

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

DECISION: PLAN CHANGE 8

TITLE: Decision on Plan Change 8 (Carparking), Issued by the Hearings Commissioners for the Queenstown Lakes District Council. ADOPTED 28 September 2007.

DATED: 5th September 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the considerations and recommendations of the Hearing Commissioners on submissions lodged to Plan Change 8 (Carparking) to the Partially Operative District Plan.

Plan Change 8 relates to the requirement for the provision of car parking spaces on a site. Plan Change 8 seeks to ensure that the District Plan includes requirements relating to minimum carparking space numbers, to ensure that current and future residents and visitors have sufficient on-site parking space for their own vehicles. The aim of the Plan Change is to align the District Plan requirements for carparking spaces with the actual parking demands for residential and visitor accommodation development.

The Hearing Commissioners heard written and verbal evidence from a range of parties between 30 April and 16 May. Based on consideration of the Plan Change and all submissions and evidence received, the Hearing Commissioners recommend the following:

- Plan Change 8 should be limited in its application to the High Density Residential Zone and the Low Density Residential Zone and not extend to the Remarkables Park Zone.
- In Queenstown, both residential and visitor accommodation shall provide 1.5 carparks per unit (split according to 1.25 carparks allocated to each unit plus 0.25 carparks per unit for staff and guests).
- That the carparking rate be the same for residential and visitor accommodation (unit type) activities.
- That an exception be inserted to the standard parking rule allowing residential and visitor accommodation units to provide up to one third of their required parking off site, provided stated criteria are met.
- In Wanaka, both residential and visitor accommodation shall provide 2 carparks per unit.

- The definition of Backpackers Hostel and the associated parking requirements for this activity, as introduced in the Plan Change, should be retained.
- Rooftop carparking should be a restricted discretionary activity. An assessment matter will address the appropriateness of such rooftop parking on a site-by-site basis.
- Amend Policy 3.8 (Residential Areas) and insert a new policy 4.7 (Transport).

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.0 BACKGROUND	5
3.0 THE HEARING	6
4.0 REASONING AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
Attachment 1: Recommended Amendments to District Plan	19
Attachment 2: Recommendations on Submission Points	23

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the considerations and recommendations of the Hearing Commissioners on submissions lodged to Plan Change 8 (Carparking) to the Partially Operative District Plan.

The relevant provisions in the Queenstown Lakes Partially Operative District Plan (referred to as the Plan) which are affected by the Plan Change and recommendations are:

District Plan Section	Provision
14.2.4.1, Table 1, Parking Space Requirements	Amend requirements for a number of activities
14.2.4.1, Table 1A, Parking Space Requirements – Remarkables Park Zone	Amend parking requirements
Definitions	Insert definition for Backpacker Hostel

In this report consideration of submissions has been grouped together based on issues where the content of the submissions is the same or similar.

In making recommendations the Hearing Commissioners have:

- (i) been assisted by a report prepared by consultant planners, including traffic engineering advice. This report was circulated to all submitters prior to the hearing taking place; and
- (ii) been assisted by legal advice where necessary; and
- (iii) had regard to matters raised by submitters and further submitters in their submissions and further submissions and at the Council hearing; and
- (iv) had regard to the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991, in particular section 32.

Attachment 1 provides the revised version of the relevant provisions of the Plan, updated to have regard to the recommendations within this report. If there is any inconsistency between the provisions contained in Attachment 1 and the text contained in the body of the report, then the provisions in Attachment 1 shall take precedence.

All recommendations on submissions are detailed under the consideration of issues in Part 4.0 of this report, and full details of recommendations on submission points are contained in Attachment 2.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Plan Change 8 relates to the requirement for the provision of car parking spaces on a site. On-site carparking is usually required through a district plan to ensure that adequate parking is provided on every site to meet its usual parking needs. This ensures that kerbside parking is not relied upon to meet private parking demand.

Plan Change 8 seeks to ensure that the District Plan includes requirements relating to minimum carparking space numbers, to ensure that current and future residents and visitors have sufficient on-site parking space for their own vehicles. The aim of the Plan Change is to align the District Plan requirements for carparking spaces with the actual parking demands for residential and visitor accommodation development. This is sought through increasing car parking requirements for some activities.

