

Attachment 4 – Summary of Feedback on the Draft Parking Management Plans

A2923200 Ndoc 591542420-177

Draft Central City Parking Management Plan

Central City Parking Proposal 1 – New developments ineligible for Residential Parking Permits The purpose of this proposal is to reduce reliance on, and future demand for, on-street parking. To be implemented when the Parking Strategy is adopted.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose
23	0

Central City Parking Proposal 2 – Establish a position of no net gain of public parking in the Central City. To be implemented when the Parking Strategy is adopted.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Support in part
9	35	1

Nine submitters supported this proposal and 35 opposed it.

Nine submitters supported the proposal

Of the nine submissions in support of the proposal, seven wanted the Council to go further, by actively decreasing car parks. Reasons included: reducing congestion, keeping cars out of the city centre, creating a modal shift, improving cycle safety, and freeing up our streets for space that can be better used to make our city beautiful, and more vibrant.

Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supported the proposed approach, with the additional qualification that public transport needs to be more accessible and frequent.

Thirty five submitters opposed the proposal

Of the 35 submitters opposed to this proposal, the key concerns were negatively impacts on businesses as lack of affordable or available parking will mean Nelson will be overlooked in favour of more car friendly areas; and the need for our ageing population, and other people with mobility and other health issues to have easy access to shops and facilities. A car parking building was suggested.

Central City Parking Proposal 3 – In the short term (1-2 years) remove time restrictions in the Central City (except P10) and manage parking demand using graduated pricing. This provides flexibility for visitors to pay for as long as they need while deterring long term/commuter parking. The following example of how this might work in Nelson was included in Appendix A:

Time and day	On-street parking	Off-street parking
--------------	-------------------	--------------------

Mon – Fri (8am to 5pm)	1 st hour free \$2/hour for next 2 hours \$5 thereafter	1 st hour free \$2/hour for next 2 hours \$5 thereafter
Sat (9am to 1pm)	1 st hour free \$2/hour for next 2 hours \$3 thereafter	1 st hour free \$2/hour for next 2 hours \$2 thereafter

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Provide 1.5 hours free parking	Retain 1 hour free parking
10	35	1	9

Keep time restrictions	Support P10	Remove 1 hour free parking	Provide 2 hours free parking
9	2 (including NMH)	3	1

Comments:

10 submitters supported the proposal and nine submitters specifically supported retaining one hour of free parking (which was included in the Nelson example of graduated pricing in Appendix A).

Two submitters requested a longer period of free parking (1.5 and 2 hours) to give more time for a stress-free lunch and leisurely shopping.

The main concern of the 35 submitters who opposed the proposal was for the viability of Nelson businesses, when it is free to park near the Richmond Mall.

Nine submitters wanted to retain the use of time restrictions – two submissions wanted time restrictions to remain on Trafalgar Street to allow easy access for the quick visits our retailers need. Two other submissions noted that time-restricted parking is an effective way to manage parking availability in busy areas, as it allows people to quickly stop by takeaway restaurants, banks, post offices, and other fast transaction places. There was some concern that the people who could afford it, would park all day in the areas with graduated pricing.

Central City Parking Proposal 4 – In the short term (1-2 years) review parking fees in the Central City, ensuring off-street parking in the Central City is cheaper than on-street parking. The purpose of this proposal is to encourage use of off-street parking resources, which reduces vehicles circulating in the Central City and reduces demand for the most convenient spaces.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose
19	1

Nineteen submissions supported this proposal, and one opposed it on the basis that there should not be any increases in car park pricing, due to the impact on businesses.

Central City Parking Proposal 5 – In the short term (1-2 years) increase the use of more flexible parking restrictions to allow for multiple or shared use based on time of day/week (e.g. P10 during business hours only, AM peak loading zones, shared bus stops and taxi zones based on time of day). The purpose of this proposal is to encourage more efficient use of parking resources.

Submission summary

Support	Qualified support	Oppose
19	9	0

Nineteen submissions supported this proposal, and made the following comments.

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supported this approach with the caution that businesses require access to loading zones at all times of day and therefore this must be factored into the planning.
- Nelson Taxis suggested using a parking management tool to implement the idea of a taxi / rideshare hub away from (but close enough to) Bridge Street for those difficult Fri Sat nights
- Nelson Taxis also suggested looking at combined use parks for set down/pick up areas in Stoke and Tahunanui, particularly around the beach areas on a busy summer day when congestion and traffic through those carparks can be troublesome when finding a safe place for passengers to alight/load.
- Nelson Tasman 2050 asked whether it is possible to remove some loading/servicing parking space allocations altogether by limiting loading/servicing to certain times of the day/week (that are unattractive to other road users) and allowing such vehicles to stop on the road (within very limited time windows). This is successfully practised overseas and results in a further reduction of required parking areas.
- Nelson Marlborough Health noted it is critically important that (if this flexible approach is used) that there is sufficient signage available so people can clearly understand the expectations for the space.

Nine duplicate submissions gave qualified support for this proposal, but did not provide details on the nature of this level of support. No submissions opposed this proposal.

