

## Appendix 4

### Challenges and pressure points identified as part of review of existing council parking policies

The following is a summary of issues identified throughout the city and across the full range of existing council parking policies.

#### 1.0 Central Area

- Weekday evenings and weekends (i.e. when there is free parking) are experiencing a heavy demand, meaning there is a potential lack of availability for those who want to visit the city for its nightlife and entertainment. There are also hotspots in the central area, where residents who do not have adequate parking in their apartment block are using these spaces
- There is a lower turnover of free on-street spaces at weekends, meaning that spaces are less available. This could be affecting commercial activity in the city and should be investigated further. There is also the issue that a car dominated shopping environment could also be influencing shoppers to choose other retail centres
- No enforcement on Sundays, meaning there is much lower turnover (see Table 1)

**Table 1 – Comparison of Turnover Rates<sup>1</sup>**

Area	Weekday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
Lambton Quay	7.7	8.4	5.1	3.3
Civic Area	8.7	9.1	5.8	3.7
The Terrace	7.0	8.2	4.5	2.9
Courtney Place	8.8	9.0	5.7	4.0
Cuba Street	6.6	6.8	5.0	4.7
Tory Street	7.4	7.6	6.1	4.1
Aitken Street	5.1	5.2	2.4	2.1
Cable Street	3.7	4.3	4.5	3.3

<sup>1</sup> Wellington City Council Occupation / Duration Surveys – 2006 – Turnover rates are the number of vehicles that used the spaces during the course of the survey period, for week day 9am to 5pm, for weekends 9am to 4pm

- Vacancy rates are lower at weekends, meaning that less spaces are available (see Table 2)

**Table 2 - Comparison of Vacancy Rates (Metered Areas)<sup>2</sup>**  
**(All figures are in %)**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Weekday</b>	<b>Friday</b>	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Sunday</b>
Lambton Quay	6	7	6	9
Civic Area	11	15	2	1
The Terrace	9	10	7	8
Courtney Place	25	24	4	3
Cuba Street	54	47	13	7
Tory Street	41	34	7	5
Aitken Street	47	35	43	50
Cable Street	45	47	12	8

- Parking on key routes coming into the central city is limiting the efficiency of the transport network and contributing to congestion at peak times. In essence, parking is being given priority over the efficient movement of vehicles at this time
- There is also a pressure on the on-street spaces in the central city, to be removed from the system for security reasons and for conversion to seating areas, urban parks, cycle lanes etc
- Concern that there are pockets of under-utilised spaces on the outer edges of the central area
- The extension of metered zone was agreed in the early 1990's, but has not been implemented. The boundaries of the existing zone need to be reviewed
- Is there adequate provision for servicing vehicles? Also, the implementation of the permit for using loading zones needs to be addressed
- There are significant issues with an over-supply of taxis in the central area. Despite an allocation of taxi ranks, in some cases drivers are using metered parking, bus stops and loading zones to wait for passengers. This is proving difficult to enforce. These issues are being worked through with the council and with the Taxi Forum

<sup>2</sup> Wellington City Council Occupation / Duration Surveys – 2006 – Averaged over the survey period. Vacancy rates are the percentage of time the space is unoccupied.

## **1.1 Issues relating specifically to the District Plan rules for Central Area**

- The lack of parking being provided in student accommodation and the refurbishment of old commercial buildings into apartments in the central area.

## **2.0 Residential Areas**

Many homes in the central area fringe do not have sufficient or any on-property parking. Some areas are experiencing a significant over demand, with three residents permits issued for each space available. In these critical areas, resident's permits are not being issued (but Coupon-Exemption permits are available). This is over-spilling into the coupon parking zones. This is an area where operational reality is not reflecting the policy intention. Whilst it is possible to give residents priority over commuters in Resident Zones, there is an issue regarding the over-demand from residents for these spaces, especially in some areas.

Also, where there is significant demand for spaces in the Resident only zones, residents are parking in the Coupon Zones, in direct competition with commuters (though only during the day). With these areas in close proximity to the central area, and hence their attractiveness for commuters, who are able to Park and Ride or Park and Walk, it is possible that residents are also walking and/or using public transport, meaning that there is competition for these spaces during the day and evening.

