

24 February 2017

Freepost WCC  
Attention: Lindsey Hill, Traffic Engineers Team  
Wellington City Council  
P.O. Box 2199  
Wellington 6140  
airportparking@wcc.govt.nz

Dear Lindsey

**Re: Proposed Miramar South 24-hour parking limit**

This submission is from the Architectural Centre, an incorporated society dating from 1946, which represents both professionals and non-professionals interested in the promotion of good design.

1. The Architectural Centre opposes the proposal to introduce a 24-hour parking limit to Miramar South because:
  - (a) the underlying issue is inadequate public transport to and from the airport and we think this should be directly addressed.
  - (b) the focus of the proposal to shift the location of car-parking (from the streets of South Miramar into Infratil airport carparking) is a short-sighted one and will only work to encourage private car use and increase poor transport choices. The council's stated aims to reduce car use needs to underpin its decision-making in this and other transport-related policy.
  - (c) the proposal appears to use council regulation to increase the profits of a private company (i.e. to shift cars from public streets into Infratil carparks). We are concerned about the timing of this which co-incides with the building of a new carparking building at the airport, which suggests a highly inappropriate motivation for the implementation of neighbourhood parking restrictions.
  - (d) on-street carparking is public space and people using this space for carparking is valid. The on-street car parks are not the property of local residents, who do not have the right to bully, intimidate or limit public space in the manner that it appears that they have been doing. We do not support the council kowtowing to this behaviour and endorsing the actions of people trying to deprive other Wellingtonians access to public space.

We make the following additional comments:

**Travel to and from the airport**

2. We encourage the council to specifically investigate real alternatives to private cars to transport air-travellers to and from the airport. It is apparent that while airport car parking, and possibly the airport bus, generate sufficient profits for the airport company, they are not meeting the needs of all sectors of society. Issues such as the cost, frequency, and convenience of public transport for luggage-laden air-travellers are likely to be factors.



the architectural centre inc.  
PO Box 24178 Wellington

3. We encourage council support for lower-cost public transport to the airport. Currently the airport bus (which we understand is not subsidised) is a significant cost.
4. Air-passengers who do not live close to the airport bus route who want to use public transport have few options, and the options they do have often involve long travel, carrying luggage between bus routes, and a higher than reasonable cost of multiple bus trips, largely due to the lack of a transfer fare system for bus fares. We cannot strongly enough emphasise the need for reprogramming the Snapper card software to enable transfers for, say, up to 90-120 minutes of travel.
5. In a similar vein we encourage the council to investigate locations for convenient park and ride facilities to complement the current airport bus and other routes (e.g. the no. 11) to assist air-passengers to make use of public transport even if it is for only part of their journey.
6. We note the proposal refers to the "general growth in vehicle ownership." Given this, we encourage the council to make use of electric taxis for travel to and from the airport preferable to private cars.
7. Such alternatives to private car travel to and from the airport should be listed on the Wellington Airport and WCC websites, in line with council ambitions to reduce the city's carbon emissions.
8. We again express support for a light rail system from the Wellington Railway station through Newtown (past the hospital) to the airport. Light rail is well patronised as a viable transport form to and from airports in all great cities. We want Wellington to be one of these.

#### **Proposed changes to the built environment**

9. We note that the council is proposing to make alterations to the built environment of the roadside berms, specifically removing ""home-made" barriers ... installed to deter parking by non-residents" to be replaced "with a combination of posts and planting."
10. We can see some benefits to re-thinking the road space allocated to private car parks, in this and other areas of Wellington city.
11. We support more planting in suburban areas, replacing carparks.
12. We encourage greater provision of bike parks, especially in areas adjacent to shops (e.g. the intersection of Caledonia and Hobart Streets) and near parks and recreation areas. These could be located in carparks.
13. We also encourage the installation of cycle lanes to replace carparks.
14. We likewise suggest that a bus lane be made along Caledonia Street in place of existing carparks.

We prefer the above ways of using road space to discourage car-parking over the suggested 24-hour limit.

If the council continues with the 24-hour parking limit proposal then we agree that it is important that the impacts are monitored. It is possible that the outcome of the parking limit will simply be to move the perceived problem to other streets in Miramar. Given this, some thinking about a plan B may be worthwhile. If the council is limiting

its thinking to this as only a parking issue, rather than the broader transport issue, then implementing a residents' parking scheme, as occurs in other parts of the city, may be advisable.

We also understand that car rental companies often use these streets for parking. This may be an important aspect to consider in any solution.

Finally, we note that the council is a large shareholder of the airport (34%) and needs to act in Wellington's citizens' interests in this role. The council has been vocal about its commitment to active and sustainable forms of transport, and, as a significant shareholder in Wellington Airport, we ask that you work to discourage greater car dependency, including not encouraging private car travel to the airport through increasing carpark provision.

We also query the public good aspect of introducing parking restrictions with the aim of shifting cars into charged airport carparking, especially given the timing of a new carpark building at the airport, which will be looking for more cars to park in it shortly. Instead we very strongly encourage the council to address this problem as one which is fundamentally about the need for viable sustainable transport to and from the airport, including adequate public transport (e.g. addressing route options, convenient park and ride options and transfer fares) and reducing the cost of electric-powered taxis. We again encourage the council to work long term to delivery high-quality light rail from Wellington Railway Station to Wellington Airport.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed Miramar South 24-hour parking limit. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Christine McCarthy  
President, Architectural Centre  
arch@architecture.org.nz