

Section 32 Report

Proposed Plan Change No. 8 to the Queenstown Lakes District Partially Operative District Plan regarding the provision of car parking spaces.

Prepared by CivicCorp.

For the Queenstown Lakes District Council
Dated 21 June 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Car parking spaces are becoming difficult to find, particularly where there is new residential and visitor accommodation development in the High Density Residential Zone. Part of the solution to this problem is to ensure new developments are designed with sufficient car parking spaces on site to service most of the vehicles associated with each dwelling.

The nature of Queenstown means access to shopping (e.g. Remarkables Park) and to leisure activities dictates that most residents, visitors and short term tenants will have a vehicle.

With land prices at their current levels, property is becoming a more and more expensive and exclusive commodity, and it may be reasonable to assume the market will force on-site parking to be part of the package. However, it is equally reasonable to assume that the maximum use will be made of the land, and parking will not be considered a priority. Therefore, forcing parking off-site so that the land can be developed to its maximum. In practice, it appears that parking is often only considered in terms of providing sufficient spaces to meet the District Plan requirements. In many cases no consideration is given to the realistic parking requirements the development is likely to generate.

Given these issues, the purpose of this Plan Change is to ensure current and future residents and visitors have sufficient parking space for their vehicles. Considering the topography of the District, the limited street car parking and the problems that are already arising from sites with insufficient car parking it is clear that it is desirable to contain the effects of car parking within the site from which it is generated.

This Plan Change aims to go some way to remedying this problem by aligning the District Plan requirements with the actual parking demands for residential and visitor accommodation development.

In considering the various ways this could be achieved the focal point is that any change to the rules will only affect new developments or alterations. Current dwellings will not be affected until such time as redevelopment takes place.

This analysis has determined that the most appropriate and cost effective option is to:

- Require two car parking spaces per residential unit for:
 - The High Density Residential Zone
 - Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density residential Zone.
 - The Remarkables Park Zone all Activity Areas except Activity Area 1.
- Require two car parking spaces per unit for all visitor accommodation (unit type construction).
- Consider Backpacker Hostels independently of other visitor accommodation and require them to provide 1 car park per 5 guests.

SECTION 32 REPORT

1.0	BACKGROUND	3
1.1	Introduction.....	3
1.2	Scope of the Plan Change.....	3
1.3	The Issues	3
1.4	The Purpose of the Plan Change	5
1.5	The Current Situation	5
2.0	THE CONTEXT AND NECESSITY.....	7
2.1	The Resource Management Act (1991).....	7
2.2	Partially Operative District Plan (2003).....	8
2.3	Regional Policy Statement for Otago.....	9
2.4	Kai Tahu Ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005	10
2.5	Regional Land Transport Strategy for Otago 2000 – 2005.....	10
2.6	Long Term Council Community Plan	10
3.0	RELEVANT NON-STATUTORY DOCUMENTS.....	10
3.1	Tomorrow’s Queenstown: Vision, Issues and Directions – July 2002	10
3.2	Wanaka 2020 Report – May 2002.....	11
3.3	The Queenstown Lakes District Affordable Housing Strategy – June 2005.....	11
4.0	CONSULTATION PROCESS	11
4.1	Letter Wanaka Residents Association – March 2004	11
4.2	Options 2020 Workshops – March/April 2004	12
4.3	Panel Display and Public Meetings - 14 & 15 June 2004	12
4.4	Statutory Consultation	12
5.0	ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE ISSUE.....	12
5.1	Broad Alternatives	14
5.2	Specific Alternative Rules	17
6.0	DEFINITIONS	26
7.0	CONCLUSION	26
8.0	PLAN CHANGE	26

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The proposed Plan Change has resulted from general feedback during public meetings concerning the limited parking availability in the residential zones of the District.

1.2 Scope of the Plan Change

The scope of the Plan Change is limited to ensuring that effects created by insufficient car parking are addressed for visitor accommodation (unit type construction) district wide and residential car parking in:

- The High Density Residential Zone
- Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density residential Zone.
- The Remarkables Park Zone all Activity Areas except Activity Area 1.

When considering the effects of car parking, the Plan Change is limited to visitor accommodation and residential dwellings, and the parking needs for the residents and visitors. Provisions for on street car parking are outside the scope of this Plan Change, and studies of this are being addressed by QLDC in its Transport Study being undertaken by Montgomery Watson. However, the adverse effects of parking on-street are taken into account here when considering the costs and benefits of different options.

At a number of places in this report mention is made of considerations which are outside the scope of this Plan Change. These observations provide the reader with a full picture of the issues involved, but are not taken into consideration in the assessment.

1.3 The Issues

General public consultation on strategic issues and a significant increase in parking complaints over recent years have led the Council to identify parking for residential and visitor accommodation activities as a problem. Part of this problem results from residents not being able to park their vehicles on their own sites and therefore parking them on the street. The Plan Change addresses the primary issue of whether the current requirements in the District Plan are appropriate for on-site car parking associated with residential units and visitor accommodation district wide.

Transfund New Zealand Research Report no. 209

The Transfund report provides statistics regarding cars per household and identifies the following:

There are some variations in car availability between cities... The variation in the average between cities was 1.27 to 1.60 cars per household. As noted... vehicle trips are not closely related to household vehicle ownership.(Pg 41)

It is recommended that a typical household parking (i.e for residents and not including visitors) demand of around 1.5 to 1.8 cars/household should be adopted if no other information is available. This means, of course, an off-road parking standard of 2 car spaces/household. (Page 43).