The Plan Change was notified on 12 October 2005 with submissions closing on 9 December 2005 and further submissions closing on 26 June 2006. A total of 105 submissions and 57 further submissions were received on Plan Change 8. The list of submitters and further submitters is contained in Attachment 2.

Plan Change 8 was closely linked to Plan Changes 6 and 10 and so the hearings were heard jointly and consideration of all three Plan Changes was undertaken comprehensively.

3.0 THE HEARING

The hearing to consider submissions and further submissions to Plan Change 8 (Carparking) commenced at 9am on Monday 30 April 2007 at the Crowne Plaza Hotel in Queenstown. The hearing continued on 1, 2, and 3 May in Queenstown, 14 and 15 May in Wanaka, and 15 and 16 May in Queenstown.

The Hearing Commissioners were Commissioner David Collins (Chairperson) and Commissioner Lou Alfeld. In attendance at the hearing at various times were Ms Nicola Rykers and Ms Stephanie Styles (Consultant Planners), Mr Tim Church (Urban Designer), Mr Nigel Williams (Traffic Engineer), Mr David Mead (Strategic Planner), Mr Scott Figenshow (Senior Policy Analyst), and Ms Jessica Dow and Ms Cathy Walker (Administrative Support).

The Commissioners had previously requested that where possible, all expert evidence should be provided in advance of the hearing. Many submitters took up this opportunity and this enabled the Commissioners to prepare in advance of verbal submissions. The following provides a summary of the verbal and written evidence presented to the Commissioners during the proceedings of the hearing:

Bryce Whiting

Mr Whiting presented verbal evidence on behalf of a range of residents in Thompson and Lomond Streets. Mr Whiting was supportive of 2 car parking spaces per residential unit in the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) and for Visitors Accommodation in the HDRZ. This was seen as important as Visitors Accommodation may potentially be used for residential activities and it is prudent to set the baseline at 2 car parks per unit.

Mr Whiting explained that Thompson / Lomond Streets are relatively narrow with yellow lines painted down the street and limited kerbside legal parking. This is restrictive for residents (they can get tickets) and in places the car parks are not useable. The residents have strong concerns over the parking situation.

Mr Whiting also commented that there needs to be more car parks for backpackers activities and workers accommodation activities eg an existing house split into 13 units for workers where 2 carparks are insufficient.

Preston Stevens – 2 Architecture Studio

Mr Stevens briefly commented on carparking in a discussion of the need to carefully control density. He considered that requiring more parking spaces would promote use of motor vehicles and the Council should be making it harder for people to own cars and therefore encourage public transport, car parking, etc.

Warwick Goldsmith

Mr Goldsmith presented extensive written and verbal submissions on behalf of a wide range of submitters.

Mr Goldsmith relied on the findings of Mr Williams' traffic report and elaborated on issues in relation to Visitor Accommodation, residential activities, public transport, and future considerations. In particular Mr Goldsmith's submissions were that there is no justification for increasing the per unit carparking requirement for visitor accommodation above 1 carpark per unit and that increasing the parking requirement for residential activities to 1.5 spaces per unit is an unnecessarily conservative approach. He considers that there is very little difference between unit type and room type accommodation, and not enough difference to justify a different set of parking rules. He believes that the Council should set carparking standards for parking need, not to encourage or discourage land use activities, or swapping between activities. He also notes that it is possible to deal with perceived problems through other methods such as residents' parking schemes.

He went on to encourage consideration of public transport alternatives as a means of reducing private vehicle use and the need to plan for the future by reducing the parking requirement back to 1 space per unit.

Mr Goldsmith also clarified that in relation to his Wanaka submitters, it was also sought that the carparking requirement be reduced back to the pre-PC8 levels.

Ray Edwards

Mr Edwards presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Property Ventures Ltd (Five Mile). Mr Edwards essentially argued that the 5 Mile development is special and will need its own requirements which are different from the standard parking requirements. It is anticipated that this matter be addressed through the 5 Mile plan change to resolve issues of shared parking and levels of demand. As it stands, Mr Edwards is concerned that the parking rules will be inappropriate for the development but did not have a suggestion for the manner in which these rules could be altered.

