or active transport alternatives don't exist. So some people own cars for those infrequent situations - and because they've already invested in the cost of that car, WoF, insurance and repairs, petrol is a marginal cost and the car parked outside is the easy default choice for journeys. However, "community cars" aka car share, parked within a few minutes' walk, give that car driving convenience for a few trips a fortnight, without all that upfront investment that otherwise lock people into using a car when that's not the best option. "Community cars" aka car share, also unlock our road space from parking mostly unused cars. Each community car removes the need for around ten privately owned cars...and ten parking spaces. Community cars are a powerful tool for freeing up our scarce city land for healthier cheaper climate-protecting shared and active travel. We desperately need Council championing community cars so that before this Council term ends, we have well-used community cars within a few minutes' walk of most Wellingtonians in most suburbs. And the answer to First to Zero's question "Is it time to end our love affair with cars?" is most definitely YES! Breaking up is hard to do, but it has to happen for a happy snarl-free healthy city that's up for this decade's climate emergency. Time to set clear boundaries in our relationship with privately owned cars - it's totally not ok for the current number of private cars to block safe cycling, scooting, walking and running routes, to restrict driving to one-way round blind corners, to blocking buggy and wheelchair access on footpaths. Let's face it, our relationship with the privately owned car is abusive and addictive, time to break free for a healthier future.

<p>Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design</p>	<p>7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
--	--

<p>features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.</p>	
<p>Central City</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.</p>	<p>8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City? Neutral</p>
<p>Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.</p>	<p>9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres? Neutral</p>
<p>City Fringe</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	<p>10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe? Neutral</p>
<p>Outer Residential Areas</p> <p>High parking space priority: bus stops, urban</p>	<p>11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas? Neutral</p>

<p>design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.</p>	
<p>Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities</p> <p>High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.</p>	<p>12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?</p> <p>Neutral</p>
<p>Council's Central City Off-Street Parking</p> <p>High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.</p>	<p>13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?</p> <p>Neutral</p>

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

For questions 7-13 I opted for "Neutral" because I didn't want my initial "Disagree" answer to be misinterpreted. For these questions, I would prefer to be able to rank the parking uses myself into High, Medium & Lowest. I appreciate the overall intent to prioritise shared transport and mobility access. But across the various parking areas, I'd like the following parking space hierarchy: HIGH: mobility access parks, bus stops, car share vehicles, e-charging stations, bike/scooter parks, urban design features MEDIUM: motorcycle parks, loading zone access, small passenger service/taxi stands, short stay parks LOW: public bus layover, coach/bus stops, residents car parks, LOWEST: commuter car parks. Note this list is also in order - so top priority is mobility parks, followed by bus stops. For Thorndon Quay, the only high priorities are mobility access (including emergency vehicles) and bus stops. In Lambton Quay, I think there should be no provision for residential car

parks, nor commuter car parks. Ideally, I'd like to see the Golden Mile be limited to parking and traffic for mobility access and walking, biking and scooting, with bus traffic (or better still, light rail) along a route parallel to Lambton Quay which becomes a bustling people-friendly area and much more attractive for shopping, cafes and services.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Sounds smart, plus easy smartphone-friendly information re which parks are currently empty - especially mobility parks.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Other (please specify) - Reduce the number of privately owned vehicles in each area, especially where vehicles are parked over footpaths, reduce two-way roads to one-way driving access (especially the downright dangerous stretches of road), and where separate cycleways and/or public transport routes are needed. I suggest where household members are unrelated (people are flatting together) and/or on community services cards, there are discounts for community car aka car share access. Importantly, providing community car aka car share access should be quantified eg x community cars for z suburb so that all residents are within a few minutes' walk of a community car. The community cars need to be actively promoted by WCC as overseas research shows that community cars grow to the scale needed, by partnering with local councils. Partnership could include targeted discounts, and no interest loans to expand car fleets quickly. Widespread community cars have a huge public payoff for Wellington, and can be an important tool in a fairer

more active snarl-free city. Also note that from a road space use perspective, there isn't any real difference between a car parked on the street or up a driveway. The driveway access from the road takes about the same space as an on-street car park.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

See all my comments throughout this survey. We have to accelerate community cars aka car share, to widespread availability and uptake this Council term. Wellington already has too many privately owned cars which block streets for safe driving, let alone clearing space for the urgently needed cycleway, footpath and separate public transport routes. With increasing population, this road space waste will just get worse. We know we urgently need to create affordable healthy homes for people, not cars that sit on precious land, mostly unused. The time for inefficient climate-destructive transport is over - we can't afford to borrow money which the younger generation will repay, then not deal with our climate and housing crises. Smart use of resources is our moral imperative post-COVID lockdown. Residents parking schemes and area reviews are some of our tools to renovate our city to work well for this decade. As First to Zero states, the strongest emissions cuts must happen this decade. Lockdown has given us a foot up, now we need to accelerate our action. As a mostly flightless kiwi, travelling to Manila to meet family two years ago, was a big eye-opener as to how a city can be reduced to a standstill, by prioritising private car ownership. Manila traffic is insane - traffic jams for hours seem to happen most days, making it impossible to predict arrival time for work, school or other events. Manila's love affair with the private car has gone very badly - a lesson in transport love for Wellington, while we can still change direction.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify) - I mostly bike or walk, Houghton Bay quite a car-centric suburb and buses not that frequent & take a long time to reach city.

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify) - Biking on our roads is still too scary. I do e-bike, but I hate being passed at less than 1.5 metres clearance, and I hate the verbal abuse from some drivers.

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Tony Randle on behalf of the Johnsonville Residents Association

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Neutral
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Somewhat important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Neutral
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Neutral

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Supporting access from suburbs and for people who do not have good alternative options from driving

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

No Answer

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Somewhat helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat unhelpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance

Neutral

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

The principle "Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply" is wrong when the City Growth Strategy assumes population growth of 50,000 - 80,000 and a lot of these will likely drive if working in the CBD. The city does not have to provide additional parking but it does have to manage and support the provision of additional parking where there is an increasing demand for it.

Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Agree

Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Agree

Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Neutral

Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Agree

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Disagree

Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Neutral

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

This form of pre-packaged options with Agree to Disagree is very unhelpful. Different areas have different needs and priorities. This approach may satisfy the councilor offices to tick the "public

consulted" box but it does not enable good quality feedback from the community. Finally, having Bus stops as the lowest for "Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities" (even lower than Bus Layover) is simply stupid. Does the WCC not support people taking PT to sports and recreation events.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

No

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

The demand pricing approach can only work if the WCC also supports increasing parking supply in areas where demand is high. As the WCC principle is to only decrease parking supply while its own growth plan include even more people trying to drive to work, also having demand pricing for parking a is just an excuse to charge more for less and to exclude lower paid (who often live in areas far away with poor PT) from work opportunities in the areas with the most jobs.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Other (please specify) - Consents in areas with residential parking areas cannot have exemptions to reduce the amount of required off-street parking. Also discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders but not EV car-owners.

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
2. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
3. Mobility permit holders

4. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
5. Second permits
6. Businesses located with the zone
7. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
8. EV owners with no off-street parking

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

There needs to be a clearer link between the building consent process and the on-street parking supply. In areas where on-street parking is limited, building consents must include adequate off-street parking.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

- Public transport is too expensive
- Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination
- When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle
- Public transport seems unreliable to me
- Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies
- Public transport route has too many transfers

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

- I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle
- I don't have a bike or want to purchase one
- I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

This submission is made by Tony Randle on behalf of the Johnsonville Residents Association. The JCA is disappointed in key elements of the WCC Parking Policy: 1) the parking policy does not support increasing parking supply in areas of high demand. 2) There is little or no connection from the parking policy with the population growth policy that requires the city to support an additional 50,000 - 80,000 more people. As North Wellington will have to support the largest portion of these residents in suburbs far from the CBD with poor PT services, we are the worst affected by the WCC's lack of support for commuter parking. 3) There is also no explicit connection from the parking policy and the building consent process yet it is clear that the only way our street parking is not to be overwhelmed is if new buildings (residential or business) also provide adequate off street parking. Johnsonville has already seen multiple new medium/high density developments in central Johnsonville where the WCC has exempted the developer from providing adequate off-street parking which is making it more difficult to find on-street parks and this policy does not address this issue.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Peter Skrzyński Individual submitter

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Somewhat important
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Somewhat important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Somewhat important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Not answered

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Not answered

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Somewhat helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Agree

Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Agree

Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Neutral

Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority:

bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Neutral

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Agree

Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Agree

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Not answered

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed pricing approach?

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

No Answer

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. Businesses located with the zone
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we have not thought of?

Not answered

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Motorcycles should be moved up the parking hierarchy. Active modes and public transport are not practicable or practical for all people, and motorcycles are one of the most efficient ways to get around. That is, they should not be classed as equivalent to private cars. It is unacceptable that motorcycles have been dismissed as being "too dangerous" by council officers in the past. Motorcycle parking, especially in the northern part of the CBD, is heavily used and it is often impossible to find a free motorcycle park when wanting a short stay park for an errand or appointment. Therefore more motorcycle parking should be provided. It seems inevitable that motorcycle parking will become user pays at some point in the future, but the method should be technically easy to use, and be priced so that people are not forced to abandon motorcycle commuting.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Erik Zydervelt on behalf of Mevo

1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Somewhat important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Support economic resilience and economic localism - parking should be one of the tools used (e.g. via the District Plan) to try and encourage urban centres to have more of the locally owned and smaller-scale businesses vs the large-format, parking-heavy and also typically offshore-owned businesses. De-couple land-use from private motor vehicle parking requirements - all private car parking requirements should be transitioned away, so that the market can function properly. Use strong evidence and data, from here and elsewhere. We have a great head start on smart city infrastructure for parking, and should be doing trials especially to prime us ahead of LGWM change. Evidence like SFPark is also so extremely compelling and should be a key pillar of the policy and – crucially – the comms about it. Support our transport network transitioning to net zero carbon.

3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Would like to see an equal balance of safety focus from micro/injury to an individual(s) (currently three objectives on individual(s) safety) to macro/environmental (currently one objective). Parking is a significant lever for transport's impact on Wellington's emissions profile which has a macro impact on our cities safety from climate related disasters.

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Neutral
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Not answered

Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Agree

Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Agree

Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

10. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Neutral

Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Disagree

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Neutral

Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Disagree

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

For all "centre" areas, Like Connect Wellington, for all areas, we want to see parking provision firmly coupled to the desired movement modes for the land uses. For example, we want to see a

land-use-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods instead of assuming “we’re in the outer area, therefore residents’ parking is a high priority”. We would also like to see an increase in the number of dedicated car-share parks available within the city centre to increase the value of car-share systems across the city. These are highly utilised and assist the reliability of carsharing as a viable single-trip transport alternative for point to point travel within the city. Key transport routes: Like Connect Wellington, agree with the caveat that movement and exchange need to be properly optimised on “key transport” routes that are also destinations, like Lambton Quay. In places like this, urban design features, and to a lesser extent bike/micro-mobility parks, can significantly improve the amenity and thereby vibrancy of a street and should have higher priority than the other types listed in here. On bus and other high-capacity public transport routes, parking must not impact peak time public transport function at all. City Fringe: We rated this neutral because we would like to see car share and bike & micromobility parking higher up in the priority list. Outer residential: Car share parks should be higher priority than residents’ parking but this is currently rated lower. Car share services such as Mevo are shown to take approximately 10 cars off the road for every car deployed. This delivers better outcomes for both car share users and other residents as car sharing improves parking availability by delivering a net reduction in parking demand. Dedicated parking in outer residential areas generally means that they are more reliably discoverable to residents of these areas who are looking for a point-to-point transport option without needing to rely on a privately owned car. Like Connect Wellington, we would like to see a land-use-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods and doesn’t assume “we’re in the outer area, therefore residents’ parking is needed”.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Mevo principally agrees with right-pricing parking use so that parks are generally always available in the area that a driver may wish to park. It agrees with the approach that Auckland Transport has taken that the purpose of pricing is to ensure that there is a *consistency* of parks available in a given location. As a business operating across Wellington City, having parking consistently available increases the value of our service as a reliable, climate-positive/negative carbon transport option.

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents’ parking schemes. Residents’ parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12 months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

18. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
8. Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Car share members are often residents in the areas with resident parking, as seen clearly in Mt Vic and other suburbs. Given carshare vehicles support the reduction in demand of parking by a factor of 1 to 10 (taking 10 cars off the road for every car share vehicle deployed), we would recommend free floating car share vehicles be granted access to resident parking areas. This benefits both car share users and other residents. Car share vehicles could then be used by residents in place of owning a private vehicle which would on average be used only 4% of the time, taking up residents parking the other 96%. Where as a free floating car share vehicle is in use >20% of the time creating availability for residents by removing vehicles and reducing the idle time of each shared vehicle.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

No Answer

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Rabeea Inayatulla on behalf of The National Council for Women New Zealand Wellington Branch

Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Initial assessment is the objectives look thorough and comprehensive, though agreement for need of more of a breakdown. We don't know what's underneath all these objectives.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

There is a need for more public transport as well as a wish for more priority to be given to electric cars, car shares and carpooling (after public transport) ahead of taxis and rideshares such as Uber. Adding more bus services doesn't help if they are not available at the right times or areas. Access for all is very broad – does this consider disability and the wide range of disabilities? What about people who are immunocompromised during flu season? Older people typically have different mobility issues and it does not serve them to move parking away from the city, they can't always access parking or use public transport. Parking spaces in the city needs to be more accessible as public transport doesn't suit all disabled or older people, especially critical for amenities e.g. hospitals. Possible solution is coupon parking used by local residents could be redistributed to disabled or older people who regularly come into town, (especially important for immunocompromised people who can't use public transport).

Large support for being an eco-friendly city however more encouragement is needed to encourage people to let go of having private cars. How can this be achieved? Safe movement - what does this mean and for who? What will it look like? It is not safe for women if they must travel further to get to their vehicle especially at night. Uber and other rideshare schemes don't have access to taxi parking – enforcement needed to discourage rideshares from using the limited private parking available. Parking is part of a connected transport system, not seen in isolation. Part of an overall strategy of movement and objectives should reflect that.

Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Pricing at a level - what does this mean? Not very transparent and not accessible, quite costly as it is. Good to see that parking is acknowledged as one part of a whole transport system. Specifically like that they will be doing check-ups and reflection and reporting.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

More specificity needed on the objective the principles are specifically referring to. Carshares should be higher up in prioritisation, ahead of residency parking schemes. Cycleways have reduced parking available e.g. Oriental Bay. Older people are unable to visit due to limited access especially if they have mobility issues. More balance on private parking required e.g. Evans Bay, otherwise people won't come into the city and will go further up the coast for their beach activities e.g. Kapiti Coast. Suggestion of WCC developing an app to let people know when car parking spaces are available or pre-book if they need to go to a place. Prioritisation given to those with high needs e.g. disabled persons booking a space for the library or shopping. From a gender lens perspective, recognise the school drop off and pick up as well as part time work is often done by women. Parking times don't take this into account – women end up paying for a whole day when they may

only park for 4 to 6 hours. Is it fair to pay for the whole day? We want to be able to encourage women to be able to work and have less expenses when dropping off children and working part time. Movement toward park sharing - making the most of a parking space at all hours of the day, if a parking space isn't being used, can it be reserved for another use? Have monorails over the city been considered or are earthquakes a deterrent.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Parking is expensive in Wellington, a deterrent compared with Hutt and Porirua. Some wanted to make weekend parking free to encourage people into the city e.g. older people with disposable income. They would bring in much needed revenue by spending money on concerts, shopping, etc. If you want to promote people using the city, the pricing is a factor. Puts people off. Can people be bothered to venture in if they must think about parking costs. Weekend functions with the family become more expensive and you can't spend as much time at the event or out to dinner. Acknowledge we can't give endless hours to people with parking because we do need to have availability and balance the needs between residential parking and visitors.

Others advised pricing fees stopped people taking their time in the city (free parking encourages people to take their time, as there is no urgency to leave). This prevents others from coming into the city as there is not enough space for them to park. There was consensus free parking would create issues around enforcement e.g. employees who need parking on the weekend and taxis taking up private parking spaces.

Better enforcement of parking rules is needed so people would move on. Parking zones are frustrating for all. People will park strategically to get cheaper or free parking Areas of high demand - how is that defined? Business district? And perhaps this is not the right factor to determine pricing. More thought needs to be put into accessibility and disability needs to determine parking spaces and pricing. These areas are in high demand for a reason. We are putting people off from visiting which impacts the businesses that operate there. More free zones. Discussion on more parking outside the city e.g. Westpac Stadium and bringing people with accessibility issues into city centre for free – can this be achieved?

Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

No Answer

Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Electric cars should be given a higher priority to residential parking spaces as part of working towards an eco-friendly city (especially if a household has more than one car).

Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Unreliability of public transport services, countless issues taking the bus to work only to have it cancel without notice – raising it with Met Service has had a limited impact. Affordability of public transport a barrier - the prices keep going up but not the quality of the service. Accessibility particularly for those who are disabled or have mobility issues. Cycling is scary as cars are too close to cycle lanes. Examples given of people who've had accidents cycling from reckless drivers. Cycling is not practical for families or those with small children. High trust in number of women Councillors at WCC – assumption they will consider issues on transport regarding childcare, family and accessibility for pregnant persons.

Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Rhona Carson, President on behalf of the Newtown Residents' Association.

Introduction

The Newtown Residents' Association is the Incorporated Society representing Newtown and its surrounding suburbs. We are an active local group who take a keen interest in the community and local issues. We are concerned with maintaining and improving our area's liveability, connectedness and sustainability and working to make our community a thriving, diverse, great place to live.

Submission

Overview

We support the principles and the proposed parking hierarchies for the different areas as outlined in the draft policy. We understand that the implementation of these policies will follow a process of area based planning so that the conditions can be tailored for local circumstances.

Local area concerns

This submission concentrates primarily on issues affecting the residents of Newtown and the surrounding area. We value a safe, affordable, attractive neighbourhood where everyone is welcome. Our streets and public places need to support this vision and values.

Suburban Centre or Key Transport Route?

In Newtown our suburban centre is also a key transport route. Riddiford St through Constable St to Kilbirnie and on to the airport is already a major traffic route, and in future this could be added to if the light rail route to the Zoo and onwards is chosen. We note that very different parking priorities are proposed for key transport routes from those for suburban centres. The only high priority on a transport route is bus stops, while in the commercial and shopping precincts there are a range of priority uses including mobility parks, urban design elements, bicycle/micro mobility parks and short stay parks. Riddiford St and Constable St are at the heart of our Newtown community. The streetscape has been designed to enhance community connections, with median strips and pedestrian refuges in Riddiford St a feature. The speed limit is 40kph, and we have been advocating that this should be reduced to 30kph. For many years the Newtown Residents' Association has been submitting, across a wide range of council policies and plans, that central Newtown should be a slow zone on the transport corridor in a way that keeps public transport in the traffic lane and preserves the amenities and local features that put people first.

We would object strongly if 'ease of movement' for vehicles travelling through was prioritised over community placemaking for those who live, work and play here. We support applying the parking hierarchies outlined for suburban centres to the streets of central Newtown. There are aspects of how these are implemented that should be discussed in area based planning, and we would like to be involved in this. As an addition to this, we would like to add an objective to the parking policy which makes it easier for businesses to get consent to repurpose parking spaces which could be used for seating/dining/coffee drinking, where doing so would not infringe upon mobility car parks. A current attempt to get permission to do this has taken several weeks and still has no resolution,

losing an opportunity to make Newtown streets more people-friendly at a time when this could have been very valuable to businesses suffering from covid-19 restrictions.

Place and Movement Framework

We note that the Draft Parking Policy [section 2.2.3] discusses having a Place and Movement Framework to guide decision-making by categorising the streets within different areas of the city. This is described as a tool that can complement the transport hierarchy and the parking space hierarchy. This seems like a useful way forward, so long as the framework is developed with a co-design process as part of area based planning.

Mobility Parking

We are pleased to see that mobility parks are given high priority in the Suburban Centre. Currently, users experience difficulty in accessing these when needed. We recommend extending the number of mobility parks in our Suburban Centre, and monitoring them more stringently. The draft gives only moderate priority in the hierarchy for mobility parking in residential streets, and this needs further consideration. There are local residents who are highly dependent on mobility parking and have no access to off street parking. Wellington City Council has assisted some of these residents by designating mobility car parks outside their homes. This is a compassionate and practical approach to inclusivity for these members of our community and we would hope that this facility would be extended to others as the need arises. We also suggest that when someone is suddenly struck with a debilitating illness or injury the parking policy should allow temporary mobility parking to be rapidly deployed, in a similar way that a building site, or road works, can cone off parking spaces for promptly required work access. Mobility Parking Permit cards can be rapidly issued based on a medical certificate, but establishing residential mobility parks is a very slow process. A temporary set up using road cones while the permanent parking space is gazetted, consulted on and formally painted and sign posted following due process could be part of the policy.

We also submit that these mobility parking spaces should be mapped online and sign posted in the street slightly differently by WCC. Currently there is no distinction between these spaces and short term public ones, when in fact they are part of the supported living arrangements for the mobility card holder in question.

Parking Priorities in the Residential Streets

We support the high priority given to **residents parking** in the draft hierarchy for City Fringe and Inner City Suburbs such as Newtown. We also support the low priority given to commuter parking. Of course at present, with 83% of the parking in Newtown being free and unrestricted, commuters have just as much priority as the majority of residents. As has been discussed before, there is a great deal of concern about the parking pressures in Newtown. Many cars from out of the area are parked here during the day while their owners are at work, either within Newtown, for instance at the hospital, or in the city – Newtown appears to have become an informal ‘park and ride’ destination for people catching buses to the CBD.

In the draft Policy [Section 4.5.5] it is suggested that where there is severe parking pressure as there is in Newtown) the existing parking scheme will be replaced by a new scheme based on a short stay (P120) approach with “resident exempt” permits for eligible residents. We have been

advocating for this to be adopted so we welcome this proposal, although the details of where and when this is applied needs further discussion. In some situations this might be necessary 24 hrs, 7 days a week, and in others restrictions that apply during business hours only might be more appropriate. We also cautiously approve of **car share parks** being given high priority. We understand that the details of any parking plan will be negotiated through area based planning so we expect that the balance of space for dedicated residents' parks and car share schemes will be worked out in that forum. We suggest that Newtown Avenue be considered as a suitable place for car share parks, and in addition suggest that EV charging stations for shared cars could be positioned here. This would give easy access for residents in the new apartments on the former Salvation Army site, which have no onsite parking of any sort.

