

Appendix One

Officer summaries of workshop attended

Below, please find summaries for most of the numerous workshops organised. These have been compiled by officers at my request. They are for councillors' reference only in case there was a topic of interest that members wanted to follow up on.

If further information is required, I would suggest that it might be useful to follow up with officers. Presentations from the conference can also be found at http://www.planning.org.nz/Category?Action=View&Category_id=211

Urban Design Forum

Facilitated by David Mead the session set about discussing what 'urban design' as a concept means for the NZ context. The session involved three speakers: Marc Bailey (Boffa Miskell), Ian Cassells (the Wellington Company) and Rau Hoskins (Unitec) providing insight and asking questions from planning, developer and Māori perspectives, respectively.

Marc asked what is an appropriate design response in NZ - looking at geological, economic, social, environmental factors unique to NZ; Ian questioned current rating and development contributions practices in NZ and whether these really enable a true user-pays system; and Rau explained 'urban design' as a concept does not fit comfortably with a Māori perspective - rather a 'Māori cultural landscape' is a more appropriate concept.

The questions and answers session mostly revolved around the working relationship between Māori and urban design.

Research Symposium

Facilitated by Dr Mark Billingham, the following issues were looked at:

- Long term bio-diversity trends more useful for planning. It takes 50-80 years to lose fauna, 100-150 years to lose tree species.
- Planners' efforts appear to have been directed into plan making with minimal resources being applied to monitoring and evaluation of plans and their results.
- Forward planning has been ignored in most cases
- What planning practice changes are needed to address biodiversity?
 - Ecological literacy appears to be a significant issue among planners and Council managers
 - Few ecologists are familiar with RMA district planning processes
 - The key issue of ecological restoration, through district planning has been the main casualty of the gap between planners and ecologists

Susie Wood and Jan Crawford

- Monitoring and evaluating Council plans and activities important

- A need for rigorous methodology
- Planners and scientists need to work together
- Challenges to monitoring plan effectiveness:
 - Lack of consistent methods for plan effectiveness monitoring
 - Complexity of plans
 - Absence of measurable outcomes
 - Need for integration of monitoring
 - Insufficient resources
- Need for integration of monitoring:
 - Monitoring should serve multiple information needs and maximise available resources
 - Best use of existing information
 - Sharing of resources
 - Align management systems
- Integration of monitoring essential
 - Horizontal - across Council activities and plans
 - Vertical – with other organisations
- Has been a lot of focus on end outcomes rather than greater attention on intermediate outcomes of attribution of cause and effect. Attribution (plan factors) vs. Contribution (external factors)
- Objectives not good for monitoring as they are high level goals. Outcomes are measurable – what, when, how etc. Outcomes are required for monitoring plans and can be used to write District/Regional Plans.
- Commitment to implementation vital.
- Case study: Plan Change 6

Young Planners Congress

The New Zealand Young Planners Congress started with drinks on the evening of Monday 28th March with the purpose of getting to know each other, levels of experience, and geographically where everyone was working.

Tuesday 29th of March kicked off with the AGM, a welcome from CEO and a mayoral address from Porirua Mayor, Nick Leggett. Mr Leggett, being a young mayor, spoke of the challenges he faces in developing Porirua City and the role he felt planners could play in supporting better outcomes – saying that they need to “be enablers not blockers”.

Steven Dale, the international keynote speaker for the Congress, entitled his presentation "insurgent ideas". Stephen describes the lack of innovation inside Politics, Planning and Policy (the P3 Paradigm) which can only deal with incremental changes. He compares these against *new technologies/insurgent ideas* which operate outside of the P3 Paradigm, changing the ways in which

professionals do things. For example, 10 years ago GIS was a huge growing industry - now people can satisfy all their GIS needs for free using Google programmes. *The Pro-Am Movement* (Amateurs performing tasks to the standard of professionals) is also transforming the way the P3 Paradigm operates. For example the website 'SeeClickFix' provides a forum for citizens to report problems/issues in their neighbourhoods and empowering citizens, community groups and governments to get involved to resolve them.

