

## **2.40 – Cycle parking - section 32 evaluation for the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan**

<b>1</b>	<b>OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Subject Matter of this Section.....	2
1.2	Resource Management Issue to be addressed.....	2
1.3	Significance of this Subject .....	2
1.4	Auckland Plan .....	2
1.5	Current Objectives, Policies, Rules and Methods .....	3
1.6	Information and Analysis .....	3
1.7	Consultation Undertaken.....	3
1.8	Decision-Making.....	4
1.9	Proposed Provisions .....	4
1.10	Reference to other Evaluations .....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND RULES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Objectives - Appropriateness .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>RECORD OF DEVELOPMENT OF PROVISIONS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1	Information and Analysis .....	16
5.2	Consultation Undertaken.....	17
5.3	Decision-Making.....	17

## **1 Overview and Purpose**

This evaluation should be read in conjunction with Part 1 in order to understand the context and approach for the evaluation and consultation undertaken in the development of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (the Unitary Plan).

### **1.1 Subject Matter of this Section**

The subject matter of this report is the approach the Unitary Plan takes to requiring cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities to be provided in association with activities and development. End-of-trip facilities include lockers, showers and changing rooms. Such facilities are intended to cater for people who commute to work, or an educational institution, using an ‘active mode’ i.e. running, walking or cycling.

This report considers the Auckland-wide approach which is contained in the district level objectives, policies and rules relating to Transport. Some higher level Transport objectives and policies which occur at regional policy statement level are also considered.

### **1.2 Resource Management Issue to be addressed**

The subject matter of this report assists in addressing the following issues of regional significance identified in the Unitary Plan:

- 1.1 Enabling quality urban growth
- 1.2 Enabling economic well-being.

More specifically, the issue is about the need to provide for and support cycling as part of an integrated transport system, and as a sustainable transport option and a viable transport alternative to the private car. The provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities is an important complement to investment in an improved on-road and off-road cycle network.

### **1.3 Significance of this Subject**

This is considered to be a policy shift of low to moderate significance. It does introduce Auckland-wide requirements for cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities in association with activities and development. However the new requirements are not retrospective, and only apply to new development. It is anticipated that implementation of the provisions will support increased cycling, as well as walking or running to work, as sustainable transport options.

### **1.4 Auckland Plan**

Chapter 13 Auckland’s Transport of the Auckland Plan contains the following priorities of relevance to this report:

‘Priority 1  
Manage Auckland’s transport as a single system’

‘Priority 2  
Integrate transport planning and investment with land use development’

In general, Chapter 13 of the Auckland Plan refers to cycleways and cycling as:

- part of the integrated transport network
- a component of the measures required to address current congestion problems, accommodate future growth, and move to a single system transport system
- important for environmental and health objectives
- a contributor to reduced fossil fuel consumption, improved energy efficiency, and decreased dependence imported fuels
- needing infrastructure improvements and measures to improve safety, personal security and attractiveness and encourage cycling as a commuting option.

## **1.5 Current Objectives, Policies, Rules and Methods**

The legacy plans generally do not require cycle parking or end-of-trip facilities on a consistent basis. There are some sites where it is required, and it may be required as part of a resource consent process - particularly where an Integrated Transport Assessment and/or travel plan is required. The Auckland City Central Area Plan includes incentives which provide for 3m<sup>2</sup> of bonus floor area per m<sup>2</sup> of cycle parking provided.

## **1.6 Information and Analysis**

The legacy document, Auckland Regional Parking Strategy 2009, which was completed by the Auckland Regional Council, set out a new direction for the supply and management of parking in the region. The strategy included two policy actions about cycling as follows:

'Policy Action 7.4: Provide free, secure and covered parking for bicycles in public parking facilities.

Responsibility: Territorial Authorities.

Policy Action 7.5: Incorporate the bicycle parking standards that are to be included in ARTA's Regional Cycle Plan into district plans.

Responsibility: Territorial Authorities.'

Technical reports have been prepared by several transport agencies to assist the council with the development of objectives, policies and rules related to parking. These reports usually include consideration of cycle parking. The documents of most relevant to this report are listed in 5.1.

The draft ATCOP (Auckland Transport Code of Practice) document includes information about cycle parking - including information about infrastructure as well as appropriate rates for different land uses.

Internal and external feedback received throughout the development of the approach to cycle parking has also provided information and analysis.

## **1.7 Consultation Undertaken**

Internal consultation has been undertaken within council and with AT. External consultation has occurred as part of the consultation on the August 2012 and March 2013 drafts of the Unitary Plan. The August 2012 draft was circulated to some key stakeholders eg NZTA, and the Key Retailers Group. The March 2013 draft was subject to an enhanced public engagement.

In general, feedback to the March draft covered the following (in relation to cycling and end-of-trip facilities):

- concern that the requirements were too onerous, and unrealistic - with specific reference to industrial activities, schools, entertainment facilities, retirement villages, major recreation facilities.
- support for the requirements
- requests for the requirements to be extended to other activities which were omitted eg retail.