Residents' Parking Permits

Unfortunately extending residents' parking and issuing more permits has its own complications. Even with the proposed priorities for issuing permits, essentially rationing availability, there are likely to be more people wanting permits than parking places available. In a low income area not everyone will be able to afford the fee for a parking permit. This will become more of an issue if the fees increase as a tool for managing demand, as foreshadowed in *Section 4.5.1: Proposed approach for pricing Council parking*. If the residents' parking zones cover most of the residential area, residents unable to afford the permit fee or unable to get one because they do not meet the criteria for permit priority, would be left with extremely limited access to parking, and those who can afford it would have no guarantee of getting what they are paying for.

We also submit that the hierarchy outlined for granting permits needs fine tuning. We would like to see more emphasis on permits being granted on the basis of need. The priority for mobility card holders is one aspect of this, but we note that the policy document acknowledges "...those who find active and public transport does not meet their needs, such as disabled people, older people, and parents with young children..." [Sec 1.1.1] and one of the draft Policy Objectives is to "Support access for all — ensure disabled people, older people, people who are pregnant, and people with babies can access car parks throughout the city..." We would like to see a process for granting residential parking permits that reflects this objective.

Possible solutions need to be worked through as part of the proposed area based planning.

Area based planning

We are aware that developing a Newtown Parking Management Plan has already been agreed, and the current expectation is that this will be developed hand-in-hand with consultation on the Newtown Connections project, planned for later this year. Our concern about this is that the timeframe for Newtown Connections is constantly being extended, and that when it does get underway the disputes over just where the cycle lanes will go are likely to be extended and difficult. We suggest that when the Parking Policy has been adopted there are a number of issues specific to local parking that should be discussed with the local community and residents, key employers, service providers and business stakeholders. This can be done independently of the larger Newtown Connections project. An example of this is fine-tuning of the proposed priorities for residents' parking permit eligibility.

Another issue is the involvement with key employers whose workers use on street parking. Wellington Hospital is the pre-eminent employer in the Newtown area, and the parking pressure from Hospital employees taking advantage of the unrestricted parking in most of our streets is a source of major frustration for residents, and also for visitors to Newtown (including hospital outpatients and visitors). In the past CCDHB had a role for a Transport Planner, and we wonder whether reinstating this role would be beneficial. Certainly a transport plan for employees, including public transport arrangements for shift workers, would be a step forward. We suggest including the Greater Wellington Regional Council in this area based planning discussion. We would like to get on with this as soon as possible.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. We would like the opportunity to speak to Councillors about it in the appropriate forum.

Angela Rothwell, President on behalf of the Mt Victoria Residents' Association Inc

The Mt Victoria Residents' Association Inc (MVRA) aims to improve the wellbeing of the residents in our neighbourhood in central Wellington through activities which include promoting the quality and heritage values of the built and natural environment of Mount Victoria and enhancing it as a place to live and visit.

Mt Victoria has nearly 50% of adults walk to work mode share, with most other residents using public transport or working from home. Mt Victoria has a resident parking scheme covering most of the suburb. This is similar to other inner-city suburbs and the central city. We support a move to carbon neutral travel in the near future.

We have been involved in Wellington's transport issues for many years, including the Let's Get Wellington Moving project to improve how people move through and about central Wellington for work, business and leisure.

General

The OECD report on environmental performance (*OECD Environmental Performance Reviews: New Zealand 2017*) is evidence that major efforts are needed to address serious shortcomings which our transport system must address:

- a. New Zealand's road transport emissions are the highest or among the highest per capita in the OECD for nitrogen and sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, non-methane volatile organic compounds and CO₂
- b. New Zealand stands out as one of the few OECD member countries that saw emissions of major air pollutants increase since 2000, with transport and industry the main drivers
- c. New Zealand's gross greenhouse gas emissions per capita and per unit of GDP remain among the five highest in the OECD, and have continued to rise, due mainly to road transport, the agricultural sector, manufacturing industries, and construction
- d. there has been insufficient development of alternative transport modes such as rail and public transport in New Zealand, and
- e. the mix of vehicle standards and taxes does not provide sufficient incentives to renew the vehicle fleet towards cleaner, more fuel-efficient vehicle technologies.

The Productivity Commission's April 2018 report on a low-emissions economy notes when compared to other developed countries, New Zealand's vehicle ownership rates are high, public transport use is low, and the vehicle fleet is old with poor fuel economy. Transport is one of the main sectors where deep emissions reductions are both necessary and possible given existing and emerging technology. The MVRA urges this report is considered, particularly its recommendation that the Government put emissions-reduction goals more centrally in government transport planning.

Parking Objectives

MVRA support the objectives with the addition of a specific objective to:

- parking management contributes to a reduction in climate change emissions

MVRA recommends the following objectives and would like to see them amended to:

- Support safe movement *and pleasant places*

Our 70% of public space that are roads include footpaths and pedestrian spaces which are used as the social gathering places of Wellington citizens. Roads are places for community as well as movement and should be reflected in the objectives. This is a key difference from existing transport policy.

- Support access for all

This should read as though it does include all people while identifying particular groups at most need of access – it is not clear whether this is access to car parking or access to spaces with well managed parking, for example, footpaths clear of vehicles so children can easily and safely walk to school.

Guiding Principles

Principle A

MVRA support iterative changes to move towards the parking objectives identified.

Consideration of impact on parking fee revenue needs more guidance on how this is intended to meet parking objectives. What priority is given to revenue compared with meeting other objectives. It is unclear if parking fees are to be full cost including environmental costs.

Principle B

This principle highlights the deficiency of the limited scope of the policy, which only addresses the 14% of central city parking that is council managed. This principle only applies to decreasing Council managed parking and not an overall decrease in car parking provision.

It should include all car parking.

Principle C

As written, this suggests that access by walking or public transport is not a WCC priority for all. Please rephrase to show that this is for those who require a car for mobility – not all disabled people can use cars, or older people, pregnant women or people with babies will want to use cars. WCC should prioritise support for walking, public transport and other active modes.

Principle D

MVRA supports this principle, pricing is an effective mechanism to manage parking demand in many situations. The principle that use of public road space for parking is a priced commodity needs to be made very clearly.

Principle E

Local area based parking plans seem like a good idea until we realise that this Parking policy has taken over two years to prepare and get to this point. Local plans have the disadvantage that they may end up with many different approaches to parking management around the city. For example, only in Rongotai /Miramar is the resident parking scheme provided 'free' to residents. Residents in other resident schemes pay to use the public road space. The idea that we should pay to use public road space only applies to some places.

Principle F

MVRA strongly supports this principle to use what existing space we have well, rather than expanding parking space. This includes not using footpaths as parking space at all.

Principle G

Maintaining good information on parking space availability in the central city seems like a good idea, as does providing this information to users. This service should be reflected in the price of car parking.

Principle H

MVRA support good monitoring and alignment of Council business with objectives. This should be alignment in the wider context of transport outcomes not just car parking objectives.

Parking space hierarchy

MVRA has concerns with the redefinition of the transport hierarchy used in the Parking Policy to include electric scooters and other vehicles in the same category as (human powered) bicycles. They are not active transport and should not take precedence over public transport. Electric motorised vehicles are similar to car-share and hire-vehicle users or motorbikes and should be included in one of those categories (page 10 Discussion document).

MVRA agree that safe and efficient movement of people and goods along roads (bus lanes etc) is an appropriate highest priority in all areas. MVRA do not agree that movement is the only function of footpaths and pedestrian areas – safe and efficient movement yes but also pleasant places for community activities that do not include movement, such as stopping for a chat.

Footpaths should not be used for any parking. MVRA seeks that footpaths are removed from consideration for parking of any vehicles including bikes. For example, in city fringe and inner suburbs it places motorbikes, bicycles and micromobility as low and lower priority, yet both of these user vehicles are currently allowed, even permitted, to park on footpaths in Mt Victoria. They take up valuable pedestrian space and cause obstacles to be navigated with difficulty by the more vulnerable of us.

Parks and other recreation facilities including off-street parking are not all about safe and efficient movement either. These places should support very low speed movement only which is not always equated with efficient movement.

In second and subsequent order priorities we assume that mobility means total mobility parking.

Key transport routes

Mt Victoria has several key transport routes

- Pirie Street and the Hataitai bus tunnel
- Number 20 Mt Victoria bus route up Hawker and Palliser Road
- SH1 access through the Mt Victoria tunnel

Access to parking for Wellington Boys College and St Marks School from Mt Victoria tunnel takes considerable road space

- Consider use of one car lane on both sides of Paterson Street as parking for school drop off in morning and evening peak. This would have the advantage of calming traffic during these times and reducing the car congestion caused by cars merging into the tunnel and speeding out of the tunnel. This would release a lot of space to increase footpaths and bus drop off along Dufferin St.

Central area

Electric vehicle charging has a higher priority than resident parking in the central area yet they are likely to often be the same users.

City fringe and inner suburbs

Inner city suburbs and city fringe – priority for mobility parks should have the same priority as for car share vehicles. EV chargers were intended for use by residents so should receive the same priority as resident parking.

WEGC and Clyde Quay School currently have parking issues at school times and like other schools need more effort to get students using public transport and walking to school.

Residential streets

EV chargers have been parked on footpaths in addition to the many other infrastructure and vehicle uses. Footpath space should be retained for pedestrians.

Parks, sports and other community facilities

Alexandra Road has many issues with car parking particularly around the SPCA and sports venues. These take up space along the road and make it less safe to walk. Commuter parking is uncontrolled but should be at least coupon parking. This area should be coupon parking and time limited.

Off-street parking

Pirie St children's play area already has issues with parking, with resident use and long term parking at times displacing children's ability to safely access the park.

Area-based approach

We note that the Policy sets out that private supply of parking will be considered in area-based plans but there is no policy guidance as to how this will happen.

Illegal parking requires a city-wide policy approach it will not be sufficient to leave that up to residents to complain and not fair to those most affected by illegal parking.

The needs of schools and early childhood centres should support the transport hierarchy and future we want and not some other default car parking hierarchy.

The needs for future transport improvements should not hold up parking reform now. For example, waiting for the Basin Reserve long term design to be resolved should not prevent better active school access now.

Illegal parking is a problem in Mt Victoria particularly of motorbikes on footpaths, and cars overhanging property boundaries and narrowing or obliterating footpath space (ie Melksham Towers).

There are significant resources both for WCC and residents required to achieve area based plans. It is unclear how area-based planning will work and there are Wellington examples of one group of residents overturning the work of another in the same suburb with both moving in different directions. Will plans be developed on a policy and evidence basis or on what some residents want basis? Newtown seems to be a focus because of the complaints – do Mt Victoria residents need to complain more to get a plan in place? Is this a good approach to managing issues?

There is an imbalance in occupancy and turnover in Mt Victoria as there are significantly more resident parking permits than resident space. MVRA would like to see this adjusted to match the demand more. Mt Victoria should not be a parking spot for out of suburb commuters or to provide parking for café patrons in the Courtenay Place area. The latter in particular is a health and safety matter, and safer means of travel should be encouraged.

Parking management tools

The intervention logic should include as a first step to encourage walking, public transport use and push cycles. A good database and monitoring of parking impacts and complaints would be required to target these tools. All inner city suburbs should be targeted for interventions to increase walking and public transport use in the first instance, both of which have high mode share now and show potential to be even higher mode shares. Combined with restricting commuter parking this would meet more climate and transport targets while alleviating parking pressures.

We would like to be heard in support of our submission.

Geordie Cassin Chairman on behalf of the Wellington District Council of the New Zealand Automobile Association (AA).

1. The District Council represents over 200,000 members. Although we are an organisation representing motorists all of our members are on occasions pedestrians and an increasing number are cyclists.
2. Our Council has carefully considered the proposed Parking Policy 2020. Our first comment is that we appreciate that significant time and effort has been put into developing this document. However, it was obviously written pre Covid-19. The policy needs to be revised to account for the long-term effects of the Covid-19 pandemic, including more people working from home and less demand for parking. We note that private parking operators are already offering discounts on parking of up to 25%.
3. Due to more people permanently working from home we predict that congestion in Wellington and other major cities will lessen as a result of Covid-19. As the long-term effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on traffic movements are unknown, we recommend that no decisions on parking changes be considered until we have been in Alert Level 1 for a minimum of 3 months.
4. We consider the Council's overall parking strategy is not clear. There are contradictory statements such as supporting business wellbeing but then also suggesting raising parking charges for the second hour. This will only encourage shoppers to go to a mall outside the CBD where parking is free. We therefore do not support any increases in parking charges.
5. If WCC propose to significantly reduce on-street parking in Wellington CBD they need to provide an attractive alternative if commercial businesses are to survive. Park and ride services are commonplace in many cities and are often free (e.g. Melbourne Tram).
6. Consequently we consider the parking plan for the CBD to be premature unless alternative arrangements are provided for shoppers such as park and ride.
7. We support measures to reduce bus travel times in peak hours to make using public transport more attractive. Removing the option of paying cash on-board buses should be at the top of any improvements and is common practice elsewhere e.g. Auckland. Also, legislation to force traffic to allow the bus back into the traffic lane is long overdue. Both of these measures should be introduced prior to introduction of further peak hour bus lanes.

We thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on this important issue and request the opportunity to make an oral submission to Council.

Alicia Hall on behalf of Millions of Mothers

Who are Millions of Mothers?

At heart, we are ordinary parents standing up for climate action, to ensure all children have a liveable planet to thrive on.

Cities designed with our children, elderly, disabled and vulnerable in mind will benefit everyone and our environment. We feel it's important to give people real choice and a sense of what is possible. When the best choices are the easiest, people will change and the knock on effects for the climate and Wellington's incredible biodiversity will be the ultimate win-win.

We **would** like to make an oral submission. We can be reached at: hello@millionsofmothers.org

Proposed Objectives

1. How important are these objectives to you?

We ranked the objectives as follows:

- Shift in type of transport used - Very important
- Safe movement - important
- Business wellbeing - important
- City amenity and safety - Very important
- Access for all - Very important
- Move to becoming an eco-city - Very important
- Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment - Important

2. Any **objectives you think** we've missed?

Support economic resilience and economic localism - parking should be one of the tools used (e.g. via the District Plan) to try and encourage urban centres to have more of the locally owned and smaller-scale businesses.

De-couple land use from private motor vehicle parking requirements - all minimum private car parking requirements should be phased out within an overall planning framework that supports liveability and the sustainable transport hierarchy

Use strong evidence and data, from here and elsewhere. There is an opportunity here to start trials to help people adjust to the LGWM change. Using evidence like SFPark is also useful to inform policy and developing good communication around this.

3. Any other comments?

No

Proposed Principles

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

- Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system. Helpful / Neutral
- Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it. Very helpful
- Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport. Very helpful
- Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives. Helpful
- Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support. Helpful
- Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply. Very helpful
- Provide parking space availability information Helpful
- Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance - helpful

5. Any principles we've missed?

Across all Council's avenues of influence (all tools, including communication and its own corporate practice) make best use of parking to change behaviour and achieve sustainable travel and liveable city goals. Communication MUST be better and stop perpetuating the idea that driving and parking are a right/entitlement. Please use the Talking About Urban Mobility guidance found here.

Where on-street private car parking is being provided in residential areas, prioritise parking for vehicles that best support mode shift and reduced car use. Examples are e-carshare and community travel vehicles, carshare (second priority), and private EVs (lower priority).

Allow automobile parking space to be used by non-cars (bikes, scooters, motorbikes) if they pay for it

Yes.

Enable the proliferation of good quality parking infrastructure for sustainable vehicles. Enable the creation of secure, weather-protected parking for other forms of transport (e-bikes, bikes, mopeds, scooters, e-scooters etc) so all streets in both residential and destination areas have parking that supports good mode choice. Especially encourage use of parking structures that have a traffic calming, greening or placemaking effect.

Transition of parking management must help reduce inequality rather than worsen it. Car-centric transport systems and urban form already exacerbate several forms of inequality, Good change will be disruptive and painful so the "pain" of change should be borne more by those most able to bear it. This should be well researched and minimise the potential for concern trolling.

6. Anything else you'd like to tell us about the principles?

"Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply" - this principle should be stronger, in light of principle A, to highlight that the council's role is about *decreasing* the current overall supply of parking in the central city and potentially elsewhere - eg at key recreation facilities to a level that private car travel is playing an optimal role across the city.

The Policy needs to be clear that there is currently an *oversupply* of parking and that people should expect to see less parking generally over time.

"Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives": the objective here should be to make better transport modes competitive: public transport, walking, scooting, cycling. Equity retrofits will of course be needed and are really important, but the base price of parking and of public transport should both be transitioned to the point where price plays its full role in making public transport realistically competitive. Consideration could be given to explicitly using parking revenue to support improved public transport services, walking, biking/scooting and street amenity in order to create a clear transition path in the mind of the public.

"Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support." Local area plans must be properly coupled to land use, and community responses and engagement are grounded in genuine need rather than simply fear of the loss of the status quo.

Parking Priority

Parking demands vary in different locations throughout the city. Prioritised parking will depend on what area of the city is being looked at, and what factors are being taken into account.

The top priority is safe and efficient movement of people and goods. The proposed hierarchy prioritises parking space use from the most important to least important for seven different areas of the city.

Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Strongly agree

Central City

High parking space **priority**: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space **priority**: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space **priority**: coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space **priority**: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Strongly agree

Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

10 To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Disagree

Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Disagree

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Disagree

Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger

service vehicles/taxi stands

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Disagree

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies? For all "centre" areas, logistics and deliveries parking that's provided should give priority and better provision to sustainable and low-impact delivery vehicles (e-cargo bikes, small e-vans instead of lorries etc) than traditional logistics vehicles. District Plans and consents should be changed to prevent use of large vehicles (HGVs et al) except in the small hours when the fewest people are around.

We also note that off-street loading zones *within buildings* provide a means of freeing up scarce corridor space for use by people, so we suggest a more nuanced approach here.

For all areas, we want to see parking provision firmly coupled to the desired movement modes *for the landuses*. For example, we want to see a landuse-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods instead of assuming "we're in the outer area, therefore residents' parking is a high priority". This would otherwise tie Wellington into sprawl.

Key transport routes: Agree with the caveat that movement and exchange need to be properly optimised on "key transport" routes that are also destinations, like Lambton Quay.

In places like this, urban design features, and to a lesser extent bike/micro-mobility parks, can significantly improve the amenity and thereby vibrancy of a street and should have higher priority than the other types listed in here.

On bus and other high-capacity public transport routes, parking must not impact peak time public transport function *at all* and ideally never.

City Fringe: We rated this "disagree" because dedicated car share and bike and micromobility parking should be higher up in the priority list as they provide the most space efficient options for point to point transport alternatives vs. private car ownership. Residents' parking should be prioritised ahead of commuter parking but is not a higher priority than measures to reduce car dependence overall.

Outer residential: Outer residential areas generally have a high degree of car dependence; a high priority needs to be given to provision for alternatives in key locations. This is part of creating the

infrastructure for 20 minute “urban villages” and supporting increased density and low car-use neighbourhoods in key areas. Furthermore, it’s bizarre that mobility parking should be a lower priority than residents’ parking. These should at least be swapped, hence our “agree”.

We would like to see a land use-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods and doesn’t assume “we’re in the outer area, therefore residents’ parking is needed”.

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

Recreation travel, sports travel and other non-commuter travel are key areas for public transport growth in Wellington. Provision of bus stops, and public bus layover need to be given high priority as part of supporting the sustainable transport hierarchy for non-commuter travel.

Pricing Approach

We are proposing to implement demand-responsive pricing.

This means that in areas of high demand, where it is difficult to get a park, the price would go up to encourage people to park elsewhere or stay for less time.

In areas of low demand, pricing would go down, to encourage more people to park in these areas at these times.

For more in depth information regarding the proposed pricing approach, please see page 16 in the Statement of Proposal.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

16. Anything else you’d like to say about it?

- We are principally in agreement with pricing parking to meet demand, however this is not sufficient. Parking supply and pricing must be strongly linked to land use. We cannot emphasise this enough, and it applies to every single area type described above. The current descriptions are broad-brush and need to be focussed more tightly to land use, like the active travel catchment of schools.
- A commuter parking levy is a sensible sounding idea: the new state highways being built and the new sprawling developments north of Wellington city centre (including in Wellington city) will impose a serious car-dependent pressure on Wellington city centre. We’ll need all kinds of positive pressure to discourage commuting by car, and a levy is one tool.
- Council must lobby whomever in central government to clarify or amend the LGA such that council can charge to reflect the opportunity cost of on-street residents’ parking. If cost recovery is to remain in the law, clarify so it can include recovering to the public the opportunity cost of the space. We cover this more in the resident parking section.
- Council should have a clear eye on what outcomes are being sought, and which tools are right for which outcomes. Revenue-raising can cloud our judgment, and obscure the value of tools that achieve higher-order goals like emissions reduction.

- Minimum pricing for parking needs to be maintained to provide incentives for use of alternatives to the private; parking pricing must support the overall sustainable transport hierarchy and mode shift for the city's big outcomes rather than be seen simply as means of shuffling vehicles between high and low demand locations.
- Real-time pricing and space availability information should be very readily accessible, to minimise cruising. We should amp up the smart cities element of parking management to the maximum, but also ensure that really basic, low-tech information is provided too so noone driving and looking for a park ends up cruising.

Residents' Parking Scheme

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

Y Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Y Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

N Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Y Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Y Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Y Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Y Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Y Introduce online application and permitting system

Y Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

Y If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Y Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents' parking permits

18. Please rank the following categories in order of priority [for getting a residents' parking permit] with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1 Mobility permit holders 2 EV owners with no off-street parking 3 Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking 4 Other

pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking 6 All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
5 Businesses located with the zone 7 = New dwellings/homes built after 2020 7 = Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Address equity issues using a solid evidence base

Any changes to residents parking needs to avoid penalising people on lower incomes who rent, and may have limited choice about where they can find rentals. Such people are also more likely to have shift work, or irregular gigs, and may also live in higher density households. Where people on low incomes own cars they are more likely to have raised loans to finance them. Furthermore, the council does not have good information about whether properties are single flat or multi-flat dwellings.