Central City Parking Proposal 6 – In the short term (1-2 years) develop and implement a new residential parking scheme, including removing dedicated residential parking bays, increasing the cost of permits, and changes to eligibility and parking exemptions. The purpose of this proposal is to provide more efficient use of parking resources. To be introduced when paid parking and time restrictions are introduced in the City Fringe.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
1	4	2

The submission in support of this proposal commented that this could help make efficient use of space.

Four submissions opposed the proposal. Comments included:

- charging residents and others for parking if their property is near the CBD is not good.
- Residents of the CBD within a historical precinct have no opportunity to change their parking situation. The proposal to remove residents' spaces (even though the submitter's zone has not been highlighted in the plan) severely limits their ability to even own a vehicle as busy times mean zero access to day parking anywhere within the CBD.

Vehicle access to the front of the property should be provided if the residents' parking spaces were removed. Better policing of resident access could improve their use as permit abuse is common. South Street and Nile Street West are often filled with vehicles that are not eligible. Increasing the cost, tightening the eligibility and better policing the volume of permits will improve the resident experience. A 1-hour limit on Nile Street West does not reflect the use of the businesses on the street and customers in the spa or health clinic are regularly being ticketed with no close alternatives.

- The intentions of this scheme are not clear. A resident should be able to have a visitor park outside their home.

Two submissions didn't specifically support or oppose the proposal. Instead they made the following comments:

- Residents without on-site parking (other than new rules) should definitely be allowed to apply for a residents parking permit so they can easily park near their house. But maybe the annual cost of these residents parking permits should increase, to reflect that having that parking space is a privilege, and is too cheap at the moment. If paid parking restrictions are introduced on those same streets, then the price of residents permits should go up too.
- A resident of Elliot Street said she is often frustrated at the inability for herself and visitors to find a car park in my own street let alone out the front of her house. These vehicles have been known to belong to residents from apartments along Trafalgar Street whose addresses have parking for one vehicle. It is not uncommon for their second car to be parked in Elliott Street as the submitter and other residents of Elliott Street have discovered. Due to its proximity to the city, the residents also get a number of Nelson city workers parking in their street.

She would like to see parking for residents of Elliot Street only, or at least 'resident only parking between hours of 2.30pm and 9.30am, making it easier on parents of school aged children and the more elderly residents of Elliott Street.

Central City Parking Proposal 7 – In the short term (1-2 years) introduce or change pricing or restrictions as peak parking thresholds are reached. The purpose of this proposal is to manage parking demand and encourage turnover. This would be implemented when parking occupancy exceeds 85% at peak times.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
0	18	1

Eighteen submissions opposed this proposal and one of these noted that graduated pricing is a better option. One other submission from Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce noted that Covid is likely to continue to impact on the way that we live and work for the next year and possible longer. Thus, we do not see this as an action for the short term but rather something to monitor over time. And as previously noted, this needs to be aligned with increased availability of public transport and other modal shifts.

Central City Parking Proposal 8 – In the short term (1-2 years) explore funding opportunities to provide short-term public EV charging spaces in Central City parking squares. The purpose of this proposal is to provide convenient 'top up' charging for the growing number of EV vehicles.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
22	1	2

Twenty two submissions were supportive of this proposal, and three of these included comments:

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce strongly encourage this to ensure that the city remains up-to-date with the current trend towards e-vehicles.
- We should provide short-term public EV parks with charging stations in the CBD. Council will need to cover its electricity costs but maybe without making a profit. The number of EV charging stations per block would depend on demand.
- The implementation of electric car chargers will not only encourage more residents to purchase electric vehicles, but also help improve the electric car charging network in Nelson.

One submission opposed this proposal, with the view that people should charge their cars and bikes at home, or at their workplace. Otherwise, the cost for these chargers will be borne by the rate payers and or tax payers, and the money could be better spent. The government doesn't spend money on fuel stations, so why should it do this for electric vehicles?

Two submissions didn't specifically support or oppose the proposal, but made the following comments:

- Nelson City Council is the only Council in NZ to turn down a "free" installation of electric bike "Locky Docks" for electric bikes. Many oldies would be happy to use these installed free around the CBD. But these were turned down due to the antiquated attitude of not allowing advertising on the Locky Dock screen.

- There is not nearly enough emphasis on Electric Vehicle usage within the CBD, nor any reference to parking that might provide spaces for EV's or charging stations.

Central City Parking Proposal 9 – In the short term (1-2 years) investigate opportunities to establish car share schemes in the City, and provide designated car share spaces in the Central City and fringe areas.

The purpose of this proposal is to provide convenient access to car share vehicles for members. It would be implemented if car share operators committed to establish operations in Nelson.

Submission summary

Support	Support subject to tighter rules	Oppose	Comments
6	14	0	2

Six submissions supported this proposal, and included the following comments:

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the Council investigating and implementing this proposal in the short term, as it is working well in other urban centres.
- Car sharing means inner city residents can have access to a car for when it is needed, such as shopping trips, sports matches or a trip to Abel Tasman for the day.
- This would have great benefits, especially if there is inner-city residential growth.