Based on the above recommendation the current provisions of the District Plan that require only one car park per residential unit would be deficient in adequately providing the necessary parking to ensure residents can park on site. This is evident by the large number of residents currently parking on the streets.

High Density Residential Zone

The High Density Zone has been identified as an area where a significant number of vehicles are being parked on the street.

It is clear on this basis that to require one car park per residential unit in the High Density Residential Zone is not adequate and is therefore an issue that needs to be addressed by this Plan Change.

Comprehensive Residential Development in the Low Density Residential Zone

In other areas of residential development such as the Low Density Residential Zone, car parking appears to be adequately provided for by the current provisions, which require two car parks per residential dwelling.

However, in areas where higher density can be created such as Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density Residential Zone, the potential for overflow of car parking similar to that already occurring in the High Density Residential Zone needs to be addressed. Particularly, as the District Plan currently only requires one car park per residential unit for this type of development, the same as for the High Density Residential Zone.

Therefore, it is important that the car parking requirements for this type of development reflect the future density of the site so that issues that are currently evident in the High Density Residential Zone are avoided.

The Remarkables Park Zone

The Remarkables Park Zone should also be given considered as the provisions for development outside of Activity Area 1 (density similar to the Low Density Residential Zone) does not specify a maximum site density. Therefore the potential for high density residential or visitor accommodation (unit type) development is anticipated in these activity areas and based on the current provisions (1 car park per residential unit) would result in similar problems those currently present in the High Density Residential Zone.

Visitor Accommodation (unit type)

As sites (particularly in the High Density Residential Zone) are increasingly being used for managed apartments that frequently serve the visitor accommodation market the distinction between residential units and visitor accommodation units are being eroded. When considering effects including car parking demand, it is difficult to differentiate between the two.

In the District Plan there is a clear division between visitor accommodation and residential usage. Within the rating system of Queenstown Lakes District Council information is held on the use of the building, which makes it clear what category the units fall into. However, the reality is that an apartment may house short term visitors for part of the year and medium term workers for another part. It is important then that the provisions for car parking ensure that if this change in use occurs adequate car parking is provided to allow for all future uses.

Backpacker Hostels

Currently Backpacker Hostels would be classified as Visitor Accommodation (guest room type) as most provide communal cooking facilities. The car parking provisions for this type of activity are based on 1 car park per 3 guest rooms. It is clear that these provisions were anticipated to cater for a 'Hotel' where most guests would have a room to themselves and would arrive via a tour bus.

However, a backpacker situation is quite different because 'guest rooms' are generally designed to accommodate a number of guests in a bunk bed arrangement. This is a very different arrangement to that of a hotel because where you would most likely have two people sharing a 'guest room' in a Hotel, you may have five or more people sharing a 'guest room' in a Backpackers.

On this basis it is considered that to require 1 car park per 3 guest rooms for Backpackers is not adequately addressing the actual demand for car parking. This is evident throughout the District where cars are parked on the street due to inadequate parking at Backpackers.

A phone call was made to all the backpacker hostels in the residential zones in Queenstown and the duty manager was asked to estimate the number of guests that arrived by car, and the number of guests per car. The manager was also asked whether the current parking provisions were sufficient. Five hostels answered the questions.

The answers were quite general, as is to be expected without the collection of actual statistics and this information is therefore anecdotal rather than statistical. However, they confirmed the statistics of the three major backpacker organisations in New Zealand (BBH, VIP and YHA) that between 25 and 50% of backpackers travel in either a rental or bought vehicle, and that there is usually more than 1 person in the car. A conservative translation of these figures equates to 1 car per 5 guests. Especially when considering that most guests arriving by one of the specialised bus tour companies for backpackers (such as Kiwi Experience and Magic) appear to stay in the Town Centre Zone hostels.

Taking into account the phone survey and design of Backpackers, it is evident that the current car parking provisions for Backpackers is an issue that needs to be addressed.

1.4 The Purpose of the Plan Change

The purpose of the Plan Change can be summarised as follows:

To ensure current and future residents and visitors have sufficient on-site parking space for their own vehicles.

1.5 The Current Situation

1.5.1 District Plan Rules

Under Site Standard 14.2.4.1 *Parking and Loading* on pages 14–13 through 14–14 of the Partially Operative District Plan the following is required:

- i Minimum Parking Space Numbers*

Activities shall provide on-site space in accordance with Table 1:

ACTIVITY	PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR:	
	RESIDENTS/VISITOR	STAFF
<i>Residential units:</i>		
<i>Low Density Residential Zone</i>	<i>2 per residential unit</i>	
<i>High Density Residential Zone:</i>	<i>1 per residential unit</i>	
<i>Residential Flat</i>	<i>1 per residential flat</i>	
<i>Visitor Accommodation (unit type construction, g. motels, cabins)</i>	<i>1 per unit up to 15 units; thereafter 1 per 2 units, plus 1 coach park per 30 units</i>	<i>1 per 10 units</i>
<i>Visitor Accommodation (guest room type construction, e. g. hotels)</i>	<i>1 per 3 guest rooms up to 60 guest rooms; thereafter 1 per 5 guest rooms, plus 1 coach park per 50 guest rooms</i>	<i>1 per 20 beds</i>
<i>Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density Residential Zone</i>		<i>One car park per residential unit; plus one visitor car park per two residential units for developments of 11- 20 units and one visitor car park per additional five residential units thereafter</i>