A scheme which allocates permits on the basis of property rather than occupancy will tend to favour low occupancy dwellings over higher occupancy dwellings. There are several ways to address this, for example:

- Allocate permits per household as a percentage of occupancy, rather than equally across all households (eg households are entitled to have permit for 50% of adult occupants)
- Reduce the price for permits for tenants as compared with owner-occupiers
- Introduce income-based pricing for permits

Any such policies need to be supported by good information and research.

A revised Resident/Coupon Exemption parking system: To ensure that there is adequate road space for other land use within resident parking areas going forward, we call for a halt to expansion of resident parking zones and instead to move towards more coupon parking exemptions for residents. This will provide more flexible and reliable parking options for residents in the area by allowing parking to be spread across the area. Residents with resident parks will still be able to park anywhere in a coupon parking spot as they can currently.

To ensure that any new solution does not indiscriminately disadvantage existing residents (renters, workers etc.) we encourage grandfathering into the system of existing users, at current prices for their resident and coupon exemption parking permits, for the period that they reside at that address.

Going forward, we would encourage all new permits issued to only be coupon exemptions, and be priced more closely to the existing coupon parking permit costs. For reference, a monthly coupon park is \$2400 a year (\$200/month). Presently, resident coupon exemptions are provided at \$120/year, or a 95% discount. These coupon exemption permits make up 23% of the overall 'resident parking' scheme, yet the opportunity cost of these discounted permits was \$3.9m in 2018.

We encourage the council to provide newly issued permits at a price range of 30-50% discount for off existing coupon parking rates on a monthly basis. As this is not a resident parking scheme, but instead a 'concession for residents to existing coupon parking', we believe that this would be permissible under the LGA.

Millions of Mothers recognises that this will raise questions of equity. This is understandable - any increases to parking are inevitably going to hit low-income households. Any such changes ought to factor in the proposals noted above, to address these.

In addition we note the following

1) **Proposed system does not affect any current residents:** As all existing residents would keep their existing parking arrangements at the current prices, they will not be subject to any changes in equity. We recognise that this may affect future residents in their decision to move to the inner suburbs which are currently subject to the resident parking schemes.

A number of the Millions of Mothers group are renters in these areas. We can assure the councillors that parking was just one of the factors in the decision to move to the location, as was proximity to town, the cost of rent and other variables. If a new parking system was to be implemented, the cost of parking would be but just another factor among many in our decision to move, as it currently is if we choose to live in downtown where there is no resident parking provided at a discount.

2) **It assumes that inner city suburb residents need cars:** Wellington already faces the most expensive cost of living in New Zealand with transport (predominantly cars) being the third largest spending category after food and rent. Many residents in these areas already use or own micromobility vehicles, ride the bus, walk or use Mevo to get around, and mode shares of these are growing. We encourage the council to recognise that the residents of these suburbs do not view car-ownership as a necessity, and to focus on equitable transition in the context of these trends.

3) At present, providing a relatively low-cost residents parking scheme, coupled with the coupon-parking exemptions, means the council is foregoing significant revenue. If increased revenue is invested in supporting measures which enable a transition away from car dependence the increased prices are likely to be both more acceptable and more equitable. Rather than simply being seen as a rationing device, parking charges are then more explicitly tied to broader sustainability and equity objectives.

With further densification planned in these areas that will enable better mass transit links and non-private car transport options, we encourage council to not let these arguments stop them from acting.

Additional Parking for Car Share Companies

We encourage the council to provide residents parking to e-carshare companies. One carshare park can replace up to 15 households' car ownership, so this is a really important way to help households transition off owning and running and storing their own car.

Additional Parking for Micromobility/Bikes/Mopeds

We would also encourage the development of micromobility parking infrastructure for bikes/scooters on-road - see earlier comments. Areas with residents parking often don't have easily accessible and safe locations to store the burgeoning transport modes of e-bikes, scooters as well as more traditional mopeds. Secure parking on road areas would be welcomed.

Barriers to public transport use

There are other factors that influence why people drive and need parking. We'd like to understand how you choose your mode of travel.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Public transport is too expensive

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

Multiple people come with me on this journey

I don't have a bike or want to purchase one

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

23. Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

YES ,we would like to make an oral submission

Alicia Hall on behalf of Connect Wellington

Who are Connect Wellington?

At heart, we are a group of people who care deeply about how we all live and move in Wellington and invest our time and energy in making things better.

We are inspired by our shared awareness that designing a city with our most vulnerable people, our environment and the climate in mind will benefit everyone, and by the urgency of the challenges we all face. What's good for nature can also be what's good for people and communities. Win-win win. Our towns and cities can be great places for everyone to flourish, and for nature, our children, and our children's children to thrive. So what does our ideal city look like? Slower streets. Beautiful and welcoming public spaces. Clean water. Fresh air. Places that are a joy to move and linger in, and where people feel they belong. Walking is safe and straightforward, and public transport is so easy and cheap that you can't resist it. Connected bike networks are safe enough for anyone. And yep, less space for cars. The most important thing we are advocating for is to give people real choice and a sense of what is possible. When the best choices are the easiest, people will change.

We **would** like to make an oral submission. We can be reached at: hello@connectwellington.org.nz

Proposed Objectives

1. How important are these objectives to you?

We ranked the objectives as follows:

- Shift in type of transport used - Very important
- Safe movement important
- Business wellbeing important
- City amenity and safety - Very important
- Access for all - Very important
- Move to becoming an eco-city - Very important
- Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment - Important

2. Any **objectives you think** we've missed?

Support economic resilience and economic localism - parking should be one of the tools used (e.g. via the District Plan) to try and encourage urban centres to have more of the locally owned and smaller-scale businesses vs the large-format, parking-heavy and also typically offshore-owned businesses.

De-couple landuse from private motor vehicle parking requirements - all minimum private car parking requirements should be phased out. Rather than assuming parking is needed, decisions about whether land and building space are used for parking can be left to developers, within an overall planning framework that supports liveability and the sustainable transport hierarchy

Use strong evidence and data, from here and elsewhere. We have a great head start on smart city infrastructure for parking, and should be doing trials especially to prime us ahead of LGWM change. Evidence like SFPark is also so extremely compelling and should be a key pillar of the policy and – crucially – the comms about it.

3. Any other comments?

No

Proposed Principles

4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

- Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system.

Helpful / Neutral

- Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it. Very helpful
- Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport. Very helpful
- Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives. Helpful
- Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support. Helpful
- Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply. Very helpful
- Provide parking space availability information Helpful
- Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance - helpful

5. Any principles we've missed?

Across all Council's avenues of influence (all tools, including communication and its own corporate practice) make best use of parking to change behaviour and achieve sustainable travel and liveable city goals. Driving and parking are neither a right nor an entitlement, and both the discourse and the policy tools need to stop perpetuating that framing. Please use the Talking About Urban Mobility guidance.

Where on-street private car parking is being provided in residential areas, prioritise parking for vehicles that best support mode shift and reduced car use. Examples are e-carshare and community travel vehicles, carshare (second priority), and private EVs (lower priority).

Allow automobile parking space to be used by non-cars (bikes, scooters, motorbikes) if they pay for it Self-evident. The current policy assigns a right to occupy space solely to cars.

Enable the proliferation of good quality parking infrastructure for sustainable vehicles. Enable the creation of secure, weather-protected parking for other forms of transport (e-bikes, bikes, mopeds,

scooters, e-scooters etc) so all streets in both residential and destination areas have parking that supports good mode choice. Especially encourage use of parking structures that have a traffic calming, greening or placemaking effect.

Transition of parking management must help reduce inequality rather than worsen it. Car-centric transport systems and urban form already exacerbate several forms of inequality, Good change will be disruptive and painful so the “pain” of change should be borne more by those most able to bear it. This should be well researched and minimise the potential for concern trolling.

6. Anything else you’d like to tell us about the principles?

“Primarily focus the Council’s role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply” - this principle should be stronger, in light of principle A, to highlight that the council’s role is about *decreasing* the current overall supply of parking in the central city (and potentially elsewhere - eg at key recreation facilities) to a level that private car travel is playing an optimal role across the city.

The Policy needs to be clear that there is currently an *oversupply* of parking and that people should expect to see less parking generally over time. As a minimum, the aim should be no new provision even as new development comes on line. “Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives”: the objective here should be to make better transport modes competitive: public transport, walking, scooting, cycling. Equity retrofits will of course be needed and are really important, but the base price of parking and of public transport should both be transitioned to the point where price plays its full role in making public transport realistically competitive. Consideration could be given to explicitly using parking revenue to support improved public transport services, walking, biking/scooting and street amenity in order to create a clear transition path in the mind of the public.

“Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support.”

Local area plans must be properly coupled to land use, and involve a solid process of dialogue so that community responses and engagement are grounded in genuine need rather than simply fear of the loss of the status quo..

Parking Priority

Parking demands vary in different locations throughout the city. Prioritised parking will depend on what area of the city is being looked at, and what factors are being taken into account.

The top priority is safe and efficient movement of people and goods. The proposed hierarchy prioritises parking space use from the most important to least important for seven different areas of the city. For more in depth information regarding parking priority, please see pages 13-15 in the

Statement of Proposal .

Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Strongly agree

Central City

High parking space **priority** : bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space **priority**: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space **priority** : coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space **priority**: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Strongly agree

Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

10 To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Disagree

Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Disagree

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Disagree

Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Disagree

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

For all "centre" areas,

Logistics and deliveries parking that's provided should give priority and better provision to sustainable and low-impact delivery vehicles (e-cargo bikes, small e-vans instead of lorries etc) than

traditional logistics vehicles. District Plans and consents should be changed to prevent use of large vehicles (HGVs et al) except in the small hours when the fewest people are around.

We also note that off-street loading zones *within buildings* provide a means of freeing up scarce corridor space for use by people, so we suggest a more nuanced approach here.

For all areas, we want to see parking provision firmly coupled to the desired movement modes *for the landuses*. For example, we want to see a landuse-coupled parking approach that enables

20-minute neighbourhoods instead of assuming “we’re in the outer area, therefore residents’ parking is a high priority”. This would otherwise tie Wellington into sprawl.

Key transport routes: Agree with the caveat that movement and exchange need to be properly optimised on “key transport” routes that are also destinations, like Lambton Quay.

In places like this, urban design features, and to a lesser extent bike/micro-mobility parks, can significantly improve the amenity and thereby vibrancy of a street and should have higher priority than the other types listed in here.

On bus and other high-capacity public transport routes, parking must not impact peak time public transport function *at all* and ideally never. It’s simply a daft tradeoff.

City Fringe:

We rated this “disagree” because dedicated car share and bike and micromobility parking should be higher up in the priority list as they provide the most space efficient options for point to point transport alternatives vs. private car ownership. Residents’ parking should be prioritised ahead of commuter parking but is not a higher priority than measures to reduce car dependence overall.

Outer residential:

Outer residential areas generally have a high degree of car dependence; a high priority needs to be given to provision for alternatives in key locations. This is part of creating the infrastructure for 20 minute “urban villages” and supporting increased density and low car-use neighbourhoods in key areas. Furthermore, it’s bizarre that mobility parking should be a lower priority than residents’ parking. These should at least be swapped, hence our “agree”. We would like to see a land use-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods and doesn’t assume “we’re in the outer area, therefore residents’ parking is needed”.

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

Recreation travel, sports travel and other non-commuter travel are key areas for public transport growth in Wellington. Provision of bus stops, and public bus layover need to be given high priority as part of supporting the sustainable transport hierarchy for non-commuter travel.

Pricing Approach

We are proposing to implement demand-responsive pricing.

This means that in areas of high demand, where it is difficult to get a park, the price would go up to encourage people to park elsewhere or stay for less time.

In areas of low demand, pricing would go down, to encourage more people to park in these areas at these times. For more in depth information regarding the proposed pricing approach, please see page 16 in the Statement of Proposal.

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Y

16. Anything else you'd like to say about it?

- We are principally in agreement with pricing parking to meet demand, however this is not sufficient. Parking supply and pricing must be strongly linked to land use. We cannot emphasise this enough, and it applies to every single area type described above. The current descriptions are broad-brush and need to be focussed more tightly to land use, like the active travel catchment of schools.
- A commuter parking levy is a sensible sounding idea: the new state highways being built and the new sprawling developments north of Wellington city centre (including in Wellington city) will impose a serious car-dependent pressure on Wellington city centre. We'll need all kinds of positive pressure to discourage commuting by car, and a levy is one tool.
- Council must lobby whomever in central government to clarify or amend the LGA such that council can charge to reflect the opportunity cost of on-street residents' parking. If cost recovery is to remain in the law, clarify so it can include recovering to the public the opportunity cost of the space. We cover this more in the resident parking section.
- Council should have a clear eye on what outcomes are being sought, and which tools are right for which outcomes. Revenue-raising can cloud our judgment, and obscure the value of tools that achieve higher-order goals like emissions reduction.
- Minimum pricing for parking needs to be maintained to provide incentives for use of alternatives to the private; parking pricing must support the overall sustainable transport hierarchy and mode shift for the city's big outcomes rather than be seen simply as means of shuffling vehicles between high and low demand locations.
- Real-time pricing and space availability information should be very readily accessible, to minimise cruising. We should amp up the smart cities element of parking management to the maximum, but also ensure that really basic, low-tech information is provided too so noone driving and looking for a park ends up cruising.

Residents' Parking Scheme

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

Y Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Y Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

N Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Y Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Y Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Y Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Y Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Y Introduce online application and permitting system

Y Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

Y If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Y Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents' parking permits

18. Please rank the following categories in order of priority [for getting a residents' parking permit] with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1 Mobility permit holders

2 EV owners with no off-street parking

3 Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking

4 Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking

6 All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space

5 Businesses located with the zone

7 = New dwellings/homes built after 2020

7 = Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Address equity issues using a solid evidence base

Any changes to residents parking needs to avoid penalising people on lower incomes who rent, and may have limited choice about where they can find rentals. Such people are also more likely to have shift work, or irregular gigs, and may also live in higher density households. Where people on low

incomes own cars they are more likely to have raised loans to finance them. Furthermore, the council does not have good information about whether properties are single flat or multi-flat dwellings.

A scheme which allocates permits on the basis of property rather than occupancy will tend to favour low occupancy dwellings over higher occupancy dwellings. There are several ways to address this, for example:

- Allocate permits per household as a percentage of occupancy, rather than equally across all households (eg households are entitled to have permit for 50% of adult occupants)
- Reduce the price for permits for tenants as compared with owner-occupiers
- Introduce income-based pricing for permits

Any such policies need to be supported by good information and research.

A revised Resident/Coupon Exemption parking system:

To ensure that there is adequate road space for other land use within resident parking areas going forward, we call for a halt to expansion of resident parking zones and instead to move towards more coupon parking exemptions for residents. This will provide more flexible and reliable parking options for residents in the area by allowing parking to be spread across the area. Residents with resident parks will still be able to park anywhere in a coupon parking spot as they can currently. To ensure that any new solution does not indiscriminately disadvantage existing residents (renters, workers etc.) we encourage grandfathering into the system of existing users, at current prices for their resident and coupon exemption parking permits, for the period that they reside at that address.

Going forward, we would encourage all new permits issued to only be coupon exemptions, and be priced more closely to the existing coupon parking permit costs. For reference, a monthly coupon park is \$2400 a year (\$200/month). Presently, resident coupon exemptions are provided at \$120/year, or a 95% discount. These coupon exemption permits make up 23% of the overall 'resident parking' scheme, yet the opportunity cost of these discounted permits was \$3.9m in 2018. We encourage the council to provide newly issued permits at a price range of 30-50% discount for off existing coupon parking rates on a monthly basis. As this is not a resident parking scheme, but instead a 'concession for residents to existing coupon parking', we believe that this would be permissible under the LGA.

Connect Wellington recognises that this will raise questions of equity. This is understandable – any increases to parking are inevitably going to hit low-income households. Any such changes ought to factor in the proposals noted above, to address these.

In addition we note the following

1) **Proposed system does not affect any current residents:** As all existing residents would keep their existing parking arrangements at the current prices, they will not be subject to any changes in equity. We recognise that this may affect future residents in their decision to move to the inner suburbs which are currently subject to the resident parking schemes. A number of the Connect Wellington group are renters in these areas. We can assure the councillors that parking was just

one of the factors in the decision to move to the location, as was proximity to town, the cost of rent and other variables. If a new parking system was to be implemented, the cost of parking would be but just another factor among many in our decision to move, as it currently is if we choose to live in downtown where there is no resident parking provided at a discount.

2) **It assumes that inner city suburb residents need cars:** Wellington already faces the most expensive cost of living in New Zealand with transport (predominantly cars) being the third largest spending category after food and rent. Many residents in these areas already use or own micromobility vehicles, ride the bus, walk or use Mevo to get around, and mode shares of these are growing. We encourage the council to recognise that the residents of these suburbs do not view car-ownership as a necessity, and to focus on equitable transition in the context of these trends.

3) At present, providing a relatively low-cost residents parking scheme, coupled with the coupon-parking exemptions, means the council is foregoing significant revenue. If increased revenue is invested in supporting measures which enable a transition away from car dependence the increased prices are likely to be both more acceptable and more equitable. Rather than simply being seen as a rationing device, parking charges are then more explicitly tied to broader sustainability and equity objectives. With further densification planned in these areas that will enable better mass transit links and non-private car transport options, we encourage council to not let these arguments stop them from acting.

Additional Parking for Car Share Companies

We encourage the council to provide residents parking to e-carshare companies. One carshare park can replace up to 15 households' car ownership, so this is a really important way to help households transition off owning and running and storing their own car.

Additional Parking for Micromobility/Bikes/Mopeds We would also encourage the development of micromobility parking infrastructure for bikes/scooters on-road - see earlier comments. Areas with residents parking often don't have easily accessible and safe locations to store the burgeoning transport modes of e-bikes, scooters as well as more traditional mopeds. Secure parking on road areas would be welcomed.

Barriers to public transport use

There are other factors that influence why people drive and need parking. We'd like to understand how you choose your mode of travel.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Public transport is too expensive

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies

I need my vehicle for work

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

None of these, I use public transport regularly

I have / I care for someone who has a mobility impairment that means I need to use a private vehicle

Other (please specify)

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

Multiple people come with me on this journey

I don't have a bike or want to purchase one

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Other (please specify)

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

23. Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

YES ,we would like to make an oral submission

John Milford on behalf of the Wellington Chamber of Commerce

ABOUT THE CHAMBER

The Wellington Chamber of Commerce (the Chamber) has been the voice of business in the Wellington region since 1856 and advocates for policies that reflect the interest of Wellington's business community, in both the city and region, and the development of the Wellington economy as a whole. The Chamber is accredited through the New Zealand Chamber of Commerce network.

Through our three membership brands, the Wellington Chamber of Commerce, Business Central and ExportNZ, our organisation represents around 3,600 businesses across the central and lower North Island. Our organisation is one of the four regional organisations that make up the Business New Zealand family and is also accredited through the New Zealand Chambers of Commerce network.

INTRODUCTION

The Chamber welcomes the opportunity to submit on Wellington City Council's *Parking Policy Statement of Proposal 2020* (Parking Policy) consultation.

As a representative of businesses in the Wellington region, all of whom are impacted by the city's car park availability and wider transport system, the Chamber has a very real stake in the outcome of this consultation. As the city looks towards economic recovery post COVID with changing ways of moving, working, technologies, and lifestyles, the Chamber hopes that this consultation is an opportunity to support the very heartbeat of our city, our business community, to survive, revive, and thrive.

OUR VIEW

Wellington needs a more efficient transport system. As the years go by, the issues only become sharper in focus. We need major change and we need it to happen faster, particularly with the expected population growth. We support the intent of this consultation - how we allocate road space for parking and manage parking differently to support our growing population is absolutely critical.

Wellington has a parking problem and limited parking options for a number of reasons, be it strengthening and construction work, earthquake closures, and the development of cycleways and laneways. Businesses are concerned about parking and access in the city. This is a common concern highlighted in our quarterly business confidence surveys. One recent comment, pre-COVID, was that 'with the significant loss of parking facilities, is making the city a very unfriendly place to meet in'. That's the last thing we want to be said of our city, certainly as we need to do all we can to encourage people back into the city post COVID. Solutions need to be found to ensure we're not exacerbating matters and closing off the CBD to recovering economic activity. The Chamber is concerned about access for users, and this needs to be a paramount consideration.

The below table, provided in the policy consultation documents, reinforces what we anecdotally hear from members. While a better measure would be spaces to regional residents or indeed spaces to commuters, regardless it shows Wellington's current parking numbers are tight.

Like the consultation documents states, the city needs to make better use of our limited road space while helping to reduce the city's carbon emissions. We agree this means moving more people using fewer vehicles; more public transport use, walking and cycling and fewer people driving and parking in busy areas. Acknowledging that there are many competing demands for the CBD and city's limited street space, it is imperative that the primary focus of the Council's parking policy supports access to businesses who are located within the central city, allowing for customer access as well as servicing and deliveries to buildings.

The Chamber is supportive transforming the way Wellingtonian's travel and the wider transport system, be this the reprioritisation of car parks, and in particular we support the greater encouragement and improvement of public transport use and pedestrianisation of parts of our city. However, echoing the issues we raised in previous consultations on these issues, we remain concerned by the Council's approach.

Firstly, Wellington's transport system must be dealt with holistically. Dealing with parking perceivably as an isolated issue will lead to poor policy outcomes, as it fails to recognise the wider impact. We note where this sits within the wider travel and transport system related documents that guide Council decision-making. However, it is the decisions made on parking policy that will impact on the effectiveness of the other parts, particularly where these are not sequenced correctly

Secondly, we are concerned that until the bigger problems are addressed – such as increasing public transport capacity and reliability and improving corridor accessibility and flow – the blunt policy solutions recommended here, like the removal of parks, will only exacerbate current issues rather than resolve them. With a growing population and the city's most critical transport improvements still decades away, these comparably small changes could create a much bigger transport problem. If the city is to begin removing and reprioritising parks, we need the wider infrastructure improvements to be sped up, so we are not caught short as demand increases.

Finally, we are concerned this is a pursuit of a particular ideology than pragmatic policy solutions, given the Council's recent traffic resolution proposals on Stout, Victoria and Featherston Streets appeared to be 'policy by stealth'. Wellington cannot afford to take purely ideologically driven actions on our transport system. The Council has collected a great deal of information from their smart parking technology, summarised in the consultation background documents, and we believe that Council must use rely on this data – on demand, capacity and accessibility – to inform and make its decisions. There is no doubt the New Zealand experience is unique and indeed Wellington, given its geographical constraints, is certainly unique. We would urge Council come up with locally based solutions, rather than simply remove carparks, or at the least as is perceived to be by the business community.

