

University Parking Plan Review Area 3 - Full Submission Table For Elected Members

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12681	Peter	Conlan	do not support the plan		I'd support if visitors or residents could park outside there own living space I understand if the roads are being used to park for uni should not however apply to residents or visitors of the residents it's kind of a no brainer really its what most city's would do have a report system for those who are not supposed to park on the streets that this is applied to thank you for reading this
14062	Christine	Peckham	do not support the plan		I don't believe our students should be penalised. As residents we moved into this area knowing it was close to university. This restriction is too hard for students when they have classes back to back. The roads close to the university should be able to be used by students trying to get a good education. They also will be paying taxes that pay for these roads that everyone is entitled to park on. As a resident, there also does not appear to be a benefit to the residents who will also have to abide by it. TOTALLY AGAINST IT, Thank you
13124	Harry	Freese	have some concerns	Member of IURRA	I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and endorse the IURRA submission. We live in Area 4 and the same and similar issues affect Angela Street as staff from businesses at the Bush Inn park in our street daily during business hours. Residents and Visitors are left with no parking.
13125	Dianne	Harker	have some concerns	IURRA	I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and endorse the IURRA submission. We live in Area 4 and the same and similar issues affect Angela Street as staff from businesses at the Bush Inn park in our street daily during business hours. Residents and visitors are left with no parking.
12644	Sue	Woodgate	do not support the plan	UC	I completely understand if I were a resident I wouldn't want everyone parking outside my house all day. But the parking cost at UC is extortionate, especially for those of us that work part-time but have to pay the full price. I can't afford parking. All you're going to do is make me walk further and we'll be outside someone else's house that will annoy them just as much as the ones we're parking in front of now. The car parks inside the UC campus at Dovedale are virtually empty, which is crazy. But we can't convince UC to either have a reduced price for part-time staff or to have a cheaper cost for those of us at the Dovedale campus. Perhaps you could put pressure on them to make the Dovedale campus cheaper than the Ilam campus so we could afford to pay for parking? I suggest you have a drive round and see just how many car parks aren't being used. Thanks for your consideration.
12634	Zdenko	Zec	support the plan		
13475	John David	Clancy	support the plan		
13061	Dr & Mrs JRL	Walker	have some concerns		<p>1. We support the proposed plan but with some minor reservations.</p> <p>2. We request that Athol Tce be included in the restricted 120 min (red) zone. Long-term parking in Athol Tce is already a problem and will become worse with the new BUPA retirement home developments.</p> <p>3. We request that white-lined parking spaces or at least "hockey-sticks" be added on the NE side of Athol Tce since we regularly suffer problems with cars parking too close to our driveway on both sides.</p> <p>4. Parking problems in Athol Tce are further exacerbated by the old-fashioned deep gutters causing extra narrowing of the road by parked cars!</p>
13117	Dr Robyn	Hewland QSM	do not support the plan	IURRA Committee member, own submission	<p>This is adding to former submission this week, and, also I support IURRA's.</p> <p>Athol Tce needs its south side outside Parkstone Village to be for Residents only, with or without parking permits, (Parkstone Village completed will have 300 residents), needing spaces for its VISITORS without time limits. Between 7-9 am and 2- 7 pm, week days, it should have NO parking on South side, as cars are bumper-bumper awaiting right turn onto Peer St. Many students walk and use scooters between University Ilam and Parkstone Ave Buildings and each Campus.</p>
12697	Libby	Bird	have some concerns		<p>For the benefit of residents in the area, the parking should be P120 Monday - Friday 9am-5pm. I am currently living on a street that has P120. I would appreciate if this was switched to P120 Mon-Fri 9-5pm, otherwise, it is very inconvenient.</p> <p>Therefore, I support the plan with the specific timeframe.</p>
12844	C	Child	have some concerns		<p>Although our street is not specifically identified for change I do wish to express my concern in regards to the commercial development in the area and lack of parking having to be provided by developers for example expansion of university &amp; college supermarket with little / no staff parking and large scale rest home with little / no parking, student high density accommodation with little / no parking. By Council planning allowing this the impact is now felt by residents with little / no impact on developers.</p> <p>Council needs to look at planning and require provision on site at campus &amp; university. University needs to ensure this is affordable.</p>
13436	Kathy	Reece	have some concerns	Bupa Parkstone	<p>See below for attachments</p> <p>Please refer to the attached submission letter from Parkstone Retirement Village</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
				Retirement Village	
12678	Jonathan	Stewart	do not support the plan		<p>This proposal only moves the problem to other areas. At my address it is bad enough, but this proposal will make it worse for us on Avonhead Rd. The church is my addresses main issue for parking now, but after this it will be students as well.</p> <p>Options?            Extend parking restrictions further            UC to increase parking options and free (with tuition) options            Resident only parking facilities            Ban commercial tour bus parking in the area - this is our main issue at our property outside of church events            Thanks</p>
12743	Leonie	Partridge	do not support the plan		Restricting parking around the University will severely impact on the UC student and staff welfare. People do not live close to campus and to use public transport to get to study or work at UC is both impractical and too expensive. The cost of living for food and accommodation for students is already so high and they cannot afford to park on campus so why put extra obstacles in their way. The students bring alot of money to Christchurch and I am wondering why the council is wanting to disenfranchise them even more. I live in the local area and think this is an extremely bad idea - does someone in council live in the area and not want cars parked outside their house?
12785	Jennifer	Aballe	support the plan		
12786	Ian	Johnson	have some concerns		<p>Our main concern is that this proposal could result in pushing more all day parking students vehicles out on to the stretch of Maidstone Road (Waimairi - Avonhead) which when heading out of the CBD doesn't have a cycle lane - so the presence of parked vehicles already poses a danger to cyclists which this proposal could exaserbate.</p> <p>Secondly, there is an increase in student cars being parked on Avonhead Rd near Maidstone &amp; the median barrier - so there is the potential that parking near this intersection will increase &amp; cause further congestion.</p>
13156	Glenys	Dickson	support the plan		
13158	Rob	Dickson	support the plan		
13160	Kerry	Taylor	have some concerns		Will there be provision for residents? - Possibly issue of resident permits with/on rate receipt
13474	Yep Wing and	Sylvia King	do not support the plan		
13047	Russell	McConchie	do not support the plan		<p>Staff are being forced to park on the street because of excesive (\$800)car paking costs imposed by University of Canterbury.</p> <p>All good for acedemitic staff on \$120k - not so good for staff on minimin wage.</p>
12704	Wayne	Mackay	do not support the plan		As a UC staff member I am forced to park in the streets surrounding the university by the exorbatant parking charges levied by the university on it's students and staff, any further restrictions to parking will just push the problem to another area,maybe the university should be providing free parking in a purpose built building,yes fanciful I know.
12727	Sarah	Pride	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	<p>I am a student at the University of Canterbury. I understand why residents in the surrounding areas would be concerned about the amount of people parking near their home, however it is my opinion that there needs to be more consideration for students in this plan.</p> <p>The parking situation at the university is next to impossible - first of all, it costs \$400 for a parking permit, which is unaffordable for many students. Even for those who do buy a permit, the carparks at university are totally full by 10am each morning, forcing those who missed out to park on the streets in the surrounding areas. I have had many days where I have been late to my lectures because it has taken so long to find a parking space, and have had to park up to 30 minutes away.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>I'm sure that many more students could take the bus or bike to university, but I suspect that only a small amount would actually change, making a minimal difference to the problem.</p> <p>Introducing more parking restrictions in the surrounding areas has the potential to make an already difficult situation much worse. I ask the council to please think carefully about the impact on students when making any changes to the parking situation around the university.</p>
12991	Ra	Steer	support the plan		There is no separate college. Both premises belong to the university and are all called as such. Students and staff can't afford the steep increase in parking charges that the university increased it too and are continuing to increase it to, doubling rates per year. Also this means that many car parks are all left empty on the university grounds, especially in dovedale campus, hence the increase in congestion around the public parking areas. It will only get worse as student and staff numbers increase.
12849	Elizabeth	O'Brien	have some concerns		<p>I live at ■ Brodie St the students from the ???? ????? already turn the Yaldhurst Rd end of our street into a car park, making it very difficult for me to get my car safely out of our drive.</p> <p>Since the opening of the large rest home in Athol Tce the other end of Brodie St is lined with cars parked on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Signage is useful but parking restrictions must be monitored by frequent visits from traffic wardens said visits are a rarity in Brodie St</p>
13058	Caroline & Barrie	Greenwood	support the plan		We would be very happy to see the restricted parking on the northern part of Brodie Street. Parking on both sides as at present is very problematic to negotiate, especially at school pick up times!