Pru Steven

Ms Steven presented written and verbal legal submissions on behalf of AQ Investments Ltd, Emma Jane Ltd, IHG Queenstown Ltd and Carter Queenstown Ltd. The evidence provided notes that reliance is also placed on the evidence of Mr Tony Penny. Ms Steven sought that the plan change be rejected in so far as it relates to the HDRZ.

Jeff Brown

Mr Brown presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Remarkables Park Limited. This evidence was focussed on the manner in which the Remarkables Park zone is different from all other zones in the district – with a

large area, mixed uses and integrated activities leading to reduced vehicle ownership and car parking demand. There was discussion with the panel over what mechanisms would be put in place to ensure sharing of parking spaces and avoidance of conflicts. In general it is Mr Brown's view that the uniqueness of the zone means that the parking rules should not be changed from the pre-PC8 requirements.

Tony Penny

Mr Penny presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Remarkables Park Limited and elaborated on the concept of shared parking arrangements. He also discussed the concept of travel plans.

Overall, Mr Penny considers that the parking requirements in the plan change and within the officer's reports are excessive and these should be reduced for the high density zone and the Remarkables Park zone. He recommends that the pre-PC8 requirements should apply and there should be more distinction among visitor accommodation types.

Michael Parker

Mr Parker provided written and verbal legal submissions on behalf of Remarkables Park Limited, which again emphasised the different character of Remarkables Park and discussed the differences between visitor accommodation and residential activities. He emphasised that the Commissioners can take comfort that Remarkables Park carparking issues have been addressed comprehensively in the past by the consent memorandum.

Trevor Williams

Mr Williams presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of the Wanaka Residents' Association Inc. Mr Williams emphasised that Wanaka is different from Queenstown and has a greater parking demand with a range of vehicle types, particularly with an extended summer peak period of demand. The Association supports an increase in carparking requirements to 2 per unit and they have concerns over the workability of fractional spaces in a shared site situation.

Graham Taylor

Mr Taylor presented and verbal evidence also on behalf of the Wanaka Residents' Association Inc., and also commented on the differences between Wanaka and Queenstown. Mr Taylor also discussed the demand for parking and the need for 2 parks per unit.

Kerry Smith

Mr Smith presented written and verbal legal submissions on behalf of the Youth Hostel Association of New Zealand, specifically in relation to parking demand for visitor accommodation as backpacker hostels. Mr Smith explained that the plan change would alter the requirements such that YHA hostels would be defined as backpackers and would be subject to the new parking standards.

Mr Smith called on the evidence of Mr Clarke and Mr McKenzie (see below) to show that the YHA would not generate parking demand to the level required by the rules and that the backpackers parking rate is unjustified.

Hamish Clarke

Mr Clarke presented written and verbal submissions as the Manager-Development for the Youth Hostel Association of New Zealand. Mr Clarke explained the future intentions for YHA development in Queenstown and Wanaka and the impact that the plan change could have on future development. He also described research available into travel modes used by YHA members and a trend towards reduced car reliance and therefore lesser parking demand.

Don McKenzie

Mr McKenzie presented written and verbal submissions on behalf of the Youth Hostel Association of New Zealand, and elaborated on parking surveys and associated research. He also provided more information on how YHA members are different and how YHA's can be differentiated from other backpacker establishments. Mr McKenzie is concerned that there is insufficient reason to increase the parking requirement.

Nicola Vryenhoek

Ms Vryenhoek presented written and verbal evidence on behalf of Lake House Consultants and clarified her concerns relating to carparking issues.

Officers Reports

Mr Nigel Williams was available for questions from the Hearing Commissioners in relation to the technical report circulated. In response to questions, Mr Williams clarified:

- The main issue for backpackers is finding an appropriate level of provision for peak seasons (not peak events), to include bus parking. Mr Williams considers that all evidence leads to 1 space per 5 beds as being appropriate.
- There is a need to consider the issue of observed demand today vs future proofing to provide for street capacity when new developments go ahead. It is clear that the difference between visitor accommodation and

residential activities was virtually impossible to identify and so rates should be interchangeable to allow easy conversion between activities.