In response to internal and external feedback on the March draft, the cycle rates for some activities were specifically reviewed and some changes made. This including adding cycle rates for retail activities. In addition, the rates which had been based on the number of employees were generally converted to a rate based on GFA.

Additional details on the consultation undertaken are provided in 5.2 and in the s32 dealing with the overall consultation approach.

## **1.8 Decision-Making**

The start of the decision making was influenced by the approach of the Auckland Regional Parking Strategy 2009, a legacy document prepared by the former Auckland Regional Council. That strategy set a policy direction of incorporating cycle parking standards into district plans.

The two reports provided by Flow Transportation Services and Transportation Planning Solutions Ltd (TPS) in early 2012 were key base documents for the development of the overall parking approach, and included consideration of cycling. Some of the recommendations in these reports were further modified, usually in response to internal and external feedback via the consultation process. The TPS report considered the City Centre while the Flow report considered the remainder of Auckland. Both reports recommended that minimum cycle parking requirements are included in the Unitary Plan and that this should be accompanied by end-of-trip facilities (including lockers and showers) where long-stay cycle parking is provided for staff.

Recommended cycle parking rates contained in the draft ATCOP (Auckland Transport Code of Practice) document were of assistance in developing the rules. The rates from ATCOP have been modified in response to the following:

- The land use descriptions used in the ATCOP rates have been amended to match Unitary Plan terms
- Review of feedback has resulted in some changes
- Most rates have been changed to relate to GFA, rather than number of employees. The use of number of employees for determining requirements is less certain than a rate based on GFA. Number of employees can change over time, and may not be known or correctly disclosed at the time a development is submitted for council approval as part of a resource consent or building consent.

## **1.9 Proposed Provisions**

### **Cycle parking**

The proposed provisions specify cycle parking rates for the following types of activity: residential (developments of 20 dwellings or more, and visitor accommodation), offices, retail (food and beverage over 350m<sup>2</sup> GFA, other retail over 500m<sup>2</sup> GFA), industrial activities and storage and lockup facilities, education facilities, medical facilities (hospitals, healthcare services, veterinary clinics), entertainment and community facilities (entertainment facilities, major recreation facilities, community facilities). Required cycle parking rates are divided into visitor (short stay) and secure (long stay) rates. Both visitor and secure rates are specified for all of these activities except for industrial activities, storage and lockup facilities, and veterinary clinics where only secure rates are specified.

The required cycle parking rates are set out in the Auckland-wide transport rules as follows:

<b>Activity</b>		<b>Visitor (short-stay)</b>	<b>Secure (long-stay)</b>
Residential	Developments of 20 or more dwellings	1 per 20 dwellings within a single building	1 per dwelling without a dedicated garage
	Visitor accommodation	1 per 20 rooms/beds	1 per 10 rooms / beds
Offices		1 per 1000m <sup>2</sup> GFA of office	1 per 300m <sup>2</sup> of office
Retail	Food and beverage	<350m <sup>2</sup> GFA	Nil required
		≥350m <sup>2</sup> GFA	1 per 350 m <sup>2</sup>
			1 per 200m <sup>2</sup> GFA

<b>Activity</b>		<b>Visitor (short-stay)</b>	<b>Secure (long-stay)</b>
	All other retail	GFA	
		<500m <sup>2</sup> GFA ≥500m <sup>2</sup> GFA	Nil required 1 per 500 m <sup>2</sup> GFA
Industrial activities and storage and lockup facilities			1 per 300m <sup>2</sup> GFA
Education facilities	Primary and Intermediate schools	1 plus 1 space per 400 students and FTE employees	1 per 30 students in Year 1 to 5 plus 1 per 15 students in Year 6 to 8 plus 1 per 20 employees
	Secondary schools	1 plus 1 space per 400 students and FTE employees	1 per 15 students in Year 9 to 13 plus 1 per 20 FTE employees
	Tertiary education facilities	1 per 800 m <sup>2</sup> GFA office, to be located outside the main entrance of each department	1 per 20 EFT students and FTE employees on site at the peak times Spaces should be distributed around the campus
Medical facilities	Hospitals	1 per 30 beds	1 per 15 beds
	Healthcare services	1 per 4 FTE practitioners	1 per 8 FTE practitioners
	Veterinary clinics	-	1 per 15 FTE employees
Entertainment and community facilities	Entertainment facilities	Either: 1 per 50 seats Or: 2 plus 1 per 1500m <sup>2</sup> GFA	Either: 1 per 15 FTE employees Or: 1 per 1500m <sup>2</sup> GFA
	Major recreation facility	1 per 150 people (other than employees) at the facility at any one time, up to a maximum of 200 spaces	1 per 10 FTE employees
	Community facilities	1 per 200 m <sup>2</sup> GFA	1 per 500 m <sup>2</sup> GFA

The rules also state:

- 'b. All cycle parking must:
  - i. be able to support the cycle without damaging it
  - ii. provide for the frame and rear wheel to be locked to the same stand, without removing the rear wheel
  - iii. be secure
  - iv. be located so that a parking or manoeuvring cycle does not block pedestrians
  - v. be located so that a parked or manoeuvring cycle is not impacted by a parking vehicle (eg opening a car door) or a moving vehicle