13141	Karen	Brown			<p>I am absolutely thrilled that the parking is to be looked at.</p> <p>I live at ■ Brodie St opposite the Bupa Hospital Care facility.</p> <p>There have been days when I have needed to go out and found car parked across driveway-all day. I am presuming it is from school and the last one I took photo of their number plate.</p> <p>Even without that, if cars are parked both sides of Brodie St it is hard to see clearly when exiting drive. Two cars cannot use road when cars parked both sides. I believe the 120 limit will not work unless policed. It's not working on the other half of Brodie St. Needs to be no parking between 9&amp;5.</p>
13157	DI & C E	Vercoe	support the plan		Just make sure the time limits are enforced
13161	Noel	Cochran	have some concerns		<p>I believe a 2hr parking restriction would be very disruptive for residents &amp; owners as they attempt to rush out &amp; move vehicles to avoid infringement &amp; attempt to find a new location &amp; would a h hour restriction be better.</p> <p>Having lived alongside College of Education for a good number of years - and speaking with attendees I'm told that parking permits for onsite parking are very expensive - therefore those onsite parks are severely under utilised (and subsequently some areas of the site have been converted to other uses - residential &amp; expansion) does the facility not have an obligation to provide a certain level of parking - as do other commercial facilities.</p> <p>Support the full year parking restrictions.</p> <p>Not sure if all those parking in area 3 are university/college of education people.</p> <p>See people parking &amp; walking to catch Orbiter</p>
13224	Allan and Helen	Cook	have some concerns	Ilam and Upper Riccarton Residents Association	<p>We the signatories below are both members of the Ilam and Upper Riccarton Residents Association. We hereby endorse the submission presented by this organisation re University Parking Plan review area three.</p> <p>Allan and Helen Cook.</p>
13229	Judith	Burrows	have some concerns		I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and fully support their submission re University Parking, area 3
12898	Gary	Lee	do not support the plan		

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13148	Miedema Family	None	support the plan		
12903	Liz	Jaganath	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	There is so much parking space available on Dovedale Campus, it would make sense to reduce the cost of parking to staff and students so this parking is utilized. This would in turn benefit the surrounding neighbours who currently have staff and students parking outside their properties.
12633	Lea	Deng	do not support the plan	Miss	<p>See below for attachments My family do not support this plan. Below is a list of comments. I also attached a photo taken just now around 7:25pm for your reference.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have a single car garage but it's challenging for my parents to maneuver the car, so the garage is used for storage instead.</li> <li>2. We have two cars. We park both cars off street on our side of the road (which has the proposed P120 restriction).</li> <li>3. My parents can not afford the annual permit fee for resident parking.</li> <li>4. More than half of the residents at Camrose Place park their cars off street. There are a few big utility vehicles that normally park off street. So it'll be very difficult for every resident to find a free parking space on street. Please see attached photo taken around 7:25pm. There will be more resident cars coming back later.</li> </ol>
12679	Lea	Deng	do not support the plan		<p>Hi Kim,</p> <p>I'd like to provide more comment on why we do not support this plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As you can see in the satellite map, 16 out of 28 properties on Camrose Place are adjacent units. 12 of these 16 units have shared drive ways. Due to the age of the properties (late 1960's to late 1970's), most garages are single. This makes it tricky for us to use the garage, or park at driveway.</li> </ol> <p>This is a unique limitation of Camrose Place. If you look at the other neighboring streets such as McLellan Place, Glenside Ave and Dalrye Place, the majority properties are full section and the residents can easily park in garage or on property. If you look at Montclare Ave, 6 out of the 10 adjacent units have separate driveways, which makes parking on property a lot easier.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There are two big parking space for UC next to Solway Ave, but why students are not fully using them? This is the root problem. Is university charging students too much for parking on uni parking site? There are always plenty spaces in uni carpark while Solway Ave is fully parked by students.</li> <li>3. Even after the new P120 is implemented, students will still park on residential streets to save cost. The new issue will be they will try to move their cars every two hours. This will cause more car movements, noise, and hazards on our streets. There are small kids in my street who often rush out on their skating boards. More car movements by the students will definitely be a safety concern.</li> <li>4. So the P120 is unlikely to stop students parking on our small streets like Camrose Place, however we residents will have to start paying the resident permit each year, and watching more car movements in our street. Both my family at ■ Camrose, and my neighbor at ■ Camrose have two cars each. Because we share the driveway, we have been parking on street in the last 6 years.</li> </ol> <p>I only drive my car once a week. Once P120 is imposed, we'll have difficulty to find free parking on our own street.</p> <p>It's not fair for us to bear 2 x resident parking permit cost each year, just because students are not willing to pay for their own university parking.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing my comment.</p> <p>kind regards,</p> <p>lea</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12733	P & E	Brady	do not support the plan		<p>1. The pressure on parking in our Street has resulted in visitors during the day having no where to park.</p> <p>2. The cars parked on both sides of the Street have turned what was a 2 way Street into a one way Street.</p> <p>3. The real problem is the University not providing parking space.</p> <p>4. This is made worse by their obscene parking changes. Consequently people park on the Streets. Drive along Solway and Dovedale and you can see the empty parking space contrasting with jammed streets.</p> <p>5. Residents are sick of it.</p>
12995	Michael	McKinnon	do not support the plan		
13053	Mrs Thelma May	Durant	have some concerns		<p>My concern is being on [REDACTED] I am in constant fear of a MAJOR ACCIDENT (continual screeching of car brakes etc &amp; near crashes).</p> <p>On turning L out of Camrose into Solway the need is to go quite away out to the centre line to check for safety of cars in Solway Ave as there is a slight bend in the road that requires caution. Also the same could be said even for a R turn when exiting Camrose.</p> <p>ALSO the yellow lines are in NEED of re-painting &amp; on the L out of Camrose an EXTRA YELLOW line could resolve that problem a great deal.</p> <p>Hopefully you can understand my scrawl</p>
13054	Quoon & Jennifer	Chin	do not support the plan		<p>NO we do not support the plan, because to MANY cars park at our front door in track make in and out from the garage is very hard and dangerous. Because our grandchildren are come in see us are very dangerous.</p> <p>All our friends &amp; relity try to come and see us, they said they cannot find a space to park their cars. Camrose Place is a Place note a street. Less parking for students the better.</p> <p>Thank you very much</p>
13149	Jill	Blackley	do not support the plan		<p>Kindly refrain from restricting Camrose Place P20, as most of the properties are tandem housing accommodating 4 or 5 vehicles which require all day parking in the street.</p> <p>Give the students FREE PARKING around the facilities, most of the time ALL the carparks are empty.</p> <p>I am fortunate I can justify what I have written, having resided at the same address for over 40 years &amp; observed the vacant car parks daily</p>
12965	Kim	Allan	do not support the plan		<p>The UC College of Education is only on the Dovedale site until the end of 2018.</p> <p>The new building will then be ready and teaching will move to the Ilam site from 2019.</p> <p>The students have enough of a hassle with lectures on the Dovedale site this year, and facilites at Ilam.</p> <p>Please make any changes after November...although if ther are no students at Dovedale next year there might not be a problem?</p>
13594	Robert and Victoria	Gane			<p>Preferred options Lynfield Avenue</p> <p>1 120 minute restrictions 9am to 4pm on both sides of the street. Resident exemption stickers for residents Feb to Nov.</p> <p>2 120 minute restrictions 9am to 5pm on both sides of the street. Resident exemption stickers ALL YEAR ROUND</p> <p>We deem resident exemption stickers a democratic right as the residence owners are rate payers.</p> <p>Resident exemption stickers have been issued previously by Christchurch City Council.</p> <p>R Gane V. Gane</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12761	Kim	Culham	do not support the plan		The university already sells more parking passes per year than they have parking spaces available. If the prime minister is making university more accessible for students, why would the council go directly against that and make it more difficult for us to access the uni? Student life is already hard enough without the council making something that is already hard for us (parking), even harder.
12992	Donald	Matheson	do not support the plan		<p>I am a staff member at Canterbury University and currently park on surrounding streets because of the high cost of parking on campus. I live out of town and, along with a colleague with whom I car share, need to bring a car to work. We need an all-day on-street park.</p> <p>Increase in on-street P120s</p> <p>I appreciate residents' needs to find parking spaces for themselves and visitors to their houses. On the other hand, increasing the amount of P120 parking would cause quite a lot of inconvenience to me as I'd have to park further away from work. As I, and other colleagues, did that, there would also be a ripple effect on residents further afield. I think a long-term solution needs to involve discussions with the university administration about campus parking.</p> <p>Extension of on-street parking restrictions to year-round</p> <p>I don't see the logic (in fact, I haven't heard a justification) for university parking restrictions to apply on an almost empty campus during the summer. The number of students on both university campuses is small and doesn't need any management. I don't see the need for the council to restrict on-street parking either, as the demand for on-street parking will also be small. The only potential benefit I can see accrues to the university in causing more people to buy parking permits.</p>
13963	John	Gordon	do not support the plan		<p>1 The university has empty car parks in the holidays. I note room for skateboarders in the Clyde Rd car park and have been on rollerblades myself.</p> <p>2. In Creyke Rd there is minimal surveillance of the 120min outside our home. Most vehicles stay most of day. Some trade vehicles are the worst.</p> <p>3. Regular parking under 'no parking signs. (Check outside parking opposite Engineering School--in the muddy holes)</p> <p>4 Give the residents a break in holidays.</p> <p>( have problems with modest overtime but the regular offenders should be penalised)</p> <p>*have lived in Creyke Rd for 28yrs</p> <p>5 The University and Dovedale Campus could accommodate more parking.</p>
13952	Sharon	Yao	do not support the plan		<p>I do not support the "University Parking Plan Review " Area Three"</p> <p>There are too many residential streets being proposed in the new plan. Staff and students' car parking in the neighbourhood is actually the University's problem, and it should be an issue they should have identified in their planning historically.</p> <p>In this 21st Century era, the University should be able to construct a robotic car parking building on the west side of their property, which is along Solway Avenue. This area of the University property has always been an under-utilized car park. It is high time the University should take a serious look, instead of procrastinating the parking matter for another x years. The time for the University to shoulder their responsibility is here. Furthermore, with the advancement of modern technology, and as the University always pride themselves in this field, plus the computer software development achieved over the years, I think they should be able to come up with the first Southern Hemisphere robotic car parking building. An automated car parking building can optimize the parking spaces.</p> <p>Placing car parking meters along these residential streets would be most unwelcome, and unfriendly.</p>
12921	Phillippa	Kidd	support the plan		<p>Not having any parking available in our cul de sac day in day out is a major problem. Restricted the time limit has worked in surrounding streets and should go some way to alleviating the problem. It would be much better if students were able to access the ample parking provided without having to pay. Day after day there are large empty car parks at the end of the cul de sac and residents and visitors can not access parking any where near their home.</p> <p>My husband passed away last year and over the period leading up to his funeral visiting family and friends were not able to access parking within a mile of our house, despite us living in a residential street. Family have been issued parking tickets by over zealous wardens for parking across our driveway when that is the only alternative available.</p>
12700	Sam	Gurney	do not support the plan		<p>I do not support this plan for 2 reasons: we use the street for parking family vehicles and do not want to be restricted to 2 hours' parking outside our own home. Secondly, we are very Fortunate to have young children in our street who make extremely good use of the reserve at the end of our street and take advantage of the cul de sac for many games and physical activities, all of which align with the council's "be active" philosophy. Several of the children are from a home school situation which means that they could be out in the street at any time. Currently our street experiences a lot of parking from University users but the cars are relatively static. This would change with a time restriction, increasing the busy-ness of traffic movement and increasing the risk of harm. Physical wellness and personal safety should always take precedence over arbitrary planning.</p>
12728	Derek	Watson	do not support the plan		<p>We have lived in Dalrye Place for 18 years and although it does get busy during the day it is not an issue. If this was in place then the residents would not be able to park on the road during this period either and that could become an unnecessary issue. At best one side of the road but it is not needed. Tell the University to lower or remove their parking fees and the problem could be solved.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12763	Helen	Watson	do not support the plan		This plan makes no exceptions for residents parking.  I intend to park outside my home for longer than 2 hours during the week.
