

## S71 PROPOSAL: LYTTELTON CARPARKING - SUMMARY OF PUBLIC WRITTEN COMMENTS

20 written comments received: 15 in support and 4 in opposition and 1 neither in support or opposition

Topic	Number of written comments received	Comment / Issue	Relief Sought	DPMC Officials Assessment of Issues
<b>Support</b>				
<b>Enable recovery and rebuilding</b>	7	<p>The town needs the buildings it lost in the quakes replaced.</p> <p>To hold that up over a couple of car parks, particularly given that Lyttelton is already comparatively well served by public transport.</p> <p>That the Proposal will enable developments that have positive effects on the community and economic well-being of the area.</p>	<p>The minimum parking requirements should be removed.</p> <p>Approve the section 71 proposal.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment to the District Plan will address the matters identified in the written comments of those supporting the proposal.</p> <p>The Proposal provides for the regeneration of the Lyttelton town centre and the rebuilding of individual sites.</p>
<b>Carparking</b>	6	<p>On-site parking requirements are not appropriate in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone because of the hilly nature and limited space available.</p> <p>The 'one size, fits all' approach of the District Plan is just plain daft. The previous Banks Peninsula plan acknowledged the particular features of the Lyttelton township. The proposed changes are sensible.</p>	<p>Parking requirements should not even exist because we need to move away from our car-dependent lifestyle towards more public and active transport.</p>	<p>Officials agree with the comments raised.</p> <p>These comments are consistent with the outcomes sought by the Council in developing the Proposal in response to issues raised by developers wanting to rebuild. It also recognises the situation that previously existed that did not require the provision of on-site parking.</p>
<b>Angle parking</b>	2	<p>That angle parking be considered on Canterbury Street and Norwich Quay.</p>		<p>This is outside the scope of the Proposal but is something that the Council could consider in the future if issues do arise with overspill parking.</p>
<b>Oppose</b>				
<b>Carparking</b>	4	<p>It is too difficult to get parks at peak times.</p> <p>People should be able to park in Lyttelton and businesses have a requirement under the district plan to provide this.</p> <p>Will overload streets affecting visitors and people with physical impairments.</p>	<p>That the current parking requirements remain.</p> <p>That it should apply to small sites and that development provide adequate parking on-site where possible.</p>	<p>The Council has assessed the regeneration benefits to the Lyttelton town centre. The existing rules are impeding the regeneration and rebuilding of the Lyttelton town centre.</p> <p>The Council in the Proposal outlines that the current rule is inhibiting development and that due to topographical constraints, site size and site dimensions that it is difficult for developments to comply with the rule requiring on-site parking.</p> <p>It may also be possible that some development may provide on-site parking. The Proposal does not prohibit the provision of on-site parking.</p> <p>The Council has considered the potential overspill parking issue and considers that the safety and efficiency of the surrounding road network will not be significantly impacted. The Council will monitor the situation and if issues do</p>

Topic	Number of written comments received	Comment / Issue	Relief Sought	DPMC Officials Assessment of Issues
				emerge overtime will respond through parking management approaches such residential parking schemes, giving priority to short-term parking and stricter enforcement.

Proactively released by the Associate Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration