

PROJECT UNITARY PLAN ADDITIONAL WORK
SUBJECT CRITERIA FOR LOCAL CENTRES
TO KATHERINE DOROFAEFF: AUCKLAND COUNCIL
FROM MAIRI JOYCE
REVIEWED BY BRONWYN COOMER-SMIT
DATE 12 SEPTEMBER 2012

1 INTRODUCTION

In 2011 Auckland Council (Council) commissioned Flow Transportation Specialists Ltd (Flow) to investigate options for the number of parking and loading spaces which should be required in the Auckland Unitary Plan (outside of the Auckland City Centre). The aim was to implement the strategic approach to parking contained in the Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy 2010-2040 (RLTS) and the Auckland Regional Parking Strategy 2009. Flow's findings and recommendations are outlined in a report dated 17 January 2012. At the same time, Transport Planning Solutions Ltd (TPS) was commissioned to complete a similar piece of work for the Auckland City Centre, and outlined their findings and recommendations in a report dated 25 January 2012. Further to this, Flow was commissioned to recommend parking provision rules for the City Centre Fringe Area, with the findings outlined in a further report dated 29 June 2012. It is also acknowledged that the TPS report and the Flow reports of 17 January 2012 and 29 June 2012 are subject to ongoing review by Council as part of the development of parking and loading provisions for the Unitary Plan.

Our report recommends the implementation of maximum, and the removal of minimum, parking provision rules, in urban centres which are identified as having potential for change, and are located on the Frequent Services Network (FSN) (or are planned to be so within the next ten years). These parking provision rules would apply within 1 km of a rail or busway station and 800 m of a FSN bus stop. This is a move away from the parking provision philosophy of existing District Plans in Auckland which generally include parking rules that specify a minimum number of parking spaces to be provided in conjunction with activities established on a site with no restriction on the maximum number of parks provided. The principal exception is within the City Centre, where there has traditionally been no requirement to provide ancillary parking for activities, and where there are also limits on the maximum number of spaces permitted. However, our report also identifies that the recent Plan Changes to the existing District Plans have resulted in the introduction of maximum parking provision rules in some urban centres including Newmarket, Sylvia Park, Orakei Point, Massey North and Hobsonville. Other Plan Changes have also resulted in reduced minimum parking standards for particular activities, again predominantly around mixed use town centres.

These maximum parking provision rules are proposed to be applied to Metropolitan Centres, Town Centres and Local Centres (as defined in the Auckland Plan). The rules will apply for a distance of 1 km around a centre with a rail or busway station and 800 m around a centre located on the FSN (but not

on the rail or busway network). However, one of the recommendations of our report is that we undertake further analysis of the Local Centres to confirm the appropriateness of the proposed parking provision rules. It is considered that the risk of parking overspill associated with removing minimum parking requirements from Local Centres is higher than with other centres, as the availability of alternative transport options may be more limited and Auckland Transport is likely to give lower priority to completing Comprehensive Parking Management Plans (CPMP) for Local Centres than for the larger centres. Our previous report recommends proceeding with the implementation of maximums and the removal of minimums in centres without waiting for the completion of CPMPs. However we also emphasise the importance of proceeding with CPMPs for centres to support the parking approach of the Unitary Plan.

This Technical Note considers a range of criteria which could be used to assess the Local Centres for their appropriateness for the implementation of maximum, and the removal of minimum, parking rates. The proposed assessment criteria take into account previous assessment work completed by Boffa Miskell¹ for the Auckland Plan and considers the appropriateness of using similar assessment criteria for the parking provision rules assessment. The Boffa Miskell report was commissioned by Auckland Council to help with the classifications of the various centres in the Auckland Plan (Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local centre etc).