- vi. include enough manoeuvring space to allow a cycle to be moved without damaging other cycles.
- c. In addition to (b) above, long stay cycle parking must:
  - i. be located in a secured area that is not open to the general public preferably behind a locked access gate or similar.
  - ii. be located close to the employee entrance to the building
  - iii. be located where the cycle does not need to be carried up or down stairs
- d. In addition to (b) above, short stay cycle parking must
  - a. be located close to the customer entrance'

### **End-of-trip facilities**

The proposed provisions specify requirements for secure lockers and showers/changing facilities for offices, education facilities and hospitals. These are 'end-of-trip' facilities intended to cater for commuters using active modes i.e. walking, cycling or running to work. The requirements are as follows:

Land use	Secure lockers	GFA	No. of showers and changing facilities required
Offices, education facilities, hospitals	1 per long stay cycle park	$\leq 1000\text{m}^2$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- one unisex shower where the shower and associated changing facilities are provided independently of gender separated toilets; or</li> <li>- a minimum of two showers (one separate shower per gender) with associated gender separated changing facilities</li> </ul>
		Every additional $7500\text{m}^2$	One additional shower

### **Infringement of rules**

Proposals which do not comply with the rules for cycle parking or end-of-trip facilities require consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The Plan provides that such applications will be considered without the need for public or limited notification. The assessment criteria are as follows:

- 'a. Sufficient provision is made for cyclists and active modes and changes in demand for such facilities can be accommodated if the operation or use changes over time, having regard to:
  - i. the nature of the operation and the likely demand for long and short-term cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities
  - ii. the availability of adequate public cycle parking for short-stay use in the vicinity. The council must have a reasonable expectation that the public cycle parking will continue to be available.
  - iii. the accessibility of the site to cyclists and pedestrians.
- b. The provision made for cyclists and active modes is practicable and adequate given site limitations and layout, arrangement of buildings and activities, users and operational requirements.'

### **1.10 Reference to other Evaluations**

The list below identifies the s32 evaluations of most relevance to this report.

- 2.1 Urban form and land supply

- 2.3 Residential zones
- 2.4 Business
- 2.6 Business building form and design
- 2.8 Sustainable design
- 2.9 Accessory parking
- 2.37 Schools
- 2.38 Non-accessory parking
- 2.39 Traffic in centres
- 2.42 Crossings on arterial roads
- 2.46 City Centre precincts

## **2 Objectives, Policies and Rules**

### **2.1 Objectives - Appropriateness**

The following objectives are proposed:-

#### *Regional Policy Statement*

The following RPS objectives under Part 1, Chapter B, Section 3 - 3.3 Transport (RPS) are relevant to the topic:

2. *An effective, efficient and safe integrated transport system that is integrated with, and supports, a quality, compact form of urban growth and associated land use.'*
- ...
4. *A transport system that facilitates transport choices and enables accessibility and mobility for all sections of the community.'*

Auckland's transport system, as described in the introduction to 3.3 Transport (RPS), includes cycling facilities:

*'Auckland's transport system comprises*  
*- state highways, all other roads, rail, ports, airports and airfields, public transport (land and sea), parking spaces and structures, accessways, cycle and pedestrian routes, and all of their related facilities.*  
*- broader elements including transport users and their behaviours, and the interaction between land use activities and transport networks.'*

(underlining added)

Cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are an aspect of the interaction between land use activities and the transport network.

#### *District level*

Objectives 2 and 3 at 1.2 Transport (District level) are:

2. An integrated public transport, walking and cycling network is provided for.
3. The number, location and type (short-term or long-term, public or private) of parking and loading spaces, including cycle parking and associated end-of-trip facilities, support:
  - a. intensification in the following locations:
    - the City, Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres zones
    - the City Centre Fringe overlay (as identified on the planning maps)
    - the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone
    - the Mixed Use zone.

- b. the effective, efficient and safe operation of the transport network
- c. the use of more sustainable transport options including public transport, cycling and walking
- d. the economic activity of businesses
- e. the efficient use of land.'

### **Relevance – Addressing the key Unitary Plan issues**

The objectives address the following issues identified in the Regional Policy Statement part of the Unitary Plan:

- 1.1 Enabling quality urban growth
- 1.2 Enabling economic well-being

### **Relevance – Achieving the purpose of the Act**

*Section 5* – s. 5(1) states that the purpose of the Act is ‘to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources’. The objectives are in accordance with this purpose. The transport system, including its cycle facilities, is a physical resource which needs to be sustainably managed. In accordance with section 5(2), the objectives seek to manage the use, development, and protection of the transport system ‘in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety’. The objectives seek to sustain the potential of the transport system to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. This is evident in objective 2 at 3.3 Transport (RPS) which refers to supporting ‘a quality, compact form of urban growth and associated land use’.

*Section 6* of the Act identifies the matters of national importance which need to be recognised and provided for in achieving the purpose of the Act. The objectives selected do not include specific reference to these matters. However these matters are addressed by other Regional Policy Statement level objectives in the Unitary Plan.