The Chamber supports changes that will ensure the overall improvement of the transport network. However, Council must make decisions based on the balance of its impact to all stakeholders – walkers, cyclers, public transport users, drivers, businesses, school children, parents, service vehicles, tourism operators and more – and be mindful of the economic disruption and impacts.

WHAT OUR MEMBERS SAY

Before sharing our specific thoughts on the elements of this consultation, we wish to share the thoughts of our members. These comments help form our policy position and we trust that the Council will consider these comments in their policy process.

It is important that we put on the record the direct feedback from Wellington businesses. It our members view is that finding a park in the central city is getting harder and harder. This is not just anecdotal feedback but is drawn from our regular quarterly business confidence survey. This survey is regionally distributed, so attracts comments from businesses from all around Wellington region and Lower North Island. The feedback reveals that pre-COVID steadily growing concerns about the ease of access and the ease of doing business in the Central city.

These comments are in response to a question on what members believe is holding the city, region, or their own business, back. Responses to this question were unprompted. These comments are taken from the three quarterly surveys pre-COVID lockdown.

- “Getting around the city - still nowhere to put a truck to unload it. Constant enforcement of parking when no alternatives are provided.”
- “The lack of parking in the city as well as places to be able to pick up and drop off passengers.”
- “Parking to visit clients (not in a position to use public transport) and the one-eyed view of the Wellington City Council against cars which at the moment remain a necessity.”
- We need “Parking in the central city for short term parking (up to 4 hours) rather than the commuters - who stop those who need to visit the city.”
- “Lifting through-traffic out of the CBD by way of flyover or tunnels. Not implementing the mayor's plan for light rail and reduction of parking in the CBD. Naive projects.”
- “Although I am a cyclist, I find the anti-Motor car movement worrying, lack of car parking and deliberate restrictions on roading.”
- “Parking is a big issue - there is so little of it around.”
- “Lack of parking in Wellington and now the council is charging for parking on weekends. This significantly reduces visitors to Wellington and makes it uneconomical to open on the weekend.”
- “Parking to visit clients (not in a position to use public transport) and the one-eyed view of the Council against cars, which at the moment remain a necessity.”
- “Getting around the city - still nowhere to put a truck to unload it. Constant enforcement of parking when no alternatives are provided.”
- “Roading. The adverse effect of increased cycle lanes on traffic flow and the lack of parking in the city as well as places to be able to pick up and drop off passengers.”

PART 1: PROPOSED OBJECTIVES

In principle, the Chamber supports the objectives put forward in the Parking Policy consultation, though with a caveat and an extension.

- City amenity and safety; Safe movement; Access for all; Move to becoming an eco-city; Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment.

- o The Chamber supports these objectives.

- Shift in type of transport used

- o The Chamber supports this, but we believe the focus should be on corridors, not modes. Each mode has a purpose and regardless of how good one option gets; it is not practical for every scenario.

- Business wellbeing

- o The Chamber absolutely supports this objective. The business community has played a major role in the re-invigoration of the inner-city in the last few decades, and it will continue to play this role for years to come. We want Wellington to be a great place to work, shop, dine, exercise and live. For this the businesses that service the city must have a city that serves their needs.

- o Business wellbeing includes loading zones for servicing businesses. COVID-19 has highlighted the consumer shift toward home delivery and this will only continue. Loading zones must remain on key routes to service businesses. For example, Lambton Quay is often not accessible via the Terrace and it remains unclear what is planned for the streets running adjacent to the Golden Mile. If Council wishes to maintain the great business environment we have on key routes, they need to ensure that they can be easily serviced.

PART 2: PROPOSED PRINCIPLES

The Chamber supports all but one of these principles.

- Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system.

- o The Chamber supports this principle and implores the Council to make decisions on 'improvements' data-driven.

- Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport.

- o The Chamber supports this principle.

- Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives.

- o The Chamber supports this principle and will expand on our thinking for pricing later in this submission. Pricing should be dynamic and balance the policy objectives with the vibrance and usefulness of the city for all stakeholders.

- Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support.

- o The Chamber supports this principle.

- Provide parking space availability information.

- o The Chamber supports this principle.
- Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance.
- o The Chamber supports this principle.
- Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it.
- o The Chamber supports this principle.
- Primarily focus the Council’s role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply.
- o The Chamber does not support this objective. The Chamber encourages Council to increase its off-street parking supply and will expand on this recommendation later in the submission.

PART 3: PARKING PRIORITY

A: Key Routes (Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay etc)

- **High priority:** Bus stops
- **Low priority (“unlikely to be accommodated”):** Urban design, mobility, loading zone, bike/micro-mobility, car share, EV charge, short-stay, motorbike, rideshare/taxi, public bus layover
- **Lowest priority:** Bus/coach, residents, commuter

The Chamber has some concerns about the level of information provided and seeks further clarification regarding the proposal for park prioritisation on key transport routes.

Firstly, it would be helpful if both the consultation and the eventual policy specifies what the ‘key routes’ are – we note the wording in the consultation documentation “key transport routes have not been identified in the policy to provide for flexibility as bus and other public transport routes may change over time”. This is unhelpful.

What one might consider a ‘key transport route’, such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, Taranaki St, Featherston St, and Kent Terrace all vary in their use, traffic volumes and level of importance. To give bus stops high priority, with everything else deemed a low priority (which Council has labelled as ‘unlikely to be accommodated’) is problematic, potentially short-sighted, and will more-than-likely result in poor policy implementation that does not serve the needs of our city. These are considerably vast routes, and bus stops will make up but a small percentage of the route that could be used more effectively. For example, the Council has utilised ‘no parking’ signs during certain times of day to manage traffic demand, where this is appropriate this should continue to do so along these routes. We need to understand what this looks like for each key transport route, and how the route interacts with the activity around it.

Secondly, as mentioned, these ‘key transport routes’ serve vastly different purposes. Lambton Quay has heavy foot traffic and provides workplaces, retail and cafes. Thorndon Quay has minimal foot-traffic with destinations, large retail and services. Willis and Taranaki Streets are lined by hotels, accommodation complexes, retail and hospitality. To treat these vastly different, and very

important, transport routes as the same is poorly considered. For example, loading zones for retail businesses are exponentially more important on Lambton Quay than on Taranaki St given retail density, space restrictions and access considerations. The point can also be illustrated when considering Thorndon Quay vis a vis others given the nature of businesses along this route we must prioritise customers and delivery companies alike access to pick up beds, carpet and homewares.

Finally, loading zones and short-stay parks need to be listed as a medium priority at the very minimum, particularly on the two listed key routes (Thorndon and Lambton Quay). Both corridors are lined with businesses, who rely on service vehicles for inbound and outbound goods. Even with hoped modal shifts, these needs will not change.

The Let's Get Wellington Moving team highlighted in the Golden Mile consultation the problems with loading zone back-up on Lambton Quay, causing congestion. Removing or lessening the number of loading zones on these routes is likely to exacerbate the problem, not remove it. With sensible planning and control of when loading zones can be used, the transport system can flow effectively. This means providing ample space for loading zones. Short-stay parks (stated by Council to be up to 180 minutes) also play a very important role for the vibrance of the city. Such parks provide opportunities for people to pick up and drop off goods or people, do some shopping, go to a meeting or appointment. Such parks are important for the economy, the livelihood of businesses and the convenience of the city's citizens. Again, data-driven planning on timing means such parks can co-exist with bus lanes and more effective flow for our key transport routes.

The Chamber firmly recommends that this approach is reconsidered, clarified, and amended. Having loading zones and short-stay parks 'unlikely to be accommodated' in these locations is of real concern given the imperative to support economic activity, and Council must be clearer on what the key transport routes are.

B: Central City

- **High priority:** Bus stops, mobility, urban design, bike/micro-mobility, loading zones, short-stay
- **Medium Priority:** Rideshare/taxi, car share, EV charging, motorbike
- **Low priority ("unlikely to be accommodated"):** Coach/bus
- **Lowest priority:** Public bus layover, residents, commuter

In principle, the Chamber supports this proposal for park prioritisation, though with one important caveat. With short-stay parks and loading zones listed as 'high priority', the Chamber expects that Council's actions reflect this.

The recent proposals for Stout St, Victoria St, Hunter St and Featherston St are not, in no uncertain terms, treating short-stay parks and loading zones as a high priority. If the Council does not intend to treat these as high priorities, then the Chamber suggests greater transparency from the Council about such plans.

Further, access to Lambton Quay – this is one very important road within a major network of roading, so any changes must ensure it is seen as part of the bigger picture. We know that each year about 3.5 million people get on and off buses along this stretch of road with over 500,000 of them getting on and off outside Farmers and over 578,000 outside David Jones. With this number

of people using public transport along Lambton Quay there's no doubt that any suggestion removing access to it will have a serious impact on the retail businesses there, so we support public transportation along this route. The Chamber is also concerned about what happens to the parking spaces on the side streets between Willis Street and Parliament, and how vehicles would circulate should access to Lambton Quay close. We have been approached by member businesses who operate within this area, who are concerned about any changes to the status quo. We must emphasise the need for practical solutions. A solution also needs to be found around how deliveries to businesses would work, because most businesses along Lambton Quay do not have delivery access available from The Terrace.

C: Suburban Centres (Shopping precincts)

- **High priority:** Bus stops, mobility, urban design, bike/micro-mobility, short-stay
- **Medium Priority:** Loading zones, motorbike, rideshare/taxi, car share, EV charging
- **Low priority:** Public bus layover, coach/bus
- **Lowest priority:** Residents, commuter

The Chamber supports this proposal for park prioritisation.

D: City Fringe & Inner-City Suburbs

- **High priority:** Bus stops, urban design, resident, car share
- **Medium Priority:** Mobility, EV charging
- **Low priority:** Short stay, loading zones, bike/micro-mobility, public bus layover
- **Lowest priority:** Rideshare/taxi, motorbike, commuter, coach/bus

The Chamber supports this proposal for park prioritisation.

E: Outer Residential Areas

- **High priority:** Bus stops, urban design, resident
- **Medium Priority:** Car share, mobility, EV charging
- **Low priority:** Short stay, loading zones, public bus layover
- **Lowest priority:** Bike/micro-mobility, rideshare/taxi, motorbike, commuter, coach/bus

The Chamber does not wish to comment on this proposal for park prioritisation, as it is not within our domain.

F: Council Parks, Sports, Recreation and Community Facilities

- **High priority:** Bike/micro-mobility, mobility, motorbike, short stay, bus/coach, urban design
- **Medium Priority:** EV charging
- **Low priority:** Car share, rideshare/taxi, resident, commuter

- **Lowest priority:** Public bus layover, loading zones, bus stops

The Chamber supports this proposal for park prioritisation.

G: Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

- **High priority:** Mobility, bike, motorbike, short-stay
- **Medium Priority:** Car-share, EV charging, commuter
- **Lowest priority:** Loading zones, coach/bus, public bus layover, urban design, bus stop, resident, rideshare/taxi

The Chamber largely supports this proposal for park prioritisation, though wish to offer an adjustment and a suggestion.

The Chamber believes that commuter parks must be given high priority status for off-street parking too. As previously discussed, Wellington still has major capacity and reliability issues with its public transport network. Until these problems are completely solved, a decline of commuter car parks – in conjunction with a swelling population – will lead to a much bigger transport, and subsequently economic, problem. Further, weather, work requirements, commute distance, and family schedules all contribute to these alternatives not being viable for many.

The Chamber suggests that Council increase the amount of Council off-street parking in Wellington. We agree that cleaning up the streets, pedestrianizing and improving efficiency will be great for the city. This can all be achieved by providing space for people to park off-street. Further, it can provide an ongoing source of revenue for the Council to contribute to projects such as Let's Get Wellington Moving.

As the city's population continues to grow, the number of cars on the road will not necessarily decline, even though the percentage of the population owning a car likely will. Personal vehicles serve a purpose, and they need to be provided space within the city. Why not make that space off-street?

We suggest that the Council have commuter parks as a high priority for off-street parking and increase their off-street parking options. This will provide the Council with additional revenue as well as helping create greater pedestrianisation, cleanliness and flow for the city's streets. Dynamic and data-driven pricing can be used to ensure occupancy levels that meet the city's needs and ensure the smoothest possible multi-modal transport system possible.

PART 4: PRICING APPROACH

The Chamber supports the Council's proposal for demand-responsive pricing. That is, in areas of high demand, the price would go up to encourage people to park elsewhere or stay for less time, and in areas of low demand, pricing would go down.

The Council has invested a large amount of capital expenditure on smart parking data, this should be utilised to inform demand-responsive pricing that is dynamic. The smart data information provided in the "Background Information and Issues Report" is a good starting point to inform the outcome of this further. Certain parking areas that are high- or low-demand are not always so

during every hour and every day of the week. The pricing should reflect this. Where an area is high-demand all day from Monday to Friday, but low-demand on Saturday and Sunday, the pricing should be responsive to this. Further, if an area is high-demand in the morning but low-demand in the afternoon, the pricing should be responsive to this.

Further we note the comments in the consultation material, regarding the PayMyPark app, which allows users to see available sensor parking spaces in real time, that this “may help.” We would agree and support greater promotion and use of this app, perhaps this has been underutilised as a tool.

The Council, businesses, and residents are all better off with heavily occupied parks at a truly demand-reflective price than with heavily occupied parks on some days of the week or during some hours of the day.

The Chamber encourages the Council to implement demand-responsive pricing that is dynamic across the hours of the day and days of the week.

PART 5: BARRIERS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT USE AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES

The Chamber cannot provide comment on the individual experiences of people with the public transport system. However, we wish to share our thinking on non-car alternatives in Wellington.

Much of the city’s transport system is at capacity and there have been multiple incidents in the last 12 months that demonstrate how unreliable it can be. Further, our post-COVID world is going to be a very different one to pre-COVID. Whether people will opt to use public-transport daily remains to be seen. The primary alternative to driving – public transport – needs improvement and a major increase in capacity if the Council is to continue removing public on-street car parks.

Further, regardless of how good our public transport or cycleways get, some factors will dissuade people from using these modes of transport, such as weather, work requirements, commute distance, and family schedules. As the population continues to grow, the Council must remember this.

Ultimately, the Council is pushing Wellingtonians towards alternative modes of transport but are yet to have the infrastructure in place for this to work and, further, fail to recognise that personal vehicles will continue to have a place in the city either way.

The Chamber encourages the Council to speed up improvements to its public transport capacity and reliability. Otherwise, the removal of parks may have a negative impact on individual experiences within the city.

The Chamber would support greater provision of mobility and “other” designated user parks but based on an occupancy that matches all car parks. Where space-by-space occupancy for these targeted parks falls below 50 per cent we would recommend a review. We understand “other” designated could mean parents with babies or click and collect shoppers, and this reflects a targeted approach to provide access and availability to the city which we note several businesses who themselves own car parks, have recently implemented.

PART 6: CONGESTION CHARGING

Finally, the Chamber reaffirms its support for congestion charging and/or other user-pays options to be introduced in the city. Wellington has several vital infrastructure projects on the horizon and needs all options on the table to fund them. A revenue source that simultaneously aids the easing of congestion can only be good for the city.

Higher rates and/or cutting back on vital infrastructure is not acceptable when the city faces difficult transport, water and resilience challenges. Rates alone cannot get Wellington to where it needs to be, and the Chamber implore the Council to reintroduce the matter to Government, and advance discussions with the Opposition on the possibility of congestion charging and/or other user-pays options.

CONCLUSION

The Chamber is supportive of improving and encouraging public transport use, of greater pedestrianisation. A city that moves better is a city that is good for business and good for residents.

We trust that Council will take on board the Chamber's feedback and suggestions and we look forward to further discussions about them.

Kind regards,

John Milford Chief Executive Wellington Chamber of Commerce

Keven Snelgrove on behalf of Tranzit Group

Tranzit Group welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on the Wellington City Council's (the Council) Parking Policy (the Policy).

As a company playing a significant role in Wellington's tourism and transport sector and generating income into the regional economy, Tranzit would specifically like to address:

- Coaches and buses play a significant role in the safe and sustainable movement of people and tourists in Wellington. They also significantly contribute to the Wellington economy with coach tour passengers typically staying two nights in Wellington and spending more at local cafes and restaurants.
- We would like the Council to place a greater priority on coach and bus parking in this Policy as well as provide both short term and long-term parking solutions that support safe and welcoming coach parking areas in Wellington. These include at event and conference venues, hotels, and major sightseeing attractions such as Te Papa, Weta Workshop, Zealandia, Old St Paul's, Mt Victoria Summit and Parliament.
- Urgently address the importance of safe and well-located loading zones for passengers getting onto and off coaches in Wellington.
- Identify a designated area in the city or on the city fringes, where buses and coaches can standby for 30 minutes, so they can remain near to major events and venues.
- Identify a designated area, or areas, in the city or on the city fringes where buses and coaches can "lay-over" at night. This area, or these areas, need to be looked at with a long-term vision to ensure more coaches can lay-over during peak tourism periods and have the potential to expand for future growth. It is important to note that many coaches and their drivers that layover in Wellington are based out of either Auckland or Christchurch so overnight parking is essential.
- Ensure a greater emphasis on coach parking is considered by event organisers during the planning stage of a large event as well as highlight lay-over locations for the duration of an event.
- Ensure town planners and commercial developers factor in sufficient coach parking when submitting their plans to Council to ensure parking infrastructure needs are met.
- To offer cruise guests the best visitor experience whilst they are in Wellington, they need to be able to wander and enjoy each location safely and without the concern of finding their coach in a major bottle neck of coaches all needing parking. The designated shuttle parking to greet passengers off the cruise ships at Centre Port, often takes away coach parking for the other coaches.

Tranzit Group would like the Council to seriously consider our submissions to the Policy to provide the necessary support for coach parking in Wellington.

Tranzit Group would also like to make an oral submission on the Policy.

Introduction

Tranzit Group is an award-winning, family owned transport and tourism company operating throughout Aotearoa, New Zealand.

Preparing to celebrate its centenary in 2024, Tranzit is a leader in its field bringing key family values into the workforce and exceptional customer service for all its passengers and clients. Employing over 1500 staff and operating more than 1500 vehicles nationwide, including 11 electric buses, Tranzit has the flexibility to meet all transport requirements and is a significant contributor to the local economy.

Tranzit Group has also been researching and developing electric bus technology since 2014. It believes this sustainable technology is the future of public transport in New Zealand and as the leaders in the industry, is committed to continuing to lead the way for more 100% electric buses on New Zealand roads. In addition to operating 10 Electric Double Deck Vehicles (EVDDs) in Wellington, it also collaboratively introduced a fully battery-powered electric bus servicing Auckland University of Technology's Northcote and Manukau campuses.

In Wellington, Tranzit Group and its subsidiary companies operate on multiple levels. Tranzit Group's tourism businesses include: Pacific Tourways Ltd with clients such as Grand Pacific Tours, Ultimate New Zealand, AAT Kings, Trafalgar, Contiki Holidays to name but a few; Hammonds Wellington Tours; as well as charter company Wellington Coachlines and urban transport provider Tranzurban. Between them they offer:

- charter coaches for small, medium, or large-scale events;
- charter coach services for international and domestic tourists under Pacific Tourways Ltd and Hammonds Wellington Tours;
- charter coaches for cruise ship excursions as well as delivering shuttle services for passengers around Wellington city;
- the delivery of Ministry of Education school bus contracts as well as contracted school runs for individual schools;
- Tranzurban operates part of the Metlink bus network in Wellington in collaboration with Greater Wellington Regional Council and completes train replacement contracts as and when needed.

Tranzit Group's Position

Tranzit Group supports the Policy's focus on ensuring the easy movement of people, tourists, and goods around Wellington in a sustainable manner. Active modes and public transport are critical to moving people around Wellington and achieving sustainability goals. However, the Policy does not place enough emphasis on providing for the safe and appropriate parking of coaches and buses during the daytime and overnight. It also does not consider coach parking during the peak tourism season.

To ensure Wellington is a welcoming and friendly place to visit by bus and coach, and to enhance the visitor experience of staying in the city, providing solutions that support coach parking is important. These can only also serve to support the city's tourism message, add to economic growth and ensure all visitors are safe.

Issues Tranzit would like to address in this Submission:

1. Loading zones and Coach Parking in Wellington

Currently, there is a lack of coach parking in Wellington which puts pressure on coach tours wanting to increase their length of stay in the city. This also puts pressure on operators who are transporting passengers to and from events in Wellington. And this lack of parking is not inviting for visitors to the City who are using buses for long distance travel.

In addition, there are very few locations where passengers can safely load onto and unload off a bus. Wakefield Street is often already taken up with buses or shuttles and no long-term coach parking is allowed during the day, just drop off and pick up. The signage on Wakefield is confusing (please refer to photo 1).

Platform 9 at the Wellington Railway Station is rarely available to use and in terms of being one of the main welcome point for visitors to the city, it can be cold, wet and uninviting – a description that is the antithesis of how WellingtonNZ.com is trying to promote the city.

There are also limited bus parks available on Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace, which Tranzit understands are likely to be removed as part of Let's Get Wellington Moving. Tranzit believes this will only increase pressure and create logistical difficulties for operators and passengers due to reducing the smooth and easy access of operators and passengers to major Wellington venues, and thereby decrease the positive experience people have when visiting Wellington.

By way of example, in 2019 Capital E held its School Fest programme as part of the New Zealand Festival Arts. Tranzit transported 15,000 Wellington students over a two-week period to venues such as Te Papa, Hannah Playhouse, St James Theatre, and the Opera House. With such large numbers, the issue of safely loading and dropping off passengers become paramount. Second to this, Tranzit struggled to park buses for the duration of the event due to lack of coach parking in the city.

2. Overnight Parking:

Currently overnight coach parking in Wellington is extremely limited. We would like the Council to identify a designated area, or areas in the city or around the city fringes, where coaches can “lay-over” at night.

Most hotels do not have enough onsite parking for coaches and their guests. In addition, the time-limits are often unrealistic operating from 7pm – 8am. With some tour groups only doing half-day sightseeing trips, the question begs, where do we park the coach for the other half of the day? During peak touring times, some operators will ask their coach drivers to lay-over at Te Papa which in turn takes up spaces for the public and coaches that have a genuine need to park there.