2 POSSIBLE CRITERIA

2.1 Criteria used in Boffa Miskell report

The criteria used in the Boffa Miskell report, which are considered potentially relevant to parking provision rules, are described below:

- ◆ Current Population - The current population within 800 m from centre, including residents, employees and full-time students
- ◆ Future Capacity - Theoretical expansion potential according to existing District Plan zoning rules
- ◆ Diversity of Activity - Compiled of different data sets, including a directory listing of supermarkets in Auckland and local knowledge
- ◆ Planning Framework – Whether the existing planning framework encourages growth and intensification
- ◆ Retailing Protection - This indicator is based on local knowledge of business areas where retail is a permitted activity or where it is easy to get a resource consent for retail activities
- ◆ Market Momentum – An indicator made up of the total number of residential resource consents that have been applied for between 1996 and 2010
- ◆ Transport – An assessment of the quality of the public transport network, walkability and road accessibility. These were assessed qualitatively
- ◆ Publicly Owned Property - The amount of publicly owned property (including Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Housing New Zealand) provides an indication of the characteristics of

¹ Boffa Miskell, 2010, Prioritising Centres: Analysis for the Centres & Corridors Workstream

the centre and the potential for Council to influence growth of the centre. The report acknowledges that this data is currently incomplete.

2.2 Additional/Amended Criteria

Additional criteria which may be useful to include in the assessment are outlined below:

- ◆ Future Zoning: One of the most important influences on future development is the extent to which it will be permitted and/or encouraged in the Unitary Plan, and the level of intensity provided for. In areas earmarked for growth it is important that the parking provision rules allow flexibility and do not inhibit development
- ◆ Classification in the Auckland Plan in terms of “Potential for Change” (as shown in Map D1 and D2 on pages 54 and 55 of the 2012 Auckland Plan). The Auckland Plan classifies areas within the Auckland region as having the potential for ‘least change’, ‘some change’, ‘moderate change’, ‘significant change’ and ‘most change’. This, in conjunction with the proposed Unitary Plan zoning, provides an indication of the potential for intensification/growth in a Local Centre
- ◆ Public Transport Access: Another important factor in analysing parking requirements is the alternative transport modes that are available for the centre. If there is no access to the Frequent Services Network (FSN), then the transport alternatives are considered to be limited. If there is access to the FSN, then the application of parking maximums and the removal of parking minimums can support the community's investment in public transport.
- ◆ Level of Existing Publicly available Parking (both onstreet and offstreet). This provides an indication of the existing, Auckland Transport controlled parking supply (and other publicly available parking) in the Local Centre, thereby providing some information on the likely risk associated with more restrictive parking provision rules. The level of risk relates to the likelihood of parking overspill due to lack of on site parking, and also the likelihood of parking undersupply within the centre
- ◆ Forecast levels of peak and inter-peak congestion. Worsening levels of congestion supports use of parking as a demand management tool.

3 ASSESSMENT OF CRITERIA

To assess each of the Local Centres identified in the Auckland Plan for their appropriateness for the proposed parking provision rules, we have considered the various above assessment criteria. A summary of these different criteria and their appropriateness for use, together with a recommendation for their use, is outlined in Table 1.

In assessing the proposed criteria we have considered the aims and objectives of parking standards which are stipulated in the Auckland Plan, those being to:

- ◆ Facilitate intensive and mixed use developments within strategic locations
- ◆ Improve housing affordability
- ◆ Reduce development costs
- ◆ Encourage use of public transportation

- ◆ Optimise investments in public parking facilities, civic amenities and centre developments
- ◆ Foster safe, convenient and attractive walkable neighbourhoods.

As a result of the analysis the following assessment criteria are proposed:

- ◆ **Proposed Unitary Plan Zoning:** If a Local Centre is zoned for multiple housing units and/or multi-storey (in excess of two storey) commercial buildings to the extent that significant increase in intensification is likely, consideration should be given to removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements
- ◆ **Auckland Plan Potential for change classification** - If the Local Centre is classified as 'Moderate Change' or above it should be considered for the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements
- ◆ **Access to the Frequent Services Network** - If the Local Centre is on the proposed FSN by 2022, it should be considered for the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements. If the Local Centre is on the proposed FSN post 2022 then it should be considered for the implementation of maximum parking requirements, but minimum parking requirements should also be retained. A Local Centre could, for example, be identified as being on the proposed FSN post 2022 if there is doubt that AT will implement the full 2022 FSN scenario.