There is also an overlap here with the development of infill policies. The 1 parking space per dwelling may not be sufficient provision for the amount of infill development required to satisfy expectations of intensification capacity along the Growth Spine. Research suggests that 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling maybe more realistic. However, there are issues in some areas where the parking requirements are impacting on the character and heritage of an area and this also needs to be considered.

The Resident Permit policy is generally working well and is doing what it was intended to do; however the following issues have been identified:

- Criteria for receiving a resident permit – this needs to be reviewed and clearly defined
- Review of existing boundaries – do these boundaries need to be expanded?
- As the city has changed, there are now areas that are under pressure from suburban centres, or expanding businesses. Should the council be introducing new resident permit zones?

- Increasing requests for designated mobility parks outside people’s homes. This restricts availability to other residents. Who should have priority?
- Should we be supplying more resident parking? E.g. at the expense of Coupon Parking, better use of existing spaces e.g. smaller spaces

Coupon Parking Scheme does not get the revenue that it should, as it is relatively difficult to enforce. However, the following issues have also been identified:

- There are areas where it is not working e.g. Mount Victoria, as it is too close to the City Centre (especially the entertainment end of the city).
- residents with a coupon exemption permit are now competing with commuters for limited spaces
- no recent technical or operational reviews carried out
- The revenue that a coupon parking space receives is approximately \$1,000 per space per year, compared with the price of an annual Resident Permit (\$90) or cost of a coupon exemption permit (\$50).

## 2.1 District Plan policies

- Infill development and conflicts with streetscape and heritage characteristics
- Lack of suburban centre parking, particularly in areas included in the growth spine

## 3.0 Town and Suburban Centres

- The short stay parking is not metered and there are lower levels of turnover.

**Table 3 - Comparison of Vacancy Rates (Suburban Areas<sup>3</sup>)  
(All figures are in %)**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Weekday</b>	<b>Friday</b>	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Sunday</b>
Johnsonville	15	15	40	59
Tawa	34	34	33	59
Karori	37	30	34	63
Kilbirnie	14	11	15	35
Newtown	38	32	37	59

<sup>3</sup> Wellington City Council Occupation / Duration Surveys – 2006 – Averaged over the survey period. Vacancy rates are the percentage of time the space is unoccupied.

#### **4.0 Council-Provided Parking**

The Council provides (and manages) parking at facilities such as recreation centres, libraries and community centres. The issue here is about how much is provided and whether the spaces are managed to ensure an adequate turnover.

There is also an issue of spillover parking in some areas from housing land (parking permits were introduced in January 2006 in response to non-tenants using spaces, families having more than one car (or car and taxi) etc. The scheme allows permit holders to park on the housing land, but does not guarantee a parking space.

#### **5.0 Mobility Parking**

A policy has recently been introduced and is being implemented across the City. The policy aims to set aside 2% of parking for mobility car parks, enhance design and signage, parking restriction to be designated 'at all times' and pro-active enforcement. The policy is being implemented in the Central Area, but there are issues with allocating already limited on-street spaces in residential areas (see section 2.0).

#### **6.0 Motorbikes**

There are issues with allocating space for on-street parking for motorcyclists in residential areas, where there is already significant over demand from other vehicles.

Motorbike parking is free of charge, should a charge be introduced, especially in the Central Area?

#### **7.0 Cycles**

Council has provided cycle stands for cyclists, but there is pressure for more to be installed. Should more stands be provided?

#### **8.0 Sports Venues / Weekly Sporting Events**

There is an issue of spillover into residential areas from sports venues. Some areas cannot accommodate events and the short-term, intense pressure they bring. There are two different sets of expectation:

- sports people expect spaces to be provided
- residents expect us to enforce infringements

## **9.0 Special Areas and Events**

Events or special use puts pressure on available spaces. The main conflict is usually with resident's parking. Compromise plans have been developed that are generally successful in achieving a successful outcome.

## **10.0 Safety Issues / Parking on Footpaths**

This issue will need to be monitored and has already been the subject of a report to SPC.

## **11.0 Enforcement and Pricing**

There are issues around pricing and enforcement e.g. developing a transparent pricing strategy, are we getting the best return on an asset (i.e the on-street spaces), council dependence on revenue, other enforcement outcomes are not being taken into consideration.

## **12.0 Tourist Parking**

There is concern regarding the lack of over night parking for tourist buses, especially in the central area, close to major hotels.