James Lunday explained his background (Town Planning, Urban Design, Economics), reminded us of historical planning ideas and the typical outcomes of modern planning (i.e. new suburbs, not mixed or dense enough, and sterile squares 'spaces without soul'). He provided the following urban design ideas:

- Balance and harmony in the built and urban environment
- Geometry – anarchy within geometry that reflects the culture within
- Pedestrianisation needs density and critical mass
- Use unique environments like ports and marinas
- Combine past, present and future elements
- Enable ideas with passion
- Think about patterns not necessarily tall buildings
- Urban Design is more about Planning than Architecture
- Cities are living entities

With regards to the "*Christchurch renaissance*" he presented the following opinions:

- A unique position to rebuild culture through the centre of the city
- Heritage is part of the arts so it shouldn't be abandoned
- Needs a planning voice, not just the voice of government
- Don't rush the rebuild the centre – take some time to think things through

James Lundy concluded reminding everyone that it is necessary to understand the layers of a city and "make no great plans".

Sir Bob Jones presented a range of opinions which the following presenters 'toyed' with.

Dr Viv Heslop introduced her ideas of "*being a positive deviant*" These ideas includes the need to think outside of the box and to not be afraid to 'say No to No'. She outlined her experience in the planning profession and reminded us that we need to employ integrated thinking when making planning decisions and not to simply act as administrators of the Plan.

Paul Turner, from LandLink discussed urban design, green design and what he considered, to be sustainable neighbourhoods - and critiqued his local neighbourhood of Waikanae. He also provided information about the Neighbourhood Rating Tool that has been developed by his company LandLink Ltd, which is a mechanism to design, assess and measure the sustainability of new and existing neighbourhoods.

Steve Preston gave us a presentation on how to do clear presentations. From his background of running courses on the Fundamentals of Communication and Leadership, he explained how to structure a presentation and confidently present to audiences so that you can get your key messages across.

Finally, to conclude the day, Caroline Miller pushed everyone to maintain NZPI membership, the NZPI president Jane Douglas recapped her experiences as a young planner and Clare Sargent concluded the day.

Overall, the range of presentations provided us with new information and challenged our opinions and personal expectations as planners in New Zealand.

Parallel Sessions: 30-31 March 2011

A1 - Major Events

This session comprised three parts.

The first, by James Gardner Hopkins (Russell McVeagh), was about the RWC Empowering legislation, the second, by Amanda Douglas and Emma Thaite (Wynn Williams) about RWC planning controls, and the third, by Alan Kerr (BECA) about planning a pedestrian focus for major sporting events.

RWC Empowering legislation

- Biggest sporting event of 2011 - 4 billion TV viewers, 60,000 overseas visitors
- 2 pieces of legislation to manage - Major Events Management Act 2007 and the Rugby World Cup 2011 (Empowering) Act 2010
- The first deals with an almost blanket ban on advertising unless it is approved by the IRB or RWC 2011. Stringent measures will be in place to ensure others do not advertise 'by association' and to prevent ambush marketing. This will require WCC to monitor and enforce
- The second, the Empowering Act, requires Council within extremely abridged timeframes, to receive, seek reports and lodge applications with the Authority. Hearings can still be held – requiring a notified application to be determined within 40 days and non-notified applications within 25 days
- Urgent applications, are even more truncated in terms of timeframes
- Only certain people may object
- It is compulsory to disregard temporary effects and the Authority must apply permitted baselines. There is some uncertainty around what constitutes 'temporary effects'

- The substantive focus is the 'event' not sustainable management
- Is this legislation justified - no certainty that it is - but depending on how it goes, may lead as a precursor to support further amendments to the RMA in terms of timeframes and situations where 'direct referral' is appropriate.

Planning Controls

- Authority established under RWC (Empowering Act) had very wide powers
- Council must provide an Administrative Secretariat to support the Authority to help it process any applications received
- Applies criteria as to whether it is reasonably necessary for an application to be dealt with under other enactments (RMA) or by the Authority
- If it is reasonable to grant under this legislation - referral to Authority
- Possibility of more appeals under urgency being received after July as clock ticks down. Transfer of some games from Christchurch (with at least one coming to Wellington) may increase possibility of urgent applications being received here
- Public hearings not essential - can conduct by video link if desirable
- General view is that this is similar to the RMA in terms of requirements, but that applications are dealt within a far shorter timeframe

Planning for Pedestrians

BECA undertaking significant work at London Olympics 2012:

- Planning for pedestrians is seen as paramount - not as an afterthought
- Requires a targeted investment in pedestrian infrastructure
- Pedestrian focussed publicity required pre-event - Early engagement means matters raised can be addressed
- As part of increasing pedestrian numbers, recommends limited or expensive parking as disincentives to vehicle use
- Provides an enhanced emphasis on 'experience' - pedestrians tend to talk more to each other
- Allows increased exposure for local businesses. Businesses can be shown benefits of footfall for increased pedestrian movement
- Experience of the event is not confined solely to the venue - there are environmental and social values as well

- Local consultation is vital - involving pedestrians in planning gives them a sense of enfranchisement.