Fourteen duplicate submissions supported this proposal subject to tighter rules (but did not provide details on what this would involve).

Two submissions did not specifically support or oppose the proposal, but made the following comments:

- I don't understand why car-sharing has to take place in the CBD, unless it is attached to, perhaps, a co-housing apartment block development where all residents share such vehicles. Why not have car shares available in each outer suburb - a Tahunanui car share and an Atawhai car share, etc?
- Special parking for shared cars is not needed at this time.

Central City Parking Proposal 10 – In the short term (1-2 years) investigate opportunities to establish micro-mobility schemes (e.g. shared scooters, bicycles) in the Central City, in consultation with operators and the community.

The purpose of this proposal is to provide convenient access to micro-mobility transport options for members, and would be implemented when micro-mobility operators committed to establishing operations in Nelson.

Submission summary

Support	Support in part	Oppose	Comments
18	1	0	1

Eighteen submissions supported this proposal, with one submitter stating that it would have great benefits, especially if there is inner-city residential growth.

The Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supported this proposal as an alternative to cars in some instances. Consideration must be given to how scooters are used so as not to impact on pedestrian use of the city.

One submission didn't specifically support or oppose the proposal, but asked whether scooter sharing schemes were worthwhile, as scooters left lying around everywhere (in other cities that have them already) create a hazard for low vision pedestrians.

Central City Parking Proposal 11 – In the short term (1-2 years) collaborate with NMIT to review their permit scheme and provide travel demand management support (e.g. public transport concessions). The purpose of this proposal is to address high parking demand in and around the NMIT campus and encourage use of alternative transport choices.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose
20	0

Twenty submissions supported this proposal, and one submitter commented that it would be of great benefit to have less student parking demand.

Central City Parking Proposal 12 – In the short term (1-2 years) review the provision of mobility, loading, motorcycle and bicycle (including electric bike charging) parking, considering the quantity, location and quality of facilities in the Central City. The purpose of this proposal is to provide safe and convenient parking for multiple users and modes.

Submission summary

Support	Support with qualifications	Oppose	Comments
5	16	0	11

Five submissions supported the proposal and included the following comments:

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supported a review and emphasised the need for businesses to have access to loading bays.
- A closer look at the abuse of disabled cards would help too. Everybody knows the system is abused.
- I agree with this being reviewed to get the best use of space.

Sixteen submissions (including 15 duplicate submissions) supported this proposal with qualifications, but did not indicate what those qualifications are. One submission supported the proposal subject to there being no reduction in spaces available in the CBD for cars.

Eleven submissions did not explicitly support or oppose the submission, but made comments related to the topic, as shown on pages x to x of Appendix X.

Mobility

- There needs to be more designated spaces for people with mobility issues and the elderly. A ratio of 5 disabled spots to 330 total spots (as found in Buxton Square) isn't enough.
- As a person with a long-term disability, who also falls into the category of elderly, I feel I am well qualified to make the following observations. When Council removes parking spaces it should firstly consider whether or not that space could have been of use to those living with a disability. The location of disabled parks deserves more attention.

For example, the one outside the Spark shop in Trafalgar Street is a problem for me – due to the acute angle of the road to the culvert, and then a high step up the gutter onto the footpath or alternatively going around behind the car where I am exposed to traffic, to the ramp provided. This is also a challenge to my balance as is the badly laid paving that I traverse in order to get to either the pedestrian crossing or the footpath. There is also the matter of the parking machine being 100 meters down the street and back before I can go about my business.

It is virtually impossible for my wife and I to go to the movies or to the Suter for exhibitions because of the inherent dangers of rough and undulating footpaths and the difficulties of getting from the disabled park to the venue. Adequate parking does exist for places like doctors' surgeries and public facilities because these are part of building requirements. The problem parks appear to be those that have been put in retrospectively by council at a later date.

- Mobility parks should only be used by people with mobility parking permits.
- Consider reducing parking fees for mobility permit holders.
- Mobility parks will be increasingly important with our ageing population. We will need at least a couple of mobility parks on each block, and I suggest that they have a two-hour free parking.
- Accessibility for non-ambulant people is critical so they can participate in the community.
- Do we have enough loading zones and mobility parking? Consultation with the business community on these matters will be required.

Loading

- Business operators need to have sufficient short-term parking to load and unload. I rely on the one-hour parking spaces in the front of the building to bring in supplies. I very much support the use of some of the short-term spaces being allocated for loading/unloading (10 or 15 minute restriction) to enable dropping off of supplies. If this sort of parking were not available at the door, it would make it unfeasible for me to continue operating at my current location.
- Regarding loading zones - there are no zones long enough to cater for car transporters. The car transporter companies have the expectation of parking outside a car yard while unloading, perhaps 8 vehicles. It would be better for the car transporters to unload the cars outside the CBD and have them driven to the

car yards. Even better would be the recognition that car yards would be better placed outside the CBD and the valuable real estate such yards occupy be used to provide space for apartment blocks, etc. in order to meet the need for urban dwelling density.