12769	Lucy	Armstrong	do not support the plan		we have multiple cars for 1 household and do not have the off-street parking to contain them. Due to insurance reasons my husband's work van must be parked on the property which leaves my car and his normal car on the street. My car is at work during the proposed hours but Jeremy's is generally on the street which would be made difficult by the proposed changes. Plus our other flatmate is a shift worker which means her car is parked during odd hours.
12841	Carol & Winston	Chin	have some concerns		It's not necessary being used the parking on the street. We're happy for students to park on our street.  It does not inconvenience us. You don't want to make it too hard and costly for students to find parks.  It cost enough to go the university and everyday living costs. You may lose students and study elsewhere, not good for Christchurch.
13145	Caitlin	Armstrong	do not support the plan		I live in a household that has four cars and only space for one car up the driveway. I am also a nurse that works shift work so I very often leave my car parked on the street during the day until I go to work @1430. I don't want to pay tickets for parking on my own street. Will there be an exemption for people living on the street? Thanks
13267	David	Yu	support the plan		
13271	Chiu-jung	Tsai	support the plan		
13965	Karen	Martin	do not support the plan		I believe that by restricting the parking time in our cul de sac ( Dalrye Place) that that will consequently lead to higher traffic change over and frequency in our street as drivers move vehicles around and look for different locations. With young children and children who are home schooled (so are home during the day) I do not want more vehicles entering and exiting our street during the day. The amount of parking traffic during the summer school holiday times has been extremely quiet in DalryePlace so I do not see this as a problem needing any further attention...  I do see two HUGE EMPTY parking lots on the western edge of the teachers college property that remain empty throughout every day of the week . I understand that the university's aim is to decrease the number of vehicles coming to uni each day by making it more expensive to park in these lots but that is at the cost to the public in the surrounding streets of higher traffic /vehicles parked ! ! I urge the Uni to make use of these areas by setting them at a reasonable rate and taking cars off our streets and onto their own property!!! Otherwise they might as well rip up the asphalt and turn them into useable and enjoyable park/garden spaces for the public to use !!!!!
14065	Peter	Cumming	do not support the plan		Oppose the plan for Dalrye Place because: Dalrye Place will lose what is left of its quiet residential nature with daily traffic movements going up by about 3 x in our little no exit street.  Also Dalrye Place will get: 1. More wear and tear on the tarseal we have 4 mini potholes at the moment. 2. Eyesore of parking signs and parking police. 3. More danger to children going to Montclare Reserve.
12966	Joost	Stenfert Kroese	have some concerns		These change will also affect the people who live in those streets. University staff will simply park a block further out from work.  The University should be pressured into providing more and cheaper parking for it's staff and students. The space is there. They just want to milk their staff and students for every last dollar.
12713	Alice	Harrison	do not support the plan		Parking at uni is EXPENSIVE! and there is never any guarantee of a park. Parks within walking distance that are longer than two lectures are near impossible to find! Reducing this with the increased amount of students seems like flawed math. Those who live in the area and complain purchased their homes with the knowledge that they were close to a university and therefore should have foreseen this to be a problem and factored it into the purchasing of their home.
13095	Lesley	Owens	do not support the plan	Member of Ilam/UpperRic carton Residents Association	I fully support the submission already forwarded by the Ilam/Upper Riccarton Resident's Association regarding Area Three parking proposal.
13152	Mr/Ms	Cochrane			Support this option ONLY if every address on red lines are allocated a card to display in vehicle window to allow residence their right to park longer
12904	Toni	Long	do not support the plan	Uni of Canterbury	I understand the frustrations of the neighbours around the university but with recent increases in the parking on campus, more staff are not willing to pay this price and are now using street parking as a transport option. Maybe the council should talk to the university about the increases and come to an agreement that way.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					I have noticed cars using 120min parking slots all day and have not recieved a ticket. Maybe it is in the councils best interest to start monitoring long length users and unsure before implementing a costly project that will not be monitored.
12983	Martin	Budd	have some concerns	HR Department, Dovedale Village, University of Canterbury	The University has quite a lot of parking on the Dovedale campus that is simply not utilised. (Only staff with a parking permit can park there, however most staff are now on the Ilam campus.) - The suggestion is to offer this parking to staff at a reduced rate, or even free, to encourage more staff to move off the residential streets for their parking. - Another suggestion is to offer incentives to staff to find alternatives to driving (eg, riding a bike). I personally am a cyclist but I find there are too many disincentives to riding a bike (mainly I feel it is very dangerous), so instead I drive. - I think the University staff should be supported in their need to park near their place work, however I think effective parking for residents is the highest priority.
12842	Caitlin	Richardson	do not support the plan		As a resident on Dovedale Avenue, I do not support the plan due to the fact that we will not be entitled to on street parking.  As there are 4 tenants in our Dovedale residence we have 4 cars minimum and not having on street parking will impact the flow we have going with parking it is necessary that we have on street parking.  Hope you're looking forward to the upcoming super rugby season.
12851	Maggie & Bill	Bayfield	support the plan		We would appreciate if cars didn't park close to our driveway as it is sometimes difficult to drive out - and often have to go into lane on other side of the road it is close to the corner and a bus route, so sometimes feels dangerous.
13077	Edmund	Sia	do not support the plan		There appears to be no exemption for the affected residents who choose to park their car on the street. One of the proposal's objective is to improve parking for residents and their visitors where possible -- well, placing a 2-hour restriction where we park our car in front of our house is going to make things worse.  I suggest all residents of the current and proposed streets are given an exemption sticker/permit so the proposed restriction would only target those who travel to park there, which is the root cause of the high congestion issues.
12721	Nicholas	Weaver	do not support the plan		It puts even further pressure on people who live in the area and park on the roadside due to lack of off street parking. The past two years while I studied I lived on Wadeley rd and constantly parked on the road side due to a lack of parks at the flat I lived in. These restrictions will add further pressure onto students living on these streets as they cannot leave their cars on the roadside through the day and would have to park further and further from their place of residence.
12970	Anton	Angelo	do not support the plan		The University does not supply enough parking for all staff, and encourage multimodal and public transport. I often use the bus, and park on campus when I need to, paying ad-hoc parking charges (which are more expensive than the bus). I often enjoy cycling through the newly improved unicycle route - which is world class.  I have been abused by Ilam residents verbally when parking in nearby streets when i have had occasion to do so, so I understand the level of frustration. However, the residents should understand that they live near a high density urban environment and should provide for their own off street parking during the day. I would recommend removing all parking restrictions around the university, and the council should encourage the University to provide free parking for all students, on campus.
12968	Rua	Murray	have some concerns		I have no problem with the extension of months for parking restrictions. As a former resident of Newbridge Place I feel that the proposal does not adequately address the problem of all day parking. The reality is that any free on-street parking place that is not time-restricted will be filled by University staff or students, owing to the excessive parking charges on campus.  * Some streets should have resident parking only (by permit), without time restrictions. * I wonder whether putting in place 240min parking restrictions (with enforcement) might also be effective - my thinking being that 120min might allow a student to attend one lecture, but not two, whereas a 240min allocation would allow staff and students to spend 3-3 1/2 hours on campus, and then move on. This may reduce demand for all day parking. * If the goal is to reduce the congestion of on-street carparks, the only effective strategy will be to reduce demand. This can be done in several ways: (i) for the Council to charge for parking; (ii) to compel the University to provide more parks at a lower cost; (iii) to invest in usable public transport to the campus (ie, direct routes running every five minutes at peak times from several parts of the city with minimal stops in between); (iv) could the Council build and operate a multi-storey carpark on University land?