- There is no evidence to suggest that parking requirements differ significantly for like activities in Queenstown vs Wanaka. Peak time effects in Wanaka may be more pronounced because the town is less intensively parked than is Queenstown.
- Cannot rely on the future potential for a comprehensive public transport system solving carparking issues in the short term.
- Rooftop carparking on steep slopes can be a practical solution. Likewise shared carparking solutions can work well in some situations.

4.0 REASONING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Application of the Rules

The Issue and Submissions

The Plan Change as notified specifically included changes applicable to the following zones:

- 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.

Submissions received sought clarification of the scope of the plan change. In particular submissions received on behalf of Remarkables Park sought that the plan change not apply to that zone, due to its unique character.

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners considered that although the plan change was notified as encompassing the Remarkables Park Special Zone, the characteristics of that zone - comprehensive planning under a single developer and the proximity of expansive commercial parking areas - justifies its exclusion from the application of PC8 parking rules.

The Commissioners also note in relation to submissions that seek confirmation that the rules do not relate to the Rural Visitor zone, that the plan change did not alter the existing rules for other zones and those rules would continue to apply unchanged.

Recommendation

Plan Change 8 should be limited in its application to HDRZ and LDRZ and not extend to the Remarkable Park Special Zone.

4.2 Carpark Numbers

The Issue and Submissions

The overall intention of the plan change was to align the District Plan requirements for carparking spaces with the actual parking demands for residential and visitor accommodation development. This was sought through increasing the carparking requirement for a range of activities and zones.

Submissions received ranged from those supporting the increased rates, to those seeking a reduction back to the pre-PC8 requirements.

The Traffic Engineer's report included survey data and resulted in a recommendation for parking rates lower than those in the plan change, but higher than those pre-PC8.

Consideration

It is the Hearing Commissioners' view that the data and submissions overall tend to support the Planning Officer's recommendation for 1.25 carpark spaces per unit plus 0.25 carpark spaces for staff and guests, giving a total of 1.5 carpark spaces required for each unit. They consider that the means in which such fractional carpark spaces will be allocated among units is an internal management responsibility. The 0.25 spaces also provides capacity to accommodate trailers, boats or other similar vehicles.

Within the Kawarau Falls site, development has been consented and is under way. While the Hearing Commissioners agree that consented development should not be subject to altered rules, any future development should comply with the new rules or be assessed for resource consent if a reduction in parking spaces is requested.

Tour coach parking is appropriately covered by the provision introduced through the Traffic Engineer's report.

The Hearing Commissioners considered that submissions requesting that separate recognition be given to workers' accommodation did not provide any evidence of a greater or lesser parking demand than residential or visitor accommodation activities, and indeed reinforced the range of parking demand occurring. Should workers accommodation be designed in a way to prove a reduced parking demand, this would be appropriately dealt with through a resource consent process. The Commissioners also noted that a future plan change is intended to address workers' accommodation issues.

The Hearing Commissioners considered that parking space numbers would most suitably be considered based on unit numbers and not lettable space or bedrooms. This was particularly due to the difficulties of definition, interpretation, and enforcement foreseen by rules not based on unit numbers.

Recommendation

In Queenstown, both residential and visitor accommodation shall provide 1.5 carpark spaces per unit (split according to 1.25 carpark spaces allocated to each unit plus 0.25 carpark spaces per unit for staff and guests).

4.3 Residential and Visitor Accommodation

The Issue and Submissions

The Plan Change alters the carparking requirements for both residential activities and some visitor accommodation activities. The submissions received sought greater clarity over these changes and, in many submissions, a reduction in the requirements.

The Traffic Engineer's surveys showed that the carparking demand of the different activities is almost indistinguishable and recommended that the parking rate be the same to recognise this consistency and to enable simple conversion between activity types.

Consideration

It is the view of the Hearing Commissioners that both types of buildings can be externally indistinguishable and units may, from time to time, shift back and forth between residential and visitor accommodation use. To set two different carparking standards would diminish flexibility and introduce a further complication in enforcement. Further, establishing a lower carpark standard for visitor accommodation could bias development away from residential uses.

