
REPORT 9
(1215/52/IM)

PARKING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: RESIDENT AND COUPON PARKING FEES

1. Purpose of Report

To consider submissions on the proposed increase to Resident and Coupon Parking fees.

2. Executive Summary

At its meeting on 3 December 2009, the Strategy and Policy Committee recommended to Council that it agree to an increase to resident and coupon parking fees from 1 July 2010, subject to any objections being considered.

The proposed fee changes were advertised as part of the traffic resolution process on 19 January 2010. This gave the public three weeks to make a submission. Five written submissions were received with four opposing the fee increases and one in favour, one oral submission was presented to the Strategy and Policy Committee. Details of the submissions are included in sections 5.1 and 5.2.

Officers do not consider that the submissions give valid reasons not to increase the parking fees.

3. Recommendations

Officers recommend that the Committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Note the submissions made for and against the proposed fee increases.*
3. *Recommend to Council that it confirm the following fees to take effect 1 July 2010:*
 - (a) *Resident Parking Permit - \$115 per year*
 - (b) *Coupon Exemption Permit - \$65 per year*
 - (c) *Daily Parking Coupon - \$7.50 per day*
 - (d) *Suburban Trade Coupon - \$7.50 per day*
 - (e) *Monthly Parking Coupon - \$120 per month*

4. Background

At its meeting on 20 August 2009 the Committee approved a recommendation to consult on proposed amendments to the Resident and Coupon Parking Schemes. The Committee added an amendment to also consult on the pricing of resident and coupon parking.

Officers subsequently reported back to the Strategy and Policy Committee at the 3 December 2009 meeting with recommended increases to the parking fees. The Committee amended these and instructed officers to advertise a traffic resolution under Clause 11 of the Traffic Bylaw notifying the public of the proposed new fees.

The proposed parking fees were advertised in the *Our Wellington* page on 19 January 2010 and five written submissions were received. Four submitters were opposed to the increased fees and one was in support.

5. Discussion

5.1 Submissions

Five written submissions were received via the Council website. Four submissions opposed the proposed parking fees, and one supported the fees. The table below contains the comments from the submitters with their reasons for opposing or supporting the proposed fees.

	First Name	Suburb	Do you agree with the proposed resolution?	Comments
1	Nathan Horne	Wadestown	No	None
2	Joanne Kelly	Vogeltown	No	No reason is given for the need to increase the Residential and exemption parking permits by 30% and the daily and monthly parking permits by 50%.
3	Janine Ford	Brooklyn	No	\$7.50 represents a 50% increase and is way too much to pay for a street park! There's no justification for it and it is simply a revenue collecting exercise. I am already being hit with rates payments as a ratepayer. Please reconsider.

4	Colin and Barbara Hamilton	Horokiwi	No	<p>Our objection to the increase in coupon parking is based on the fact that it's an unfair bias against those of us who live in Horokiwi. Why - with the closure of the median barrier public transport is now impractical for us to use to get to Wellington and return, as once alighting at Petone we then have to drive almost all the way back to the city (ie Ngauranga) to return to Horokiwi. We feel residents of Horokiwi are therefore significantly disadvantaged by having to drive into Wellington rather than benefitting from subsidised public transport. We have to drive and park in the city - there is no choice for us. Perhaps the City Council might consider issuing the residents of Horokiwi with a number of free parking coupons for use throughout the year as a means of helping to support this community. Thank you for taking our submission into consideration.</p>
5	Dave McArthur	Melrose	Yes	<p>Agree because car owners are destroying our economy and driving the nation into debt. They receive vast subsidies - especially at the cost of education, health, superannuation, housing and other vital systems. Provision of hundreds of miles of car parking in a hilly compact city comes at a massive cost, including the losses incurred because the land cannot be used for profitable enterprises and can be a source of rates. Any investment in car parking now can only have a very short-term return as private vehicles rapidly become less affordable as mineral oil prices rise and national/local government capacity to maintain the immense subsidies they give car owners. Car parking charges should rise to reflect the true cost of the cars and the income invested in quality mass transit systems, thus reducing some of the unjust tax burden on non-car owners.</p>

5.2 Oral Submissions

Dave McArthur made an oral submission to SPC on the 2nd of March, outlining his support for the proposed increase in Resident and Coupon parking fees.

In summary the basis of his submission was his opinion that private vehicles are heavily subsidised by the Government and lead to an over reliance on oil. He states this reliance puts us at a, “major risk of economic implosion and worse”.

5.3 Response to submissions

- Submitter one provided no reasons to support their opposition.
- Submitters two and three feel that the increase in parking fees has not been adequately justified.

Explanation; the increases in parking fees are aimed to better reflect the value of the parking space and to act as a control on demand.

Coupon Parking is predominantly used as cheap commuter parking. The desire is to increase the fees to be more in line with the inner city parking rates and to encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport. Providing all day parking at rates lower than the cost of public transport will not achieve Council's goals to reduce demand on the road network and encourage alternative transport modes to the private car.

Resident Parking fee increases are proposed to better reflect their true value. The last fee increase was in 2002 since which time the value of the space and cost of maintaining the space has increased. Council believes the current cost is too low for a priority on-street park.

- Submitter four believes there is an unfair bias against residents from Horokiwi.

Explanation; the median barrier along State Highway 2 was installed by NZTA as there was a significant safety issue with vehicles entering and exiting from the State Highway. It is true that public transport may be a less attractive option for Horokiwi residents than was previously the case. However officers do not consider this justifies scaling back the proposed fee levels and in any case it would not be practicable to make a special concession for Horokiwi residents.

- Submitter five supports the proposed increase in parking fees.

The submissions, individually and collectively are not considered to present sufficient justification for the Council not to go ahead with the proposed increases in parking fees.

- Oral submission

While Mr McArthur's views may be seen as relatively extreme, they do align with the Council's desire to reduce the reliance on the private motor vehicle. Parking fees can be used as a traffic management tool to promote more sustainable modes of transport, which aim to reduce congestion on the roads.

6. Conclusion

There were a very small number of submissions opposing the proposed fee increases and none of them are considered to provide sufficient reason for Council to not proceed with the fee increases as advertised.

It is therefore recommended that the Committee agrees to proceed with the advertised fee increases to take effect on 1 July 2010, also that the submitters are thanked and informed of the Council's decision.

Contact Officer: *Stephen Carruthers, Transport Planner, Transport Planning Group, Infrastructure Directorate.*

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

The Parking Policy supports Council's strategic direction in that it aims to balance and deliver desired outcomes in the Transport, Urban Development, Economic Development, Environmental, Social and Recreation, Cultural wellbeing Strategies. The Policy supports Council activities as a provider of on-street parking, a manager of public road space, a regulator of off-street parking and a facilitator of arrangements to achieve parking goals.

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact

The proposed parking fees are expected to increase revenue by approximately \$250,000. It should be noted that the proposed fees are expected to reduce the number of Coupon Permits sold, this has been assumed at a rate of 15%.

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

N/A

4) Decision-Making

This is not a significant decision.

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

This is a report back from consultation as per the traffic resolution process.

b) Consultation with Maori

Mana whenua have not been consulted separately.

6) Legal Implications

Council's lawyers have been consulted during the development of the traffic resolution report.

7) Consistency with existing policy

This report recommends parking fee increases which are consistent with the WCC Parking Policy 2007.