3. Event Planning:

Event planners need to place a greater emphasis on transport and coach parking in the early stages of planning an event, especially large-scale events, as well as providing for lay-overs for coaches during the event.

This is because transport to and from an event is often the last thing planners think about and it can result in unnecessary stress for all involved. However, having transport front of mind is one of the most responsible things an event planner can plan for, as it eliminates a variety of logistical issues and ensures the safety of guests.

4. Hotels and planning for future hotel developments

Current situation

Whilst we acknowledge the Council is doing a great job on one side of promoting the city as a tourist and/or events destination, there needs to be more emphasis in this Policy on coach parking at hotels and afore mentioned safe loading zones.

Several hotels in Wellington have limited coach parking. One such example is the James Cook Grand Chancellor on The Terrace has one dedicated parking zone on the footpath outside the hotel. This hotel is a major series tour hotel with numerous tours staying throughout the touring season. The driver needs to reverse the coach into the coach park on to the footpath while at the same time watch for pedestrians plus cars entering or exiting the James Cook Carpark that pass behind the coach.

In a busy season, the Grand Chancellor hotel for example will have Grand Pacific Tours with S Series and R Series – each completing four movements over two or three days. With several tours in town, we are talking about 40 + movements. That means that is 160 times that the driver is expected to back up for that tour – and that is only one tour operator.

At the Ibis, coach drivers have to fight with the taxi drivers for a parking space which is not a good look for the passengers or hotel guests.

Future developments

When new hotels are being built in Wellington, we would like more onus put on the developer to allow for coach parking and a safe loading zone. For e.g.: Neither the Mercure Hotel or QT Hotel have suitable space for coaches with guests often having to off-load on a footpath or even with no space at all.

5. Cruise ships

In October 2019, WellingtonNZ.com issued a media release saying that 123 cruise visits will occur during the summer season, until April 2020. That topped the previous year's record number of visits of 110. This meant more than quarter of a million tourists will arrive in Wellington, accompanied by a further 100,000 crew. Obviously, the season was cut slightly short due to COVID-19, but this media release suggests what visitor numbers are coming into Wellington – on cruise ships only – during the peak tourism season. These figures do not represent coach tours visiting at the same time nor reflect domestic visitation through events, conferences or those visiting family and friends.

To offer cruise guests the best experience in Wellington they need to be able to safely wander and enjoy each location without the concern of finding their coach in a major bottle neck of coaches all needing parking.

This positive experience begins the moment they disembark a vessel at Centre Port where passengers are met by different operators. The designated shuttle parking to greet these passengers often takes away coach parking for the other coaches.

The parking at key Wellington attractions such as the Mt Victoria summit, the Botanic Gardens and Old Saint Pauls (once reopened) all have very serious parking concerns on a cruise day. With Wellington wanting more and larger cruise ships there is an increased need to cater for the number of coaches needed to deliver a first-class experience in Wellington city. It is even more important that this experience is positive so these cruise passengers, who are here for a short time, wish to return for a longer stay.

On cruise ship days, there can be as many as 5 -10 + coaches all wanting parking in the aforementioned city attractions for 15-30 minutes. This needs to be in a safe, orderly, and logical fashion. However, because parking is currently so limited it is now a major issue and creates lengthy delays for our visitors and is one of the biggest stresses for our professional driving teams. Despite driving teams from different companies trying to work together, there are always delays for passengers forced to sit in a coach as it manoeuvres out of a bus park. More well thought out coach parking is desperately needed.

In addition, major Wellington attraction Te Papa has limited coach parking. If you have a group booking at the museum, Zealandia, or Weta the only option a driver has is to drop off and collect due to major coach parking limitations. Transit understands the planned new Wellington Convention Centre, across the road, has no coach parking planned. This will rely on drop off only and passengers crossing the busy which is not ideal nor is it safe.

5a. Wakefield St

The other key consideration this Policy needs to give is for parking on Wakefield Street, near the Wellington i-SITE Visitor Information Centre Cruise. This location is where shuttles use the tour stop opposite Amora Hotel and where all small sightseeing operators relocate and depart from the Amora Hotel side of the street, which is currently coned off due to building works.

This popular and central site works well only with support from Wellington Ambassador teams, as this requires several people to redirect passengers safely across pedestrian crossings. Here small sightseeing coaches also need to do U-turns in Wakefield Street which can pose some safety issues at times. Transit Group understands investigations were taking place and looking at part of Wakefield Street (Victoria St to Cuba St) becoming one way and leading to the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Cuba and Wakefield Streets which will help make traffic flows work better and should be safer for pedestrians and passengers. Regardless of whether this goes ahead or not, the health and safety of people and drivers needs to be a priority.

Another issue along Wakefield Street is long term parking overnight. The photo (on page 3) clearly shows the sign, which causes confusion within the coach industry. Some coach drivers do not read the sign properly and they can be parked there in the middle in the morning well after 6am and this makes for a challenging time, especially on a cruise day, but also a normal day with a number of sightseeing operators requiring short term parking. It can take a long time to locate the driver to move the offending coach.

As a short-term solution, Transit Groups recommends the Council erects a less ambiguous sign but also pleads the Council find a permanent coach parking in this part of town with its nearby venues Wellington Town Hall, Michael Fowler Centre, the library and of course the i-SITE.

6. Stadium Access:

Transit currently finds providing transport for groups to games at Sky Stadium cost prohibitive for a lot of school and charity groups. Reason being there is no suitable “drop off/Pick up zone” for Sky Stadium, which often leaves them needing to apply for a coach permit that costs \$110.00 and is not always available. This is often the make or break for group organisers to attend stadium events. There should be better suitable drop off zones for events held at the stadium ultimately opening the opportunity for people to travel in groups and less reliance on private transport.

7. Churches

In Wellington, many churches have very limited coach access. When providing transport to and from a wedding or funeral or mass gathering at a church, again it is important to recognise the safe carriage and ability to load and offload passengers.

The New St Pauls on Molesworth Street parking is hit and miss, and Boulcott St for St Mary’s of the Angles is non-existent, especially during peak business hours.

Conclusion

Transit Group believes coach parking has not been a priority in town planning in Wellington for many years. For the Capital City of New Zealand to function well and become the “go to” conference and events Capital, coach parking needs to be urgently addressed especially with a new convention centre underway.

This will help encourage the smooth and easy movement of people, tourists, and goods around Wellington in a sustainable manner and also vastly improve those people’s experience of visiting, working and staying in Wellington.

Transit Group thanks the Council for this opportunity to make a written submission and looks forward to making an oral submission on the Parking Policy as well.

Jackie Pope/Ann Mallinson, co-Presidents on behalf of the Oriental Bay Residents Association

The Oriental Bay Residents Association has considered the Parking Policy 2020 Statement of Proposal, and would comment as follows:

1. We assume we come under the category City Fringe and Inner City Suburbs. Our comments are made on that assumption.
2. We support a hierarchy of use for inner city parking in Oriental Bay for residents, and we want short stay to have a similar priority.
3. We agree with the proposal that commuters should have a low priority.
4. We do not support rationing residents' parking to only one space per house that has no off-street parking.
5. If however Oriental Bay is viewed as a key transport route, we would object strongly to residents having such a low priority.
6. The Recreation category needs to be expanded to include beach-side parking, to enable short stay visitors to enjoy the Oriental Bay Beach.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on this important matter. If oral submissions are available, we would like to speak to our submission.

Jackie Pope/Ann Mallinson

Co-Presidents, Oriental Bay Residents Association

Isabella Cawthorn

Individual submitter

Proposed Objectives

How important are these objectives to you?

Shift in type of transport used - Very important

Safe movement – important

Business wellbeing – important

City amenity and safety - Very important

Access for all - Very important

Move to becoming an eco-city - Very important

Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment - Important

Any objectives you think we've missed?

De-couple landuse from private motor vehicle parking requirements.

all minimum private car parking requirements should be phased out. Rather than assuming parking is needed, decisions about whether land and building space are used for parking can be left to developers, within an overall planning framework that supports liveability and the sustainable transport hierarchy.

Have a strong evidence base, from here and elsewhere.

Evidence like [SFPark](#) is also so extremely compelling and should be a key pillar of the policy and – crucially – the comms about it. Don't let "we don't have Wellington data" be used spuriously to block change, where Wellington is in fact exactly the same as elsewhere.

Also, we have a great head start on smart city infrastructure for parking, and should be doing trials especially to prime us ahead of LGWM change.

Support economic resilience and economic localism.

Parking should be one of the tools used (e.g. via the District Plan) to try and encourage urban centres to have more of the locally owned and smaller-scale businesses vs the large-format, parking-heavy and also typically offshore-owned businesses.

Any other comments?

Nope

Proposed Principles**4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?**

Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system. Helpful / Neutral

Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it. Very helpful

Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport. Very helpful

Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives. Helpful

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support. Helpful

Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply. Very helpful

Provide parking space availability information Helpful

Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance - helpful

5. Any principles we've missed?

Across all Council's avenues of influence (all tools, including communication and its own corporate practice) make best use of parking to change behaviour and achieve sustainable travel and liveable city goals. Driving and parking are neither a right nor an entitlement, and both the discourse and the policy tools need to stop perpetuating that framing.

The Talking About Urban Mobility guide should be used for all communication.

Where on-street private car parking is being provided in residential areas, prioritise parking for vehicles that best support mode shift and reduced car use.

E.g. e-carshare and community travel vehicles, carshare (second priority), and private EVs (lower priority).

Enable the proliferation of good quality parking infrastructure for sustainable vehicles.

Enable the creation of secure, weather-protected parking for other forms of transport (e-bikes, bikes, mopeds, scooters, e-scooters etc) so all streets in both residential and destination areas have parking that supports good mode choice. Especially encourage use of parking structures that have a traffic calming, greening or placemaking effect too.

The transition of parking management must help reduce inequality rather than worsen it. Car-centric transport systems and urban form already exacerbate several forms of inequality. Good change will be disruptive and painful so the "pain" of change should be borne more by those most able to bear it. This should be well researched and minimise the potential for concern trolling by public figures.

6. Anything else you'd like to tell us about the principles?

"Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support."

Local area plans must be properly coupled to land use, and involve a solid process of dialogue so that community responses and engagement are grounded in genuine need rather than simply fear of the loss of the status quo.

“Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives” –

the objective here should be to make better transport modes competitive: public transport, walking, scooting, cycling. Equity retrofits will of course be needed and are really important, but the base price of parking and of public transport should both be transitioned to the point where price plays its full role in making public transport realistically competitive. Consideration could be given to explicitly using parking revenue to support improved public transport services, walking, biking/scooting and street amenity in order to create a clear transition path in the mind of the public.

“Primarily focus the Council’s role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply” –

this principle should be stronger, in light of principle A, to highlight that the council’s role is about *decreasing* the current overall supply of parking in the central city (and potentially elsewhere – e.g. at key recreation facilities) to a level that private car travel is playing an optimal role across the city.

The Policy needs to be clear that there is currently an *oversupply* of parking and that people should expect to see less parking generally over time. As a minimum, the aim should be no new provision even as new development comes on line.

Parking Priority

7. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Strongly agree

8. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Strongly agree

9. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

10 To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Disagree

11. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Disagree

12. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Disagree

13. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Disagree

14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

For all "centre" areas,

Logistics and deliveries parking that's provided should give priority and better provision to sustainable and low-impact delivery vehicles (e-cargo bikes, small e-vans instead of lorries etc) than traditional logistics vehicles.

District Plans and consents should be changed to prevent use of large vehicles (HGVs et al) except in the small hours when the fewest people are around. There are lots of neat and cheap innovations in this area overseas and we should use them. No more 18-wheelers coming into Tory St during the daytime!

I note too that off-street loading zones within buildings provide a means of freeing up scarce corridor space for use by people, so suggest a more nuanced approach here.

For all areas, I'd like to see parking provision firmly coupled to the desired movement modes *for the landuses*. For example, a landuse-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods instead of assuming "we're in the outer area, therefore residents' parking is a high priority". The current approach is tying Wellington into sprawl.

Key transport routes:

Agree with the caveat that movement and exchange need to be properly optimised on "key transport" routes that are also destinations, like Lambton Quay.

In places like this, urban design features, and to a lesser extent bike/micro-mobility parks, can significantly improve the amenity and thereby vibrancy of a street and should have higher priority than the other types listed in here.

On bus and other high-capacity public transport routes, parking must not impact peak time public transport function *at all* and ideally never. It's simply a daft tradeoff.

City Fringe:

I disagree because dedicated car share and bike and micromobility parking should be higher up in the priority list as they provide the most space efficient options for point to point transport alternatives vs. private car ownership. Residents' parking should be prioritised ahead of commuter parking but is not a higher priority than measures to reduce car dependence overall.

Outer residential:

Outer residential areas generally have a high degree of car dependence; a high priority needs to be given to provision for alternatives in key locations. This is part of creating the infrastructure for 20 minute "urban villages" and supporting increased density and low car-use neighbourhoods in key areas. Furthermore, it's bizarre that mobility parking should be a lower priority than residents' parking. These should at least be swapped, hence our "agree".

I would like to see a land use-coupled parking approach that enables 20-minute neighbourhoods and doesn't assume "we're in the outer area, therefore residents' parking is needed".

Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities:

Recreation travel, sports travel and other non-commuter travel are key areas for public transport growth in Wellington. Provision of bus stops, and public bus layover need to be given high priority as part of supporting the sustainable transport hierarchy for non-commuter travel.

Pricing Approach

15. Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes

16. Anything else you'd like to say about it?

I agree in principle with pricing parking to meet demand, but the policy isn't strong enough. Parking supply and pricing must be strongly linked to the desirable movement for the nearby land use. I cannot emphasise this enough, and it applies to every single area type described above. The current descriptions are broad-brush and need to be focussed more tightly to land use, like the active travel catchment of schools.

Council must lobby whomever in central government to clarify or amend the LGA such that council can charge to reflect the opportunity cost of on-street residents' parking. If cost recovery is to remain in the law, clarify so it can include recovering to the public the opportunity cost of the space. See Residents' parking section.

A commuter parking levy is a sensible sounding idea: the new state highways being built and the new sprawling developments north of Wellington city centre (including in Wellington city) will impose a serious car-dependent pressure on Wellington city centre. We'll need all kinds of positive pressure to discourage commuting by car, and a levy is one tool.

Minimum pricing for parking needs to be maintained to provide incentives for use of alternatives to the private; parking pricing must support the overall sustainable transport hierarchy and mode shift for the city's big outcomes rather than be seen simply as means of shuffling vehicles between high and low demand locations.

Real-time pricing and space availability information should be very readily accessible, to minimise cruising. We should amp up the smart cities element of parking management to the maximum, but also ensure that really basic, low-tech information is provided too so no-one driving and looking for a park ends up cruising

Council should have a clear eye on what outcomes are being sought, and which tools are right for which outcomes. Revenue-raising can cloud our judgment, and obscure the value of tools that achieve higher-order goals like emissions reduction.

Residents' Parking Scheme

17. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?

Please tick all that apply.

- Y Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking
- Y Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
- N Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking**
- Y Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits
- Y Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)
- Y Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone
- Y Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)
- Y Introduce online application and permitting system
- Y Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use
- Y If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive
- Y Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Allocation of residents' parking permits

18. Please rank the following categories in order of priority [for getting a residents' parking permit] with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

- 1 Mobility permit holders
- 2 EV owners with no off-street parking
- 3 Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
- 4 Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
- 7 All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
- 5 Businesses located with the zone
- 6 New dwellings/homes built after 2020
- 8 Second permits

19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents' parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Address equity issues using a solid evidence base

Any changes to residents parking needs to avoid penalising people on lower incomes who rent, and may have limited choice about where they can find rentals. Such people are also more likely to have shift work and may also live in higher density households. Where people on low incomes own cars they are more likely to have raised loans to finance them. Furthermore, the council does not have good information about whether properties are single flat or multi-flat dwellings.

A scheme which allocates permits on the basis of property rather than occupancy will tend to favour low occupancy dwellings over higher occupancy dwellings. There are several ways to address this, for example:

Allocate permits per household as a percentage of occupancy, rather than equally across all households (e.g. households are entitled to have permit for 50% of adult occupants)

Reduce the price for permits for tenants as compared with owner-occupiers

Introduce income-based pricing for permits

Any such policies need to be supported by good information and research.

Transition to a better Resident Parking - Coupon Exemption system:

Wellington needs to stop the expansion of resident parking zones and instead move towards more coupon parking exemptions for residents.

This will provide more flexible and reliable parking options for residents in the area by allowing parking to be spread across the area. Residents with resident parks will still be able to park anywhere in a coupon parking spot as they can currently.

To ensure that any new solution does not indiscriminately disadvantage existing residents (renters, workers etc) Council should do grandfathering into the system of existing users, at current prices for their resident and coupon exemption parking permits, for the period that they reside at that address.

Going forward, I encourage all new permits issued to only be coupon exemptions, and be priced more closely to the existing coupon parking permit costs. For reference, a monthly coupon park is \$2400 a year (\$200/month). Presently, resident coupon exemptions are provided at \$120/year, or a 95% discount. These coupon exemption permits make up 23% of the overall 'resident parking' scheme, yet the opportunity cost of these discounted permits was \$3.9m in 2018.

I encourage the council to provide newly issued permits at a price range of 30-50% discount for off existing coupon parking rates on a monthly basis. As this is not a resident parking scheme, but instead a 'concession for residents to existing coupon parking', the LGA shouldn't be a barrier.

I recognise that this will raise questions of equity. This is understandable - any increases to parking are inevitably going to hit low-income households. Any such changes ought to factor in the proposals noted above, to address these.

Further:

Proposed system does not affect any current residents: As all existing residents would keep their existing parking arrangements at the current prices, they will not be subject to any changes in equity. Obviously this may affect future residents in their decision to move to the inner suburbs which are currently subject to the resident parking schemes, but people will take that into account.

I have many friends who rent in these areas and they're all very clear that parking was just one of many factors in their decision to move in there. If a new parking system was to be implemented, the cost of parking would be but just another factor among many in our decision to move, as it currently is if we choose to live in downtown where there is no resident parking provided at a discount.

The current scheme assumes that residents of inner city suburbs need cars: Wellington already faces the most expensive cost of living in New Zealand with transport (predominantly cars) being the third largest spending category after food and rent. Many residents in these areas already use or own micromobility vehicles, ride the bus, walk or use Mevo to get around, and mode shares of these are growing. I encourage the council to recognise that the residents of these suburbs do not view car-ownership as a necessity, and to focus on equitable transition in the context of these trends.

At present, council is foregoing significant revenue – providing a relatively low-cost residents parking scheme, coupled with the coupon-parking exemptions. If increased revenue is invested in supporting measures which enable a transition away from car dependence the increased prices are likely to be both more acceptable and more equitable. Rather than simply being seen as a rationing device, parking charges are then more explicitly tied to broader sustainability and equity objectives.

With further densification planned in these areas that will enable better mass transit links and non-private car transport options, I encourage council to not let these arguments stop them from acting.

Additional Parking for Micromobility/eBikes/Mopeds etc

I'd also like to see encouragement of the development of micromobility parking infrastructure for bikes/scooters on-road - see earlier comments.

Areas with residents' parking often don't have easily accessible and safe locations to store the burgeoning transport modes of e-bikes, scooters etc. Secure parking in the road corridor would be welcomed.

Additional Parking for Car Share Companies

I encourage the council to provide residents parking to e-carshare companies.

One carshare park can replace up to 15 households' car ownership, so this is a really important way to help households transition off owning and running and storing their own car.

Barriers to public transport use.

20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Public transport is too expensive

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me – principally for going to the airport, otherwise I've got used to it

Public transport route has too many transfers – for going from Plimmerton to (e.g.) one of the southern suburbs, or to the Hutt

Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies

I need my vehicle for work

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

None of these, I use public transport regularly

I have / I care for someone who has a mobility impairment that means I need to use a private vehicle

Other – The timetable sometimes doesn't suit for going home later in the evening. Weeknights if I miss a train it's an hour til the next one, so that can cramp my style for weeknight going out because it makes it a really late night before work the next day

21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

Multiple people come with me on this journey

I don't have a bike or want to purchase one

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Other (please specify)

22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

No

23. Please check below if you want to make an oral submission

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission

Michelle Rush, Transport Portfolio Leader on behalf of the Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group

This submission is from the Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group. ERG has submitted on an earlier draft of the parking policy (2019). Click [here](#) to see the comments provided.

If you are not familiar with ERG, please see the background information provided here:

<p>Purpose of the Environmental Reference Group (ERG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise Council on the best ways to improve Wellingtonian’s quality of life environmentally, socially, culturally and economically by protecting and enhancing the local environment. Bring knowledge and insight into Council around the environment, including water, energy, waste, biodiversity, urban design and transport management, in the context of Council’s roles and priorities.
<p>ERG Principles guiding advocacy on transport and land use planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wellington should minimise the use of private vehicles, by modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport, and by reducing the need for people to travel. The footprint of the transport system should be reduced, by travel demand management, choice of transport modes, and good design. Transport disadvantage that has no travel demand management benefits should be eliminated. Transport corridors should be managed as public spaces that deliver multiple benefits, including biodiversity, recreation and amenity benefits, and public spaces should support walking and other active transport journeys. Land use design should minimise travel needs, help optimise the use of transport infrastructure, and make it easy for households to be car-less. Urban and transport infrastructure design should encourage walking and other active transport activities, to deliver public health benefits, encourage the development of communities, reduce social isolation, and re-connect people to their local environment.

Oral Submissions

ERG **WOULD** like to make an oral submission to Councillors.

Section Two: Parking Policy Scope and Objectives

Overall Comment on Parking Policy Scope

ERG believes that the scope of this policy is too narrow. Whilst the operational elements of this policy, namely the parking hierarchy mechanism and parking pricing, are rightly limited to decisions about streets and the facilities owned and operated by WCC, the problem this policy seeks to address and the measures required for this extend beyond just these elements.

In our view therefore, there is an opportunity for this policy, if afforded a broader scope and higher status in the WCC strategic framework, to also guide decisions made in the district plan review and the transport strategy currently under development.

1. We submit that the scope of this policy is widened and its place in the WCC strategic framework is accorded higher priority so that the purpose and objectives set out in the parking policy must be taken into account by these other documents.

Reason: Parking can literally make or break the economics of a city, and with it, communities and the environment. There are well documented, disastrous examples of this from many US cities (source: [Donald Shoup](#)). New Zealand has its own versions and degrees of these problems; but the forethought many years ago here in Wellington through removal of minimum parking requirements from the central city, saw the worst of this avoided. Nevertheless, the issues raised in Section 3 of this policy show that there is plenty of room for improvement.