It is considered that if a Local Centre meets all three criteria then it is appropriate to apply the more restricted parking provision rules as outlined above. However, where the proposed zoning is not available (or where existing District Plan zoning is to be carried forward to the Unitary Plan without further analysis) then the more restrictive parking rules should still apply.

It is considered that these criteria are most closely aligned with the aims and objectives of parking standards included in the Auckland Plan as they relate to the desire to increase density and encourage the use of public transportation. The aims of improving housing affordability and fostering safe, convenient, attractive and walkable neighbourhoods are also achieved through encouraging the development of compact local centres through allowing increased flexibility in parking restrictions in the immediate vicinity of the centre.

As outlined above, it is acknowledged that the development of CPMPs by Auckland Transport in the Local Centres is likely to be lower priority than in other more major centres and as a result the potential for negative parking overspill effects is higher. However, the potential development within these local centres is also anticipated to be lower priority, resulting in the likelihood of the effects occurring being lower. It is also considered to be important that development within local centres is not encouraged over the larger centres as a result of less restrictive parking standards.

Overall, it is considered that if a Local Centre meets the criteria outlined above, the risks associated with potential negative parking overspill effects should be given less weight than the risk of undesirable low density development in Local Centres, which will be difficult to change once complete.

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Current Population	Useful to identify centres by size and to put them in perspective in relation to other centres. Provides an indication of current density and helps to indicate potential for future density	Does not necessarily influence the potential for growth and development of the centre in the future	For centres included in the Boffa Miskell Report use the same figures. Census data can be used for the other centres	Include if budget allows
Projected future population (from the Auckland Plan growth projections)	Provides an indication of the potential for future density in an area	This information is to some extent duplication of the Unitary Plan zoning which should reflect potential for growth in an area	Use the growth projections in the Auckland Plan	Do not include as a separate criteria. Use the proposed Unitary Plan zoning (if available)
Future Capacity under existing zoning	Useful to identify potential for change and therefore intensification	The existing zoning may be outdated. If the Unitary Plan zoning is available this would be more relevant	If the Local Centre is zoned for future increased intensity then the implementation of maximum, and removal of minimum parking provision rules may be appropriate to support increased density and sufficient use of land	Use the proposed Unitary Plan zoning (if available)

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Diversity of Activity	This indicator provides an understanding of the maturity and commercial interest in the respective centre, which may give an indication of the future intensification of that centre	<p>This indicator is to some extent subjective as it includes the local knowledge. Therefore it may be difficult to replicate for centres not included in the Boffa assessment</p> <p>In addition, this information is to some extent duplicates the 'Market' and 'Emerging' classification included in the Auckland Plan (or may have been used to make this classification)</p>	Unclear. May have to contact Boffa Miskell to determine the full methodology used	Replace with 'Market' and 'Emerging' classifications from the Auckland Plan but do not include (see below).

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Planning Framework	May provide some indication of appropriateness of intensification and growth in the Local Centre	<p>A large part of this indicator appears to be whether or not the area has “market-enabled parking rules” in place. This means that there is no imposed minimum parking requirement in the area specified. The rationale behind this is that the “market” will be more inclined to invest in town centres where there are fewer parking restrictions.</p> <p>The criteria relies too much on existing parking requirements and is hence of limited relevance in determining what parking approach should be adopted in the Unitary Plan. Most Local Centres have minimum parking requirements but this does not mean those requirements are appropriate for the Unitary Plan</p>	Unclear. May have to contact Boffa Miskell to determine the methodology used	Replace with the Unitary Plan zoning and potential for change classification included in the Auckland Plan
Retailing Protection	Retail is an important element to the future growth of urban centres	This is based on the existing District Pan provisions which may not be relevant to the Unitary Plan	Review the existing District Plan rules for rules related to retail	Do not include. Use the Unitary Plan zoning (if available)