- More loading zones are needed.
- We urgently need to do something to enable goods service vehicles to park when making deliveries. My building at the corner of Hardy Street and Collingwood Street (Panama House) is regularly damaged by Bidfood delivery vehicles crashing in to the verandah. This has incurred a significant cost replacing spouting and repairing the building. (\$10,000+).

Bicycle parking

- Bike racks need to be more accessible to a wider group of people of differing physical needs and also allow for changes in the types, shapes, recharging needs, and weights of the bikes of the future.

Central City Parking Proposal 13 – In the short term (1-2 years) review Nelson’s car pooling scheme to assess the demand for these spaces.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Support, subject to tighter rules	Comments
4	0	12	1

Four submissions supported this proposal. Comments included:

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supported a review to ensure that sufficient car parks are in place to encourage this.
- One submission noted that not everyone can physically cycle or walk, and the buses can be inconvenient, so, my biggest suggestion for modal shift is that you should spend a lot more effort on promoting and encouraging the carpooling scheme.

Add more car pool spaces scattered around town locations, put some spaces in really visible central locations, (Montgomery or Buxton squares clearly marked).

The submitter asked why does it have to be working commuters only, why can’t it be other people travelling together into town for shopping or NMIT study or other purposes?

Don’t let other people use those spaces after 10am. Carpool permits only. If people see them empty occasionally it might spark their interest to think they are available any time of the day arriving.

- The review should consider how to get the best use out of designated spaces depending on time of day etc

Twelve (duplicate) submissions supported the proposal subject to tighter rules, but did not indicate what this would look like.

One submission did not specifically support or oppose a review, but included the following comments on carpooling:

- Provide heavily discounted rates for proven carpooling – folk will respond to this.

Central City Parking Proposal 14 – In the short term (1-2 years) increase parking enforcement to manage the larger extent of parking restrictions in the Central City and fringe areas. Consider using technology such as Licence Plate Recognition monitoring. The purpose of this proposal is to encourage compliance with restrictions and turnover of parking spaces.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
General support: 7 Technology: 6 Enforcement: 2	3	2

Seven submissions included general support for this proposal, and another six specifically supported the use of technology – for both payment and enforcement systems. Two submissions specifically supported increased enforcement.

Comments related to technology included:

- NMH supports the investigation into integrating the public transport Smartcard system with the Pay by Plate Parking systems as this would make it easier to use the different transport options in Nelson. NMH also supports electronic permits, enforcement technology and digital parking communication systems as these would make the parking management system more efficient for users and the Council.
- Does the NCC have the correct mechanism for checking and collecting parking income. Would “Frog” parking monitoring & parking income be considered, especially in the three main areas, Buxton, Montgomery, and Achilles car parking areas. This could be rolled out onto the main streets. The churn affect of the carparking would be beneficial. Better utilisation of the carparks and electronic boards would be required; however costs benefit ratios are required.
- Apps and software that allow commuters to remotely pay for parking will increase practicality and likely the amount of time people spend in the city. While current parking meters allow for payment by cash or card, future payment methods could include Smartcards (like bus cards) that people swipe, reducing the amount of physical money that goes into parking meters and thus reducing the need for those machines to be emptied.
- There are electronic car park monitoring systems available, they read your rego entering and they read it out then charge. With electronic monitoring we should be able to provide discounted parking for the elderly and the needy.
- We support finding ways to make electronic parking payment easier, to reduce cash-handling and security problems.

One submitter made a comment related to enforcement:

- the handicapped parking outside the Page & Blackmore bookshop is terribly abused.

Three submissions opposed this proposal.

Two additional comments were made on parking infringements, which are relevant to this topic:

- Penalties for parking violations are too low as many people can afford to pay \$12 for overstaying. Impose a higher fee system as a priority.
- We support advocacy for national increases of parking penalties to ensure infringements deter illegal parking.

Central City Parking Proposal 15 – In the short term (1-2 years) carry out ongoing monitoring of parking occupancy and duration of stay (e.g. every 3 to 6 months). The purpose of this proposal is to assess demand for parking resources and identify trends that may trigger changes to parking management.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
8	1	3

Eight submissions supported this proposal, and one of these included a comment:

- The use of technology would be of benefit with this.

One submission opposed the proposal.

In addition, three submissions provided comments on the proposal:

- Monitor the all day parking offer during peak times.
- Carry out monitoring once a year
- High parking demand should be seen as failure with active and public transport. Rather than increasing parking supply in the face of high demand you should be questioning why your active and public transport policies aren't working well enough. And longer term you must question whether you are allowing enough people to live close in rather than sprawling out into car dependent suburbs.

Central City Parking Proposal 16 – In the medium term (3-5 years) introduce a combination of paid parking and time restrictions on City Fringe streets.

Appendix A of the Draft Plan recommends paid parking and parking restrictions during business hours for streets where there are high commuter parking demands, such as Grove Street. Introducing paid parking on one side of the street (such as \$5 per day) and P120 restrictions on the other side will provide some space for commuters, short term parking for visitors and parking for residents overnight. Existing residents without off-street parking will be eligible to purchase a residential parking permit that provides an exemption to time restrictions.