*Section 7* of the Act identifies ‘other matters’ which need to be given particular regard to in achieving the purpose of the Act. The matters of particular relevance to the objectives are:

- ‘(aa) The ethic of stewardship
- (b) The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources
- (c) The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values’
- ‘(f) Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment
- (g) Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources’

*Section 8* requires the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti O Waitangi) to be taken into account in achieving the purpose of the Act. The objectives need to be considered in the context of the Unitary Plan as a whole. When viewed within that context, the objectives do not require amendment to reflect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti O Waitangi).

### **Usefulness**

The objectives at the regional policy statement level, are useful in setting the direction which the district plan level objectives need to give effect to.

Both the RPS and district level objectives will be useful for assisting decision-making when assessing plan changes, notices of requirement, and resource consents involving the transport system.

### **Achievability**

The Regional Policy Statement level objectives are in accordance with the council’s functions as a regional council under s.30(1) of the RMA. In particular it is in accordance with the following functions:

- 'a. the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the region:
- b. the preparation of objectives and policies in relation to any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land which are of regional significance:'
- ...
- 'gb. the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use through objectives, policies, and methods.'

The objectives 2 and 3 at 1.2 Transport (District level) are in accordance with the council's functions as territorial authority under s31(1)(a) of the Act i.e.:

'The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.'

The Unitary Plan will contribute to the achievement of these objectives as they relate to cycle facilities by policies and rules which:

- provide for cycle facilities and infrastructure
- require cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities
- integrate land use and transport.

The following methods, which occur outside the Unitary Plan, also contribute to the achievement of these objectives:

- the construction, operation and maintenance of cycle facilities and infrastructure by Auckland Council, AT and other transport providers and operators
- education and advocacy to encourage cycling and provision of cycle facilities
- monitoring and review.

### **Reasonableness**

The outcomes set are expected to have greater benefits than costs.

The objective 3 at 1.2 Transport (District level) is reasonable because it adopts a balanced approach and recognises that the supply of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities needs to be managed to support a range of outcomes.

#### **2.1.1 Policies**

##### *Regional Policy Statement*

The following policies under Part 1, Chapter B, Section 3 - 3.3 Transport (RPS) are relevant to the objectives:

'1. Enable the effective, efficient and safe development, operation and maintenance of an integrated intra-regional and inter-regional transport system including:

...  
f. pedestrian and cycle networks.'

'14. Improve the attractiveness and efficiency of more sustainable transport options, such as buses, trains, ferries, cycling and walking, by:

...  
c. incorporating pedestrian and cycle networks and facilities in public and private developments  
...'

Both these policies give effect to the objective by providing for cycling facilities as part of an integrated transport system and as a transport choice.

*District level*

The following policy at Part 3, Chapter H, Section 1 - 1.2 Transport (District level), is relevant to the objectives 2 and 3 (at 1.2 Transport (District level)):

- '11. Support increased cycling and walking by:
- a. requiring cycle parking to be included in larger residential developments and in developments including offices, retail, industrial activities, education facilities, medical facilities and entertainment or community facilities
  - b. requiring end-of-trip facilities, such as lockers, showers and changing facilities, to be included in developments with high employee and student numbers
  - c. providing for off-road cycle and pedestrian facilities to complement facilities located within the road network.'

The policy clearly contributes to achieving objective 2, which seeks to provide for 'an integrated public transport, walking and cycling network'.

The next portion of this report considers how the policy listed above contributes to achieving the sub-clauses of objective 3.

Objective 3(a) - Intensification in City Centre zone; City Centre Fringe overlay; Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres zones; Mixed Use zone; and the Terraced Housing and Apartment Buildings zone. The requirement in policy 11 to provide cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities in conjunction with some developments does require land. However it can also support intensification by encouraging some commuters to shift from car use to cycling. This may reduce the amount of land required for car parking.

Objective 3(b) - Safe and efficient operation of the transport network. The policy does not contribute toward this.

Objective 3(c) - More sustainable transport options. The policy contributes to the achievement of objective 3(c) as it supports cycling which is identified in the objective as a more sustainable transport option.

Objective 3(d) - Economic activity of businesses. The policy makes limited contribution to achievement of objective 3(d). It may impose additional costs to business that they would not have otherwise incurred. Providing cycle facilities may however reduce costs by reducing the amount of parking a business needs to provide for its visitors and employees.

Objective 3(e) - Efficient use of land. The requirement in policy 11 to provide cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities in conjunction with some developments does require land. Some developers, businesses or educational institutions may not regard this as efficient use of land. However by encouraging some commuters to shift from car use to cycling, less land may be needed for car parking.

## **2.1.2 Rules and other methods**

The proposed provisions are summarised in 1.9 above. Cycle parking rates are specified for the following types of activity: residential (developments of 20 dwellings or more, and visitor accommodation), offices, retail (food and beverage over 350m<sup>2</sup> GFA , and all other retail over 500m<sup>2</sup> GFA), industrial activities and storage and lockup facilities, education facilities, medical facilities (hospitals, healthcare services, veterinary clinics), entertainment and community facilities (entertainment facilities, major recreation facilities, community facilities).