If this Site Standard is not complied with the development becomes a Discretionary Activity, and would be assessed against the following assessment matters set out in 14.3.2 on page 14-22 and 14-23:

iii Parking and Loading Provision

- (a) Whether it is physically practicable to provide the required parking or loading spaces on the site in terms of the existing location of buildings, access to the road, topography and utility location.*
- (b) Whether there is an adequate alternative supply of parking or loading spaces in the vicinity. In general on- street parking is not considered an alternative.*
- (c) Whether there is another site in the immediate vicinity that has available parking or loading spaces which are not required at the same time as the proposed activity. In such a situation the Council will require the associated parking or loading spaces to be secured in some manner.*
- (d) Whether a demonstrably less than normal incidence of parking or loading will be generated by the proposal, such as due to specific business practice, type of customer, bus transportation.*
- (e) Whether the Council is anticipating providing public car parking that would serve the vicinity of the activity.*
- (f) Whether a significant adverse effect on the character and amenity of the surrounding area, particularly pedestrian amenity and safety, will occur as a result of not providing the required parking or loading space.*

- (g) *The extent to which the safety and efficiency of the surrounding roading network would be adversely affected by parked and manoeuvring vehicles on the roads.*
 - (h) *Any cumulative effect of the lack of on-site parking and loading spaces in conjunction with other activities in the vicinity not providing the required number of parking or loading spaces.*
 - (i) *Whether there is efficient public transport within the vicinity of the proposed activity.*
 - (j) *The proximity of residential areas, visitor accommodation, commercial offices or other mixed use developments to the proposed activity, and the ability for people to walk to and from the site.*
 - (k) *Where there is any consideration to any requirement for coach parking recognition be given to the availability of designated coach parking provided off site.*
 - (l) *Where a reverse manoeuvre is undertaken from a rear site whether the effects are mitigated by the width of access and visibility at the road boundary.*
- iv *Parking and Loading Area and Entranceway Design*
- (a) *Any adverse effects on the safety and security of people and vehicles using the facility.*
 - (b) *The extent to which the safety of pedestrians, both on and off the site will be affected.*
 - (c) *Any adverse effects on the amenity and character of surrounding properties and public areas.*
 - (d) *The extent to which there could be any adverse effect on the safety and efficiency of the frontage road.*
 - (e) *The extent to which any reduction in the design characteristics could result in the parking and loading area and/ or access and manoeuvring areas being impractical, inconvenient or unsafe be used by vehicles or pedestrians.*
 - (f) *Any cumulative effect of the reduction in the design characteristics in conjunction with the effects generated by other activities on the frontage road.*

2.0 THE CONTEXT AND NECESSITY

2.1 The Resource Management Act (1991)

Section 32 of the Resource Management Act (the Act) states that an evaluation of the alternatives, benefits and costs of any plan change must be carried out before adopting any plan change. The evaluation should examine the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, whether the policies, rules or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives. An analysis of the costs and benefits of alternatives amendments is contained in Section 6 of this report

This chapter of the report sets out the relevant provisions in various statutory documents.

This Plan Change has been prepared as a means of achieving the purpose of the Act, which is expressed in Section 5 as follows:

- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) *In this Act, “sustainable management” means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while –*
 - (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
 - (b) *Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
 - (c) *Avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The change will ensure that people can continue to provide for their wellbeing by parking their cars near to their dwelling or accommodation unit, while ensuring the adverse effects of car parking are managed to avoid adverse effects on the amenity values in the residential zones.

Section 7 lists “other matters” that the Council must have particular regard to. The following sub-sections are of particular relevance to this Plan Change.

- (b) *The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
- (c) *The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (f) *Maintenance and enhancement of quality of the environment:*
- (g) *Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:*

This Plan Change is instrumental in enhancing amenity values of the residential zones of the District by ensuring sufficient car parking is provided for those living and staying in the District.

Section 31 of the Act sets out the functions of territorial authorities. This Plan Change relates specifically to Council’s functions under 31 (a), which reads:

- (a) *The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district:*

Section 74 of the Act requires that the Plan Change be in accordance with the Council’s functions under section 31, the provisions of Part II, its duty under Section 32 and any regulations or bylaws.

2.2 Partially Operative District Plan (2003)

Within the Plan the following Issues, Objectives and Policies on pages 7-2 and 7-3 relate to this plan change and are given effect to by the Plan Change, in particular Policy 3.8 as cited below.

7.1.1 iv Residential Amenity

Protection and enhancement of people's social well being resulting from the amenity values of their living environment.

7.1.2

Objective 3 – Residential Amenity

Pleasant living environments within which adverse effects are minimised while still providing the opportunity for individual and community needs.

7.1.2

Policy 3.8

To encourage on-site parking in association with development in residential areas to ensure the amenity of neighbours and the functioning of streets is maintained.