Options to charge for parking in residential areas include the use of coupons or introducing parking meters in these areas.

This proposal would be implemented after major public transport improvements (scheduled for 2023), and would be applied to City Fringe streets based on parking occupancy exceeding 85% at peak times, in conjunction with community consultation.

Summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
3	22	12

Three submissions supported this proposal, and these submissions included the following comments:

- Paying for parking should be more widespread to even out demand.
- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supports this in the medium term, but notes that this needs to be undertaken with a communications plan to ensure that the community is engaged with this.
- I am in support of encouraging those commuting into the central city to work to find alternatives to transport where feasible. For myself, I would consider parking at a distance and using an electric scooter to get from my car into the centre.

Twenty two submissions opposed this proposal, and these submissions included the following comments:

- I do not support the theory that CBD employees must obtain private all-day parking or park further away from the CBD than they currently do.
- I oppose this at present but could be viable in the future.

Twelve submissions did not specifically support or oppose the proposal, and instead provided the following comments which are relevant to this topic:

- I like the idea of outer city, or fringe, car parks. This still provides parking for people needing to drive personal vehicles, but it forces them to walk, bike, scooter or skateboard the last 1km into the city.
- You appear to think it's quite OK to force CBD employees to either obtain private all-day parking, or must park further away from the CBD than they do at present. Just look around the free riverside parks during the day. Once again, no bus /van services are provided to go through the main CBD streets with short term drop off -pick up sites.
- Reducing commuters access to parking in the CBD without an alternative will only make our city a less desirable place to work and enjoy while alienating many of our core consumers who are the backbone of our daily hospitality business. Perhaps the council is relying on the fact that commuters have to come to work and will simply have to adapt. We have proven this assumption false with the large numbers of people choosing to work from home and the harm this has caused to the CBD retail and hospitality.
- Cars parking on the City fringe makes it very difficult for residents to get out of their driveways safely, with high fencing and large vehicles obstructing views.
- Time restricted parking is one of the best options for parking by parks and reserves. One of the issues with parks and reserves near the city is the potential

for commuters to park there, defeating the purpose of reserves with nearby parking. To solve this problem, dedicated parking could be implemented, stating that only people using the park or reserve are allowed to park there.

- We note that the parking data identified that there are currently limited options for convenient and affordable all-day parking. We do have concerns that despite this, the draft strategy proposes to further restrict all-day parking. We understand that the reason for proposing this is to hopefully drive modal shift and deter commuter traffic from coming into the city. However, this could cause unintended consequences, as outlined below.

The Council has a stated aspiration for a vibrant city centre. Part of achieving that is having a mix of successful central city businesses, shops, cafes, restaurants, and other hospitality venues. To be successful, these businesses all need people to run them. The hospitality industry has been hit very hard by the Covid pandemic and is still struggling to attract staff. Making it harder for workers to find all day parking could exacerbate an already tenuous situation. As an example, a hospitality worker scheduled for an evening shift trying to find a park midafternoon. Often there are none available. Then at the end of their shift, around 11pm, midnight or maybe later in the weekends, they want to be able to get back to their car safely, and not having to trek a long distance. There is nothing in the draft parking strategy to address this issue, and public transport won't be an option that time of night.

The tool of severely restricting all day parking to deter single car use by commuters to achieve modal shift is a very blunt instrument which does not consider varying commuter requirements and appears to potentially compromise people's safety during their transition between work and their transportation mode.

- You appear to think it's quite OK to force CBD employees to either obtain private all-day parking, or must park further away from the CBD than they do at present. Just look around the free riverside parks during the day. Once again no bus /van services are provided to go through the main CBD streets with short term drop off -pick up sites.
- Workers and residents will put pressure on city centre parking. This will be the key area to consider as the city intensifies with residents. 'Free' all day spaces in Hathaway Terrace and Trafalgar Park, Shelbourne Street, and areas around NMIT will face more pressure with growth. Continued work on the PT network and improved safe linkages for walk and cycle (with more cycle facilities!) will help reduce pressure.
- If we call current Central City parking zone 1, and the new proposed restricted city fringe streets with 100% occupancy zone 2, I think you need to make it a very clear map showing where zone 2 is located all around the fringe, and that you need to be consistent with what you introduce to all those streets so that they all have same new parking system (eg Grove, Nile, lower Trafalgar, Sherborne, outer Bridge, Tasman etc all the same). Otherwise it will create a "nimby/ unfair" type response from one street to the next.

For every street you bring into this new fringe Zone 2 parking system, please designate some carpool spaces as well.

Maybe you could create an online system where people could pay for a zone 2 commuter parking permit. Go to website, put in numberplate, pay your \$\$ (\$5

per day seems reasonable suggestion) (ability to choose daily, weekly monthly), print out a permit that you can put in your windscreen.

Unless you have some modal shift alternative transport options available when you bring in these fringe street prices – all that will happen is people who have no choice will pay and continue to park there, but those who can walk and who don't want to pay will just park further out. Moving the problem outwards.