12757	Remi	Lamarche	do not support the plan		

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13086	Kathryn	Hearsum	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	<p>I think this proposal is a little too late as a vast majority of the staff will be moving back to Ilam campus this month therefore the parking needs will decrease. If it had been looked at 3 years or when the Engineering students started coming here, you would have been able to formulate a plan but now is the wrong time.</p> <p>I also want to know how the Council proposes to deal with all the students and staff that need to drive to the University (I being one of those) because of where they live and public transport not designed to be efficient enough to warrant using it.</p> <p>The University parking charges are out of reach for a lot of people and are continuing to rise each year so it's not a viable solution for a great number of people. What is your position on this?</p> <p>Does the Council want to see the number of students coming to UC to go down, because parking is a big part of being able to attend and if there is no where to park and no convenient way of getting here, they will consider going to another University.</p> <p>Why can't the Council and the University come to an agreement that has an agreeable outcome for all concerned?</p> <p>The problem will not go away because people will continue to park in other areas that are not too far from the University so you will be forced to extend the zoned parking areas.</p> <p>Where is our support!</p>
13039	Christoph	Bartneck	do not support the plan		<p>The University of Canterbury has dramatically increased its parking fees over the past years without any good justification. Staff and students are suffering from this immense financial burden and parking around the university is often the only feasible alternative. This is particularly true for staff members with a low income that cannot afford the onsite parking. Furthermore, families with young children often need to transport their children with the car to/from child care centres. Buses and bikes are no true alternative, in particular on rainy days. I therefore do not support this plan and I would like to urge the city council to put pressure on the University of Canterbury to provide affordable and sufficient parking for students and staff.</p>
12971	Eric	Cox	have some concerns	University of Canterbury (Worker)	<p>I understand the issues around parking on the streets in the vicinity of the University and that the local people want a fair go at the parking. The problem is made worse by the actions of the University. First the charging for parking being pushed higher and higher (from Zero when I started to around the \$1000 mark soon) and forcing the Staff (and Student at half price) to make the decision at what point do they park on the street for nothing and walk the last bit to work. Also the University is cutting the number of parks that are provided as a move to encourage more people to think of alternative transport or allow for building expansion. The V.C. has stated they are not in the business of parking cars. Does the Council have a recommended number of car parks for the number of people or size of area an organisation services?</p>
12808	Morgan	Hodgson	do not support the plan		<p>As a commuter to the area I find parking incredibly restrictive for daily use at present, increased limited time parking will further exacerbate my access to parking</p>
12778	David & Julie	Cook	do not support the plan		<p>We strongly object to restricting parking to 120 minutes on my side of Glenside Avenue.</p> <p>We have lived at his address for 25 years with no real issue with cars parked in the Avenue.</p> <p>Something we have learn to live with. Although since the University has taken over the site from teachers training college and charging for onsite parking this has resulted (human nature) on more cars using the free parking on the road.</p> <p>Introducing 120 minute parking is only going to push the problem further out. How does this resolve the shortage of on street parking or congestion?</p> <p>My main concern is with the proposed 120 minute parking directly outside my address where do I park my car or guests cars. Forces me to park elsewhere that I can not keep an eye on for security.</p> <p>The University has already closed off the large car park corner of Solway &amp; Parkstone with shipping containers where they are proposing to build a high rise in that corner. Should they not be providing more car parks as part of resource consent rather than decreasing on site car parking. Or come up with a solution to the problem?</p> <p>The more they charge for on site parking the problem is only going to get worse?</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					David Cook
12928	Richie	Smith	have some concerns		Dovedale/Solway/Parkstone university car parks, hold approx. 600 car spaces, which you have to pay for, These parking spaces are never used. If the university wants too be part of the llam community then they should in good faith make these car spaces free to all students, which would take 600 car off the surrounding streets.
13144	Ken	Russell	support the plan		It come soon enough as the traffic volumes have increased beyond the design of this Ave.  It is becoming a health and safety issue
13073	Wallace	Woodley	do not support the plan		The plan suggests that 120 parking would be staggered along street sides creating confusion for residents and students alike. Signage would be prolific and complex  Residents in 120 areas would be greatly disadvantaged in that visitors, work contractors and family members would need to shift vehicles every 2 hours - to where? Having restrictions in place through vacation periods as well would increase the burden when no relaxation during 'holidays' was available  Students & staff members normally attend classes for more than 2 hours a day. It would be ridiculous expecting them to leave study programmes in order to re-park vehicles.  Reduce fees for students parking on site; provide more bicycle racks; encourage car pooling
12985	Peter	Glassenbury	do not support the plan		Parking on campus is restricted to the few that either afford or arrive at a time that it is possible to find a carpark (because of the University "license to hunt" permits). With the current slow and unreliable bus service, car is the *only* option for those that live on the other side of town. (I have used the orbiter service which ranges from normal 40 minutes waiting at bus stop to arrival to 90 minutes !)  As a long term parker in the areas you are describing, my only option is to mover further out.  I would point out a flaw in your reasoning of the high use which I believe is not summer courses. The current building programme on campus means that the contractors (who start at between 7am and 8am) take all the close parks along Montana ave and Creyke road. When that building programme ends, the usage should revert to normal.
12765	Conan	Fee	have some concerns	JWF Futures Ltd	Has the CCC actually consulted with the University over the planned use of the Dovedale Campus? The mailed-out document refers to "Canterbury University" and the "Christchurch College of Education" The latter no longer exists and hasn't for some years - it has been part of the University of Canterbury for well over 10 years. Furthermore, the whole College of Education is to move from its current site to the main llam campus this year. What are the University's plans for the Dovedale campus? Will there actually be teaching activities there? Of what nature and is it still relevant to pre-suppose that there will be a high demand for parking off-campus? It is clear to me, from the mistakes regarding the "Chch College of Education", which no longer exists, that CCC staff have not even bothered to talk to the University to find out near- and long-term changes in occupancy and activities before putting out this consultation plan. Residents cannot possibly provide informed feedback on the future need for parking restrictions if they are not even aware of changes of use for the Dovedale Campus.
13417	Wendy	Poole	do not support the plan		Our tenants have told us that they are not happy about restricted parking in front of their place. I don't blame them either as I won't want it. If anything it will create more traffic flow with people moving their cars. Please provide better access so students don't need to drive in....in the first place.
13159	Maggie	De Freitas	support the plan		
12871	Adele	Geradts	do not support the plan		I don't support this plan. My adult children attend (or have attended UC from 2011- now). There is increased student housing on campus, but there has not been any increase in student parking spaces. The cost of parking on campus has increased from \$120/ year back in 2011 to All-year student parking permit was \$350 in 2017, and for 2018 it is \$400. Students can't always walk or bus to university due to needing to have a part-time job to cover their costs.  Public transport is not always possible if you have to work 20 hours a week alongside studying. For example, my daughter is in year two at UC - she works at Mcdonalds [REDACTED] from 5 am till 9 am 4 days a week - then goes to UC and her first classes are 11 am - the days she works, and she finishes around 3 pm.  However, there is no bus from halswell to the CBD at that time - the earliest bus is 5.42am and takes 42 minutes meaning she could start work at 6.30 - 7 am but would then only get half the hours and half her pay. She used \$400 of the student loan course-related costs to cover parking this year instead of books. So she wouldn't get any parking tickets. Even so, she struggles to find a park on the campus as there are so many students driving she often ends up parking on the street anyway.  She is 19, and on a limited income, she can not afford parking tickets, and she can not, just not drive to work. While biking might be an option from here to Mcdonalds on [REDACTED] in the dark at 4.15am (approx 35-40 minutes on a bike) each day then to university and home again would make for exhausting days.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					Limiting parking around the university any further will only hurt students, and discourage students staying in Christchurch to further their studies. I feel for the residents of the area - but the residents and the council should be talking with the university about increasing parking on campus to reflect the numbers of students travelling by car. Finding out why students are driving and how better to support them. Please don't penalise students by further limiting parking near the university.
12689	Courteney	Currey	do not support the plan		Needs to be parks longer than that
12686	Finn	Seelen-Smith	do not support the plan		I NEED SOMEWHERE TO PARK
12967	Anna	Tyson	have some concerns		As an employee of the University of Canterbury, I can appreciate the frustration of local residents with the use of street parking by University of Canterbury employees. However, as an employee of the University of Canterbury, I am also unable to justify paying the exorbitant cost of \$800 (said to rise to \$1000 in 2019) for an annual parking permit to park on university grounds, particularly when it's a license to hunt for a park, not a guaranteed park. For my part-time colleagues who have to pay the same price for less usage, it is even more objectionable. When one can see the virtually empty campus carparks on the Dovedale Campus (since many colleagues are similarly disinclined to pay this money) and gaps on the Ilam campus, questions should be asked of the university regarding whether it is being a responsible neighbour to the Ilam/Upper Riccarton community, and the impact it is having on the local community through policy decisions of it's own making.
12696	Ruby	Allsop	do not support the plan		Parking for university students is already terrible enough without the council enforcing 120 parking zones around the uni.
13085	RON & ANN	WHITNALL	have some concerns		We are members of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and strongly endorse the submission that they have recently lodged on the Area Three Parking Plan Review.
13140	W N	Scales	support the plan		The 120 minutes signs on Ilam Park Place have faded badly. You can not read these 2 signs and so will need replacing. They are situated on the entrance of Ilam Park Place
13142	Peter	Malcolm	support the plan		
13143	Adrienne	Malcolm	support the plan		
13237	CHARLES and SHIRLEY-ANNE	COLLINS	support the plan		We have read the submission from the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and entirely support the views expressed in this submission.