A3 - The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

This session facilitated by a number of planners from private companies and NZTA looked at two recent Board of Enquiry processes for projects of national significance run by the EPA, the Tauhara II geothermal plant, and the Waterview motorway project. Presentations were made by the planner who was the reporting officer for the EPA on the Tauhara consents, and by the consultants who are acting for NZTA in the Waterview consents.

There was considerable discussion around the pros and cons of the new processes, and in particular:

- Necessity for working closely with the EPA in a “pre-application” phase.
- Use of pre-hearing meetings with submitters to help resolve or narrow issues before the hearing.
- Use of caucusing of experts representing all parties, both before and during the hearing.
- Appointment of a “friend of the submitters” – a “neutral” planner who assists the lay submitters work their way through the process.
- The “flavour” of the process depends on the judge who chairs the Board. For example, the Tauhara process was less judicial in tone, and was very accommodating of tikanga and achieved some real community engagement. Other processes have been very much like Environment Court proceedings, and not so accessible for lay submitters.
- The need for applicants to have much more detailed information and design done for the Board of Enquiry process than was typical in the former “two stage” process. For example, previously conditions were proposed in an application, refined at a Council hearing, then further refined at the Environment Court.

The role of councils acting on behalf of their community was also discussed; Councils have to make a decision on whether or not to become a submitter. Regardless of whether or not council submits, there is a large workload and cost associated with providing information to the Board of Enquiry and these costs are not reimbursed.

The very telling comment was made that for big roading projects like Waterview, the decision to proceed is made well in advance of the consenting process. The most appropriate place for community input is when the strategic decision to proceed is made, rather than in the actual consent process.

A4 - Natural Hazards & Climate Change

The four speakers from various research institutes plus a WCC staff member discussed planning for natural disasters both in terms of unexpected disasters (i.e. earthquake/tsunami) and slow onset disasters (i.e. climate change). The key to planning for disasters is understanding and identifying risk, in terms of the likelihood of the risk and the level of consequences. In NZ we often construct buildings in high risk areas like flood areas and on the coastline. Due to climate change the number of disasters will increase, therefore we need to be proactive in our planning - either by reducing

exposure to risk or reducing vulnerability. This can be contrary to consents planning, which is led by the economic interests of the developer. In our city if an engineer says a development can be done (e.g. building on a cliffside) then the Council typically approves it. But is this acceptable when the risk is still present?

The key message from the session was that climate change poses a very real risk, and will also increase the number and severity of natural disasters. Responses to risk that are static in time (e.g. stop banks) give people a false sense of security. Local government decision makers need to look at flexible solutions to risk including reducing socio-economic inequalities. Risk management needs to be adaptable over time and publicly accessible. As planners we have a responsibility to the public in relation to risk – i.e. by providing information for developers to make informed decisions, and by carefully considering applications for sites in high risk areas. Finally, in Wellington specifically, we need to plan for the highest projected sea level rise (being up to 2 m by 2100), raise awareness of this, and plan appropriately.

A5 - Maori Participation

The first speaker Shadrach Rolleston (University of Auckland) on 'Maori Planning Models' gave a brief outline on the statutory framework and Maori aspirations. He did a review of current practices with discussion on obstacles, future options and innovations. A series of examples were then given on different levels of engagement. Overall it was a well-structured talk with the options for different scenarios/levels of engagement a useful contribution.

The second speaker Andrew Henderson (Boulder Planning Ltd) spoke on 'The RMA and Maori Values - A non-Maori Perspective'. He presented an overview of how Maori world views are addressed within the RMA, taken from the position of his thesis written in 1994 and contrasting with what has changed subsequently. His conclusion was that Maori values within resource management are still well underrepresented. He acknowledged that small step changes over time have been made and would be expected to continue. Overall, focus was too concentrated on past grievance and institutional disenfranchisement while not offering possible solutions/options for future.

The third speaker did not show.