- Paid parking should be extended to the fringe areas which are currently overrun with cars. More parking in central Nelson should be available for commuters.
- It bothers me that the Trafalgar Centre is being used as free parking for commuters and isn't monetised. In any other city this wouldn't be the case. The council could be implementing their current parking technology in this zone to be collecting revenue (even \$5 a day - extremely reasonable) for all-day parkers.
- I am a Nelson City Fringe Rate payer - Manuka Street. I would love to see city workers find a park in the city rather than our street every day. Between the hours of 8.15am - 5.30pm on weekdays there is not a vacant park available in our street. It is impossible to accommodate parking for anyone visiting our house during work hours. There need to be better options for the city worker/commuter.

Central City Parking Proposal 17 – In the medium term (3-5 years) review provision of 1 hour of free parking. Regularly reviewing the provision of one hour of free parking is recommended once the planned improvements to bus networks are introduced, and when Richmond introduces paid parking in the town centre. The purpose of this proposal is to ensure those who use parking contribute to the cost of parking provision.

Summary

Support	Oppose
1	19

One submission supported this proposal, and 19 opposed it. Two comments (in opposition) were included:

- I believe that some shoppers really do find this an attractive option and would generally not even use the full hour.
- I strongly support the continuation of 1 hour free parking for a long (and defined) period of time rather than a continuous threat of it being removed. One hour free parking is a fundamental operating assumption that retailers have in their business models + the uncertainty that is created by the proposal to remove it is damaging for business confidence.

As a mother of 2 young children, ease of parking in close proximity to the shops I want to visit is the only reason I go into town. If life were made 'harder' for me though removal of parking spaces, removal of free parking - I simply wouldn't go into the CBD.

Central City Parking Proposal 18 – In the medium term (3-5 years) investigate cordoning parking meter revenue from Central City parking meters and reinvest it in improvements in the Central City and to public transport. The purpose of this proposal is to ensure local businesses directly benefit from parking charges. Implementation would be linked to a review of the policy to provide one hour of free parking.

Support in part	Oppose
1	23

The Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce submission supported this proposal in part, as outlined below:

- We support this if it adds to investment in public transport and the inner-city improvements. Council must consider the opportunity cost.

Seventeen submissions opposed this proposal, with the following comment provided by one of these submitters:

- Money from parking should be used for parking improvements or creating more car parks in the future for the office and retail workers and future residents.

Central City Parking Proposal 19 – In the medium term (3-5 years) review parking availability wayfinding from arterial corridors to the City Centre parking squares. Consider supplementing with real time information to provide information on availability on electronic signage, apps, etc. The purpose of this proposal is to contribute to reducing vehicle circulation and to provide information for visitors. It would be implemented alongside cordoning off parking revenue (as described in Recommendation 18).

Submission summary

Support	Oppose
18	0

Eighteen submissions supported this proposal, and two comments were included:

- We support this initiative and would encourage that it is implemented as soon as possible. The ability for visitors to the central city to see parking availability will reduce frustration.
- This will help to minimise vehicle circulation.

Central City Parking Proposal 20 – In the medium term (3-5 years) investigate mechanisms to implement paid parking in Rutherford Park and Hathaway Terrace reserves. The purpose of this proposal is to manage parking demand in reserves and ensure those who use parking contribute to the cost of parking provision.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
1	9	1

One submission supported this proposal and nine opposed it (with a comment provided by one of these submitters):

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce stated that we do not see this as a priority given the limited amount of parking available in these areas.

An additional comment related to this topic was provided by a submitter:

- Public park carparks should not be used for commuters. This impacts on the quality of life around the park.

Central City Parking Proposal 21 – In the long term (5-10 years) investigate opportunities to redevelop the Central City parking squares (e.g. mixed use development of residential, commercial and parking). The purpose of this proposal is to use valuable land more efficiently, enhance the place value of the Central City and consolidate parking.

Submission summary

Support	Oppose	Comments
5	17	1

Five submissions supported this proposal, and included the following comments:

- Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce supports this as a way to increase the numbers of people living in the Central City and therefore stimulating the local retail and hospitality sectors, who in turn support local supply chains. It would also add to the safety of the Central City.
- Multi-storey mixed use and residential development on currently open car park sites would result in much more efficient land use and the immediate reduction in demand for car parking (and on the road network), as each occupant of such central housing options would result in one less car on the road and a multitude of daily trips removed from the road network. We would strongly encourage NCC to investigate the comprehensive redevelopment of parking areas with urgency, possibly with the creation of some on-street (or even structured) parking.
- Optimisation studies for Nelson's carpark squares should be undertaken by international expert consultancies. These studies should look at the carpark squares not only as a parking resource for council, but also as overall land assets of council, and as resources that may be underleveraged already, and which could be better leveraged to provide housing, retail, offices, placemaking and other community resources if the land was developed for optimal utilisation. This has to be done in an integrated way with the City Centre Parking Management Plan and with the overall Parking Strategy.
- Mixed use and residential development of open car parks would result in much more efficient land use and the immediate reduction in demand for car parking (and on the road network): each occupant of such central housing options would result in one less car on the road and a multitude of daily trips removed from the road network. I would strongly encourage NCC to investigate the comprehensive redevelopment of parking areas with urgency, possibly with the creation of some on-street parking, but without the costly integration of car parking buildings or

inefficient (and unattractive) "airspace apartments" (which would retain open car parks at ground level).