13272	Jenny	Smith	have some concerns		The problem of University staff and student vehicles parked all day on residential streets is because the University charge students a fee for using its own car park. The car park nearest Solway Avenue is nearly empty on week days while the streets are full of vehicles parked all day long. To rectify the problem the University needs to provide free parking even if it has to increase all student fees.
13413	Roger	Murdoch	support the plan		Although not yet a member of the Ilam Upper Residents Association, I have seen and support their submission (undated) on this matter.
13733	Fred (Farid)	Samandari	have some concerns		Have considered the submission from Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association put through its chairman, Phil McGoldrick and agree with their submission.
13087	Veronica	Wingrove	do not support the plan		Cycleways have been put in place for the very reason of decreasing traffic/parking issues-students might be encouraged more to utilise these cycleways & not use their cars.
12645	Claire	McNeill	support the plan	University of Canterbury	
13049	Lewis	Winn	support the plan		
14064	None	Henderson - McDonald - Leask	do not support the plan		
13066	Emma	Read	support the plan		I have seen numerous occasions where parking has been dangerous on our street. Many of those who park there do not move their cars until the end of day. I would also like to see yellow lines painted on the corners at the entry to Ilkley Place as people park right on both corners making it impossible for cars in either direction to see if anyone is coming
12840	Douglas	Kelly	support the plan		We also need corner markings on the entrance to Ilkley Place to stop the dangerous corner parking blocking the view of Wadeley Rd traffic. I have approached the Council several times about my concerns.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13091	Emma	Read	support the plan	IURRA	I am a member of IURRA and support their submission that the proposed parking restrictions do not go far enough in abating the problem of university related parking in my street. I also want to state that a lot of the whole day parking is by staff from the University of Canterbury.
13102	Douglas	Kelly	support the plan		ILKLEY Place is such a narrow and short street that the north side needs to be restricted to "RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING"
13949	Brian	HICKEY	have some concerns		<p>See below for attachments It's Great that there is recognition of the problems. But concerned about the One Solution, 120min parking ■ Fits All ?</p> <p>Special consideration should be given to those much narrower laneway access streets &amp; no exit, turn circle streets, within this neighbourhood. Narrow Streets such as Ilkley Place, have vastly different issues than wide Wadeley Road, around the corner. For us just having vehicles changing a bit more frequently, is not a solution to Street Blockades. The issue that vehicles constantly restrict street access to a one way gauntlet, to creep through, is not solved through 120min parking! That could even just increase searching traffic volume.</p> <p>Service vehicles have particular difficulty lining up to access our street. Ambulance &amp; Fire appliance access to many properties, is impossible most of the daytime! We even have to resort to street parking our own vehicles on some days, just to be sure of being able to get out of our driveways, to get to any appointments.</p> <p>We would much prefer Resident Only &amp; Visitor parking, in Ilkley Place. Even on just one side of the street, would be a vast improvement.</p> <p>Just a bit of "Yellow Paint" especially around the corner curves into the street, would also be a Major Improvement to access. Unbelievable how often vehicles park around the curb, restricting vision and access. More "Yellow Paint" - Stopping Restriction in the too short space between Nos. ■ Ilkley Place, would be of immense assistance to Four adjoining properties who need turning assistance to exit their driveways. "Yellow Paint" is a very simple &amp; cost effective solution too many of the Residents of Ilkley Place's parking issues!</p>
13056	Laurence & Georgina	Ennor	have some concerns		<p>1. Parking restrictions outside University &amp; College years are probably not necessary - i.e. between November &amp; January.</p> <p>2. As owners of ■ Camrose Place we would like to see the P120 outside this place</p>
13473	Peter and Jane	Gordon	have some concerns		<p>Signage on Ilam Park Place needs updating, current restrictions applying.</p> <p>Athol Terrace would be safer with no parking on southern side. 120 limit on northern.</p> <p>Parkstone Terrace extend 120 restriction to Avonhead Road. NP outside 57 and 59 as narrow section. Road is quite dangerous there.</p>
13062	JGH & AV	Wilson	support the plan		<p>The plan seems a practical approach to an intractable problem as long as not having your own car is regarded as abject poverty.</p> <p>The parking limit signs in Athol Terrace are very faded and require ..... to read</p>
13068	Janet & Peter	Noonan	support the plan		<p>We live in Kelson Lane, off Ilam Park Place. There is already a 120 min time limit but the signs are so faded they can hardly be read.</p> <p>Cars are parked here for definitely more than 2 hours a day - some all day.</p> <p>How will this regulation be policed or monitored?</p> <p>We have seen no action in the past 3 years we have been living here.</p> <p>As there is no parking in our lane, we depend on Ilam Park Place for visitor parking if our driveway is full</p>
13174	Fiona	Greene	do not support the plan		The University should provide sufficient low cost parking for staff and students
12729	Roselle	Bremmers	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury College of Education	<p>While I totally understand the view of residents, the reality is that staff of the University have to park somewhere. Lectures often run into the evenings and biking or catching buses is not always an option, especially in winter.</p> <p>Maybe the Christchurch City Council could liaise with the University about reducing parking fees on campus. It seems ludicrous that there are hundreds of empty car parks on the two campuses while the streets are full. A number of staff pay for parking permits but for part-time staff, it is a huge chunk out of their wages. Also, full-time staff with mortgages and children often cannot justify the cost of purchasing a parking permit. Utilising the University car parks for staff and students would free up the streets for residents and their visitors.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12896	Vanessa	Forrester	do not support the plan	Univerisity of Canterbury	<p>I am a staff member at UC and I do pay for parking on-site.</p> <p>I do not support the plan as I believe the timing for this is inappropriate. With most of the staff and students moving off the Dovedale site during 2018 this seems to be poorly timed and will waste council money and resources on an outcome that is known to be changing. It would be better to undertake the survey after 2019. I understand the issue of parking has become tight over the last few years and the frustration levels may be quite high. Perhaps a better outcome would be for council to get UC to consider cheaper parking on Dovedale site to ensure staff and students utilise the car parking which is available and often empty.</p>
12722	Bronte	Barber	do not support the plan		<p>Personally I think it is ridiculous that this is being proposed. 1) Residents that are complaining will soon complain that they are being ticketed outside their house when it's 120min and 2) They are choosing to live in the University area, in which students will drive to attend their lectures. It is going to cause more stress for the students as many have a 2hr lecture, then a break then another 2hr lecture, or they just want to study for exams, but then they'll be stressed that they have to move their car, but then not be able to find a park.</p> <p>I was extremely annoyed when I moved into my flat on Kirkwood Ave that at the start of February the council decided to put up 120min park signs on the "odd" side of the road, meaning that we now have limited parking space around our house if we don't want a fine as the "odd" side of Balgay Street is 10mins.</p> <p>Following through with this proposal will be ridciouls, especially as UC move the Education Campus (Dovedale) to the Ilam in July as that is creating more students on one campus with NO parking.</p> <p>Therefore I extremely disagree with this proposal and hope their are more people like me that disagree so it doesn't go ahead. P.s. Take down the new 120min on Kirkwood. It is not needed.</p>
12716	Laura	Goodman	do not support the plan		<p>Students often do not have a choice but to drive to university. It is common knowledge that parking onsite is near impossible due to the demand. I don't support this proposal because it will just shift the onstreet parking problem to other streets as these students will still need to park somewhere.</p>
13075	Ross	McDonald	do not support the plan		<p>Already in Lodge Place we have no parking between 9am &amp; 4pm Mon - Fri on the side of the street shown on your plan.</p> <p>Already parking is difficult particularly for the CuldeSac residents who have no street frontage. The present situation works ok for now - don't change it to 2 hr parking because that will only encourage students to park on the other side of the road disadvantaging residents</p>
13589	Kelvin	Duncan	have some concerns		<p>We are pleased that the parking restrictions on Lodge Place are proposed to be eased, but we make the following points.</p> <p>1 Students have never been much of a problem in Lodge Place, even before restrictions were put into place.</p> <p>2 The shifting of teacher training to the main campus has greatly lessened the parking problems on the streets surrounding the Dovedale campus.</p> <p>3 The current problem is due to roomer rentals, not students. Perhaps rooming houses with over 6 or more tenants should be required to provide off street parking? They are commercial activities in a residential zone, so perhaps should be even prohibited.</p>
13175	christine	scott	have some concerns		<p>I support the P120 proposal, ONLY if the residents are given Exemption Car Stickers. I have one parking space on my property and there times when I need to park on the street outside of my property. I do not want to have to worry about incurring traffic infringements</p>
12758	Jack	Button	do not support the plan		<p>My house is on one of the proposed streets of the parking review and with 4 cars in our house we are not all able to park our cars on our property so we need to have a car parked on the road most of the time.</p>
12850	Yalun	Lu	support the plan		
12629	Thomas	Wright	have some concerns		<p>We thoroughly support restrictions on parking around the University. Given how narrow our street Lynfield Ave is with cars parked on both sides, our neighbours complain of having trouble backing out of their driveway. We also feel that only making one side of the street p120 will not solve the problem, only shift it to one side of the street, and spread the cars down the street further. The university under Rod Carrs leadership seems to be of the opinion that where students and staff park is not the university's concern, but rather the local ratepayers. We feel that a full p120 restriction would be the only way to ensure the university backtracks on its current position and takes responsibility for the parking issues it creates. As our property has a driveway suitable for only two cars, and we the occupants have four car we are concerned about resident parking. We feel that under a full p120 restriction resident parking stickers/permits should be introduced. This would ensure that residents can park outside their homes, and when they return to their home, still be able to find a park. We feel that this would completely solve the university parking issue, where the university's own huge carparks in the dovedale campus are completely empty yet the streets are lined with a ludicrous number of cars.</p>
12739	Mark	Griffin	do not support the plan		<p>I do not belive a parking restriction is needed. The money would be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>The top half of the street I live in, the parking during the day is related to the businesses in the Waimariri Rd shops or those who live here, not the University users.</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>The local community group has been pushing this (trying to get my signature often), the only real reason they have given me is that it can be narrow to drive down. The correct streets you identified with restrictions often have cars parked both sides when I regularly drive them, so to me the effect of doing this has been minimal, and just spreads any problems that might exist elsewhere. People need to park somewhere, and residents like me, selecting to live by a varsity should expect this to be a norm during varsity hours.</p> <p>It would be better to require more parking when proposals like the new halls of residence are built at the of the street, or use the money to make public transport cheaper for travelling to/from such training facilities (note: I am not a student, a varsity employee, and have off street parking).</p>
12748	Celia	Mclean	do not support the plan		I live in this area and have not got enough parking off-street parking spaces.
