

Before the Wellington City Council Strategy and Policy Committee**In the Matter of** The Proposed Resident and Coupon Parking Schemes**By** Raymond Chang**Introduction**

1. I am currently a resident of Mount Victoria, and have been a resident of the inner city suburbs since I moved to Wellington three years ago. I am a car owner, and currently dwell in a multi-unit complex at 31 Pirie Street, Mount Victoria. Two people in my unit own a car. One of the cars is garaged within the complex, while another holds a current resident's parking permit. In the past, I have also held resident's parking permits.
2. I have read Mr. Spence' report to this committee dated 20 August 2009 providing a review of the Resident and Coupon parking policies. I have also examined Appendices 2, 4, 5 and 6 to his report. I will refer to Appendix 2 of his report in this submission.

Key points

3. I have made a number of key points in my original submission to this Committee. I assume that the original submission will have provided you with some background to the issues I wish to focus on today. These include:
 - 3.1 Proposed changes to the cost of Resident/Coupon parking
 - 3.2 Proposed processes to changing/adding more resident parking areas
 - 3.3 Proposed limitations on parking permits for multi-unit complexes
 - 3.4 Proposed changes to the Mount Victoria resident's parking permit zoning
4. I support the recommendation that the fees for resident/coupon parking be reviewed. An increase in daily coupon parking should take into account the proximity of relatively cheap parking within walking distance of the CBD. I suggest that a higher cost for commuter parking will result in a commensurate increase in the update of public transport, which provides environmental benefits. This needs to be balanced with the provision of public transportation services at a frequent and reliable interval.
5. Resident's parking fees could be increased, however, any cost needs to take into account the needs of residents, and the relative planning restrictions around the development of off-street car parking.
 - 5.1 I submit that it would be unfair to increase the resident parking fees to a level which would serve as a deterrent to applying for one, without a relaxation on the district plan to allow off-street car parking development as a permitted activity.
 - 5.2 This also needs to be balanced against my colloquial understanding that very few lots in the parking zones have the space to develop off-street car parking.

6. Mr. Spence has recommended criteria for the public to apply for new resident parking areas. Of concern, the criteria recommended suggest that 75% of residents in the affected area need to support the proposal.
 - 6.1 It is unclear as to who will pay to undertake this survey. I submit that it would be unfair to require a community to pay for this to be undertaken, and that a threshold of requests from a certain number of residents in an area be enough for Wellington City Council (WCC) enter into the consultative process and direct proceedings from there.
 - 6.2 I also submit that 75% of the community is a high rate of acceptance, and propose that 66% (2 in 3 people) is a more realistic figure given that many within a community are unlikely to respond to a survey.
7. I support the recommendation that, with increasing dependence on higher-density housing, the maximum allowance of resident permits per multi-unit complex be reduced from two per household unit to one per household unit. I submit that this is a pragmatic solution to the continued intensification of land use in these areas.
 - 7.1 I do not support other measures which link the number of off-street parks to the number of resident parks available. A home-owner should not be penalised for having off-street car parking available, and should still be given the same allocation as those who have been less well planned in the past.
8. My main point of contention is the proposed change in eligibility for Mount Victoria parking zone as recommended in Appendix 2. I have not examined the other zones in detail; however, I request that the Committee review the recommended streets for similar incongruities which I will examine below.
 - 8.1 The recommendation is to remove properties which are currently eligible for residential or coupon parking that are legitimate residential properties. There does not appear to be any justification for the recommendations attached in Appendix 2, however, I assume that they are to address the over-demand in the Mount Victoria permit zone or to make the zones more consistent with the District Plan.
 - 8.2 It has been recommended that certain streets become restricted. A few examples of a number include excluding Home Street from coupon exemptions entirely, restricting all numbers below 7 odd and 12 even on Roxburgh Street, and restricting all numbers below 41 odd and 30 even on Pirie Street.
 - 8.3 In total, this would theoretically remove a total of 66 permits from the Mount Victoria permit area, going some way towards solving an over-demand (if it exists). However, it has also been recommended that all existing permits continue to be honoured, and as such, these would not be 'removed' until residents of these areas move or change vehicles.
 - 8.4 Conversely, it has also been recommended that the currently restricted Oriental Parade (from 82 to 374 only) become unrestricted and added to the Mount Victoria permit zone.
 - 8.5 This is incongruous with the perceived intent of the imposition of restrictions on Pirie, Roxburgh, and all other streets in Appendix 2. There is a suggestion that 22 permits would become validated if the restrictions are lifted. However, having walked past much of



Oriental Parade, it appears that a number of multi-unit complexes and apartments abound in the currently restricted numbers.

- 8.6 Unrestricting Oriental Parade could potentially open many more resident parking permit applications.
 - 8.7 In simple terms, it appears from the recommendations in Appendix 2 regarding the Mount Victoria permit area will take from those with existing access to the permit area and add people and properties without existing access to the parking area.
 - 8.8 If the intent of the change in restrictions is to align the permit zones with the District Plan zones, I submit that all existing residential use remain within the permit zone. This provides for existing residential use which allowed for parking of cars on the road as part of the planning to remain, (and not simply the existing occupiers of that residential area), while ensuring that future developments within the restricted areas account for the lack of parking available.
 - 8.9 I contend that this is not logistically complex, given that address databases could be kept for individual addresses for access across the internal parking/WCC network.
 - 8.10 I submit that the proposed restrictions need to be researched much more in depth, and that should not be accepted without further consultation and discussion. I submit that there is inadequate justification around the removal of some streets of the Mount Victoria permit area, and that the addition of Oriental Parade.
9. Finally, I support the overall intent of the report and recommendations, with the above exceptions. I have not traversed other points in detail, but strongly support the provision of more parking areas for residents within the permit zones, and for residents to be prioritised over commuter traffic. This is consistent with the WCC Parking Policy, and I submit that this will also discourage the use of private motor vehicles as commuter traffic into the CBD during and for work.