Seventeen submissions opposed this proposal, but did not provide comments.

One submission did not specifically support or oppose the proposal, but made this comment:

- A parking building is not needed. However, if the new library proposal needed to be moved away from river, car parking and the library could be constructed in the same multi story building in Buxton or Montgomery car park.

Draft Tahunanui Parking Management Plan

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 1 – In the short term (1-2 years) provide mobility parking bays on Beach Road. The purpose of this proposal is to support inclusive access for visitors to the town centre.

Submission summary

Tahunanui Community Hub and Nelson Marlborough Health supported the mobility parking bays proposal. Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association wants more input on the number and location of these, and Tahunanui Community Hub would like additional ones near the medical facilities, the library and Natureland, and in the Abel Tasman car park.

Nelson City Business Group and Achilles Properties Group (duplicate submissions) said there should only be two mobility parking spaces.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 2 – In the short term (1-2 years) reduce existing P90 time restrictions on SH6 to P60. The purpose of this proposal is to encourage turnover and provide short term customer parking for the most convenient spaces in Tahunanui. Reduced parking on SH6 due to changes arising from the Nelson Future Access project will increase demand for convenient short term customer parking.

Submission summary

Two (duplicate) submissions supported the proposal. Both the Tahunanui Community Hub and Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association queried whether one hour parking along SH6 was long enough, for example for church attendance and hairdressing appointments.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 3 – In the short term (1-2 years) implement parking restrictions in the most northern bay of angled parking spaces on Beach Road, e.g. P120. The purpose of this proposal is to provide convenient medium-term parking for customers visiting the centre and to minimise use of these parking spaces for long term parking by commuters or staff.

Submission summary

Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association and the Tahunanui Community Hub both expressed concerns about this proposal, as it is not clear where else staff could park reasonably close to where they work. This is especially an issue for those working in hospitality industry in this area at night. Nelson City Business Group and Achilles Properties Group (duplicate submission) also opposed this proposal.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 4 – In the short term (1-2 years) replace all P5 spaces with P10. The purpose of this proposal is to provide consistent time restricts for locations where rapid transactions and high turnover is required.

Submission summary

This submission was unanimously supported by five submitters.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 5 – In the short term (1-2 years) increase parking enforcement in Tahunanui. The purpose of this proposal is to encourage compliance with restrictions and turnover of parking spaces.

Submission summary

Two submissions supported this proposal, and suggested returning to having a Community Constable and a Community Patrol. Two submissions opposed the proposal.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 6 – In the short term (1-2 years) carry out ongoing monitoring of parking occupancy and duration of stay (e.g. every 3–6 months). Monitoring to include collection of data over summer peak period to understand changes in seasonal demand. The purpose of this proposal is to assess demand for parking spaces in the town centre and identify trends that may trigger changes to parking management in the centre.

Submission summary

Two submissions supported this proposal, and suggested consulting the community to identify the best times to monitor to gain a good understanding of parking demand. Two submissions opposed this proposal.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 7 – in the medium term (3–5 years) review the previous 2004 Structure Plan for Tahunanui to enhance amenity and access within the town centre and guide future development and growth. The purpose of this proposal is to guide future direction and identify opportunities for land use and transport, and give certainty to residents, businesses and developers.

Submission summary

Four submissions commented on this proposal. One submission supported it, but said they lacked confidence that it would happen, given there was such little progress in implementing the 2004 Structure Plan. Another submission noted they had been requesting an update to this plan for some time. Two other submissions asked Council to implement the current plan.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 8 – in the medium term (3–5 years) review opportunities to enhance the place function of Beach Road through landscaping, urban design and traffic calming. The purpose of this proposal is to create a more attractive destination that will contribute to enhancing the vibrancy and economic activity of the town centre.

Submission summary

Two submissions supported this proposal, with qualifications (but did not provide further detail). Tahunanui Community Hub supported the proposal. The Hub's suggestions include:

- bike parks on this side of the field as well as beside the playground/beachside of Tahunanui Reserve.
- extension of the bike path along Beach Road
- a stop sign instead of a give way sign on Bisley Walk to allow traffic to flow (also requested by Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association)
- more traffic calming for the Tahunanui Reserve area, through the areas adjacent to the Lions Playground and Tahunanui playing fields
- No more traffic calming on Beach Road (also requested by the Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association).

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 9 – in the medium term (3–5 years) investigate opportunities to create pedestrian connections through the town centre (between Beach Road and Muritai Street/SH6). The purpose of this proposal is to enhance pedestrian access between Beach Road and SH6, which can contribute economic activity and vibrancy.

Submission summary

Two submissions supported this proposal, with qualifications (but did not provide further detail). Tahunanui Community Hub and the Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association encouraged Council to engage with property owners to provide accessways to provide these long overdue connections.