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Market Momentum/attractiveness	This is an indication of recent growth in an area and therefore the likelihood of intensification/growth in the medium term (as opposed to very long term). In addition, higher attractiveness suggests greater economic benefits from use of parking for other purposes.	This is based on the existing situation, where as the Unitary Plan applies to the long term In addition, this information is to some extent duplicates the 'Market' and 'Emerging' classification included in the Auckland Plan (or may have been used to make this classification)	Would need access to consent data for centres which is not included in the Boffa Miskell assessment	Replace with 'Market' and 'Emerging' classification from Auckland Plan
Transport	The availability of alternative transport choices is important to the appropriateness of restricting parking supply and/or removing minimum parking requirements	None	If the Local Centre is on the proposed FSN by 2022, it should be considered for the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements	Include the FSN criteria (see also Public Transport Access criteria below)
Publicly Owned Property	Provides some indication of potential for growth in a centre, and the ability for council and other public agencies to influence the timing and nature of that growth.	Very specific and not clear how it directly relates to parking provision rules. May have been considered in the potential for change classification used in the Unitary Plan	Information will be available from Auckland Council	Do not include

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Future Unitary Plan Zoning	The zoning will indicate the level of intensification likely to be achieved in the centre	None (unless not available)	If a centre is zoned for multiple housing units and/or multi-storey (in excess of 2 storeys) commercial buildings consideration should be given to the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements	Include
Public Transport Access	The availability of alternative transport choices is important to the appropriateness of restricting parking supply and/or removing minimum parking requirements	None. This is considered a key criteria which must be included.	If the Local Centre is on the proposed FSN by 2022, it should be considered for the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements If the Local Centre is on the proposed FSN post 2022 (for example there is doubt that AT will implement the full 2022 FSN scenario), then it should be considered for the implementation of maximum parking requirements, but minimum parking requirements should also be retained	Include

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Auckland Plan Classification for Potential For Change	Provides an indication of the potential for intensification/ growth and therefore the appropriateness of the proposed parking provision rules	None, although this may have to be cross referenced with the proposed zoning for the Unitary Plan	If the Local Centre is classified as 'Moderate Change' or above it should be considered for the removal of minimum and implementation of maximum parking requirements	Include
Auckland Plan Classification for 'Emerging' or 'Market' urban centre	Provides some indication of how quickly a centre will become intensified. If a centre is classified as 'market' driven it may develop more quickly due to interest from the private sector	None of the Local Centres are classified as 'Market' driven, with only three classified as 'Emergent' Centres. The impact of this on parking provision rules is not fully understood although it is clear that earlier development will influence parking supply and demand	Use the classification in the Auckland Plan	Do not include as impact on parking provision rules are unclear. In addition, none of the Local Centres are classified as 'Market' driven.

Table 1: Assessment of Criteria

Criteria	Reasons to Adopt	Reasons to Not Adopt	How to Measure	Recommendation
Level of existing publicly available parking	Provides an indication of the risk associated with restricting parking supply in an individual centre	This information is not easily available, though some would be available in previous parking plans. More suitable for consideration in a CPMP	Would need to survey each individual centre	Do not include at this stage due to the time and cost involved in collecting this information and the fact that the potential negative parking overspill effects should be given less weight than the risk of undesirable low density development in Local Centres, which will be difficult to change once complete. This information should be included in a CPMP
Forecast levels of peak and inter-peak congestion	Worsening levels of congestion supports use of parking as a demand management tool	Projecting congestion relies on assumptions regarding where development will occur. Increased density will nearly always result in increased levels of congestion if management methods are not put in place. Managing the supply of car parking is a proven management technique and therefore should be included as a tool in any areas where increased density is desired and alternative transport options are available	Use the growth predictions in the Auckland Plan and traffic modelling to identify areas where congestion is projected	Do not include at this stage as the management of parking supply should be used as a tool to manage congestion in all centres as density increases. However, predicted congestion could be used as a tool to manage the prioritisation of CPMP.

Reference:S:\ACUP\007 Unitary Plan Parking Additional Work\TN3B120911.docx - Mairi Joyce