Recommendation

That the carparking rate be the same for residential and visitor accommodation (unit type) activities.

4.4 Off-site parking

The Issue and Submissions

The District Plan requirements are for activities to provide on-site carparking in accordance with the activity proposed. The Plan does not provide for required parking to be provided off-site, but does allow consideration of this by way of resource consent, through assessment matter 14.3.2 iii (c) which states:

“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.”

Evidence presented at the hearing suggested that it may in some situations be appropriate to provide for some of the carparking requirement to be provided off-site.

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners considered that because parking requirements may result in an inefficient use of scarce land resources, up to one-third of the parking requirement may be met off-site, for example in shared parking structures, provided such spaces are within a reasonably close walking distance and are dedicated for the use of that development’s residents and/or visitors.

Recommendation

That an exception be inserted to the standard parking rule, stating: *“Residential and visitor accommodation units may provide up to one-third of their parking requirement on another site. This off-site parking must be within a reasonably close walking distance (considering inclement weather) of the application site and must be dedicated for the use of that development’s residents and/or visitors.”*

4.5 Wanaka

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not differentiate between Queenstown and Wanaka, requiring the same level of carparking provision for activities in both areas. Some submissions and evidence received from Wanaka indicated that a higher carparking rate would be more appropriate, with different levels of demand being experienced, especially in the summer months. The carparking surveys carried out did not show a marked difference between the areas (but were not carried out during the peak summer period).

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners are of the opinion that submissions and evidence received have demonstrated that parking demand in Wanaka differs from Queenstown, especially during the summer holiday period when many families and friends join together. The profusion of cars, trucks, boats, trailers and other “adult toys” overcrowds streets and lawns and leaves little space for residents and their guests and so tends to undermine the social fabric and sense of community. Two carparks per unit appears a more appropriate rule for Wanaka.

While 2 carparks per unit for visitors’ accommodation is high, it allows for easy transfer between residential and visitor accommodation activity. If development eg a traditional motel on one title, can demonstrate a lesser demand for carparking, then this would be appropriately dealt with through the resource consent process.

Recommendation

In Wanaka, both residential and visitor accommodation shall provide 2 carparks per unit.

4.6 Hotels

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not alter the carparking provisions for Visitor Accommodation (guest room type construction, usually not containing a kitchen facility, e.g. hotels). Submissions received indicated that there is little perceived difference between “unit type” and “guest room type” visitor accommodation activities and developers want the flexibility to change between accommodation types.

The officer’s reports did not consider parking for guest room type accommodation, nor was this surveyed as it was explicitly excluded from the plan change as notified.

Consideration

The rules proposed in the Planning Officer’s report seem well supported by data. Some unit type visitor accommodation may have no greater than typical guest room type visitor accommodation, but unit

type accommodation clearly has the potential to be used for longer term and even permanent residential accommodation, with resultant higher parking demand. On this basis, no change is necessary in this regard.

Recommendation

No change to the rules is necessary.

4.7 Backpackers

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change identified that backpackers activities with bunk room arrangements, operate differently than other visitor accommodation, and expressed a concern that parking requirements need to be more specific to the backpacker activity. This led to the introduction of a definition of Backpackers Hostel and the introduction of a specific set of parking requirements for this activity.

Submissions received were both in support of these introductions and in opposition. Evidence was only presented by the YHA and identified their differences from other backpackers operations. The special circumstances of the YHA is best dealt with through the resource consent process.

Mr Williams surveyed backpackers activities and supported the requirements introduced through the plan change as reflecting an appropriate level to meet current and future parking demands.

Consideration

The rules proposed in the Planning Officer's report seem well supported by data.

Recommendation

The definition of Backpackers Hostel and the associated parking requirements for this activity, as introduced in the plan change, should be retained.

4.8 Rooftop Carparking

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not mention the concept of rooftop carparking, however a number of submissions received commented on the potential for this to occur and the associated visual impacts. Mr Williams considered that rooftop carparking may in some situations be appropriate, eg steep slopes.