Session B3 - Spatial Planning

Dr Anna Johnson looked at The Dunedin Spatial Plan and made a number of observations:

- Spatial Plan = city development strategy (or growth management strategy or urban development strategy). The purpose of the strategy is to outline broad objectives for Dunedin's urban development for the next 30 years.
- Common Drivers – Sustainability, liveability, responsiveness and resilience
- Why do a Spatial Plan
 - LTCCP does not provide clear vision for urban development decisions
 - There is a disconnect between the LTCCP and the District Plan
 - The LTTCCP - address woolly ideas and outlines projects and contains no logic as how you get from the big ideas to the projects

- No co-ordination between different plans
- The District Plan is effects based - no real concept of space
- 3 phases
 - trend identification
 - preferred vision
 - action plan

Note that the spatial plan does not create a new regulatory framework

It will influence:

- management of location and design of activities
- infrastructure/community facilities development
- urban design and amenities

Dr Kerry Grundy discussed The Whangarei District Growth Strategy. He looked at the experience of Whangarei under an effects based planning system and how this resulted in dispersed uncontrolled rural residential development and ribbon coastal development. The lack of spatial planning has made it difficult to provide orderly and efficient infrastructure and control the cumulative long term environmental effects. Consequently the need for strategic land use planning (a spatial plan or growth strategy) was identified.

Two speakers from Russell McVeagh finally looked at the information and evidence base on which spatial plans are based and to tools that are currently available to collect, analyse and interpret the data.

B4 - Transport planning

Terry Moore from ECONorthWest, Portland, USA made the following points:

- It is important that planning is integrated with solving transport problems. Transport planning must have considerable weighting for the wider land use impacts.
- Need to work within an integrated framework that is; correct, supported by basic facts, simplified, understandable, accepted, work within its limitations.
- Terry showed us a model of an Integrated Transport Planning Framework which starts off with the objective of Making Transportation Effective and continued to expand in different tiers to show all the components that must be considered.
- This demonstrated a practical model that can be used to make Integrated Transport Planning decisions and how to take into account the wider land use components and more 'triple bottom-line' thinking, i.e. Economic, Social, Environment.

Keith Hall - CH2M Hill argued the following:

- NZS4404-2010 - This is the New Zealand Standard for Land Use and subdivision engineering.
- It introduces Land Use context to transport planning when subdividing sites and looks at earthworks, roads, drainage, water supply, services, and landscaping, and is a guide to good practice.
- It is a great spatial planning tool and brings land use into transport.

Myles Andrews and Steve Higgs (NZTA) outlined the following:

- This also reiterated the point that land use decisions affect transport outcomes and vice versa.
- NZTA is trying to become a smart investment partner for transport planning outcomes.
- They then outlined the statutory framework for NZTA including:
 - Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991
 - Land Transport Management Act - RLTS, GPS
 - Local Government Act - long term plans
- NZTA supports statutory processes and develop non-stat tools.
- Roads of National Significance (RoNS) - each RoNS has a network plan that incorporates the land use component and this is a living document.
- Two examples were discussed - the Waikato Expressway and Christchurch.

Jonathan Cutler discussed the following:

- This presentation was about how removing minimum car parking requirements in the Central Business District to provide for better land use outcomes.
- Wellington City District Plan is an example of how the removal of minimum parking requirements has had a positive impact on urban design.

We were shown some examples of the significant area taken up by vehicle parking, manoeuvring and access ways in areas that can have high density development.

B6 - Planning Practice

Jan Crawford discussed development planning, monitoring & outcomes. Her conclusions included:

1. that the conditions needs to be enabling, clear, measurable and outcome based; and
2. that we need to think about the long term vision; are we achieving what we set out to do?

Richard Munneke discussed the principles of 'consent success':

- keep it simple (no legal and/or planning jargon etc.)

- have respect for other people lives
- the need to communicate well (and ask for feedback)
- provide leadership and professional advice
- time is money 'cut to the chase' and be positive
- focus on resolution rather than the problem(s). The need for the Planner to take ownership of the consent process, they are 'oil' to the process, the facilitator and the decision maker that will make an impact on the lives of others.

Andrea Rickard and Simon Butler talked about how to speak 'constructur'. Speaking 'constructur' in their words means:

- speak plain English
- be specific
- write better conditions. At the end of the day the AEE and its justifications gets filed and shelved, but the conditions needs to be able to 'stand alone' by itself.

To a contractor it's all about cost & programme and health & safety. We as planners need to get out on site and understand what is going on - talk to the contractor(s), dress appropriately, get our hands dirty.

Lessons learnt

There was nothing new in what each of the speakers was discussing. The Development Planning team are currently in the process of reviewing all of our standard conditions to make sure they are clear and measurable.