In our view, an important 'next frontier' will be suburban centres and the need to ensure that local neighbourhoods are thriving, as part of increasing city resilience and climate change proofing.

Ensuring that use of street space is optimised in a way that supports businesses and 'place-building' in these areas is a key part of this. Application of the parking hierarchy, coupled with removal of parking minimums through the district plan, aligned decision making in the transport plan, and responsive parking pricing will all need to be used.

In our view, broadening the policy's scope represents a true opportunity to 'get parking right' to achieve the vision and outcomes that WCC has set out in its [long term plan](#).

Section 2

Section 2 describes other plans and strategies relevant to parking, but none of the subsections explicitly say HOW this policy will influence, or be influenced, by those other documents or the mechanisms for achieving that. With WCC's size and role complexity, we believe it is necessary to be explicit about this or run the risk of this policy being overlooked: with the significance of parking to matters at the very fabric of our city (prosperity, land use, transport and place), this is a risk ERG does not want to see WCC take.

2. Include, in Sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, an explicit statement as to

- a) where this policy 'fits' in terms of hierarchy (what gives effect to what) with each of the plan or strategy instruments named; and
- b) a clear description of how this will operate in practice, in relation to each.

Refer also to our comments on the objectives below.

1. Proposed Objectives

The proposed parking policy objectives set out what we want to achieve – now and into the future. The objectives are designed to guide the Council when it makes parking decisions.

They are:

Support shift in type of transport used – facilitate a shift to using active (eg, walking and cycling) and public transport through parking management and pricing, to move more people driving fewer vehicles.

Support safe movement – facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods by focusing on people moving along transport corridors rather than people parking or storing stationary vehicles.

Support business wellbeing – ensure parking management and pricing controls support economic activity in the central city, suburban centres and mobile trades and services.

Support city amenity and safety – ensure on-street parking design and placement supports overall city amenity, safety, good urban design outcomes and attractive streetscapes

Support access for all – ensure disabled people, older people, people who are pregnant, and people with babies can access car parks throughout the city, Council facilities, and venues. This will be achieved, in part, through an improvement in mobility parking across the city.

Support move to becoming an eco-city – facilitate the uptake of car sharing, electric vehicles and other transport with low carbon emissions. Manage parking and incentivise a decrease in vehicle use to contribute to better water quality, air quality, stormwater management and biodiversity outcomes.

Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment – provide a high standard of customer service for people who use Council parking spaces and introduce self-service and automated processes for all parking charges and permits to improve the parking experience (as technology allows). Ensure a safe working environment for those who deliver the parking service.

Overall ERG supports the objectives. We are particularly pleased to see that the revised wording now acknowledges a number of the matters raised in our 2019 comments on the earlier draft including:

- the need to provide for tradespeople’s vehicles (Support business wellbeing);
- the need to broaden the meaning of safety and efficiency (now picked up in both Support safe movement and Support city amenity and safety)
- the need to be clearer about how parking placement can affect amenity and people’s experience of a streetscape (Support city amenity and safety); and
- the need to include ride-share in the mix (Support move to becoming an eco city).

A. How important are these objectives to you?

All of the proposed objectives are **Very Important**.

B. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

3. Include an additional objective: Parking is costed to reflect the value or ‘opportunity cost’ of urban space.

Reason:

Wellington streets are space-constrained. Parking is space-intensive. Donald Shoup, an international authority on parking, has amassed a considerable body of research that shows how a failure to reflect the opportunity cost of urban space allocated to car parking has distorted transportation choices, led to poor urban design and damaged city prosperity.

To its credit, WCC has already taken steps to address some of the issues Mr Shoup describes, e.g. the removal (some iterations ago!) of minimum parking requirements for the central city from the district plan and charging for public parking both on-street and off-street.

Further changes, to remove the link between parking requirements and land uses will be needed if we are to realise more affordable housing, enable businesses to establish with more ease, and support the shift to more sustainable transport modes.

Inclusion of this objective, we believe, will help achieve this as it underpins the core tenets of the proposed policy (a parking hierarchy that supports the sustainable transport hierarchy in the Te Atakura, and a responsive pricing model), and provides the necessary transparency that will benefit city ratepayers and businesses, and the ‘true’ market signals that will benefit developers.

4. Include an additional Objective: Support a convenient and efficient parking experience through pricing parking to ensure optimal use.

Reason:

Parking hassles annoy any driver. In a space-constrained city with other transport options, not finding a park on the street or in a WCC off-street facility, is a signal that parking is priced too cheaply for the value it is providing, thus creating hassle, inconvenience, congestion, increased

greenhouse gas emissions and other issues that are traversed in *Section 3 What is the parking problem?* of the proposal.

A sensitive pricing regime, coupled with the parking hierarchy this policy provides, has the benefit to make a very positive difference to Wellington city through increasing parking turnover and ensuring that it is optimally used.

WCC has a real opportunity to transform the parking experience for drivers through using its already-installed sensor technology to the fullest in running an effective demand-responsive priced parking model and linking this to signage and real-time information for drivers.

The evidence of the benefits to everyone of this approach is overwhelming. We provide examples from just two – Auckland (a NZ experience), and San Francisco (a hilly city).

“In 2012, AT [Auckland Transport] completed a review of parking in the city centre and found that the time restrictions were not aligned to the amount of time customers actually wanted to park. The on-street parking was also at capacity for much of the day which resulted in frustrated customers and increased traffic congestion. The review led to the implementation of a new on-street parking management system called the City Centre Parking Zone (CCPZ). The changes implemented under this project were:

- removal of time limits for on-street parking,
- introduction of demand-responsive pricing to manage demand,
- introduction of a 10 minute grace period so no payment is needed for short stops,
- reduction of hourly rates in car park buildings to encourage people to park off-street.

These changes have been very successful and have been well received by the public and business association.” (Source: [Auckland Transport Parking Strategy](#))

In San Francisco, the SFpark Pilot Project is a major parking trial that has had the benefit of intensive and in depth evaluation.

This project aimed to make it easier to find a car park, through increasing the amount of time parking was available on a given street.

It had demand-responsive parking pricing at its core. Not only did it achieve that aim, but it provided a myriad of other benefits besides.

Stuart Donovan, a parking policy expert with a background in engineering and economics sums it up as an approach ‘where everyone benefitted.’

“For on-street parking, the SFpark used occupancy data from in-ground parking sensors in each space to adjust parking fee rates at meters up or down to help achieve a target occupancy rate of 60–80 percent. Time limits were lengthened, and easy-pay meters installed.

The pilot showed that even as the economy, population and overall parking demand grew, parking availability improved dramatically in SFpark pilot areas; the time to find a park decreased almost by

half; and greenhouse gas emissions dropped by a third. There were other benefits too, including public transport speed and reliability as congestion eased and double-parking behaviour reduced. Net parking revenue increased slightly. (source: https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/reports-and-documents/2018/04/sfpark_eval_summary_2014.pdf)

C Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

5. Amend the following objective:

Objective 'support city amenity and safety'

We submit that the explanation provided with the objective 'support city amenity and safety' be revised to include placemaking, community building, heritage and creative arts.

Reason: To ensure that the term 'amenity' is interpreted widely, e.g., to consider matters such as creating a place people enjoy being in, that is attractive, that enables people to connect, to feel a sense of place and know its stories.

6. Amend the following objective:

Objective 'support access for all'

We submit that the objective 'support access for all' include, in its explanatory notes, that Council will include equity considerations.

Reason:

Parking charges may disadvantage low income commuters, from suburbs poorly served by public transport and beyond a distance at which active transport is an option.

Whilst we strongly support demand-responsive pricing as a way of managing demand (and acknowledge that this can actually decrease parking costs, (see the evidence from the [San Francisco study](#)), we recommend that Council be open to equity measures for lower income earners when developing parking plans until lower income commuters from such suburbs are better and more equitably served with more sustainable transport choices. However, it is critical that in seeking solutions where true equity issues exist, that those solutions do not distort the objective of parking being charged at its true cost as a use of scarce urban space.

7. Amend the explanation of the following objective: Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment

Include in the explanation to this objective accessible, timely (and where necessary, real-time) information for people needing access to the curb for delivery / pick-up, or to park.

Reason:

Overseas (and Auckland!) experience shows that high quality information is an important part of making parking work for everyone. Wellington has a head start already with this with signage providing real time information for some parking options and the sensor system in some areas already. It provides a good basis to build on.

8. **Make explicit how the objectives will be weighed up in light of the Place and Movement Framework. We ask that in the explanation as to how the objectives will be applied (you acknowledge that some of them necessarily conflict), you explain how they will be guided by the Place and Movement Framework, currently under development as part of the LGWM package.**

Reason: This will help clarify, for example, how the objective 'Support Safe Movement' might be viewed relative to 'Support city amenity and safety,' for a particular area.

9. **Make explicit how the objectives will be reflected in relation to the District Plan, and also with the Regional Land Transport Plan and WCC Transport Strategy.**

Reason: As stated in our overall comments on scope, and our comments on Section 2, to achieve the objectives sought, it is important that they are also given effect through supportive and complementary mechanisms in aligned plans such as the District Plan. Correspondingly, the transport strategy may well guide how one objective is seen in light of another: clarifying how each guides the other in relation to the task of weighting of these objectives in parking plan decisions for a particular part of the city, would be a helpful addition. Note, also, that the ERG has submitted comments on the District Plan in relation to greenhouse gas emissions from transport in Wellington City. Those comments are also relevant here.

10. **Incorporate, somewhere, either through explanation of an existing objective, or as a stand alone objective, that parking is currently oversupplied and that the supply needs to decrease.**

Reason: The current over-supply of parking is causing problems for other transport modes, e.g., holding up buses, stopping the development of safe cycle ways and encouraging continued growth in use of private vehicles. Use of the parking hierarchy to re-allocate street space as and where required (e.g., for busways), and doing this whilst implementing a demand-responsive parking pricing approach, will reverse this distortion and enable Council's long term outcomes, and the outcomes of Te Atakura and LGWM to be achieved.

Section Three: ERG Submission on Proposed Parking Policy Principles

2. Proposed Principles

The proposed parking policy principles set out how we will apply and manage the policy.

A To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Overall comment:

ERG is pleased to see that the revised Principles pick up on a number of the matters we were concerned about in our 2019 comments.

Below are specific responses to the proposed principles:

Principle A: make iterative parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system. Any parking management changes will consider the effect that related changes in revenue will have on ratepayers.

11. Reword principle to read: Make iterative parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system.

Reason: This Principle risks an internal contradiction: the way it reads leaves open the possibility that iterative improvements do NOT get made, for instance, where parking revenue might be decreased, e.g., where parking is removed to enable buses to run on time on a route. We suggest some additions to the principles to address the important matter of parking revenue separately (see below).

Principle B: manage the decreasing supply of Council controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses the spaces.

12. Retain this Principle

Reason: This principle is clear and unequivocal, and therefore provides certainty as to how the policy will be applied. It is important as it signals that supply will be decreasing, a necessary step in achieving mode shift and better recognition of the true cost of parking.

Principle C: Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport.

13. Reword this Principle to read: Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and / or public transport.

Reason: the 'and' by itself risks the principle being applied more widely than it needs to be to achieve the inclusive access objective.

Principle D: Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives, is consistent with broader transport objectives and supports Let's Get Wellington Moving.

14. Reword this Principle to read: Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives, namely ensuring that better (more sustainable) transport modes are more competitive, therefore helping achieve broader transport objectives and Let's Get Wellington Moving.

Reason: The true cost of parking is not yet reflected in the prices vehicle drivers pay, therefore distorting transport choice and incentivising continued growth in private vehicle use at the expense of other, more sustainable modes. Implementation of a well designed parking pricing strategy can be a highly effective tool in managing travel demand and congestion, as well as other benefits. Research by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute quantifies potential benefits alongside a range of parking pricing strategies. Source: [Litman \(2020\)](#)

Principle E: Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support.

15. Retain this Principle

Reason: Identifying satisfactory solutions to parking problems in some parts of Wellington city will be complex. The ability to develop tailored plans with the affected communities will be very helpful.

Principle F: Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply.

16. Amend this principle to read: Focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply.

Reason: If parking is priced appropriately, private providers will pick up any unmet demand for parking; persistent demand, at a higher cost point provides a clear signal to developers to consider investing in private parking as achieving a return becomes possible. Experience of cities like Tokyo show how this can operate. And if WCC would like a local example, [Cathedral Cove](#), a tourist hot spot located in a rural area, shows how pricing of the scarce public parks enabled a range of transport and parking alternatives, with subsequent local economic benefits to be set up whilst removing the chaos and congestion that had hitherto reigned.

Principle G: Provide parking space availability information.

17. Retain this Principle

Reason: Provision of high quality, timely (and where possible real-time) parking information is a significant contributor to parking regimes labelled 'successful' in the research and case studies we have seen.

Principle H: Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance.

18. Amend this principle to read: Align Council business operations and relevant policy decisions with the parking policy and report annually on performance.

Reason: As detailed previously, we believe that this policy will be more effective if its purpose and objectives are afforded real weight, and given effect through policies, and policy decisions in aligned plans and strategies.

B Are there any principles you think we have missed?

19. Include an additional Principle to support Principle D that makes clear the approach that will be taken to demand- based pricing of parking.

Word this principle as: Demand-based parking pricing for on-street and/or off-street WCC carparks or facilities will be priced at a level that sees parking space operate at an optimum level of use (85% of capacity).

Reason: Evidence from overseas shows that where pricing is designed to 'optimise' use, it is highly effective in enabling the 'true' value of a car park to be realised. For example, in an area which becomes less busy (e.g., if people increasingly choose alternative modes), costs will drop accordingly. Similarly, in an area seeing an increase in traffic wanting to park, the price goes up and does one or more of: encouraging use of other forms of transport, seeing some drivers visit at other times, achieving faster turnover etc., all of which help 'optimise' the use of the space. (Note: the 85% level of use of available parks in an area is what experts suggest is optimal).

20. Include an additional Principle to support development of parking infrastructure to aid access and mobility; and secure, weather-protected facilities for micro and active transport modes

Reason: Provision of such infrastructure in streets (residential and city) and destinations (shopping areas, parks etc) enhances equity for people who need to use mobility parks (many are currently of a sub-standard design), and further improve competitiveness of micro and active transport modes. When well designed and placed, such facilities can also enhance amenity, calm traffic and contribute to place making.

3 Parking Priority

Overall, we are in strong support of the Parking Priority approach detailed here.

Reason: The parking priority proposals for each type of area align very well with the sustainable transport hierarchy, and will enable council to make clear and transparent decisions on the use of scarce urban road space and public land for parking purposes. Implemented well, and coupled with a carefully designed demand pricing regime, should see a whole host of benefits achieved for the city's communities, businesses and the environment.

Here is an example of such benefits, where active transport parking (in this case cycling) is provided, in contrast to car parking:

A [study](#) in Manhattan in New York City, N.Y., compared a bike station on one side of Broadway with three parking spaces occupying the same length of curb on the other side of the street. In one hour, 200 people arrived at or departed from the bike station, while only 11 people arrived at or departed from the parking spaces. If we measure productivity by the number of people served, the bike station was 18 times more productive than the parking spaces. (Source: 'Pricing the Curb' 2020, Donald Shoup)

There is community support for this too: [surveys](#) undertaken in 2013-2014 of drivers, and of shoppers in Tory St as part of a study exploring a better southern commuting route for cyclists, found that 60% of drivers interviewed supported carparks being removed to provide a safer cycle route. The research involved an online survey of 600 people and a survey of 400 Tory St shoppers. About 60 % of non-cyclists supported sacrificing on-street car parks for a cycle route, citing concerns for cyclist safety and the stress of sharing roads with them. About half the respondents said they would consider biking in the city if they felt safer on the roads. A separate survey of Tory St shoppers found only 6 % used on-street parking on Tory St.

Another important benefit the Parking Priority approach will enable, is progressive improvement to the provision of mobility parking: WCC's 2019 survey identified needs and ideas for solutions for this.

And finally, the approach will directly support WCC's [bus priority programme](#): a key problem noted in the business case for the programme is that 'road space on key corridors is not optimised for movement or place outcomes making it less attractive to travel by bus, bike or walking.'

21. We submit that the Parking Priority proposals be retained for:

- A. Key Transport Routes
- B. Central City
- C. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)
- E. Outer Residential Areas
- F. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation and Community Facilities
- G. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

22. That the Parking Priority proposals for D. City Fringe be retained with one amendment:

Amend D City Fringe, to reverse the order within High priority, to put car-share parks ahead of residents' parks.

Reason: This better aligns with where transport needs to head in the future – fewer cars, and more efficient use of those cars that are parked on public land, e.g., car-share can see a vehicle shared between many households, and in better use. Evidence shows many cars spend most of their life parked on the street rather than being used.

3 Pricing Approach

We are proposing to implement demand-responsive pricing. This means that in areas of high demand, where it is difficult to get a park, the price would go up to encourage people to park elsewhere or stay for less time. In areas of low demand, pricing would go down, to encourage more people to park in these areas at these times.

Do you agree with this pricing approach?

Yes. ERG strongly supports demand-responsive parking pricing.

23. We submit that the approach of demand-responsive parking pricing be retained.

Reason: As described earlier in this submission, evidence from Auckland, which has implemented this approach and San Francisco, which had the benefit of a fully evaluated parking trial, show that this has multiple benefits: increasing business prosperity (frequent turnover); decreasing carbon emissions (less cruising and use of other modes); increasing customer satisfaction (quicker to find a park as demand-responsive pricing keeps supply closer to the optimum).

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

5 Residents Parking Scheme We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

24. Retain the priorities proposed for residents parking schemes with some amendments. ERG's proposed priority list is below.

- 1 Mobility permit holders
- 2 EV owners with no off-street parking
- 3 Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
- 4 Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
- 7 All existing dwellings with one or more off-street spaces
- 5 Businesses located within the zone
- 6 New dwellings/homes built after 2020
- 8 Second permits

19 Do you have anything else to add about the residents' parking scheme or any ideas we haven't thought of?

25. We submit that Council investigate, manage and monitor any real equity issues found to exist from a proposed scheme.

Reason: Changes to residents' parking needs to avoid penalising low-income earners who rent, and who are more likely to be in a household with multiple people. Schemes which give out permits on the basis of property rather than occupancy will tend to favour low occupancy dwellings over higher occupancy dwellings. There are several ways to address this. For example, allocate permits per household as a percentage of occupancy, rather than equally across all households (e.g., households are entitled to have permits for 50% of adult occupants). Other options are to reduce prices for tenants as compared with owner-occupiers, or use an income-based pricing mechanism for permits.

26. Transition the residential parking scheme to a Coupon Exemption parking system so that parking is priced closer to its true cost

Reason: To manage change and growth and increasing demands on use of scarce road space within the city, it is our view that resident parking zones should be phased out, and replaced over time with a coupon parking exemption regime for residents. So that current residents are not disadvantaged, we encourage grandfathering into the system of existing users, at current prices for their resident and coupon exemption parking permits, for the period that they reside at that address.

Changing the regime in this way will see, over time, that residents are paying closer to the true cost of using a public space for a private purpose.

Currently, a monthly coupon park is \$2400 a year (\$200/month). Presently, resident coupon exemptions are provided at \$120/year, or a 95% discount. These coupon exemption permits make up 23% of the overall 'resident parking' scheme, yet the opportunity cost of these discounted permits was \$3.9m in 2018.

We encourage the council to provide newly issued permits at a price range of 30-50% discount off existing coupon parking rates on a monthly basis. As this is not a resident parking scheme, but instead a 'concession for residents to existing coupon parking', we believe that this would be permissible under the Local Government Act.

27. Use some of the revenue collected to invest in on-street infrastructure that supports other modes and place-making in areas with exemption parking regimes, e.g. secure scooter and bike parks, and support for car-share schemes (one car can support many households).

Reason: This will help residents see a direct benefit to their streets from the revenue raised from using scarce public space to store their vehicles.

ENDS

Angela Stewart Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

- Shift in type of transport used - Very unimportant
- Safe movement – Very important
- Business wellbeing – Somewhat important
- City amenity and safety - Very important
- Access for all - Very important
- Move to becoming an eco-city – Neutral
- Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment – Very important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

all of the above objectives should also be calibrated against the diverse needs of the community. I think we should be aware of ageism as well as all the other forms of discrimination that are undesirable.

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Scooters and bikes on footpaths are dangerous for foot traffic - unless there is a very well developed culture of courtesy as is practised in Japan for example but alas not here. I have been almost bowled over on Lambton Quay by cycles scooters and skate boards.

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space	Very unhelpful
Provide parking space availability information:	Somewhat helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Somewhat helpful

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Pricing of parking currently makes it unaffordable for the average person who is not always young, fit and able to cycle and run or scoot everywhere. Many people need to have appointments with medical practitioners and also have friendly contact with others and also to be involved in the life of

the city even when they no longer work in the CBD. E bikes are very heavy and expensive and not easy for a small or older person to lug about. This heavy handed and expensive approach to parking that is currently on offer will drive retail from the CBD - what is a city where only youth, office workers and tourists are able to use it?

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

7. Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Neutral

Q8. Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Disagree

Q9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

Q10. City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Neutral

Q11. Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Neutral

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation community facilities?

Neutral

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Neutral

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

just don't forget the elderly, the partially sighted, the hearing challenged and the physically challenged (who don't always qualify for a special needs permit) EVERYONE deserves to use our city - the people you think are just old and past it have had a hand building this city into what it is now and still deserve to use its amenities

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? No

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Please see my previous comments - currently only very wealthy individuals can afford to pay \$ 4 .50 per hour -an appointment will take much longer than one hour and time for a coffee break would make it \$9.00. Take a walk around Wgtn CBD during the day and observe please how few elders you see walking around. National super is a modest income

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme:

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme? Please tick all that apply.

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Other (please specify)

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking

1. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
2. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
3. Second permits
4. Mobility permit holders
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
7. EV owners with no off-street parking

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Please care about the whole community and those who won't have the ability or the time to fill out online questionnaires like this one. Young women combining challenging career and parental duties are often just too tired and stressed to have anything left over at the end of the day to give - that includes filling in surveys such as this one. Older people don't always have the internet or a computer - can't afford it or can't see well enough to do such a survey. Please consider what older or otherwise abled people would like to have - they live here too in early adulthood or middle age its not possible always to imagine what is an impediment for others - please consult with people of all ages and include the wishes of older adults. Your parents and grandparents may be able to share ideas with you.