12802	Tony & Lois	Cairns	have some concerns		We live on the corner of Lynfield Ave and Dovedale St and have constantly struggled to be able to get parks outside our property for guests and tradespeople due to people parking all day long while at the university. We would like to see residents only parking along the residential side of Dovedale Street. If that is not possible, we would support the proposed 120 minute parking limit on weekdays as that should at least ensure a reasonable turnover of parking spaces.
13065	AJ & LM	Sparks	do not support the plan		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 120 parking both sides of Lynfield Ave</li> <li>2. Parking restrictions Feb to Oct only</li> <li>3. Permit parking for residents</li> <li>4. NO parking north side of Dovedale Ave</li> <li>5. University to use parking that is available on-site (Solway Ave). Parking fees need to be abolished so students can park in this area. A waste of space at the moment</li> </ol>
13076	Marguerite	Vivian	do not support the plan		<p>I currently live at No █ Lynfield Ave (Close Maidstone). Living down a long driveway parking isn't a problem for myself or 1-2 guests, but if your proposed P120 restrictions (Mon-Fri 9-5) gets implemented this would be a problem if more of my guests want to park longer than 120 mins on the Rd.</p> <p>I did own No █ Lynfield which shared a drive with a back flat, any guests would always park on the road outside the house. Currently there are flatmates whom I am aware, 1-2 park there cars on the road. Yr proposal would penalise them if they worked nights or had there cars on the road longer than 120 mins Mon-Fri 9-5pm</p> <p>My front neighbours are flatting Asian students with many cars. Yr proposal would penalise them although they already pay high fees to be here.</p> <p>It is noted Lynfield Ave can be busy with a few cars but it fluctuates over the day. It should be FIRST IN, FIRST SERVED. Being at university is hard enough! Don't make it like Ara where you have to walk kms to get to class, and why pass the problem to outer streets (pass the proposed streets for restrictions)</p> <p>I pay BIG enough rates to be living in Ilam and as a rate payer of Ilam, do not support yr proposal. Your restrictions take away the fridnely, calm natural way people go about their business. You will industrialize the whole area. Cause friction with people having to rush to move their cars from one 120 min to another. I say if residents have a problem don't live by university!</p>
13078	Pauline & Ken	Callaghan	have some concerns		<p>With some major concerns which would require addressing</p> <p>Solution Recommendations:  Restrict parking Lynfield Ave as in Rutherglen St, both sides 120 mins - 9am - 5pm Mon-Fri Feb-Nov  Supply resident exemption passes for 1 or 2 cars  Suggest university reduce their exhorbitant on-site parking fees  Take some responsibility to local residents and student by encouraging utilisation of their own 1/2 empty existing carparks, and provide some more space within their considerable grounds for more parking to keep street parking to a minimum.</p> <p>Reasons for recommendations:  Staggered restricted parking proposed in Lynfield Ave will NOT solve anything. The street will still be fully parked, both sides, all day, every week day. There will just be far more traffic movement in the restricted areas but the result for some will be never having a carpark available outside their own home during the week.</p> <p>Lynfield Ave now has a number (which in increasing) of multi occupied rental homes. Many have six plus residents and nearly the same number of cars, mostly and nearly always parked out on the street 24/7. With staggered parking these tenants with restricted parking outside their rental homes will just move and park their cars over the road outside houses with no restricted times. This will cause those property owners/residents to never have any parking outside their own homes, and this is not acceptable.</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>Lynfield Ave is narrowed to a one lane usable roadway when cars are parked on both sides all day during the week. It is used by many drivers as a cut-thru by-pass to avoid the Waimari/Maidstone Rd traffic lights at that intersection, so there is a lot of through traffic. With the width of Lynfield Ave, traffic movement and the bends from Maydel St to Maidstone Rd, the traffic flow is very compromised and it is almost impossible for turning cars to enter or exit at the Lynfield/Maidstone Intersection. There should definitely be restricted parking on both sides, for these reasons alone.</p> <p>Conclusion For students, requiring parks to attend the university, all residents enjoyment of their existing homes and their street, the accessibility to their properties in and out of driveways, and reasonable safe traffic flow, there should be 120 minutes, 9am-5pm, Mon-Fri, Feb-Nov restricted parking on both sides of the street, with possible resident exemption passes for 1 or 2 cars.</p> <p>This would be a fair compromise for all interested and affected parties.</p> <p>Extending parking restriction to all year - 9am-5pm</p> <p>For those who live permanently in Lynfield Ave / all other homes in Zone 3 with restricted parking. This would mean that they would never have the opportunity to park all day outside their own property on any day of the week during the year "Ever". Unless resident exemption passes were approved, this option would be totally unacceptable to most and incredibly unfair to the residents. ALL YEAR restricted carparking must be accompanied by resident exemption passes. Absolutely non-negotiable if this option is to be ratified.</p>
13420	AJW & GA	Lamb	have some concerns		<p>Lynfield Ave has three main purposes. Access and parking for residents. As a rat run short cut to avoid the Waimairi Road Maidstone traffic lights. As parking for the university. We are concerned to have adequate parking for short term and the danger from fast dangerous speeding motorists. We believe that parking restrictions p120 as in Ratherglen on both sides of the whole length of the road and parking permits for residents would be the best solution.</p>
12923	Sue	Chamberlain	have some concerns	Spokesperson for Lynfield Avenue Residences Neighbourhood Watch Group	<p>As am a member of the IURRA Committee, I have visited all the residences of Lynfield Avenue to discuss the issue of parking. The vast majority prefer to have 120 Parking Restrictions on both sides of our street with only (March to November). We consider to be a fair allotment of parking for the street rather than unlimited parking in front of some residences.</p> <p>Also the residences want parking exemption stickers to enable them to park outside their own properties</p> <p>I have also asked each resident to submit their own individual submissions on this issue but this summarises the situation for you.</p>
13497	Glenis and David	McNab	have some concerns		<p>Full length of Lynfield Ave parking on both sides leaving one lane of traffic available to negotiate street. Maydell Lynfield corner particularly bad with cars parked up to and around bend making driving very hazardous in already narrow street. Suggest making parking areas on street to stop cars parking over driveways etc.</p> <p>University of Canterbury Dovedale campus needs to solve the issue of staff and students not using parks on campus because of parking costs. On an average weekday probably 75 percent of car parks on site are empty with staff and students parking all day on local streets.</p> <p>Before earthquakes when Training college, no such issues, but then high density buildings at Dovedale campus has created this problem and Canterbury University should be held accountable for this problem and fix their parking on site issues.</p> <p>We have lived in ■ Lynfield Ave for 32 years and have noticed in the last 5 years the increased parking issues, with difficulty accessing and egressing our driveway.</p> <p>The shopping strip at corner of Maidstone and Waimairi also means staff of the shops park in Lynfield Ave all day as well.</p> <p>We support Area 3 parking plan but suggest that there should be residents permits that entitle all residents to use the 2 hour parking without penalty. It is not right that the rate paying residents should be penalised by the University of Canterbury parking issues.</p> <p>We live at ■ Lynfield Avenue and have recently also purchased ■ Lynfield Avenue, solely to prevent more students saturating the area with such high density living. The comments we have made for ■ Lynfield Ave also apply to ■ Lynfield Avenue.</p>
13732	Daniel	McDowall	have some concerns		<p>I have lived on Lynfield Avenue for just over the year, and have had far too many issues with parking. Between me and my flatmates, we have 4 cars, and we can only park two off-street. If one of our cars on street is used during the day, we often return to no on-street parking on our whole street and have to park on the burm,</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					thus damaging the burm. I have noticed many of the people parking down our residential street are studying/employed at UC Dovedale, so these people are clogging up our street and not using UC parking facilities as they should. I support parking restriction so we can park near our house and visitors also have place to park when they visit, but are concerned how a P120 zone in the area around our house would affect our own vehicles which are often parked up all day outside our house. I would support a residents parking scheme, so we can still park outside our house and not in the designated non-P120 area far away from our property (I'm not comfortable having my valuable car parked a considerable distance down the street for security purposes, as i'm sure you would also).
14056	Dianne	Leadbetter	do not support the plan		Yes I would like 120 car parking on both side Avenue, and residence parking permit.