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners agreed that rooftop carparking may be a good solution in engineering terms, but has the potential to create an unattractive outlook from properties above. Smaller scale rooftop

parking may be considered more acceptable but rooftop parking should be considered on a site by site basis, including appropriate mitigation measures proposed.

Recommendation

Rooftop carparking shall be a restricted discretionary activity. An assessment matter shall address the appropriateness of such rooftop parking on a site-by-site basis.

4.9 Objectives and Policies

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not seek to amend any of the objectives and policies within the District Plan. A number of the submissions received express concern that the changes within the Plan Change are inconsistent with or contrary to the objectives and policies of the District Plan, and that there is a lack of integration between these parts of the Plan.

Consideration

The majority of the suggested alterations to the Objectives, Policies and associated text, are not considered necessary. Additions are proposed, however, to provide for situations of off-site carparking provision.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 3.8 (Residential Areas) and insert a new policy 4.7 (Transport).

4.10 Proximity to Town Centres or Public Transport

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not specifically recognise or provide for situations where a development site is close to a town centre or a public transport route. There are however already assessment matters within the Plan which consider this possibility. A number of the submissions received sought particular provisions to reduce carparking requirements in such situations.

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners were not persuaded that proximity to a town centre or a public transport route would be sufficient to result in a significantly lesser parking demand. It may for some individuals but not for a whole development. Should a particular situation result in a clearly reduced demand, this could appropriately be dealt with through the resource consent process on a site by site basis. This would be covered by the existing assessment matters which address this issue.

Recommendation

No changes necessary.

4.11 Stormwater and Groundwater

The Issue and Submissions

The plan change did not address groundwater or earthworks in any way. A submission from Otago Regional Council sought the introduction of provisions in relation to stormwater quality and quantity and groundwater interception.

Consideration

While the Hearings Commissioners acknowledge potential for impacts on surface and groundwater from parking provision and earthworks associated with basements, these matters are most appropriately dealt with through the Regional Plan and the District Plan earthworks controls and not within the Transport rules. There are amenity advantages through providing carparking within basements that the Commissioners would not want to see discouraged.

Recommendation

No changes necessary.

4.12 Process Status

The Issue and Submissions

Under the Plan Change, any proposal seeking to provide reduced carparking spaces falls within clause 14.2.3 which states that it shall not be publicly notified. Submissions received included a range of views on this, including those seeking that it be changed to provide for public notification.

Consideration

The Hearing Commissioners considered that there was insufficient evidence to change this clause. It was noted that this appears to work appropriately at present and generally this would be a technical matter for assessment and notification would not assist with a decision. Should special circumstances apply to a proposal the RMA provides for consideration of notification. In some cases a proposal to provide for off-site parking may be deemed as special circumstances.

Recommendation

That the present process status remain without change.

4.13 Definition of parking space minimum dimensions

Consideration

In establishing new requirements for the minimum number of carparks, the Hearing Commissioners have taken note of an anomaly in the District Plan whereby the table in Subsection 14.2.4.1 (viii) that defines the minimum dimensions for a “parking space” leaves the minimum width of the parking spaces at the ends of rows undefined. The Hearing Commissioners consider that it would be unacceptable if the effort that has gone into this Plan Change were to be compromised by needless quarrels over the definition of what is meant by a “parking space” and so have accordingly recommended a minor correction to the definition to close this potential loophole.

ATTACHMENT 1: RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT PLAN

Objectives and Policies

Amend Policy 3.8 in the Residential Areas chapter as follows:

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

Insert a new Policy 4.7 in the Transport chapter as follows:

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

Rules

Amend the relevant rows of Table 1 – Parking Space Requirements - under 14.2.4.1i to read as follows:

PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR		
ACTIVITY	RESIDENTS/VISITOR	<u>VISITORS</u> or <u>STAFF</u>
Residential Units: High Density Residential Zone (<u>Queenstown only</u>)	2 per residential unit <u>1.25 per residential unit⁽¹⁾</u>	<u>0.25 per residential unit⁽²⁾⁽³⁾</u>
All other Zones (including the HDR Zone in Wanaka)	2 per residential unit	-
Residential Flat	1 per residential flat	
Visitor Accommodation (unit type construction, including all units containing a kitchen facility, e.g. motels, cabins) – <u>excluding Wanaka</u>	2 per unit <u>1.25 per unit⁽¹⁾</u> plus 1 coach park per 30 units	1 per 10 units <u>0.25 per unit⁽²⁾⁽³⁾</u>
<u>Wanaka</u>	<u>2 per unit</u>	
Visitor Accommodation	1 per 3 guest rooms up to 60 guest rooms; thereafter 1 per 5	1 per 20 beds