Implementation methods

(i) District Plan

- (a) Rules relating to building height, sunlight and outlook for neighbours, street scene, separation from neighbours and outdoor living space.*
- (e) Rules for transport, parking, access and manoeuvring.*

Giving consideration to the Policies and Objectives stated above it is apparent that the current level of resident cars being parked on the streets in areas of denser development is impacting on the amenity of the residential zones, reiterating that the current car parking provisions are not adequate. Specifically, it is clear that the current provisions are not adequately assisting the achievement of *7.1.2 Policy 3.8 To encourage on-site parking...* again emphasising the need to address the car parking provisions.

The existing rules relating to on-site car parking for residential activities are set out in paragraph 1.5 of this report.

2.3 Regional Policy Statement for Otago

Section 74 specifies that regard must be had to any Regional Policy Statement or Regional Plan and section 75 (2) specifies that a District Plan must not be inconsistent with these statements or plans. The Regional Policy Statement for Otago (14 September 1998) is of some relevance to this Plan Change and therefore the relevant parts of that document have been included:

Objective 9.4.1

To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:

- a) Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and*
- b) Provide for amenity values; and*
- c) Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and ...*

Policy 9.5.4

To minimise the adverse effects of urban development and settlement, including structures on Otago's environment through avoiding, remedying or mitigating:

- ...*
- (d) Significant irreversible effects on:*
 - (i) Otago community values*
 - (vi) Amenity values*

Policy 9.5.5

To maintain and, where practicable, enhance the quality of life for people and communities within Otago's built environment through:

- a) *Promoting the identification and provision of a level of amenity which is acceptable to the community; and*

This Plan Change is instrumental in enhancing the amenity values of the residential zones of the District by ensuring sufficient car parking is provided for those living and staying in the District.

2.4 Kai Tahu Ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005

Section 74(2A)(a) of the Act requires that a territorial authority takes into account relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority. Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan (KTKO NRMP) was made publicly available in June 2005. This Plan contains issues, objectives and policies for Otago in general and specific catchments within the region. There are no provisions in the KTKO NRMP that relate to this proposed Plan Change.

2.5 Regional Land Transport Strategy for Otago 2000 – 2005

This report documents the general transportation situation in Otago in the year 2000 and the predicted changes over the following 5 years. It establishes that car ownership is increasing and that it is the number one means of transportation in Otago.

However, there is no specific reference to car parking and none of the issues, objectives or strategies relate to either off or on site car parking.

2.6 Long Term Council Community Plan

The Queenstown Lakes District's Long Term Council Community Plan identifies the following community outcomes of relevance:

- *A safe and healthy community that is strong, diverse and inclusive for people of all age groups and incomes.*
- *A high quality urban environment that is respectful of the character of individual communities.*

3.0 RELEVANT NON-STATUTORY DOCUMENTS

3.1 Tomorrow's Queenstown: Vision, Issues and Directions – July 2002

The Tomorrow's Queenstown document was prepared following a public workshop held between 7 and 11 July 2002, with the purpose of providing a community vision, strategic goals and priorities for Queenstown for the next ten to twenty years.

The document makes a number of statements that are relevant to the on-site parking issue. These include:

- *Priority Issue 5 – Improving access and transport networks – Parking in central Queenstown*
- *Strategic Goal - Creating quality urban environments - Preparing a town centre strategy for Queenstown Bay including an overall car parking strategy for the area.*
- *Strategic Goal - Creating quality urban environments - Reviewing the District Plan controls to ensure that the controls allow for and encourage quality intensive residential development and prevent or discourage poor design.*

3.2 Wanaka 2020 Report – May 2002

The Wanaka 2020 document was prepared following a public workshop held between 24 and 28 May 2002, with the purpose of providing a community vision, strategic goals and priorities for Wanaka for the next ten to twenty years.

This report does not make any specific statements regarding parking off or on site in the residential areas. However, it does discuss the importance of retaining high amenity values.

3.3 The Queenstown Lakes District Affordable Housing Strategy – June 2005

Council adopted the Queenstown Lakes District Affordable Housing Strategy in June 2005. Its purpose is to set out the actions that the Council proposes to undertake over the next five to ten years to address the problem of a lack of access for residents to affordable housing. The strategy contains 'Goals' and focuses on 'Actions' to achieve these.

The overall goal of the Strategy is:

To increase access to quality, affordable housing that is integrated into the community so as to support the community's outcomes related to the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of the QLDC area.

Although no direct reference is given to car parking in this strategy, car parking requirements could have the potential to affect affordable housing in an indirect manner. If the Plan Change were to reduce the number of car parks required, there could be an increase in affordability. On the other hand, increased car parking requirements could reduce affordability although this could be offset by the improvement in amenity values.

4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS

The issue of parking has come up time and time again in letters, public meetings and other consultation processes:

4.1 Letter Wanaka Residents Association – March 2004

The Wanaka Residents Association expresses a number of concerns they had with the provisions in the Partially Operative District Plan, and the consequential development prospects in Wanaka. One of the issues raised was the provision of on site car parking in the High Density Residential Zone. The Association believes it should be raised to 2 car parking spaces per dwelling. The Association also raised concerns with respect to the car parking provisions for Backpacker Hostels. It was identified that this form of visitor accommodation provides predominantly dormitory style accommodation of 4 to 12 single beds per room, and

therefore is not really covered by the current provisions which specify a number of parks per room or unit.

