

Draft Central City Parking Policy

Summary of feedback

We met with a range of central city business, community, and residential advocacy and interest groups and representatives to share information about central city parking, and to hear their issues and suggestions.

In developing the draft policy, we have considered a wide range of feedback, key elements of which are summarised below:

- There was general agreement with the proposed goals to:
 - Promote 85% occupancy of parking spaces in the central city at peak times
 - Support CO2 emissions targets
 - Support high amenity off-street parking that makes efficient use of space
 - Support a vibrant, people-centric, central city
 - Improve parking data and information.
- There was widespread acknowledgement of the need to balance competing demands on limited on-street space, and there feedback from various quarters highlighting the need to differentiate between central core and wider central city parking issues and needs. There were different suggestions about what uses are most important:
 - Competing uses raised included loading zones for retail; customer parking for a wide range of shops, services, and attractions; mobility parking; residential parking; taxi and other passenger vehicle drop off, pick up and parking; bus and bicycle stops/parking; and private vehicle (including bus), cyclist and pedestrian movement.
 - Specific issues about the number and locations of parks were raised for many types of parking. For mobility parking concerns were raised about the design of parks, as well as the location and number. The location and number of parks, and pick up and drop off areas, were also raised as an issue for taxis.
 - Commuter parking was generally considered the lowest priority for on-street space by those to whom we spoke. In residential areas, central city residents sought prioritisation of residents' on-street parking over other parking types like commuter and Air B&B parking. Concerns were raised by businesses that insufficient short-stay visitor parking was available in the central commercial area.
 - We heard that needs may vary by time of day and day of week.
 - Views diverged on whether enough parking is available in the city, with some considering there is and some considering there is not. Some felt that parking was not necessarily in the right place.
- Different views were presented on how to meet demand for parking off-street:

- Some raised concerns that the number of temporary surface gravel car parks reduces amenity, affects the viability of providing parking capacity in multi-story buildings, deters the development of vacant land, and inhibits the recovery of the central city. Some felt that more off-street parking in multi-story buildings and/or shared car parks should be encouraged. The point was made that people do not come to the city to park and that the offering in the central city needs to be sufficiently attractive and differentiated to draw people into the city.
 - Others felt that free or cheap parking and temporary surface car parks are vital to the survival of central city businesses, that people in Christchurch do not want to park in multi-story buildings, that cycle lanes are not a greater priority than parking, that public transport is not a viable alternative to car travel, and that land owners should be supported to rent vacant land to those wishing to park in the city. There was a concern that the cost of parking makes it difficult for the central city to compete with malls.
 - Some discussed the need for improving access, public security, amenity and the pedestrian environment to support businesses and encourage visitors, with various views as to how this was best achieved.
 - There were various views about the Council's role in providing parking, with some considering that the market should respond to demand, and others that the Council should act to meet demand.
- Views on the role of active and public transport differed with some advocating for greater uptake supported by improved service (in particular, to assist with reducing emissions) and others preferring private vehicle travel. Some advocated for a greater use of alternative solutions such as shared off-street private parking spaces, park'n'ride, pick up and drop off rather than parking for passenger vehicles with dedicated waiting areas being further out, and reinstatement of the free shuttle.
 - Looking to the future, there was general agreement that we need to harness technology to manage and direct demand and support payment methods, for a seamless user experience. It is important we rely on robust data and information to development and implement our parking policy. We also need to identify and plan for changes in the way people live, travel, and park, whether this be changes in transport technology that may reduce the need for parking or greater inner city residential development without onsite parking provision.