Nelson Marlborough Health notes that these changes are not proposed to occur until Years 3-5, and asks the Council to consider what infrastructure improvement can be made to enhance pedestrian facilities in the interim.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 10 – in the medium term (3–5 years) provide parking wayfinding from SH6 to Beach Road. The purpose of this proposal is to contribute to reducing vehicle circulation and provides information to visitors to the area.

Submission summary

Three submissions support this proposal, and the Tahunanui Community Hub notes that more wayfinding signage is needed to crucial health facilities, as well as to the Tahunanui Beachside Village/Township and to Tahunanui Beach Holiday Park.

The Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association states that people with impaired mobility require parking on Tahunanui Drive SH6 to provide close safe access to medical, business and other facilities. Parking on Beach Road would require negotiating the crossing of the very busy Tahunanui Drive.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 11 – in the long term (5–10 years) implement time restrictions for other streets within the town centre. The purpose of this proposal is to ensure customers retain convenient access to local businesses.

Submission summary

Two submissions noted that this is not currently needed.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 12 – in the long term (5–10 years) implement parking meters (with free parking). The purpose of this proposal is to use pay and display meters to monitor duration of stay, improve the efficiency of enforcement and minimise long stay parking by staff or commuters.

Submission summary

Two submissions noted this is not currently needed, and one of these said this is something to be looked at if Tahunanui Drive has six storey apartments in future.

Tahunanui Parking Proposal 13 – in the long term (5–10 years) introduce paid parking. The purpose of this proposal is to manage increasing demands on parking in the centre if average parking demand exceeds 85% occupancy at peak times. Reducing time restrictions further (e.g. to P60) could also be considered. However, this may not align with customer or business needs.

Submission summary

One submission noted this is not currently needed, and another said that the introduction of paid parking would be detrimental to the use of the major recreation facility on the Tahunanui Beach Reserve.

Impact of State Highway 6

Submission summary

Nelson Marlborough Health pointed out that further work needs to be done to make it easier for pedestrians to cross the road in the Tahunanui shopping/medical centre area, especially if there will be more mobility parking bays on Beach Road.

Additional comments

Submissions summary

Nine submissions made comments about Tahunanui parking which were unrelated to the recommendations in the Tahunanui Parking Management Plan.

The Tahunanui Community Hub discussed the Parking Strategy objectives in relation to Tahunanui – seeking bike parking, EV charging points, urban design improvements, inclusive access to medical facilities, and engagement with businesses on possible removal of car parks, and the need to gather more data. The Hub also expressed concern about the proposed clearway.

The Nelson Transport Strategy Group suggested Council buy the land currently used for a car sales yard and develop it for mixed use, including more car parking, to avoid

people needing to park on Beach Road and then cross Tahunanui Drive to access the medical facilities.

Two submissions requested no reduction in car parking. One submitter noted there was more pressure on parking in Muritai Street, especially around the Community Centre/school area, due to no parking on one side of the road.

Nelson Marlborough Health requested bike parking in Tahunanui, one submitter requested an EV charging station in Tahunanui, and another requested retention of parking along Rocks Road for access to the swimming steps.

One submitter requested that Council retain the parallel parking at the playing fields on Beach Rd and put the parallel parking back on the end of Beach Rd near the BMX track and Modellers Pond

Recommendation: [Sue/Marg] Add bike parking facilities in Tahunanui? Consider what safety improvements could be made for people crossing State Highway 6 from Beach Road to the Tahunanui shops?

Draft Stoke Parking Management Plan

Strawbridge Square Parking Proposal 2 – In the short term (1-2 years) reduce existing P90 time restrictions on SH6 to P60. The purpose of this proposal is to provide consistent time restrictions for locations where rapid transactions and high turnover is required.

Submission summary

Nelson Marlborough Health supports the intention to phase out P2 and P5 parking restrictions and replace them with P10 as this enables elderly people and people with young children more time.

Stoke Parking Proposal 1 – In the short term (1-2 years) replace existing P180 parking spaces with P60 on Main Road Stoke (retain existing P10 parking spaces). The purpose of this proposal is to improve efficiency and increase turnover of premium spaces on this key corridor.

Submission summary

One submission opposed this proposal, preferring to retain current parking in Stoke, as it shows Stoke is ready for business.

Stoke Parking Proposal 5 – In the short term (1-2 years) replace angle parking with parallel parking on Putaitai Street. The purpose of this proposal is to improve safety for vehicles travelling on Putaitai Street.

Submission summary

Two submissions support this proposal for safety reasons.

Stoke Parking Proposal 6 – In the short term (1-2 years) investigate providing mobility parking bays on Putaitai Street (outside Greypower). The purpose of this proposal is to support inclusive access for visitors to Greypower.

Submission summary

One submission supports this proposal.

Recommendation:

Adopt proposal.

Stoke Parking Proposal 8 – In the medium term (3–5 years) consider implementing parking meters (with free parking). The purpose of this proposal is to use pay and display meters to monitor duration of stay, improve the efficiency of enforcement and minimise long stay parking by staff or commuters.

Submission summary

One submission opposed this proposal.

Recommendation:

Adopt proposal.