4.2 Options 2020 Workshops – March/April 2004

In both Queenstown and Wanaka workshops were held at the end of March and the beginning of April 2004. These aimed in part to inform the public of the work undertaken by the Council as a result of the community consultation in 2002 and to gain feedback from the community regarding the current issues. Feedback was predominantly obtained in the form of 'post-its' on various 'issue boards'. Some of the statements relevant to on-site car parking were:

- Require two car parks per unit
- We need more vehicle parking space
- Developers must supply more car parks
- Give more consideration to car parking for high density development – not enough car parks, accessway to developments and no respect for neighbours already there.

Various statements were also made concerning on-street parking requirements.

4.3 Panel Display and Public Meetings - 14 & 15 June 2004

The outline of the proposed plan change for residential activities in the High Density Residential Zone was printed on a full colour A2 panel and displayed on 14 June in Wanaka and on 15 June in Queenstown from 10 am to 4 pm. During this time members of the consultant team working on this plan change were present to answer questions and gain feedback.

On the same days in the evening public meetings took place, and the proposal was presented to the attendants.

The feedback indicated the public was interested in the big picture, and agreed something needed to be done about parking particularly in the High Density Residential Zone, as had been gleaned from previous consultation sessions. However there was no feedback regarding the requirement of one parking space per bedroom, as presented.

4.4 Statutory Consultation

Statutory consultation was undertaken with the Minister for the Environment, Kai Tahu ki Otago, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, the Otago Regional Council and the Department of Conservation by way of a letter and information explaining the proposed Plan Change sent on 1 September 2004. At this stage reply has only been received from the Otago Regional Council who identified they had no concern with the proposal.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

Having identified that there is an issue (or problem) with the car parking requirements for residential and visitor accommodation activities, it is necessary to consider the alternative methods for overcoming this problem. Firstly, it needs to be decided whether regulation is necessary, and, if so, what form that regulation should take.

This assessment process works through the options available to the Council at the broadest level, getting progressively more detailed and refined to a point where the exact wording of alternative rules are compared with one another.

A record of this assessment is contained in the following tables. In the first table (6.1) the broad options available to the Council are considered. Each option is assessed in terms of the environmental, economic and social costs and benefits and how effective and efficient the option is in terms of achieving the purpose of the Act and the objectives and policies of the Partially Operative District Plan. A conclusion is then reached on each option as to whether it is an appropriate method to incorporate into the Plan.

In Table 6.2 alternatives within the preferred option are considered further.

5.1 Broad Alternatives

Option	Advantages/ Benefits	Disadvantages/ Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
<p>1. Do nothing approach</p> <p>The do nothing approach would mean removing all existing regulation imposed in the residential zones with regards to providing parking spaces on residential and visitor accommodation sites</p>	<p>Benefits to developers who could maximise use of their sites.</p>	<p>Adverse effects on amenity.</p>	<p>This option would be ineffective in encouraging on-site parking in association with development in the residential areas. Therefore, the amenity of neighbours and the wider streetscape values and the functioning of streets would not be maintained.</p> <p>The provision of on-site parking would be determined by the market. The desire to keep the cost of development down may result in all but properties at the top end of the market not having any on-site parking.</p> <p>Policy 3.8 of the Plan would not be achieved.</p> <p>This option should therefore be discarded as being ineffective and inappropriate.</p>
<p>2. Remove all regulation and rely on non-regulatory mechanisms</p> <p>As 1. above but rather than rely</p>	<p>Benefits to developers who could maximise use of their sites.</p> <p>Developers would be informed</p>	<p>Adverse effects on amenity.</p> <p>Cost of developing guidelines.</p> <p>Non-regulatory, therefore no mechanism to ensure provisions</p>	<p>This option would be ineffective in encouraging on-site parking in association with development in the residential areas. Therefore, the amenity of neighbours and the wider</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

<p>solely on the market, intervene in a non-regulatory manner through the provision of guidelines and education.</p>	<p>of the car parking that is anticipated by the Council.</p>	<p>are met.</p>	<p>streetscape values and the functioning of streets would not be maintained.</p> <p>As above, this option would not be effective in achieving Policy 3.8 of the Plan.</p> <p>However, guidelines and education could play a role in making it clear to the public why it is necessary to have rules and what the rules require.</p>
<p>3. Status Quo – Retain the existing site standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides certainty regarding how many parking spaces are required • This provision has been in place in the District Plan since 1998. Before that a similar requirement was contained in the Transitional Plan. Therefore people are aware of it. • Not having to process a Plan Change would be a cost saving to the Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes no differentiation between small and large units/flats/dwellings • Car ownership in the residential zones District wide was 1.8 vehicles per dwelling according to the 2001 census. This means an average of 1+ car on the street per unit. Consequently, we are seeing residents cars being parked offsite. • Car parking provisions for Backpacker Hostels are assessed against inappropriate standards (guesthouse and hotel) that do not take into account actual use. • Because of the above, adverse effects on amenity 	<p>As shown by census figures, one parking space per unit as currently required for High Density Residential, Comprehensive Residential Development, and Residential Activities in the Remarkable Park Zone (other than Activity Area 1) is not adequate, and results in cars being parked on the street..</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that in order to achieve the objectives and policies of the Plan, this option be discarded.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