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

Other (please specify) Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply

I don't have a bike or want to purchase one

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Please be aware that there are always "fashions in thinking" - "woke" meant something else a few years ago... All fashions change - nothing is forever - we must try to get out of being in the present phase if it stops us from thinking very clearly about what are the real facts and issues that affect everyone as opposed to just a significant few who currently fit the fashionable paradigm

Tania Ali on behalf of Aotearoa Accessibility Tourism

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Shift in type of transport used - Very important

- Safe movement – Very important
- Business wellbeing – Very important
- City amenity and safety - Very important
- Access for all - Very important
- Move to becoming an eco-city – Very important
- Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment – Very important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

its important to have objectives i can tell you something.

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Yes, I will like to tell you about the objectives, please let me visit to see you for an appointment with you please in April 2020.

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Neutral
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Neutral
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres	Neutral
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives	Neutral
Support local area-based parking plans	Neutral
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Neutral
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Neutral

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

oh well i will like to say something about the problem is the issues.

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Yes, i will like to tell you about the principles and will need to see you when you have an appointment with you please. thanks

7. Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Neutral

Q8. Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Agree

9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts);

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Neutral

Q10. City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Agree

11. Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Agree

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation community facilities?

Agree

13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Agree

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

its very big high priority for everyone and what important to the people want

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

slow prices and expensive about the prices cost

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme? Please tick all that apply.

Other (please specify)

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits. Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

Not answered

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Talk to the residents parking scheme and what they want to say...

Q20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule

Public transport is too expensive

Public transport is too far from where I live or from my destination

When the weather is bad, I choose to use my private vehicle

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Public transport route has too many transfers

Other (please specify)

I have / I care for someone who has a mobility impairment that means I need to use a private vehicle

None of these, I use public transport regularly

I don't feel safe using public transport early in the morning/late at night

I need my vehicle for work

Using public transport is difficult when travelling with young children/babies

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Multiple people come with me on this journey

I don't have a bike or want to purchase one

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Other (please specify)

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

I am not able to physically access these modes of travel due to my personal circumstances

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

yes i will love to know the topics are more important and email me to see you and need to talk with you in our appointment. thanks city. Disappointed with this lack of quality in thinking.

Hari Sundaram Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

- Shift in type of transport used - Somewhat unimportant
- Safe movement – Somewhat important
- Business wellbeing – Neutral
- City amenity and safety – Not answered
- Access for all – Somewhat important
- Move to becoming an eco-city – Very important
- Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment – Somewhat important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Two points, Affordability is key - right now it has become a revenue generation mechanism for WCC than meaningfully address people's needs. Electric vehicle parking - the city council is sending muddled signals on this. What exactly is your objective in enabling and encouraging EV?

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

I suggest providing contextual help to show what you mean by these objectives. For example - support shift in type of transport is too large and vague to indicate anything.

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

- Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system – Very helpful
- Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it – Somewhat helpful
- Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport – Somewhat helpful
- Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives – Very helpful
- Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support – Very unhelpful
- Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply - Neutral
- Provide parking space availability information - Somewhat helpful

- Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance - Neutral

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Differential pricing based on vehicle emissions. Use parking as a signal to encourage electric vehicle adoption - dedicated ev spaces, free charging while parking etc.

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Heaps. It is not at all clear with the above principles what the city council objectives are. Principles need to direct the design, behaviour and development of our city. these principles are are not clear enough to guide the future state of our

Q7. Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Agree

Q8. Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Disagree

Q9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Agree

Q10. City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Agree

Q11. Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Agree

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation ; community facilities?

Agree

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Disagree

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Off street parking is a wild west zone. It needs better thinking and planning. There are blind spots in Karori, Northland where people park the cars. Accidents are imminent. Please have more thought on this. Further with the rise of autonomous vehicles ensure clear marking for OSP. Else it will cause vehicles to err and cause accidents.

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? No

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Disagree and disappointed. This is a very lazy approach to pricing, there are so many variables that need to be considered and contingent on several other factors. If people cannot carry pets in public transport and need to travel to city - they have no choice but to take the car.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

**Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?
Please tick all that apply.**

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. **Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.**

1. EV owners with no off-street parking
2. Mobility permit holders
3. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
4. Second permits
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
7. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
8. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

not answered

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify)

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

I live too far from where I'm going to walk or cycle

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

This is a stale approach to defining parking. What case studies of other cities have you looked at? What can be learnt? Demand side is reviewed with very little thought on managing supply.

Mike Mellor Individual Submitter**Q1. How important are these objectives to you?**

Shift in type of transport used - Very important

Safe movement important – Very important

Business wellbeing important – Somewhat important

City amenity and safety - Very important

Access for all - Very important

Move to becoming an eco-city - Very important

Delivering service excellence and a safe working environment – Somewhat important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

not answered

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

not answered

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Make parking changes that are linked to improvements in the overall transport system – Very helpful

Manage the decreasing supply of Council-controlled parking by prioritising how space is used and who uses it.
Very helpful

Ensure that access to the city centre, Council facilities and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritises people who can't use active and public transport - Very helpful

Parking is priced at a level that achieves policy objectives and is consistent with other transport objectives – Very helpful

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need and community support – Very helpful

Primarily focus the Council's role on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply - Very helpful

Provide parking space availability information – Somewhat helpful

Align Council business operations with the parking policy and report annually on performance – Very helpful

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

not answered

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

Q7. Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?**

Strongly agree

Q8. Central City High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?**

Strongly agree

9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts) High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?**

Strongly agree

Q10. City Fringe High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space ;priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?**

Strongly agree

Q11. Outer Residential Areas High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?**

Strongly Agree

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation Community Facilities High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation; community facilities?**

Strongly Agree

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Strongly agree
High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?**

Q14. **Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?**

not answered

Q15. **Do you agree with this pricing approach?** Yes

Q16. **Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?**

Rather than in low-demand areas "to encourage people to park" I suggest "to enable people to park". Encouraging parking means encouraging private vehicle use, which is inconsistent with other WCC policies.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. **Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme? Please tick all that apply.**

- Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
- Introduce online application and permitting system
- Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use
- If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive
- Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits. Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. **Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.**

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
6. Second permits

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

I think the age of a building is not relevant, so where I've shown no priority in q18 they are all 3=

Q20. What deters you from using public transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Other (please specify)

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

not answered

Bernard O'Shaughnessy

Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

CBD central library rebuild with bus and cycle lanes connected

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Yes, put in to future - that is "Let's do it all by 2025"

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Somewhat helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	"city centre is closed"
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Somewhat helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Somewhat helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Neutral
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	"What rubbish"

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

transparency, honesty, kindness

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Yes, principles weren't an election issue

Q7. Key Transport Routes (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Q8. Central City Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Q9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts) Disagree

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Q10. City Fringe Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Q11. Outer Residential Areas Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?**

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation, Community Facilities Agree

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation, community facilities?

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Agree

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?**

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

see attached memo *Note from Helen Bolton - no memo attached.*

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

not answered

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. **Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme?**

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone
 Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)
 Introduce online application and permitting system
 Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners
 If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. **Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.**

1. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
2. Mobility permit holders
3. EV owners with no off-street parking
4. Businesses located with the zone
5. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
6. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
7. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
8. Second permits

Brad Olsen on behalf of the Youth Council

Introduction

1. The Wellington City Youth Council (Youth Council) welcomes the opportunity to submit on Wellington City Council's Parking Policy Review **2020**.

Proposed Parking Policy Objectives

2. Youth Council supports the seven objectives outlined in the Parking Policy review discussion document.
3. Move to becoming an eco-city, city amenity and safety, and access for all are the most important objectives for Youth Council. These three objectives have a focus on addressing Wellington's environmental challenges as well as keeping young people safe and engaged in the City.
4. Wellington must continue to work to reduce our impact on the environment, and this Policy does, and should remain, focused on this objective.

Proposed Parking Policy Principles

5. We broadly support all eight principles outlined in the discussion document.
6. Wellington has limited space and increasing competition for the use of this space. Getting the best out of the limited space we have is important. This is specifically true for parking, and we agree with the proposal to not increase parking areas, but to engineer the best use of the current parking area stock by prioritising different uses.
7. A shift away from car use, for many, is hampered by other transport options that do not fully or partially meet their needs. For example, a shift to public transport or cycling is not simple for many groups, and so it is important to balance making adjustments to Wellington's parking with how Wellingtonian's need to move about.

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Yes, see attached memo *Note from Helen Bolton - no attached memo.*

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

I have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Other (please specify)

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport?

Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify)

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

See attached memo. *Note from Helen Bolton - no attached memo.*

8. The prioritisation of public transport, electric vehicles, and non-private car use (like car share parking options) are a good balanced position to incentivise different parking and transport choices, while still retaining usual parking options, but delivered in a different way.
9. Specific parking solutions should be planned in consultation with local users in areas that are readily identified as youth-orientated, such as around university and education providers, and recreation areas. This consultation should allow for better utilisation and prioritisation of space, with youth users likely requiring a different mix of parking options (tilted towards active transport options) compared to other parts of Wellington.
10. Variable pricing is encouraged to best dynamically manage parking across Wellington.
11. A focus on lowering carbon emissions is critical to Wellington's parking approach. However, this must also be weighed against the ability for people (and in particular, certain groups like young people) to pay. To ensure that an environment focused approach is taken, without making options unaffordable to young people, efforts to incentivise and motivate other transport options is a core element of the success of the proposed Parking Policy.

Consideration around residential parking options

12. Youth Council does note that just because a dwelling has a carpark doesn't necessarily mean that dwelling has access/use of that carpark. This is particularly true for rentals, with young people often without a carpark as part of their rental, or needing to pay additionally for access to the carpark.
13. The proposed Policy's focus on the level of off-street parking available in an area may not fully capture the likely potential for off-street parking use by residents.
14. In other words, the discussion around household access to private off-street parking is unlikely to reflect actual use, and so some areas of Wellington may appear to have greater availability of off-street parking when the reality may be that this access is not provided to actual residents.

15. We urge Council to consider this point when preparing its Parking Policy, particularly with regard to young people renting in Wellington who may struggle more than anticipated if on-street resident parking access is decreased or costs increased.
16. We urge Council to work to better understand this actual, rather than observed, access and its possible impacts on on-street parking access before making a final decision.

Conclusion

17. Wellington's constrained geography, but expanding population, means some tough decisions need to be made about how the City uses its space.
18. Youth Council support Council's proposed Parking Policy, with particular support for the Policy's focus on changing behaviours and allowing for a greater focus on Wellington's environmental outcomes.
19. Enabling other transport methods to be prioritised and incentivised will support younger Wellingtonians have options around transport.
20. We urge Council to better understand how on- and off-street residential parking access realities may differ from observed access, and how this may impact young people.

Pim Borren on behalf of the Bus & Coach Association (New Zealand) Incorporated

1. Introduction

1.1. The Bus and Coach Association NZ (BCA) is a membership organisation that represents the interests of the bus and coach industry. We provide industry leadership, advocacy, networking and services for more than 300 members (and their over 6,000 buses and coaches). The BCA represents the majority of New Zealand's bus and coach operators and domestic and international bus manufacturers.

1.2. The bus and coach industry is a significant contributor to New Zealand's economy. The industry contributes over \$1.2 billion to gross domestic product per year and employs over 10,200 people. In 2015 tourist expenditure on passenger transport (not including air travel) in New Zealand was \$3.4 billion and more than 1.24 million international visitors used bus and coach services.

1.3. The BCA welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on the Wellington City Council (the Council) Parking Policy (the Policy).

2. Policy intent

2.1. The Policy aims to ensure Wellington's parking supports easy movement of people and goods around Wellington. The Council's vision is that Wellington's transport system will enable less reliance on private vehicles to access the city. This supports the city's aim to be a zero-carbon capital by 2050.

2.2. The Policy also aims for parking to support the Council's vision for the city. This includes adapting to population growth, making the city more people friendly, supporting economic growth, including retail, hospitality and tourism, and moving more people using fewer vehicles in the future.

2.3. The Council's transport hierarchy gives priority to active modes of transport, such as walking and cycling, and public transport. When decisions are made on road space, these modes will take priority over parking.

3. BCA Position

3.1. The BCA supports the Policy's focus on ensuring that Wellington's parking supports easy movement of people and goods around Wellington in a sustainable manner. Active modes and public transport are critical to moving people around Wellington and achieving sustainability goals.

3.2. Although the Council's vision for the city emphasises the importance of economic growth and tourism, the Policy does not mention the impact of tourism and events on the movement of people. Tourism currently contributes \$2.7 billion dollars to Wellington's economy and coaches play a significant role in the movement of people and tourism in Wellington, therefore need to be considered in the Policy. Currently, the Policy states coach parking is a low priority which is unlikely to be accommodated in the city centre and surrounding areas.

3.3. Coaches rely significantly on parking to ensure visitors can access the city, and due to the size and height of coaches, they cannot be privately accommodated. They also support the Council's vision for the city by helping reduce the number of vehicles in the city, each coach providing capacity for up to 55 passengers.

3.4. Wellington is one of the worst cities for coach parking due to high demand for coach parks, and limited available coach parking. The Policy needs to address this issue to ensure coach tours continue to come to Wellington, and to ensure the safe access of people to Wellington venues.

4. Coach Parking in Wellington

4.1. While the amount of tourism and events will be significantly reduced for some time due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, this policy is about creating a long term framework for Wellington parking, and therefore needs to factor in coach parking. Addressing these issues now will lay the foundation for sustainable growth of the coach tour industry in Wellington.

4.2. Previously many coach tours would choose to arrive in Wellington in the evening, stay overnight and then leave in the morning. Considerable work has been done to increase the numbers of tours that stay in Wellington for 2-3 nights, the success of this work has brought significant economic benefit to Wellington. However coach parking continues to be an issue, particularly when coach operators look for overnight parking.

4.3. Coach parking continues to be removed to make way for other projects including roadworks, servicing cruise passengers and commuter bus transport. The lack of coach parking puts pressure on coach tours wanting to stay longer in Wellington.

4.4. During peak tour season there can be between 15-20 coaches in Wellington, all looking for overnight parking. Many operators choose to use the limited bus parks available on Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace. But there still is not enough available coach parking to meet these demands, and leads to extremely difficult and frustrating experiences for coach operators. The parks on Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace are also likely to be removed as part of Let's Get Wellington Moving. This will increase pressure on coach parking in Wellington.

4.5. However, if this pressure continues, it will likely result in tour companies looking to move on and stay in other areas where parking is readily available. The Council should focus on expanding the number of tours staying multiple days in Wellington, rather than deterring them due to a lack of facilities.

5. Access to venues – pick up and drop off zones

5.1. Coach operators also struggle with access to major event venues and hotels, due to lack of parking space and loading zones near major venues and hotels. Hotels which host conferences often do not have enough nearby coach facilities to match the capacity of their conference facilities. This creates logistical difficulties, and limits the smooth and easy access of operators and passengers to major Wellington venues, and decreases the positive experience people have visiting Wellington.

5.2. The lack of coach facilities also creates safety concerns for drivers and passengers. In many instances the lack of facilities means there are no safe places to drop school children or groups at events.

5.3. The lack of drop off/pick up zone near Sky Stadium mean that groups must apply for a \$110 permit to enter the stadium. This cost is often prohibitive to school and charity groups accessing the stadium. These groups should not be deterred from accessing key Wellington venues due to insufficient pick up and drop off areas.

5.4. Many drop off areas also have tight corners which are difficult to manoeuvre around, especially near hotels, for example the parking spaces near James Cook Grand Chancellor require coaches to turn around to pick up and drop off guests. These difficulties should be considered when evaluating coach parks, and creating new coach parks.

5.5. Any development of hotels with conference facilities should at an early stage of development be required to ensure there is sufficient coach parking/loading zones for coaches near the venue. This will ensure safe access by passengers to these venues, and remove logistical issues for coach operators in the long term.

5.6. We urge the Council to use this opportunity to address key safety risks created by a lack of suitable coach parking facilities by providing sufficient and safe coach parking near venues and hotels.

5.7. We would welcome the opportunity for the BCA to consult on the future development of coach parking or pick up and drop off zones in Wellington.

6. Economic Benefit of Coach Parking

6.1. Coach tours provide significant economic benefit to Wellington city. This is reflected in the up to 55 passenger per tour that spend money at Wellington eateries, retail stores, accommodation and attractions. Each extra day and night visitors stay in Wellington delivers a significant positive impact on Wellington's economy. On average visitors to Wellington spend \$362 a day.

6.2. As stated in the Council's vision for Wellington's parking it is critical that the Policy supports the economic growth of the City, and ensuring that it is a people-friendly place to visit. Providing solutions that support coach parking will expand the economic opportunities coach tours provide for Wellington businesses. It will also enhance the experience of coach tour operators and passengers, thus supporting the Council's vision for Wellington.

7. Recommendations

7.1. In the short term, dual-use parking will allow maximum usage of parking areas such as loading zones or goods and service parking for coach parking overnight from 6pm.

7.2. As a long term solution, the Council must designate an area in the city or fringe city location where buses and coaches are able to standby for 30 minutes to be within close proximity to major events and venues.

7.3. The Council should also allocate a specific location which accommodates the large number of coaches regularly parking overnight in Wellington, and other areas which may accommodate more coaches during the peak tourism period. The Council should also consider how to expand coach parking for further growth in the industry.

8. Conclusion

8.1. Coach parking and loading zones should be accommodated in the Policy due to the significant role they play in Wellington's tourism industry and the movement of people for events. Coach parking issues in Wellington have been exacerbated by reduced parking and increased demand for coach parks. The lack of coach parking has also increased safety concerns for passengers disembarking coaches. If the Policy does not accommodate coach parking, there will likely be negative impacts on Wellington's economy and tourism industry and the ability of coaches to move people to and from events.

8.2. The BCA urges Wellington City Council to adopt our proposed changes in the Proposal to provide for coach parking in Wellington.

8.3. We would like to make an oral submission on the Policy.

Pim Borren

Chief Executive of Bus and Coach Association

Jill Ford Individual Submitter**Q1. How important are these objectives to you?**

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Somewhat important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Neutral

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Specific reference to becoming carbon zero, being 'an ecocity' is vague. Prioritising transport modes, in order to achieve the above the Council needs to prioritise transport - and adopt the internationally recognise transport hierarchy, which prioritise in this order; walking, cycling, public transport, commercial vehicles, taxis, high occupancy, single occupancy. With e scooters, motor bikes, disability vehicles slotted in.

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Again access for all is vague, is this equal access, equitable access,

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system: Very helpful,
 Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it: Somewhat helpful,
 Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent: Very helpful,
 Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support: Neutral,
 Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply: Very unhelpful,
 Provide parking space availability information: Neutral

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Need to decrease parking for private vehicles in central city, (but increase disability parking, motorbike, cycle parking) so as to reduce the number of private vehicles coming into the city. NO Free / low cost parking any where with CBD or nearby suburbs, eg Glenmore st, or on key arterial roads - Kent / Cambridge terrace, Taranaki st. In suburbs there needs to be a significant reduction in 'free parking', with residents only parking and fees, how these fees are paid should be flexible, eg monthly AP or one off, so as to be affordable to people on low income.

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

Parking in private apartments, office buildings add significantly to the amount of parking and traffic into the city and all new developments need to have compulsory cycle parking. In fact, we need much more cycle parking, take out some car parks and use the space for cycles, e scooters instead on cluttering up pavements.

Q7. Key Transport Routes;(such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) Neutral

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Q8. Central City Neutral

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Q9. Suburban Centres;(shopping precincts); Neutral

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?**

Q10. City Fringe; Disagree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium; parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover.

Lowest; parking space; priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Q11. Outer Residential Areas Disagree

High; parking space; priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.

Medium; parking space; priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.

Low; parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest; parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation, Community Facilities Agree

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium; parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low; parking space; priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest; parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation, community facilities?

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Agree

High; parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium; parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

What's with urban design features everywhere?? Do these need to be on roads, surely pavements, parks etc are better spaces. Why do we have any parking on the road on major transport routes bicycle and micro-mobility can fit on pavements in some of these places and most have side streets where motorbikes, disability parking and delivery can go. This happens in so many cities overseas and everyone manages. Finally why have we no options of motor vehicle free CBD and suburban shopping areas, again this is VERY common overseas. And is really good for businesses, shops cafes etc.

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Just reduce parking and have no private motor vehicles from Beehive to Courtney place - great er parking for motor bikes, delivery and disability vehicles on side streets, with good bike, micro mobility parking.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. **Please tick all that apply.**

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces
Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking
Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)
Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone
Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)
Introduce online application and permitting system
Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use
If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive
Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. **Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.**

Mobility permit holders
Businesses located with the zone
EV owners with no off-street parking
Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
New dwellings/homes built after 2020
All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
Second permits

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

This has to be integrated with a better and more reliable public transport system, safe secure cycle lanes, so that people are able to use these alternative forms of transport. The current situation has many households having more vehicles than they really need because there is free parking outside their house. Also places like the hospital, University, need to take responsibility for parking of employees, students instead of which areas like Newtown become one big free car park.

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Please select all that apply.

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Why does the council keep repeating consultations, I answered a whole heap of these questions or similar a while ago. Meanwhile, NOTHING happens. Congestion gets worse, buses cant be on time because of parking and congestion and its still not safe to cycle.

Callum McMenamin Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Very important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Very important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Supporting human enjoyment of life. I think these objectives focus on safety, environment, and business. I think we need to design cities to make humans happy, and well.

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Hmm, perhaps we should also support socialisation and connectedness between humans.

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Very helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Very helpful
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

not answered

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

Q7. Key Transport Routes;(such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Q8. Central City Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Q9. Suburban Centres;(shopping precincts) Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Q10. City Fringe; Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?**

Q11. Outer Residential Areas Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. **To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?**

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation; Community Facilities Agree

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium; parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low; parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest; parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation; community facilities?

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Agree

High; parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

not answered

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

This would evenly balance the load across parking facilities by using price incentive. This may disproportionately effect those on low incomes - they may be priced out of prime parking locations, leading to inequitable outcomes in terms of financial inequality.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

Please tick all that apply.