B7 - Film by Leonie Sandercock

As explained in her key note speech the film looks at multi-media as a planning tool. It was a very interesting piece.

Session C1 - Planning Practice Making it work

Nick Williamson from Whangarei District Council gave an interesting and relevant talk about how Whangarei are managing their rolling review process. He described the advantages and disadvantages of the process as well as some of the lessons they had learned to date. This is particularly relevant given that we are also undertaking a rolling review.

Overall the speaker emphasised the need to:

- prioritise where there was greater need (they had rules that had been widely criticised by the Environment Court especially as they related to coastal subdivision/development)

- leave rules and high level policies alone but retro fit a mid-layer of policy (note: Whangarei District Plan contained high level objectives and policies and rules and very few or no specific zone based policies)
- leave parts that are less used and/or working well
- focus on discrete topics that don't have historic baggage
- develop a 3 year priority programme (beyond this it is difficult to plan as regulatory environment/priorities may change)
- leave tidy ups till later

They undertook a Plan Change called Introduction and Procedures – it heralded the review, illustrated new structure, removed verbiage (no longer required by the Act), aided interpretation and provided a format guide for private plan changes.

The speaker defined a number of important lessons that had been learned such as:

- topics (each plan change) came in for a high level of scrutiny
- people have more time to participate
- groups and industry may have difficulty seeing the big picture
- the DP programme is dependent on the LTP

Main advice given included:

- make a decision on the plan structure early on
- set a 3 year work programme
- work on discrete topics/issues
- engage early with community and stakeholders
- advance each topic as soon as possible
- don't get too hung up on the details (gaps and overlaps can be tidied up later).

Tania Richards from Richmond Planning and Gerard Thompson from Barker and Associates used Sylvia Park in Auckland as an example the presenters showed how the private plan change process or developer-led planning can have a significant effect on Council policy. This is an example of a 'bottom up' approach to planning rather than a 'top down' or council led approach.

Sylvia Park had been identified as an opportunity site in a number of Council planning documents for a number of years. The site was purchased by Kiwi properties and a private plan change prepared. The overall scale and intensity of development envisaged by the developers and eventually agreed to by the Council resulted in the need to amend a number of existing planning/policy assumptions for example the retail hierarchy.

C2 - RM Reform

Michael Garbett from Anderson Lloyd Lawyers gave a brief overview of the issues associated with Phase I and Phase II of the RMA Reforms as well as recent case law impacting on planning practice. It went through the various problems and possible solutions relating to the National Environmental Standard relating on Urban Design and attempts to explicitly recognise the Urban Environment within the RMA. This included options at modifying the definition of 'Environment' and/or 'Amenity Values'. It also discussed issues and option around the Auckland Spatial Plan and touched on options to improve housing affordability, including requiring Council's to provide over 20 years of Land Supply for their region. Another option discussed was the potential to extend the powers of land acquisition under the Public Works Act to include land for urban regeneration projects.

C3 - Health Impact Assessments and Urban Planning

A very effective joint presentation by a Hasting City Councillor and Flaxmere community member; District Health Board staff; and a Hasting City Council planner. The joint presentation reflected the organisational and personal relationships that have developed through the project.

Key points –

- For Flaxmere, there was a strong community push for change – a “galvanising moment”
- Not all projects will suit the HIA approach. Have to choose suitable projects where the HIA can actually influence the outcome.
- The process “started by following the book” then moved past it. It resulted in actions at a number of levels e.g. community garden and mobile BBQ, structure plan for town centre, formation of a Council property company to facilitate economic development of the town centre.
- Success is very much based on the relationships within organisations, between organisations and with the community.
- HIA doesn't solve all the issues, and can have internal conflicts. For example in Flaxmere, one of the key goals was to improve the amenity and viability of local shopping centre by attracting a large supermarket. However this was in direct conflict with the goal of not introducing any further alcohol outlets into the community.
- The outcome of an HIA can serve as a lever for redevelopment, a reference tool for RMA processes and a checklist for future actions by the organisations involved.

C5 - Infrastructure

Emily Rudkin and Frances Lojkine from MWH discussed the wide ranging and not always obvious impacts of climate change on a large inventory of infrastructure. This included discussion of compounding or cumulative effects as well as flow on effects into social and economic areas. They discussed responses at national, local and site levels including a range of planning responses (strategic, 2nd generation plans, 'global' resource consents, asset and maintenance plans and non-regulatory responses). They also discussed case study in North Otago, over-allocation of water and

some discussion of 'sunset' clause envisaged where water permits will be surrendered in 2021 (RMA?).