		values through parking off site.	
<p>4. Amend the rules to require on-site parking for the number of vehicles genuinely associated with a residential or visitor accommodation unit or flat and the genuine number of cars associated with Backpacker Hostels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amenity value of the residential area would be improved as a result of fewer cars parked on the road. • Should the Council wish to implement paid parking in the residential zones in the future, having sufficient parking on residential sites will make this easier to implement and will impose less costs on future residents. • Providing units with sufficient amenity (in this case parking) would encourage longer term residents to remain rather than moving out to a location with more space. • There is no difference between residential and visitor accommodation activity in situations where the visitor accommodation is unit style and may at some time be used as residential. Therefore, effects can be better managed if this is taken into account in the rules. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase development costs for applicants, as land must be used for parking as opposed to residences. • There are costs for Council involved in processing a Plan Change. • Drivers visiting the Town Centres, where parking is paid and limited may use the empty spaces on the streets in the neighbouring residential zones eliminating benefits to the residents and streetscape. 	<p>This option would be an effective way of achieving the purpose of the Plan Change. There are costs involved in the process of undertaking a Plan Change. However, it is considered that the environmental and (potential social) benefits outweigh the economic costs of this option.</p> <p>Where an applicant demonstrates that the provision of additional parking is not necessary, this can be addressed through the consent process.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that this is the most effective and efficient option and should be pursued.</p>

5.2 Specific Alternative Rules

Following the above analysis, it has been determined that a Plan Change is necessary in order to ensure that the policies of the Plan can be achieved effectively. The following table considers in further detail the options for new rules.

Table 1: Residential Car Parking

Residential Car Parking in:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The High Density Residential Zone - Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density Residential Zone. - Residential Flats - The Remarkables Park Zone - all Activity Areas except Activity Area 1. 			
Rule Options	Advantages/Benefits	Disadvantages/Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
<p>A. Change the site standards to require 1 car park per bedroom.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census data indicates there is a linkage between the number of bedrooms on a property and the number of car parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation of what is and what is not a bedroom would be an issue (is a room that is to be used as an office, but could be used as a bedroom a bedroom?). • Would require defining a bedroom to avoid misinterpretation. However, defining a bedroom is difficult and may on its own create interpretation issues. • Discourages properties with large numbers of bedrooms such as family homes, which could provide for affordable housing. 	<p>This option is not considered to be effective or efficient because the term 'bedroom' is difficult to define in a way that ensures it is legally robust and not open to misinterpretation.</p> <p>Therefore, this option is not recommended.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

<p>B. Require one car park per x sqm of net floor area, per residential unit or residential flat up to two car parks per unit/flat.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This takes into account the size of the unit. • This rule is easy to interpret. • There is unlikely to be confusion over net floor area. • May assist affordable housing by providing an incentive to create small units that may be cheaper. • The floor area of a unit would give some indication of how many people could occupy the dwelling and therefore indicate how many car parking spaces should be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extensive development of small units would be likely to have no visitor parking available and insufficient street frontage for parking in front of the complex. • Does not reflect the Transfund data of 2 spaces/household. • May create a situation where all units are developed just below the threshold so only 1 car park is required although several bedrooms and people may reside in the dwelling. • May promote the creation of small units which do not provide for sufficient residential amenity. For example, in Auckland they are trying to discourage the creation of very small units. • There appears to be little correlation between the size of the unit and the number of bedrooms/ demand for car parking. For example, one apartment development has two bedroom units with a net floor area of 30m², whereas another has 1 bedroom apartments of 51m². Therefore, it would be difficult to set the threshold at an appropriate level to ensure adequate car 	<p>This option is not effective or efficient because it relies on the size of the dwelling which may not reflect the demand for car parking, and therefore would not achieve the purpose of the Plan Change.</p> <p>Therefore this option is not recommended.</p>
--	---	--	---

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

		<p>parking was provided to meet demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census data indicates there is a linkage between the number of bedrooms on a property and the number of car parks; this is not reflected by this option. 	
<p>C. Change the site standard to require two car-parking spaces per residential unit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not overly complicate the District Plan. • The majority of the cars owned by a household would be able to be parked on site. • The value of land would encourage innovative car parking solutions, such as underground garages etc, almost certainly resulting in a more efficient use of the site and higher amenity values. • Would provide a clear requirement that would not be open to interpretation. • Would reflect the findings in the Transfund report, which identified an off road car parking requirement of two spaces/household. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding an additional car parking requirement to align all residential units in the residential zones would impose an economic cost on landowners, which in turn could contribute to increased property prices. • It would disadvantage single bedroom units where there may genuinely only be demand for one car. However, current car parking provisions allow for two car parks to be provided in tandem for a single residential activity on a site. Therefore, the actual area required for the additional car park would not necessarily be that of a full additional car parking space. • It may discourage the development of single bedroom units and therefore have implications on affordable housing. However, for multi unit developments there is more opportunity to provide 	<p>Requiring two car parking spaces per unit is considered an effective and efficient option for achieving the purpose of the Plan Change. This option would provide a clear car parking requirement, which ensures adequate on site car parking is provided that is not open to interpretation.</p> <p>Adverse effects from inadequate parking provisions would be avoided, or remedied or mitigated through the consent process.</p> <p>Therefore this option is recommended.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