Required cycle parking rates are divided into visitor (short stay) and secure (long stay) rates. Both visitor and secure rates are specified for all of these land uses except for industrial activities, storage and lockup facilities, and veterinary clinics where only secure rates are specified. Of all the alternatives considered, these rules will be the most effective at achieving the objectives. In particular, the number, location and type of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities will support cycling as a sustainable transport option (1.2 Transport (District level) O3). In terms of efficiency, the costs of this alternative are outweighed by the benefits. These rules would be relatively easy to implement as part of a building consent or resource consent process by requiring applicants to identify activities and cycle facilities. Implementation does become more difficult as changes in use occur over time and monitoring and enforcement is required.

As noted in 2.1, other methods which support the rules are:

- the construction, operation and maintenance of cycle facilities and infrastructure by Auckland Council, AT and other transport providers and operators
- education and advocacy to encourage cycling and provision of supporting facilities
- monitoring and review.

### **2.1.3 Costs and Benefits of Proposed Policies and Rules**

The costs and benefits of the alternatives considered, including the proposed policies and rules, are outlined in 3 below.

The description of costs and benefits is generally provided in a qualitative rather than quantitative manner.

The requirement for cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities will support cycling as a more sustainable transport mode. It is not expected that the provisions will have any measurable effect on economic growth and employment to be provided reduced.

Monetised costs for cycling facilities, and comparison with parking costs are set out in the tables below.

**Table: Cost of providing bicycle parking**

Type of cycle parking / storage	Total cost	Bicycle capacity	Cost per bicycle
Cycle cage <sup>1</sup>	\$A 100,000	26 (up to 40)	\$A 3850 (26 cycles) \$A 2500 (40 cycles)
Cycle lockers (for bikes) <sup>2</sup>	\$NZ 2,700	2	\$NZ 1,350
Cycle stand	\$NZ 200	2	\$NZ 100

**Table: Cost of providing car parking<sup>3</sup>**

Type of parking	Cost per m <sup>2</sup> *	Notes	Cost per car park (\$NZ)
At grade car parking	\$120-150	Depending on ground conditions, there could be significant additional cost involved.	\$3,600 - \$6,750
Structured car parking	\$750-800	Including architectural	\$22,500 - \$36,000

<sup>1</sup> Martin & den Hollander (2009) Parkiteer – Secure bicycle parking at PT nodes in Melbourne

<sup>2</sup> These are usually used at train stations.

<sup>3</sup> NZTA (2011) Travel planning toolkit guidelines and resources, Resource 1 – Facts and figures

Type of parking	Cost per m <sup>2</sup> *	Notes	Cost per car park (\$NZ)
building:		façade and sub-ground structure; some additional cost could be incurred in poor ground conditions	
Basement car parking (above water table)	\$900–1000	Depending on ground conditions.	\$27,000 - \$45,000
Basement car parking (below water table)	\$2000–2500	Requires a building on top to hold the car park down against water pressure	\$60,000 - \$112,000

\* These figures do not include costs for GST, land costs, design fees, resource consent, building consent, site contamination etc.

**Table: Amount of land required for parking per car<sup>4</sup>**

Average area of land (m <sup>2</sup> ) per car	Qualifiers
30m <sup>2</sup>	per car for a very efficient building (double loaded 'corridor' – ie one isle feeding two rows of car parks)
up to 45m <sup>2</sup>	per car for an inefficient building (single bay per isle / irregular floor plate).

#### 2.1.4 Adequacy of Information and Risk of Not Acting

There is uncertain or insufficient information available about:

- the costs of providing cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities
- the existing and future demand for cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities
- the extent to which the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities will result in increased cycling and other active modes of transport (such as running and walking), particularly among commuters and students.

The risks of not acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities to encourage an increase in cycling. The lack of end-of-trip facilities will also make walking and running to work or an education institution less attractive.

It is considered that the risks of acting are outweighed by the risk of not acting in accordance with the preferred alternative.

### 3 Alternatives

The proposed preferred alternative is discussed in 2.0 above. The status quo alternative is outlined in 1.5 above.

The alternatives considered are:

1. Status quo: Approach of legacy plans
2. Alternative 1: No rules - leave it to the market
2. Alternative 2: Encourage through incentives in the Unitary Plan
3. Alternative 3: Preferred approach - Require provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities
4. Alternative 4: Assess provision via resource consent and assessment criteria

The table below discusses each alternative compared to the preferred alternative.

---

<sup>4</sup> NZTA (2011) Travel planning toolkit guidelines and resources, Resource 1 – Facts and figures