(guest room type construction, usually not containing a kitchen facility, e.g. hotels)	guest rooms, plus 1 coach park per 50 guest rooms	
Comprehensive Residential Development within the Low Density Residential Zone – <u>excluding Wanaka</u>	<u>2 per residential unit</u> <u>1.25 per residential unit⁽¹⁾</u>	<u>0.25 per residential unit⁽²⁾⁽³⁾</u>
<u>Wanaka</u>	<u>2 per residential unit</u>	

Note 1: In calculating the total parking requirement, the requirement for residents/visitors and the requirement for visitors or staff shall be added together, then rounded up to the next highest whole number. Eg for 5 units the requirements are:

residents/visitors 5 x 1.25 = 6.25

visitors or staff 5 x 0.25 = 1.25

total of 7.5, rounded up, gives a total requirement of 8

Note 2. If the requirement for residents/visitors and/or the requirement for visitors or staff involves a fraction, only the whole number of spaces have to be allocated and located for that purpose. Eg for 5 units, only one space has to be located on common land (see note 3 below) and allocated to visitors and staff.

Note 3. These spaces shall all be held on common land.

Where the site is used for visitor accommodation these spaces shall be made available for staff. Where the site is used for residential purposes these spaces are to be accessible to visitors, or for use for parking trailers and other vehicles.

On sites containing more than 30 units, the site's access and three of the visitor/staff spaces must be arranged so that a design tour coach can enter and park on or near these spaces. These three spaces may be allocated for coach parking.

Retain the following row within Table 1 – Parking Space Requirements – under 14.2.4.1i:

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

Amend 14.2.4.1ii to add as follows:

- (e) Residential and visitor accommodation units may provide up to one-third of their parking requirement “off-site”, on another site. Off-site parking must be:
- Dedicated to the units within the development, and
 - Located so that all the “off-site” car parking spaces allocated to the development are within a 150m walking distance of the boundary of the development, and
 - With guarantees of the continued availability of the parking (or an equal alternative) for the units the off-site parking is intended to serve.
- (f) Rooftop carparking shall be a restricted discretionary activity.

Amend Subsection 14.2.4.1 (viii) Residential Parking Spaces (page 14-17) as follows:

- (a) Any residential parking spaces for Class 1 and Class 2 vehicles (see definitions in Appendix A7) required by this Plan shall have the following internal dimensions:

	Width	Depth
Single	3.1m	5.5m
Double	5.6m	5.6m

and where the last spaces at the end of each row shall be counted as single spaces to provide sufficient width to fully open vehicle doors in the end parking spaces.

Note: A row of three parking spaces would require a total width of 8.7m and not the minimum 7.5m width indicated by Table 1 in Appendix 7. A row of more than three parking spaces would use Table 1 widths for the intervening spaces between the two end parking spaces of 3.1m each.

- ...
- (c) Where two parking spaces are provided for on a site containing only a single residential or visitor accommodation activity unit, they the two parking spaces may be provided in tandem.

Assessment Matters

Insert the following into the assessment matters under 14.3.2iii:

- (m) The extent to which the visual amenity of surrounding public spaces may be adversely affected by rooftop parking, and the potential for mitigation of rooftop parking.
- (n) The extent to which visitor accommodation can demonstrate a lesser parking demand and/or can demonstrate that potential for conversion to permanent residential accommodation is precluded.

Definitions

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

BACKPACKER - Means visitor accommodation where rooms

HOSTEL

and other facilities are shared by more than one person and beds are let as distinct from guest rooms

ATTACHMENT 2: RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSION POINTS

A schedule showing whether individual submissions are recommended to be allowed, disallowed, or allowed in part is available on CD.