14057	Yi - Yuan	Chang	do not support the plan		We would like 120mins carparking on both sides of Lynfield Ave, with residents issued with parking permits.  n.b. I Brenda Ball and Lynfield Ave have written this submission at the request of Eric & Penny as they have difficulty with written English, however are fluent English speakers. Thanks
14059	Alan	Lory	have some concerns		1. The 2 hour limit proposed should help to encourage students to alternative commuting (e.g. bus or cycle)  2. The present free parking areas in my street are a constant congested problem facing visitors, tradesmen & danger for children & pedestrians during university lecture times.  3. 2 hour parking limit on both sides of all Lynfield Ave would be more suitable !!  4. Eliminate all free parking on Dovedale North completely for safety reasons !
14060	Denise	Biddiscombe	do not support the plan		We would prefer 120 parking on both sides of whole avenue with residents parking permits. I often have vehicles parked over my drive entrance and it is then difficult and dangerous for me to reverse out. Many Thanks Denise
14063	Janine Ogier & Alan Wood	None	do not support the plan		We would like P120 in Lynfield Avenue on both sides - all along - with residents permits for parking please. The residents can park 24/7 but visitors can park P120. Thanks
14162	David & Brenda Ball	None	do not support the plan		Having 120mins will discourage drivers parking all day and will stop traffic congestion for those who need to travel along the avenue, we would like both sides of the street to have 120mins Lynfield Avenue has become a very busy street as drivers use it as a short cut by travelling from Waimairi Road, through Maydell Street, Lynfield Avenue onto Maidstone.  We as residents need parking permits to allow us to park on the street as many of us do not have room on our driveways to accommodate visitors or tradespeople for the period over 120mins. Thank You
12962	Catherine	McEvedy	do not support the plan		I have lived in this street since 2012. The parking by staff and students at both the university and the teachers college has become diabolical in the last year, such that I agree something needs to change. I do not support the current plan as it will mean that some residents will be unduly penalised under the park in some areas and not others.  I work from home so entertain clients here and come and go from my address all day. Weekly I am ringing the CCC parking unit, feel free to check the stats, you will see I often ring and report vehicles that prevent egress from my driveway. I try to be fair and often will put notes under windscreens first, but it is a tiring and wary process. All of my visitors are unable to find a park to visit, and if they are clients are uncomfortable that they will need to park in my driveway.  I am lucky I do have a decent driveway. The proposal in its current form has free parking outside my address. This will mean that my visitors and clients cannot visit me and park there, which I will find inconvenient. Across the road there is a student flat with six cars domiciled there. They come and go at all times of the night. As the free parking will be outside my house and my bedroom, they will also park outside my home.  I would submit that in fairness to all owners in the street that the 120 limit be for the whole street or it is changed to 240 to allow longer parking. It will allow for people to come and go as to their needs and also allow my clients and friends to visit and not be penalised.  I do not wish for my name or address to be publically posted with my submissions. I am happy to discuss by phone the need to protect my privacy, however I do what my submissions to be considered.  Kind regards, Catherine

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12812	Jotham	Barmentloo	do not support the plan		<p>The restrictions proposed would not help, because after 5pm parking is not an issue as a resident on the busy Maidstone Rd. Most students very rarely use 2hr parking, and that's coming from me who used to commute into town for 2 years before moving close by.</p> <p>Most students don't park on the restricted 2hr parking spots unless desperate because we almost always have 2-6hrs of lectures/labs a day and usually stay to study on top of that. I only ever used the restricted parking when I was late to class and couldn't spend the time walking to park further away.</p> <p>Students aren't going to use the extra restricted parking spaces. I think if you put in more restricted parking spaces you'll find the locals won't use them AND the students won't use them. No body wins. You only need to look at Ilam Rd parking, the unrestricted side is parked full from the uni end all the way up to the bend daily where it joins Tuirau place. On the opposite side of the street where parking is restricted, it's empty. No one uses it. This may have changed in the last year since I've started living locally but I'd be very surprised if that is the case.</p> <p>If the university had more parking on site or made it cheaper.. that might be an avenue to explore. But adding more restricted parking spaces.. I don't see how anyone wins. Am I missing something? I don't think so, but if I am, please do email me I'd be curious to hear the counter argument.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
12890	Anastasia	Boyle	support the plan		
13218	Caleb	Meyer	have some concerns		<p>I support the plan but I am also concerned about resident parking options. We don't have great off street parking and for most of the last 3 years several of my flat mates use parking on the street. Obviously if this becomes restricted to 120 min on one side of the road the parking available for residence will be harder to get. I would be very happy for the plan to go ahead if property owners got 1 or 2 residence parking stickers or permits which allowed them to park for longer than the 120min limit.</p> <p>Alternatively there could be set residence parking spaces, similar to what is shown along Cashel street between montreal st and park ave.</p>
12635	Nicholas	Shimasaki	support the plan		These parks are taken Monday through Friday for the whole day, often by the same people and we do not feel that this is acceptable for a residential area.
12705	Charlie	Kavanagh	do not support the plan		We live in a flat down Maidstone road and this will make me want to move flat. We do not have enough car space for the flat size so we have NO idea what we will do. I do not support his proposed plan change AT ALL.
12706	jules	haus	have some concerns		We are residents on maidstone road and we do not have enough parking space on out property. We heavily rely on parking on the street. If it was turned into a P120 zone our concern would be that we would have to move our car every 120 mins.
12707	Georgina	Williams	do not support the plan		I live down Maidstone Road and have to park my car down there as my flat mates and I do not have parking available at our flat (all three of us park on the street). I think it's really unreasonable considering this area is predominantly a student area and student flats generally have more cars than a family home therefore requiring street parking.
12710	Tahlia	Thompson	do not support the plan	4a Maidstone Road	Making parking 120 minutes along Maidstone Road would make life hell for all of the residents. Some of us live in buildings that hold over 7 people and driveways that accomodate for 1-2 cars. Where are we supposed to park during the day while we are at university or working? We are already paying extremely high rent and to have to pay for parking on top of that is just cruel - especially when we chose to live in this area because of the availability of parking. We are paying high rent to live close to uni and be able to park our cars. Most of, if not all of, the parks along Maidstone Road are occupied by people who live here anyway. Please do not do this to us.
12734	Joyce	Seale	have some concerns		<p>In the first instance the University of Canterbury should be required to have enough parking for both staff and students on "their" property. The CCC should not have to accommodate UC parking on neighbourhood streets!</p> <p>Secondly on Maidstone &amp; Ilam Road parking should be restricted on BOTH sides of the road - not just one side. So many cars are doing U-turns to get parks in the opposite direction on Madistone &amp; Ilam!</p> <p>Just this year I have noticed UC using Maidstone west of Wainoni Road and Ilam Road north of Maidstone ALL THE WAY to Memorial Ave - and to Jellie Park!</p>
12853	Warren	Chinn	have some concerns		We do not have any off street parking. We live on the [REDACTED] and Maidstone Rd on the eastern quarter (proposed 120 min restriction). We acknowledge the non-restricted parking proposed on the opposite corner to our property. That improves our situation but reduces the total space for parking during entire week days. We need a creative solution to the restricted parking proposal. Life style issues not with standing, we have a 9 month (+) baby which requires efficient and safe access to our car. We also have a very busy bus stop outside our property on Maidstone Rd - a dangerously busy section of road.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					Ironically, our car is parked on the road all day because I bike to work - easing the very problem this submission is about: Too many cars! so as a form of compensation a solution, could we please be granted a residency parking slot on the Lynfield /Maidstone corner. The city needs less cars. Thank You
12874	Wayne	Keenan	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	<p>It should be known that the University of Canterbury, College of Education will be moving all of it's teaching to the main Ilam campus to the building at the corner of Arts road and Forestry road either in July or December of 2018. After the move there will be a significant change to the demand for on street parking particularly north of Dovedale Ave and west of Solway Ave.</p> <p>Based on the timeline suggested you would be making changes for a situation that would only exist for a few weeks at most.</p> <p>A better longer term solution might be to lobby/force/negotiate with the University to have Car Park 1, and Car Park 2, on Solway Ave rezoned as free parking as at current UC pricing is keeping these car parks almost permanently empty.</p>
12876	Terry	Creagh	support the plan		Parking review would address the huge number of illegally parked cars that constantly block driveways and obstruct the cycle lane on Maidstone road causing significant health and safety risk to young cyclists travelling to school along this cycle lane - the residents could have resident parking permits issued - as in most international cities to allow them to park longer outside there properties
12882	June	Telfer	support the plan		<p>I urge the council to take action regarding parking in this area before there is a serious accident outside our house. I absolutely agree that parking changes are essential in this area. We live on Maidstone Road and every day we have issues getting out of our driveway and onto the road. Parked cars obstruct our view and threaten our safety of ourselves and other road users. It is usually impossible to see oncoming traffic without driving into the cycle lane and putting cyclists at risk, not to mention myself and my children.</p> <p>We have regularly called the Council Parking enforcement officers and have cars either ticketed or towed from their position across our exit. The constant hazard of getting in and out of the driveway is becoming a daily source of stress to myself and my family. We also have my elderly parents looking after our children and I fear for their safety as they exit our driveway, they really are struggling to see oncoming traffic.</p> <p>We will continue our near daily now reporting of offending cars until matters improve. We would suggest yellow lines would improve our safety on the Eastern side of our driveway and 2 hour parking or at least parking bays so as to identify the legal safe parking distance from our driveway on the West side.</p> <p>Please contact me for any further information as we are desperate to see changes to the parking on Maidstone Road.</p> <p>Dr June Telfer</p>
12892	Peter	Curnow	support the plan		I bike past this area every day and find the cars parked over driveways with residents cars trying to get out a real hazard, almost a lottery. I also know of a family who live in the area very close to University Halls and we go there from time to time to visit - our kids go to the same primary school - and getting there and parking nearby is also complete lottery, even driving into their place is a problem sometimes as cars park so close to their entrance way that it is difficult getting in and out.