		<p>comprehensive car parking layouts to accommodate the additional car parking requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census data indicates there is a linkage between the number of bedrooms on a property and the number of car parks, this option is not reflected by this. 	
<p>D. Change the site standard to require two car-parking spaces per residential flat.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not overly complicate the District Plan. • The majority of the cars owned by a household would be able to be parked on site. • The value of land would encourage innovative car parking solutions, such as underground garages etc, almost certainly resulting in a more efficient use of the site and higher amenity values. • Would provide a clear requirement that would not be open to interpretation. • Where residential flats contain more than 1 bedroom, it is more likely to enable all cars to be parked on site. • Avoids problems with units in the High Density Residential Zone being termed a 'Flat' to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May discourage the development of residential flats. • Changing the car parking requirement for residential flats is not necessary because consultation and research has identified that the problem is with cars parking on the street associated with higher density developed. Specifically, development in the High Density Residential Zone and development with similar characteristics such as comprehensive residential development, which results in higher numbers of dwellings per site and therefore places pressure on street parking. Where as the characteristics of the Low Density Zone ensure there is less pressure for on street car parking. • The characteristics of the Low 	<p>This option is considered to be effective in achieving policy 3.8 of The Plan because it would require additional on site car parking. However, it is not efficient because it places a greater requirement on residential flats that doesn't reflect their size and likely car parking demand.</p> <p>Therefore, this option is not recommended.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

	<p>avoid providing additional car parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would reflect the findings in the Transfund report, which identified an off road car parking requirement of two spaces/household. 	<p>Density Residential Zone and Plan Change 7 being developed to limit the size of residential flats will ensure that if there is an increase in the number of residential flats being developed, the effects of car parking associated with this development is mitigated.</p>	
<p>E. Retain one car park per residential flat.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide a clear requirement that would not be open to interpretation. • Requiring one car parking space for residential flats may provide an incentive to create them and therefore promote affordable housing. • If a residential flat is small, requiring only one car park would reflect the demand for parking on site. • Car parking for residential flats has not been identified as a problem. They are most likely to be located within the Low Density Residential Zone where site coverage is lower so there is likely to be more room to accommodate car parking on site. • A Plan Change is also being undertaken to ensure that residential flat is subsidiary to the unit it is attached to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring only one car park per flat does not reflect the Transfund data of two spaces/household. • May result in units within the High Density Residential zone being labelled residential flats so that only one car parking space is required. However this is unlikely because the flat can not be subdivided from the existing unit. 	<p>This option is considered to be effective and efficient because it reflects the likely demand for car parking that results from residential flats.</p> <p>Therefore, this option is recommended.</p>

TABLE 2 - Visitor Accommodation (unit type)

Rule Options	Advantages/Benefits	Disadvantages/Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
<p>A Require 2 car parks per unit but no staff or coach parks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not overly complicate the District Plan. • The value of land would encourage innovative car parking solutions, such as underground garages etc, almost certainly resulting in a more efficient use of the site and higher amenity values. • Would ensure that if the units were used for residential activities in the future that sufficient car parking was provided to accommodate the number of cars that would be anticipated, associated with the change in use. • Where people arrived by coach, even though no specific coach park is required, the coach could park over the unused car parks. • If the units were not fully occupied, staff would be able 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide for 'staff' parking, therefore would not adequately ensure parking spaces are designated for staff at all times. Staff may have to park on the street. • Because there would be no requirement for coach parks, a coach may not be able to physically enter or exit the site without the car park design being developed to provide for coaches. • If the development was used for unit type visitor accommodation in perpetuity, providing up to two car parks per unit may result in surplus car parks. For example, it is unlikely that guests staying in a two bedroom unit would arrive in two cars. 	<p>This option is deemed effective in ensuring adequate car parking is provided for a change in use of the units. (i.e a change from visitor accommodation to residential)</p> <p>However, it creates additional issues by not providing coach and staff car parks.</p> <p>This option is not recommended.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

	to park in the spare car parks.		
<p>B Require two car parks per unit, plus one coach park per 30 units and one staff park per ten beds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not overly complicate the District Plan. • The value of land would encourage innovative car parking solutions, such as underground garages etc, almost certainly resulting in a more efficient use of the site and higher amenity values. • Would ensure that if the units were used for residential activities in the future that sufficient car parking was provided to accommodate the number of cars that would be anticipated, associated with the change in use. • If people arrived by coach the car park design/access width would be adequate to ensure a coach could physically enter and exit the site. • If people arrived by coach there would be a designated space for the coach to park to avoid the coach having to park on the street if the car park spaces for the units 	<p>If the development was used for unit type visitor accommodation in perpetuity, providing up to two car parks per unit may result in surplus car parks. For example, it is unlikely that guests staying in a two bedroom unit would arrive in two cars.</p>	<p>This option is deemed effective and efficient in ensuring adequate car parking is provided for a change in use of the units while still ensuring adequate staff and coach parking is provided.</p> <p>This option is recommended.</p>

	<p>were occupied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff car parks would be provided therefore ensuring staff would not have to park on the street. 		
--	--	--	--

Note: Consideration of the appropriate number of car parks per unit has not been explored further, because it has been considered through Table 1 Residential Car Parking.