	<b>Status quo</b>	<b>Alternative 1 – No rules - leave it to the market</b>	<b>Alternative 2 – Encourage through incentives in the Unitary Plan</b>	<b>Alternative 3 – Preferred approach</b>	<b>Alternative 4 – Assess provision via resource consent and assessment criteria</b>
	Status quo - retain the approaches of legacy district plans. This would be a combination of alternatives 1, 2 and 4, with different alternative approaches applying in different parts of Auckland.	<p>Do not include any rules in the Unitary Plan requiring cycle parking or end-of-trip facilities. Allow the individual developer, institution or business to decide whether or not to provide these, and how much.</p> <p>This alternative can be accompanied by education and advocacy where the council and Auckland Transport encourage the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities.</p>	<p>Include rules in the Plan provide incentives (such as additional height or floor space) to encourage provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities.</p> <p>For example the Central Area Section of the legacy Auckland City District Plan provides for 3m<sup>2</sup> of bonus floor area per m<sup>2</sup> of cycle parking provided.</p>	<p>Cycle parking rates are specified for: residential (developments of 20 dwellings or more, and visitor accommodation), offices, retail (above a certain size), industrial activities and storage and lockup facilities, education facilities, medical facilities, entertainment and community facilities.</p> <p>Requirements for 'end-of-trip facilities', i.e. secure lockers and showers/changing facilities, are specified for offices, education facilities and hospitals.</p>	<p>There would be no rules requiring a specified number of cycle parking spaces or end-of-trip facilities. Rather specific assessment criteria would result in the appropriate level of provision being required as part of a resource consent process. For example, developments of over a certain size or number of employees could be required to submit a transport assessment and associated travel plan as part of a resource consent process.</p>
<b>Appropriateness</b>	<p>This alternative does not support the objectives.</p> <p>This alternative does not address the issues because, in most locations, it does not ensure that cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are provided to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>The alternative does not support the objectives.</p> <p>This alternative addresses the issues to a limited extent. It encourages (through education and advocacy) but does not ensure that cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are provided to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>The alternative provides some support to the objectives.</p> <p>This alternative does address the issues to some extent because it encourages the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>The alternative does support the objectives.</p> <p>This alternative addresses the issues by ensuring that cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are provided to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>The alternative provides some support to the objectives.</p> <p>This alternative does address the issues to some extent because it will result in some cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities being provided to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<p>This alternative will have some or limited success at achieving the objectives. The degree of success will vary depending on the extent to which the legacy plan provisions require or encourage the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities.</p>	<p>This alternative will have limited success in achieving the objectives. It will not achieve the outcome of providing for 'an integrated public transport, walking and cycling network' (1.2 Transport (District level, O2)). Neither will the number, location and type of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities support cycling as a sustainable transport option (1.2 Transport (District level, O3)).</p>	<p>This alternative will have some success in achieving the objectives. It will provide some encouragement towards achieving the outcome of providing for 'an integrated public transport, walking and cycling network' (1.2 Transport (District level, O2)). It will also encourage the outcome where the number, location and type of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities support cycling as a sustainable transport option (1.2 Transport (District level, O3)).</p>	<p>Of the alternatives considered, this one will have the greatest success in achieving the objectives. It will make the most contribution towards achieving the outcome of providing for 'an integrated public transport, walking and cycling network' (1.2 Transport (District level, O2)). It will also make the most contribution to the outcome where the number, location and type of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities support cycling as a sustainable transport option (1.2 Transport (District level, O3)).</p>	<p>This alternative will have some success in achieving the objectives. It will make some contribution towards achieving the outcome of providing for 'an integrated public transport, walking and cycling network' (1.2 Transport (District level, O2)). It will also contribute to the outcome where the number, location and type of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities support cycling as a sustainable transport option (1.2 Transport (District level, O3)).</p>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<p>The costs of this alternative outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>Continuation of the status quo would be relatively easy to implement, though the differences in approach across Auckland may cause some difficulties.</p>	<p>The costs of this alternative outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>This alternative would be easiest to implement from a resource management perspective as the council would not need to regulate the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities in the Unitary Plan.</p>	<p>The costs of this alternative outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>This alternative would be relatively easy to implement as part of a building consent or resource consent process by requiring applicants to identify activities and cycle facilities. Implementation does become more difficult as changes in use occur over time and monitoring and enforcement is required.</p>	<p>The costs of this alternative are outweighed by the benefits.</p> <p>This alternative would be relatively easy to implement as part of a building consent or resource consent process by requiring applicants to identify activities and cycle facilities. Implementation does become more difficult as changes in use occur over time and monitoring and enforcement is required.</p>	<p>The costs of this alternative do not outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>This alternative would be relatively easy to implement as part of a resource consent process by requiring applicants to identify activities and cycle facilities. Implementation does become more difficult as changes in use occur over time and monitoring and enforcement is required.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<b>Inconsistent approaches</b> Retaining the legacy approaches misses	<b>Fewer cycle facilities</b> Fewer cycle parking and end-of-trip	<b>Fewer cycle facilities</b> Depending on the attractiveness of the	<b>Less flexibility for developers / institutions / businesses</b>	<b>Fewer cycle facilities</b> Fewer cycle parking and end-of-trip