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. **Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.**

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
3. EV owners with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
6. Businesses located with the zone
7. Second permits
8. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

not answered

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

- Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule
- Public transport seems unreliable to me

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

not answered

Melissa Clark-Reynolds Individual Submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Neutral
Support city amenity and safety	Somewhat important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Very important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

1. Health of citizens, resident (eg encouraging me to walk or cycle for my wellbeing)
2. Community cohesion (eg by having opportunities for locals to see each other, families to walk/cycle to school together)

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

The supporting safe movement objective doesn't seem well framed. Yes, we want stationary vehicles out of the way of cyclists and people walking. However this needs to be differently applied in a cul de sac from a main thoroughfare. In a cul de sac, perhaps parking on the street makes sense so that more people can live in that street. Where car traffic is a minimum, dedicated bike lanes are not needed. The Principles don't seem to take this into account. It might also make sense to free up road reserve for parking if the objective must be to remove stationary cars from the streets. The policy doesn't seem to understand that car ownership is likely to decline in the coming decade. While NZ has some of the highest car ownership rates in the world, this is not a sustainable trend. Elsewhere, cars as a service (combining Uber type services with car use as required vs car ownership) is a trend that is here to stay. Every major car manufacturer has cars as a service offers in market across the globe. These services can be expected to become mainstream in NZ in the next 10 years. We could accelerate this trend away from multi car households by limiting the parking allowed to be associated with housing. The best way to reduce cars might well be to require people to park them on the street. This is not canvassed in the document at all. I can no longer effectively use public transport, and my car use has increased in the last year, going against my personal trend for the past 5. Our local bus no longer goes to where I want to go, and a trip home at the end of the day requires at least 2 buses. In wellington with our weather (wind and rain) this just isn't practicable. The time it takes to get to my work by bus is now prohibitive and I have switched to using Uber. I cannot believe this is good for the City - but it is the best option for me. I gave up cycling 5 years ago as it was too dangerous in the inner City.

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Not answered

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

1. Health and Wellbeing of communities. 2. We will grow our City by becoming more densely populated, not by increasing the total area of the City.

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

The explanations in the document are not very clear. I don't know what is actually meant by principle A, for example. Principle C should start with how to make public transport accessible, and then as a back up make the parking inclusive. Principle E sounds good, but clearly isn't what is done now. Again I think this needs a wider variety of examples. What is actually meant here? Does that mean that fewer new builds will be required to prioritise parking? or that new builds will have to prioritise off street parking? Principle H is also too vague to be very useful.

Q7. Key Transport Routes;(such as Lambton Quay, Strongly agree
Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Q8. Central City Strongly agree

High; parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium; parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low; parking space priority: coach/bus parks.

Lowest; parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Q9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts); Strongly agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Q10. City Fringe Neutral

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Q11. Outer Residential Areas Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation; Community Facilities Agree

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation; community facilities?

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Neutral

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Car share parks should be ahead of resident parks in City fringe, and no new off street parking should be required for infill housing. This will help to signal the need for less cars on our streets, and a preference for new developments to engage with public transport and car sharing. Recreational facilities, Parks etc should have easy access by public transport - so bus stops will be required. It is hard to imagine why any taxi stands are needed at all given the trends to app based hailing of shared cars. They should not be prioritised at all.

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? No

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Increasing the cost per hour over time seems clever, but only works if people are able to stay in the park for a long period of time, otherwise the situation will just encourage people to move and churn the parks. Under the proposal, it would be cheaper for me to move the car in and out of a park hourly than to stay for 2 hours. Demand based pricing might be better. Blair and Allen Streets are excellent examples. They are empty during the day, mostly, then full at night. It would make sense to charge less during the day than in the evenings in these areas. It is time to plan for a time when all parking is able to be managed by apps. This could mean a major reduction in investment in parking infrastructure. There may also be other ways of managing revenue - eg congestion charging - which might discourage people from bringing cars into the central city.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. For more in depth information regarding the residents parking scheme, please see page 25 in the Statement of Proposal. **Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme? Please tick all that apply.**

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Other (please specify)

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest.

Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders

2. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

3. Businesses located with the zone

4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking

5. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking

6. EV owners with no off-street parking

7. Second permits

8. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

If you are going to continue to require infill housing to create more off street parking (which I don't agree with), then allow people doing new build to install parking stacking machines - these to count as 2 parks, rather than the existing Council requirement that parking for new residences must be side by side.

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

Public transport timetable doesn't suit my schedule I

have to make multiple stops or multiple journeys

Public transport route has too many transfers

Public transport seems unreliable to me

Other (please specify)

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify)

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

I'm really surprised that you don't reference rideshare or app based ride systems. I would have thought these were the biggest threat to public transport use (other than the poor routes and now unreliable service). They also provide a huge opportunity. In many cities I use the Uber share option and catch a ride with 3 to 4 others going the same direction as me. I do not want to see the electric scooters on the footpath as it makes me feel really unsafe. Again I have spent a lot of time in other cities (eg LA) where they use the bike lanes on the road. Finally, the parking scheme cannot be separate from any longer term scheme to make the city more liveable and green. It is time you stopped insisting on off street parking for new builds in residential areas, and accepted that cars are going to wane, and people will resent having garages that are a requirement of the Council, but only used as storage for bikes etc which need far less space.

Ellen Blake on behalf of Wellington Living Streets

General

Thank you for this opportunity to submit on the Parking Policy. Our comments should be read in conjunction with submissions we have previously supplied on parking in October 2018 and August 2019.

We support the review of the parking policy as a mechanism to progress issues around the allocation of public space; like many cities most, 70%, of accessible public space is the road.

We commend staff on providing an informative discussion of the issues scoped. This is important to support an evidence-based approach to transport issues.

Issues to address

Scope

There are significant omissions from the scope of the parking policy. The scope of the policy only covers a narrow range of parking availability similar to the current Parking Policy.

1 Footpath parking is not covered at all. There is a significant amount of on-footpath parking provided by WCC around the city for bicycles and now also micro-mobility. Using footpath for vehicle parking directly reduces the level of service and amenity provided to pedestrians. Clearly this reduces footpath space for pedestrians and encourages these vehicle users to ride on footpaths also. For example, bicycle parking has even been sited in the kerb build-outs for pedestrian crossings at schools, clearly a safety issue. Car parks and other on-road space should be used for all vehicle parking including bicycles and the new micromobility vehicles. This should extend to not 'parking' vehicle accessories on footpaths like parking meters, EV charging stations and traffic signs. This clutter makes many footpaths inaccessible to some people.

2 There is a significant issue with illegal parking on footpaths and the discussion on enforcement does not address this. This means that footpaths are often blocked or too narrow for ordinary pedestrian movements, and this has been exacerbated with Covid19 distancing. Motorbike parking on footpaths is common and there is no enforcement outside the central area (and often within the central area too). Some streets in Wellington have footpaths that are always used for car parking such as Ohiro Road in Brooklyn (there is footpath on only one side of this busy road and it is a walk route to school), and Adelaide Road in Newtown. Clearly the actual enforcement priority for pedestrians needs to match the policy.

A simple change in this enforcement policy should be that any observation or complaint of illegal parking should be enforced, that is ticketed. The policy needs to be clear on the consequences of non-compliance. This can be enhanced by warranting more WCC staff to undertake parking enforcement when they see it – such as City Hosts.

3 Only 14% of inner-city parking is covered by this policy. The other 86% of parking is outside the scope and this makes any effort to manage inner city parking as a means to reduce climate emissions or meet placemaking and liveability objectives difficult to achieve. Covering the council managed on-street parking only addresses a small number of the issues and is a more operational type policy than the strategic overview required.

4 For the rest of Wellington all on-street parking is included but not off-street parking. The link to District Plan requirements is weak and the strategic direction for off-street parking is missing. For instance, use of land for parking leads to less affordable housing in residential areas, and lost opportunity near public transport stops.

To advance parking management in Wellington the policy needs to provide a strategic direction and should cover all parking in Wellington: footpath parking; both on-street and off-street; public and private; and how the WCC managed portion fits into the overall strategy.

Principles required are

- Allocation of land to parking – no minimum parking requirements anywhere so valuable residential land is not taken by parking, an approach to parking at public transport stops so that this most valuable space is not used for free parking
- Allocation of public space to parking so that there is equitable use of our valuable public road space
- Reasonable expectation of how people can access their properties and use of the neighbourhood that is consistent across all of Wellington.

This policy needs to include all parking and provide a clear direction of how it will be managed overall. This proposal clearly is a high level approach and should include this high level overview of all parking in Wellington.

Transport hierarchy

Living Streets has concerns with the redefinition of the transport hierarchy used in the Parking Policy to include electric scooters and other motorised vehicles in the same category as (human powered) bicycles. They are not active transport and should not take precedence over public transport. Electric motorised vehicles are similar to car-share and hire-vehicle users or motorbikes and should be included in one of those categories (page 10 Discussion document).

Requirement for more area-specific plans to be developed

Detailed plans for different areas will be required but we find it hard to see how this will be accomplished as it is a very time consuming approach both for staff, residents and NGO groups too. This could result in different approaches to parking in different parts of the city. Road users both in vehicles and on foot will benefit from certainty about how parking works overall.

Good design required

Removing parking space seems appealing at first glance but has well recognised downsides. Removing parked cars allows those driving through to speed up and removes the buffer pedestrians have between us and moving vehicles which decreases walking amenity. This phenomenon was noted with the reduction in traffic during level 4 lockdown that vehicle speeds increased. Parked cars provide an important barrier for pedestrians between moving vehicles and safe walking space on the footpath. This does not mean parking space should remain but that if parking space is removed safety for pedestrians on footpaths must be considered and alternative designs used to provide this – stormwater gardens, and other plantings can achieve this, as can siting all vehicle infrastructure on the road – like EV chargers, parking meters, road signs etc. Permeable car park spaces can also be used not only to improve stormwater management but to provide a slower speed safety zone before the footpath.

Removing on-street car parking usually results in increased off-street provision which requires vehicle accessways across the footpath. The more driveways allowed results in reduced safety for pedestrians on footpaths. Good design and consistent application of policy and rules can go some way to mitigate this. An overall policy outlining this is required.

Pricing as a mechanism to control parking availability

Pricing is shown to be an effective means to manage demand for parking and allow people to make choices about their trips and parking behaviour. However, pricing should not encourage vehicle users to park on the

footpath, such as motorbike parking prohibited from paid spaces, or lack of facility for bicycle and micromobility parking. These types of vehicle usually have free parking.

Parking Objectives

Living Streets support the parking objectives but recommends the following objectives are included:

- Support safe movement *and pleasant places*

Our 70% of public space that are roads include footpaths and pedestrian spaces which are used as the social gathering places of Wellington citizens. Roads include footpaths that are places for community as well as pedestrian movement and this needs to be reflected in the objectives. This is a key difference from existing transport policy.

- Support access for all

This should read as though it does include all people while identifying particular groups who have particular access needs. It is not clear whether this is access to car parking or access to spaces with well managed parking, for example footpaths clear of vehicles so children can easily and safely walk to school.

Guiding Principles

Principle A

Iterative changes to move towards the parking objectives identified is supported as a practical way to achieve the outcomes.

Consideration of impact on parking fee revenue needs more guidance on how this is intended to meet parking objectives. What priority is given to revenue compared with meeting other objectives. It is unclear if parking fees are to be full cost including environmental costs.

Principle B

This principle only applies to decreasing Council managed parking and not an overall decrease in car parking provision which should be the goal.

It should include all car parking.

Principle C

Please rephrase this to show that this is for those who require a car for mobility – not all disabled people can use cars, or older people, pregnant women or people with babies will want to use cars. WCC should prioritise support for walking, public transport and other active modes. For instance support for affordable family passes on public transport should be a priority.

Principle D

Pricing is an effective mechanism to manage parking demand in many situations (for instance, mobility parking is an exception). The principle that use of public space for vehicle parking is a priced commodity should apply consistently across the city.

Principle E

Local plans have the disadvantage that they may end up with many different approaches to parking management around the city.

Principle F

Living Streets strongly supports this principle to use what existing space we have well, rather than expanding parking space. This includes not using footpaths as parking space at all.

Principle G

Maintaining good information on parking space availability in the central city is a good idea and providing this information to users to more efficiently plan a trip. This service should be reflected in the price of car parking.

Principle H

Living Streets support good monitoring and alignment of Council business with objectives. This should be alignment in the wider context of transport outcomes not just car parking objectives.

Parking space hierarchy

The safe and efficient movement of people and goods in vehicles along roads (bus lanes etc) is an appropriate highest priority in all areas. However movement is not the only function of footpaths and pedestrian areas – safe and efficient movement yes but also pleasant places for community activities that do not include movement, such as stopping for a chat.

Living Streets seeks that footpaths are removed from consideration for parking of any vehicles including bikes. Priority for motorbikes, bicycles and micromobility are low and lower priority in many areas which encourages use of footpaths. This means valuable pedestrian space is used and causes safety issues and obstacles to be navigated with difficulty by more vulnerable pedestrians. We recommend motorbike, bicycle and micromobility parking has a higher on-road priority in all areas.

Parks and other recreation facilities including off-street parking are not all about safe and efficient movement either. These places should support very low speed movement only which is not always equated with efficient movement.

Living Streets strongly supports flexibility in allowing occasional parking for visitors, service and tradespeople to access places in controlled parking zones. One mechanism to achieve this is presented in the discussion.

Residential streets

EV chargers have been parked on footpaths in addition to the many other infrastructure and vehicle uses. Footpath space should be retained for pedestrians.

Parking management tools

The intervention logic should include as a first step to encourage walking, public transport use and push-cycles. A good database and monitoring of parking impacts and complaints would be required to target these tools. All inner-city suburbs should be targeted for interventions to increase walking and public transport use in the first instance, both of which have high mode share now and show potential to be even higher mode shares with sufficient support in the future. Combined with restricting commuter parking this would meet more climate and transport targets while alleviating parking pressures.

About Living Streets

Living Streets Aotearoa is New Zealand's national walking and pedestrian organisation, providing a positive voice for people on foot and working to promote walking friendly planning and development around the country. Our vision is "More people choosing to walk more often and enjoying public places".

The objectives of Living Streets Aotearoa are:

- to promote walking as a healthy, environmentally-friendly and universal means of transport and recreation
- to promote the social and economic benefits of pedestrian-friendly communities
- to work for improved access and conditions for walkers, pedestrians and runners including walking surfaces, traffic flows, speed and safety
- to advocate for greater representation of pedestrian concerns in national, regional and urban land use and transport planning.

For more information, please see: www.livingstreets.org.nz

Karl Hewlett Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used	Very important
Support safe movement	Very important
Support business wellbeing	Somewhat important
Support city amenity and safety	Very important
Support access for all	Very important
Support move to becoming an eco-city	Somewhat important
Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment	Somewhat important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Support for needs for space, nature and open areas for physiological and cultural wellbeing

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

not answered

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives? ;

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system	Very helpful
Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed	Very helpful
Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it	Very helpful
Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent	Very helpful
Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support	Somewhat helpful
Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply	Very helpful
Provide parking space availability information	Neutral
Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance	Very helpful

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Free public space allocated to parking and other needs and priorities high capacity transport over motor cars (with peak occupancy of 1.3 on average and 95% of the time parked with 0 occupants)

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

Q7. Key Transport Routes;(such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.) **Agree**

High parking space priority: bus stops.

Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers.

Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Q8. Central City **Disagree**

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks.

Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City?

Q9. Suburban Centres (shopping precincts) **Agree**

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space; priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks.

Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Q10. City Fringe

Neutral

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks.

Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micro- mobility parks, then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Q11. Outer Residential Areas

Agree

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover.

Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation & Community Facilities

Agree

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features.

Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks.

Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking Agree

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks.

Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks.

Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands.

To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Remove all requirements for parking g spaces from the district plan. Allow people to build houses, etc without having to allow for 1950s transport options. Ban cars from the city centre and suburban centers. E.v. are not the solution. The space requirements of cars are unchanged and given 75% of particulate pollution for car use does not come from the exhaust pipe changing the fuel is a sop to keep car manufactures in business

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes**Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?**

As part of the rates demand letter inform people what percentage of rates subsidises the private car (road cost, parking, etc plus increased cost of 3 waters due to car-induced sprawl, etc) and what percentage of the city is unrated (roads). Similar to the information about public transport subsidies.

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme. We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking.

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for 12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits.

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. Please put the priority rank from 1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. Businesses located with the zone
3. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
4. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
5. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
6. New dwellings/homes built after 2020
7. EV owners with no off-street parking
8. Second permits

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

The only priority IMHO should be where there is no reliable public transport option or a Dr's cert indicates the person cannot use public transport. Everyone else should carry all costs - economic and otherwise of deciding to own and use a low capacity transport option

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

None of these, I use public transport regularly

Public transport route has too many transfers

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

Other (please specify)

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

We need to start with planning g rules that encourage car usage. And then actively make decisions that remove cars from high density areas and replace them with high capacity option

Linda Beatson Individual submitter

Q1. How important are these objectives to you?

Support shift in type of transport used: Very important,

Support safe movement: Very important,

Support business wellbeing: Very important,

Support city amenity and safety: Very important,

Support access for all: Very important,

Support move to becoming an eco-city: Very important,

Deliver service excellence and a safe working environment: Very important

Q2. Are there any objectives you think we have missed?

Not answered

Q3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the objectives?

Making changes that link to improvements in transport system: Very helpful,

Prioritise how Council-controlled parking is managed: Very helpful,

Ensure that access to the city and suburban centres are inclusive and prioritise those who need it: Very helpful,

Parking is priced at a level that achieves objectives and is consistent: Very helpful,

Support local area-based parking plans where there is a need & support: Very helpful,

Focus on prioritising existing space, not on increasing parking supply: Very helpful,

Provide parking space availability information: Very helpful,

Align Council operations with the parking policy and report on performance: Very helpful

Q4. To what extent do you think these principles will help us achieve our objectives?

Not answered

Q5. Are there any principles you think we have missed?

Not answered

Q6. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the principles?

not answered

Q7. Key Transport Routes; (such as Lambton Quay, Thorndon Quay, etc.)

High parking space priority: bus stops. Low parking space priority: urban design features, mobility parks, loading zones, bicycles/micro-mobility parks, car share parks, EV charging parks, short stay parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks then public bus layovers. Lowest parking space priority: bus/coach parks, residents parks, then commuter parks. To what degree do you think we have this correct for key transport routes?

Strongly agree

Q8. Central City

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, loading zones, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, EV charging parks, then motorcycle parks. Low parking space priority: coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space

priority: residents parks, public bus layover then commuter parks. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the Central City;

Strongly agree

Q9. Suburban Centres shopping precincts)

High parking space priority: bus stops, mobility parks, urban design features, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: loading zones, motorcycle parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, car share parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: public bus layover then coach/bus parks. Lowest parking space priority: residents parks then commuter parks. To what degree do you think we have this correct for suburban centres?

Strongly agree

Q10. City Fringe

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, residents parks, then car share parks. Medium parking space priority: mobility parks then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones, bicycle/micromobility parks, then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. To what degree do you think we have this correct for the city fringe?

Strongly agree

Q11. Outer Residential Areas

High parking space priority: bus stops, urban design features, then residents parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, mobility parks, then EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: short stay parks, loading zones then public bus layover. Lowest parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands, motorcycle parks, commuter parks, then coach/bus parks. To what degree do you think we have this correct for residential areas?

Strongly Agree

Q12. Council Parks, Sports, Recreation Community Facilities

High parking space priority: bicycle/micro-mobility parks, mobility parks, motorcycle parks, short stay parks, coach/bus parks, then urban design features. Medium parking space priority: EV charging parks. Low parking space priority: car share parks, small passenger vehicles/taxi stands, residents parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: public bus layover, loading zones then bus stops. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council parks, sports, recreation & community facilities?

Strongly Agree

Q13. Council's Central City Off-Street Parking

High parking space priority: mobility park, bicycle/micro-mobility parks, motorcycle parks, then short stay parks. Medium parking space priority: car share parks, EV charging parks, then commuter parks. Lowest parking space priority: loading zones, coach/bus parks, public bus layover, urban design features, bus stops, residents parks, then small passenger service vehicles/taxi stands. To what degree do you think we have this correct for Council's central city off-street parking?

Strongly agree

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the proposed parking space hierarchies?

Not answered

Q15. Do you agree with this pricing approach? Yes

Q16. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this proposed pricing approach?

Not answered

Q17. Residents Parking Scheme

We are proposing to change existing and new residents' parking schemes. Residents' parking schemes prioritise residents to park on the street near their home and ensure access for their visitors. The introduction of a scheme will be guided by the number of households with off-street parking compared with households with no off-street parking. Which of the following aspects would you like to see included in a residents parking scheme? Please tick all that apply.

Residents' parking schemes will be guided by the ratio of households with off-street parking to households with no off-street parking

Provide car share, mobility and micro-mobility on-street parking spaces

Reduce, remove or relocate coupon parking where it conflicts with residents access/parking

Change on-street parking to short-stay parking only (up to 3 hours) with residents exemption permits

Reduce the size of residents parking exemption zones (so residents with permits can only park close to their home address)

Limit the number of permits issued to 85% of capacity/total available spaces per zone

Set an annual application/renewal date and only issue permits for

12months (with a refund option if you move out of zone)

Introduce online application and permitting system

Provide residents with an annual allocation of one-day exemption passes for visitors/tradespeople etc to use

If a second permit is issued for the same household, the second permit is more expensive

Introduce discounted exemption permits for mobility permit holders and EV car-owners

Q18. Allocation of residents parking permits

Please rank the following categories in order of priority with 1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest. Please put the priority rank from

1 - 8 to the left of the category.

1. Mobility permit holders
2. EV owners with no off-street parking
3. Pre-1930s houses or pre-1940s apartments with no off-street parking
4. Other pre-2020 dwellings with no off-street parking
5. Businesses located with the zone
6. All existing dwellings with 1 or more off-street space
7. Second permits
8. New dwellings/homes built after 2020

Q19. Do you have anything else to add about the residents parking scheme, or any ideas we haven't thought of?

Not answered

Q20. What deters you from using public transport?

Please select all that apply.

Q21. What prevents you from walking, cycling or using other forms of active transport? Please select all that apply.

None of these, I walk/bike/scooter regularly

Q22. Do you have any final comments about the topics raised in this submission?

Not answered

Q23. Please check below if you want to make an oral submission (Oral submissions will be scheduled for the end of May with additional dates at the end of June)

Yes, I would like to submit an oral submission