TABLE 3 - Backpacker Hostels

Rule Options	Advantages/Benefits	Disadvantages/Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
A. Require one car park per guest room, plus one coach park per 50 guest rooms and one staff park per 20 beds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would provide more onsite car parking for guests than currently required therefore improving amenity. • Would still require staff and coach parking as already required, which has not been identified as an issue and therefore would continue to ensure coaches and staff can park onsite. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The car parking requirements for guests is still related to the number of bedrooms, which does not reflect the nature of Backpacker Hostels (bunk style rooms) where a number of guests would stay in one room. • Guests would have to park on the street if more than one group of guests arrived by car but stayed in the same room. 	<p>This option is not effective as it does not relate the car parking requirements to the nature of Backpacker Hostels where a number of guests stay in one room.</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
B. Require one car park per five guest beds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects the nature of Backpacker Hostels by relating the number of car parks to the number of guest beds. • Aligns the number of car parks to a reasonable level, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No staff car parking is required and it is reasonable to consider that some staff will be required to run the Backpackers. • No coach parking is required, it is reasonable to assume that 	<p>This option is considered effective in providing adequate car parking to ensure guest vehicles are not parked on the street. However, this option would shift the problem to staff and coaches parking on the street and therefore is not an effective option to address the issue.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 8 TO THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACES.

	<p>determined by the fact that one car could hold up to 5 guests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects the information obtained through the phone survey. 	<p>some guests will arrive by coach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By amending the guest parking requirements the effects of guest parking on the street has been addressed. However, because no staff and coach parking is provided the problem would be shifted from the effects of guest parking on the street to staff and coaches. 	<p>This option is not recommended.</p>
<p>C. Require one car park per five guest beds, plus one coach park per 50 guest rooms and one staff car park per 20 beds.</p> <p>This option adopts the positive aspects of the two previous options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would provide more onsite car parking for guests. Reflects the nature of Backpacker Hostels by relating the number of car parks to the number of guest beds. Aligns the number of car parks to a reasonable level, determined by the fact that one car could hold up to 5 guests. Reflects the information obtained through the phone survey. Would still require staff and coach parking as already required, which has not been identified as an issue and therefore would continue to ensure coaches and staff can park onsite. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of car parks required may have an adverse visual effect on the amenity of the site. Increase cost to landowners. 	<p>This option is considered effective at providing adequate car parking to ensure guest vehicles are not parked on the street by reflecting the nature of Backpacker Hostels. It is also considered efficient as it does not amend coach or staff parking requirements, which have not been identified as an issue.</p> <p>This option is recommended.</p>

6.0 DEFINITIONS

Associated with the proposed changes an additional definition needs to be provided for Backpacker Hostel to reflect the new provisions proposed for this activity.

7.0 CONCLUSION

This report has analysed the range of options for the requirements for on-site car parking for residential activities and visitor accommodation (unit type) and backpackers. In assessing each option, relevant statutory and non-statutory documents have been considered, in addition to the results of public consultation undertaken in the first half of 2004.

This analysis has determined that the most appropriate and cost effective option is to:

- Require two car parking spaces per residential unit for:
 - The High Density Residential Zone
 - Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density residential Zone.
 - The Remarkables Park Zone all Activity Areas except Activity Area 1.
- Require two car parking spaces per unit for all visitor accommodation (unit type construction).
- Consider Backpacker Hostels independently of other visitor accommodation and require them to provide 1 car park per 5 guests.

8.0 PLAN CHANGE

Amend the relevant rows of Table 1 - Parking Space Requirements - under 14.2.4.1 to read as follows (struck through text is to be removed, underlined text is to be added):

ACTIVITY	PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR:	
	RESIDENTS/VISITOR	STAFF
High Density Residential Zone:	1 per residential unit <u>2 per residential unit</u>	
All other Zones	2 per residential unit	
Residential Flat	1 per residential flat	
Visitor Accommodation (unit type construction, <u>including all units containing a kitchen facility,</u> e.g. motels, cabins)	1 per unit up to 15 units; thereafter 1 per 2 units, <u>2 per unit</u> plus 1 coach park per 30 units	1 per 10 units
Visitor	1 per 3 guest rooms up	1 per 20 beds

Accommodation (guest room type construction, usually not containing a kitchen facility, e.g. hotels)	to 60 guest rooms; thereafter 1 per 5 guest rooms, plus 1 coach park per 50 guest rooms	
Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density Residential Zone	<u>2 per residential unit</u>	One car park per residential unit; plus one visitor car park per two residential units for developments of 11-20 units and one visitor car park per additional five residential units thereafter

Add the following row to Table 1 – Parking Space Requirements – under 14.2.4.1:

Visitor Accommodation (Backpacker Hostels)	<u>1 per 5 guest beds, plus 1 coach park per 50 guest rooms</u>	<u>1 per 20 beds</u>
--	---	----------------------

Amend Table 1A - - Remarkables Park Zone: Parking Spaces Required as follows:

ACTIVITY	PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR:	
	RESIDENTS/VISITOR	STAFF
Activity Area 1	2 per residential unit	
All other Activity Areas	4 per residential unit <u>2 per residential unit</u>	- -

Include the following definition of “backpacker hostel” in the Definition section:

<u>BACKPACKER HOSTEL</u>	- <u>Means visitor accommodation where rooms and other facilities are shared by more than one person and beds are let as distinct from guest rooms.</u>
---------------------------------	---