Ben Farrell from the New Zealand Wind Energy Association outlined how guidelines for the development of wind farms are currently being developed. The New Zealand Wind Energy Association is consulting with all interested and affected parties over next 2 years. He discussed the benefits of wind farms as well as practical constraints and the position of NZWEA (NZ Wind Energy Association). The 'who, what, when, where, why and how' of the development guidelines were then examined. Points of note - NZWEA envisage 'best *achievable* practice (not best practice but more than good practice), guidelines focus on RMA consenting issues, will be very available in a number of mediums, will use real examples as well as case law, will be industry led and envisage adoption at some level by Councils, MFE etc. NZWEA want to simplify and streamline consenting issues in line with the Act as well as in line with achieving 95% renewable energy and consistent with NPS on renewables when that is released, NZWEA still setting the scope of the guidelines, and NZWEA have timelines in place for progressing the timelines.

C6 - Transport Planning

This session was split into 3 parts:

Steven Dale (CUP Projects, Toronto, Canada) discussed the following looking at alternative urban transport options:

- Cable Car: bottom supported, Cable Transit: support from top
- Industrial uses from 1834, recreational use from 19th century
- Roosevelt Island Tram
 - Originally temporary
 - Suffered from full integration (subway etc.)
 - Since full integration in mid 2000s, it quickly became the preferred method of transport
- Examples in Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, USA
- Gondolas vs. aerial trams:
 - Continuously circulating vs. shuttle based
 - Arguably, aerial tram systems worst performing of all aerial systems
 - Corners near impossible with aerial trams, and capacity low

Dana Moran (Wellington Tunnels Alliance) looked at the following issues:

- Alliance: contractual model for procuring and delivering projects where the owner, contractors and consultants work collaboratively.
- Features:
 - High cost, large scale
 - Need for flexibility to deal with change
 - Significant or undefined risk

- Scope for innovation
 - Tight programme for design and construction
 - Significant stakeholder/environmental/political implications
 - Project controlled by the PAB – one member from each party
 - Legal relationship avoids blame
 - Fixed return by integrated team
- NZ Tunnels Alliance:
 - NZTA – owner
 - Leighton – contractor
 - Aecon – Designer
 - SKM – Planners/Consultants
 - \$80 million budgeted for both Mt Vic and Terrace tunnel refurbishments
- Why an Alliance?
 - Construction project – high cost
 - Risks uncertain – tunnel refurbishments not common
 - Goal to complete project quickly
 - Undefined design outcome
 - Potential to set a benchmark for refurbishment of tunnels
- Active risk management – All disciplines needed to identify risks and report. Risk based approach beneficial as it highlights risks/problems early.
 - Special mention to Council officers involved with the planning approvals – really good to work with an identified planner for all jobs (build relationship, establish trust).

Jenson Varghese from McCormick Rankin Cagney made the following points about economic development through parking reform:

- Minimum parking requirements define the amount of parking to be supplied by developments:
 - Minimise risk of spill over parking
 - Estimate of the near peak demand for unpriced/free parking
 - NZ example: Retail and commercial to provide 1 space per 15sq m.
- Minimum parking requirements based on cheap land and demand for un-priced parking.
- Unintended consequences on urban form caused by minimum requirements:
 - Urban sprawl
 - Fragmented parking facilities
 - Increased traffic – drive many, park many
 - Low pedestrian volumes
- Consequences have economic impacts on Councils, developers and business:

- Increased vehicular movements (leads to increased pressure and costs on transport networks and vehicle/pedestrian conflict points).
- Increased developments costs (costs of construction and maintenance and opportunity cost of land required for provision of car parks)
- Reduced retail expenditure (loss of accidental or discretionary purchases)
- For example Beenleigh Town Centre, Queensland
 - Focus on how parking management could promote a walkable town centre
 - Concern from public and developers about the current state of parking
 - Increased public complaints about viability of car parks
 - Minimums limiting redevelopment options
- 5 Stages in Parking Management Plan
 1. Strategy and policy review
 2. Modelling economic impacts
 3. Identifying potential shared parking facility developments
 4. Financial analysis of funding options
 5. Recommendations to Council
- Gap between strategic planning and planning framework
- Removal of minimums and managing demand were key recommendations to Council:
 - Remove minimum parking requirements
 - Price to manage demand
 - Facilitate shared parking
 - Discontinue in-lieu payments (removes an arbitrary cost of development)