	Status quo	Alternative 1 – No rules - leave it to the market	Alternative 2 – Encourage through incentives in the Unitary Plan	Alternative 3 – Preferred approach	Alternative 4 – Assess provision via resource consent and assessment criteria
	<p>an opportunity to create a more consistent approach across Auckland with a consistent set of objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p><b>Costs as per Alternatives 1, 2 and 4</b> Depending on the approach carried over from the applicable legacy plan, the costs from alternatives 1, 2 and 4 will apply</p>	<p>facilities are likely to be provided. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. The absence of end-of-trip facilities also makes walking and running to work or an education institution less attractive.</p>	<p>incentive, less cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities are likely to be provided. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. The absence of end-of-trip facilities also makes walking and running to work or an education institution less attractive.</p> <p>The city centre has an incentive provision in the legacy plan. However the report prepared for Auckland Council on the Number of Parking and Loading Spaces Required for the city centre did not consider this sufficient, and recommended that the Unitary Plan make mandatory provision for cycles and cyclists at destinations.</p>	<p>Developers, institutions and businesses may need to incur financial and opportunity costs associated with providing cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities in excess of what they want or need in order to meet planning requirements. Developers, institutions and businesses are likely to regard this as less efficient use of land as it gives less flexibility to them in designing their developments. In economic terms, this is an opportunity cost because it reduces the space available for alternative uses.</p> <p><b>Resource consent costs</b> Rules which apply generically are not always the most appropriate standards for a particular site or proposal. There are costs and uncertainty associated with obtaining a resource consent to depart from the standard requirements. Costs and uncertainty are incurred by businesses, developers, and residents. Processing costs are incurred by the council. Processing costs are partially recoverable but the amount charged to applicants does not always cover the full cost to the council.</p> <p>The extent to which resource consent costs are likely to be incurred will also vary depending on the level at which the rules are set.</p> <p>The costs and uncertainties are reduced by the use of the restricted discretionary activity status. Also the Unitary Plan states that such applications will be considered without the need for public or limited notification.</p>	<p>facilities are likely to be provided. This is because it is likely that the resource consent process would be reserved for larger developments. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. The absence of end-of-trip facilities also makes walking and running to work or an education institution less attractive.</p> <p><b>Resource consent costs</b> There are costs and uncertainty associated with obtaining a resource consents. Costs and uncertainty are incurred by businesses, developers, and residents. Processing costs are incurred by the council. Processing costs are partially recoverable but the amount charged to applicants does not always cover the full cost to the council.</p> <p>The extent to which resource consent costs are likely to be incurred will also vary depending on the level at which the consent process is triggered. For example, it could be based on the number of employees or students, type of activity, GFA, or number of parking spaces provided.</p> <p>The costs and uncertainties can be reduced by the use of the restricted discretionary activity status. Also the Unitary Plan could state that the application will be considered without the need for public or limited notification.</p>
Benefits	<p><b>Familiarity with existing approach</b> Users of the legacy plans (including applicants, developers, planning consultants and council officers) are familiar with, and used to applying, the existing approach.</p> <p><b>Benefits as per alternatives 1, 2 and 4</b> Depending on the approach carried over from the applicable legacy plan, the benefits from alternatives 1, 2 and 4 will apply</p>	<p><b>More flexibility for developers / institutions / businesses</b> Developers, institutions and businesses do not need to incur the financial and opportunity costs associated with providing cycle facilities in excess of what they want or need in order to meet planning requirements. Developers, institutions and businesses are likely to regard this as more efficient use of land which gives them greater flexibility in designing their developments.</p> <p><b>Avoiding resource consent costs</b> Avoids the costs and uncertainty associated with obtaining a resource</p>	<p><b>More flexibility for developers / institutions / businesses</b> Developers, institutions and businesses do not need to incur the financial and opportunity costs associated with providing cycle facilities in excess of what they want or need in order to meet planning requirements. Developers, institutions and businesses are likely to regard this as more efficient use of land which gives them greater flexibility in designing their developments.</p> <p><b>Avoiding resource consent costs</b> Avoids the costs and uncertainty associated with obtaining a resource</p>	<p><b>Ensures provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities</b> This ensures that cycle parking is provided for most activities. It also ensures that end-of-trip facilities are provided for offices, education and hospitals. This makes cycling more attractive as a transport choice. Providing end-of-trip facilities also makes walking and running to work or an education institution more attractive.</p>	<p><b>Site specific approach</b> Rather than applying a generic standard, the appropriate provision for a particular activity on a particular site could be determined. This could involve the preparation and implementation of a travel plan as part of the resource consent process.</p>

	Status quo	Alternative 1 – No rules - leave it to the market	Alternative 2 – Encourage through incentives in the Unitary Plan	Alternative 3 – Preferred approach	Alternative 4 – Assess provision via resource consent and assessment criteria
		<p>consent to depart from the requirements. Costs and uncertainty are incurred by developers, institutions and businesses. Processing costs are incurred by the council. Processing costs are partially recoverable but the amount charged to applicants does not always cover the full cost to the council. Rules which apply generically are not always the most appropriate standards for a particular site or proposal.</p> <p><b>Consistent approach</b> There are benefits in applying a consistent approach across Auckland. A consistent approach is easier to apply. Leaving the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities to the market avoids the anomalies that occur when the rules vary for different activities.</p>	<p>consent to depart from the requirements. Costs and uncertainty are incurred by developers, institutions and businesses. Processing costs are incurred by the council. Processing costs are partially recoverable but the amount charged to applicants does not always cover the full cost to the council. Rules which apply generically are not always the most appropriate standards for a particular site or proposal.</p>		
Risks	The risks of acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. Walking and running to work or an education institution will also be less attractive because of the lack of end-of-trip facilities.	The risks of acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. Walking and running to work or an education institution will also be less attractive because of the lack of end-of-trip facilities.	The risks of acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. Walking and running to work or an education institution will also be less attractive because of the lack of end-of-trip facilities.	<p>There is uncertain or insufficient information available about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the costs of providing cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities</li> <li>• the existing and future demand for cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities</li> <li>• the extent to which the provision of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities will result in increased cycling and other active modes of transport (such as running and walking), particularly amongst commuters and students.</li> </ul> <p>The risks of not acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. Walking and running to work or an education institution will also be less attractive because of the lack of end-of-trip facilities.</p> <p>It is considered that the risks of acting are outweighed by the risk of not acting in accordance with this alternative.</p>	The risks of acting in accordance with this alternative are that there will be a lack of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. This makes cycling less attractive as a transport choice. Walking and running to work or an education institution will also be less attractive because of the lack of end-of-trip facilities.

## **4 Conclusion**

Based on the above discussion, the following conclusions are drawn. Alternative 3 is the preferred approach. This alternative specifies cycle parking rates for most activities. Requirements for 'end-of-trip facilities', i.e. secure lockers and showers/changing facilities, are specified for offices, education facilities and hospitals. This approach is preferred because it will require a supply of cycle parking and end-of-trip facilities to support cycling as part of an integrated transport system and as a sustainable transport option and a viable alternative to the private car.

The following alternatives are not recommended:

- Status quo - Retain the approach of the legacy plans
- Alternative 1 - No rules - leave it to the market
- Alternative 2 - Encourage through incentives in the Unitary Plan
- Alternative 4 - Assess provision via resource consent and assessment criteria

The following alternative is recommended:

- Alternative 3 - Preferred approach

In conclusion from the preceding discussion, the following are the recommended objectives, policies and methods:

- the objectives and policies at Part 1, Chapter B, Section 3 - 3.3 Transport (RPS) and Part 3, Chapter H, Section 1 - 1.2 Transport (District level) as outlined in this report
- the rules contained in Auckland-wide transport rules which give effect to Alternative 3.

## **5 Record of Development of Provisions**

### **5.1 Information and Analysis**

Date	Author	Title	Comments	Appendix
2004-10-06	Dept of Planning and Community Development, Victoria, Australia	Clause 52.34 Bicycle Facilities of the Victoria Planning Scheme (Introduced by Amendment VC28, gazetted 6 October 2004)	Reference document informing development of cycle parking rates	3.40.1
2011	NZTA	Travel planning toolkit guidelines and resources, Resource 1 – Facts and figures	Provides information about costs associated with providing bike and car parking.	3.9.1
2012-01-17	Flow Transportation Specialists	Number of Parking and Loading Spaces Required	Base document informing approach.	3.9.3
2012-01-25	Transport Planning Solutions Ltd; Houghton Consulting Ltd; Urbanismplus Ltd	Number of Parking and Loading Spaces Required for the city centre	Base document informing approach.	3.9.4
2012-06-29	Flow Transportation Specialists	Auckland city centre Fringe	Base document informing approach.	3.9.6

Date	Author	Title	Comments	Appendix
2012-07-06	Auckland Transport	ATCOP Chapter 11 Cycle Infrastructure Design - Revised Draft 2012-07-06	Contains information about design of cycle parking, including recommended cycle parking rates	3.40.2
2012-09	Auckland Council	Provisions as included in the August 2012 draft of the Unitary Plan	Circulated internally and to some stakeholders	3.9.7
2012-10	Auckland Transport	Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines	Final draft. Not to be finalised prior to Unitary Plan. Includes recommended cycle parking rates	3.9.4
2012	Hamilton City Council	Hamilton City District Plan. 15-2 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas - Tables and Figures. 25.14.4 Rules - General Standards	Contains requirements for visitor and staff cycle spaces, and bicycle end-of-journey facilities.	3.40.3
2013-02	Auckland Transport	Cycling statistics	Cycle statistics from AT show cycling is increasing steadily in Auckland	3.40.4
2013-08-07	Flow Transportation Specialists	Technical note: Cycle parking	Technical advice on matters raised in feedback on the March 2013 draft of the Unitary Plan	3.40.5

### Legacy documents

Date	Author	Title	Comments	Appendix
2009-03	Auckland Regional Council	Auckland Regional Parking Strategy	Sets a policy direction of incorporating cycle parking standards into district plans	3.9.15
	Legacy councils	Legacy district plans	Researched by Flow and TPS as part of their reporting.	

### 5.2 Consultation Undertaken

Date	Author	Description	Comments
2012-09	Various	Feedback received to August 2012 draft of the Unitary Plan. Responses also.	Feedback received from Auckland Transport, NZTA, Built Environment Unit, Transport and Strategy Unit, Key Retailers Group
2013	Auckland Council	Draft Unitary Plan, March 2013	Enhanced engagement covered in relevant s32.

### 5.3 Decision-Making

Refer to the general decision making process part of the s32. There has been no specific political decision making on this topic.