13050	Cameron	Rhys & Gwyn Richards	do not support the plan		
13074	Jo	Kendall	do not support the plan		<p>I in no way support this plan.</p> <p>The students who attend the university should not be penalised for the university not having sufficient parking. By making their parking on the street more restrictive, this impacts them in terms of cost, class disruption, undue stress and long distances to walk in sometimes unpleasant weather.</p> <p>To have them park further away is unfair and unreasonable. As a home owner I -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. have off street parking</li> <li>2. have no claim to roadside parking</li> <li>3. If I have a problem with people parking all day outside my property - I could have purchased a house in an area away from the university so this issue would not impact me. The university website states they have been there since 1873 - most home owners would not have purchased without knowing the uni was there.</li> </ol> <p>Solutions that can be negotiated between the Uni &amp; Council would be more favourable i.e.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>1. Increase parking options on site</p> <p>2. Off site shuttle service</p> <p>3. Free up land for multistory parking.</p>
13089	Diane	Singleton	do not support the plan		<p>See below for attachments</p> <p>Has anyone looked at the parking areas at the University? It is currently term time at the university with lots of cars parked in the streets. Today (approx. 10:30-11am) I had a wander around the area. In what is called Car Park 1 at the University I found 153 empty car parks with another 28 car parks being used for shipping containers. In Car Park 2 there were 127 empty car parks. Why isn't anyone parking at the university? The main reason is cost I suspect - \$800 per year for staff and \$400 per year for students.</p> <p>The council should be asking questions of the university to why these car parks are 80-90% empty. Why are residents having to put up with bad parking when these people should be parking on university grounds?</p> <p>Unless the issue of empty university car parks is solved then the parking problems will continue. The proposed plan will ease some issues for residents in the areas where the restrictions are to be put in place but this will just mean a new set of residents will have issues with illegal parking.</p>
13153	None	None	support the plan		
13419	Ilka & Malcom	Norrie	do not support the plan		<p>Do not see any need to extend the current March to November restrictions to year round. There seems to be plenty of parking available over the summer months. Parking has been particularly tight due to increased demand from tradespeople and rebuild staff.</p> <p>We do experience issues with vehicles infringing on our driveway. Restricting parking to 120 min would not solve that. However enforcement of the Road Code would. Council currently only acts upon complaint.</p>
13598	Glenna	Wong	do not support the plan		<p>The main problem lies with the University of Canterbury charging expensive parking fees for staff and students from \$455 for staff in 2016 to \$800 in 2018 and will increase to \$1000 in 2019, students from \$304 to \$400 in 2018.</p> <p>So many have been forced to come early and park on the streets. It used to be applied from Feb to Nov and now it is for the whole year. So many empty parking spaces in Dovedale campus. If they lower the parking fees, it will accommodate more people to park on campus rather than on the streets and this may create more revenue for UC. UC should consider proportional payments aligned with income or number of weekly work days. I would like to have friends, visitors to be able to park on the streets without parking limit restrictions so therefore I vote against the plan.</p>
13599	Merle	Conaghan	have some concerns		<p>Looking at the plan I can see the students parking further out along Maidstone Road. Traffic is already diabolic on this major road.</p> <p>I would like to see the restriction's enforced the entire length of Maidstone Road which includes [REDACTED].</p> <p>With such a demand for car parking its a pity the intellectuals and City Council didn't have the foresight to build a car park building on the Dovedale campus near Solway Avenue.</p>
13850	Liam	Gray	do not support the plan		<p>The parking outside our house next to Ray Blank park is fine and it is often quite easy to find a park. By enforcing a 120 minute restriction on parking all of the residents will not be able to park outside our houses, which we need to do as our driveway is small. Everyone will be forced to compete with other residents, University students and staff for the parking not in the restrictions zone while the restrictions parking remains empty as most people who drive to University stay for more than 2 hours and there is not enough demand for parking to fill up both restrictions and non restrictions parking. I think that the parking next to Ray Blank Park should be left as is or excluded from area three as there is not enough demand on parking for restrictions.</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13856	Luke	Parkinson	do not support the plan		I live alongside a planned area to put a p120 restriction opposite Ray Blank park. I park my car on this section of the road constantly and only have little trouble finding a place to park between the proposed hours. The problem I have with this proposal is I often leave my car here for many days in a row and a P120 restriction will mean I will have to find alternate parking further from my house when there is no need for this. Restricting residents from parking outside their house does not solve the problem of university staff and students filling the streets as it will just make the fewer all day parking spaces more competitive. These restricted parking spaces will be mostly empty like on Newbridge Pl as university staff or students often stay for longer than 120 minutes and residents will not be able to park all day in front of their own residence. I believe the proposed plan will mostly disadvantage residents living alongside the restricted areas. I do not support this plan that will restrict residential parking. The general pattern of parking in this section judging by day to day pattens seems to be residents parking opposite Ray Blank Park and university staff/students parking alongside Ray Blank Park
12764	Brooke	Smith	do not support the plan		I live at the address ■ Maidstone road, the only parking we have is on street parking, if these changes were to move forward we would no longer have any parking, there are three of us living at the location all with cars
12984	Eileen	Whiteside	do not support the plan		This will just push the parking issues out into other streets further out.  The increased parking issues for the community are a result of the university increasing the cost of parking on campus, and making this a year round policy. There are now empty parks on campus while the streets surrounding the university are full with parked cars.
13120	Paul	Southward	do not support the plan	N/A	The university has, in recent years, increased the cost of parking far in advance of the cost of inflation or any pay increases. It has now become too expensive for many staff and students to park on campus and the surrounding streets are now the only obvious alternative. If you put more limitations on parking then many will simply park at the end of these limitations and walk further - shifting the problem to someone else's doorstep. Put pressure on the university to reduce the parking costs and that will ease pressure on the local roads.
12680	Melanie	Holley	have some concerns		I'm not against the plan my only issues is parking for my Flatemates as residents. We have a four bedroom house and cannot fit all cars on the property and one is on night shift therefore has to park on road in day as he sleeps and doesnt have to get woken. If we could come up with some parking permit & visitor permit as it's not fair on residents and others in this street for it to be changed like this.
13055	Christopher	Adams	have some concerns		P180 may be better
13781	Camilla	Kruize	have some concerns		There needs to be parking permits for residents
13080	Summer	Pringle	do not support the plan		I am an employee at the University of Canterbury and I work on the Dovedale side of campus.  My submission relates to the proposal to increase the parking restrictions on the streets around the Dovedale side of the University's campus.  I strongly disagree that there is "high all day parking demand" in the subject area. And I am surprised that there have been complaints from residents because it is clear that there is still ample all day parking available.  Putting that to one side, I believe that it is premature to make any changes to parking provisions in the streets around the Dovedale side of campus.  The reason for that is because a large number of students and staff will be moving to the Ilam side of campus this year. I understand that it will be in the region of over 300 staff and 2,500 students who will move across. That move will start in April this year. It is highly unlikely those staff and students would continue to park around the Dovedale side of campus after they have moved to the Ilam campus.  Also the prefabricated buildings at Dovedale will be removed this year and not be replaced, making it a grassy area.  Given the above, it is my submission that any changes to parking provisions should not be made until next year.  It is also my submission that some kind of analysis should be undertaken (possibly early next year) to observe parking patterns.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>Personally, I would be significantly disadvantaged if the parking restrictions were to increase in the subject area because I am a mother and have child drop off and pick up responsibilities which mean I must use my car for transport (as opposed to when I would previously bike to and from work prior to having children).</p> <p>However, I have not based my submissions on the significant potential implications for me, personally, and I believe that my submissions above are objective and reasonable in all the circumstances.</p>
13057	Lesley	Robertson	do not support the plan		<p>The University of Canterbury has MANY empty parks at Dovedale Campus and possibly on site on the main campus. Why are they not encouraged to get staff to use these spaces? I am aware that it is expensive to get a parking permit. Many staff populate the streets early so that they do not have to pay, that I do understand. What I do not understand is how you are willing to prevent people who live on those streets, from parking on the road during the day . My Partner cycles to work and it isn't possible for him to park in the driveway.</p> <p>I would support the plan if the council issued permits for the permanent residents ( as they do in London)so that they will not get fined for leaving their cars parked longer then 2 hours. As McLellan Place has a large number of multi car houses the areas without parking restrictions will be filled up rather quickly. This will happen in other streets too.</p> <p>I also feel that people will just park further away and clog up those streets.</p>
12828	Vivien	Qin	do not support the plan		I do NOT support the new proposal. It would restrict the amount of time of my visitor could spend with me and my family when they visit us. It will cause inconveniences to me and my visitors. I do not want parking restrictions on our side of road.
12847	Seonaid	Church	support the plan		
12998	Te Hurinui	Karaka-Clarke	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	The cost of parking on the University grounds is prohibitive for many students studying at the university and their only alternative is to park out on the surrounding streets. An increase to the P120 restrictions in this area will make an already difficult task of finding all day parking even more difficult. Most students who study at the College of Education have classes which run the length of the day rather than piece meal timetables where they could be on campus for a couple of hours at a time. While I acknowledge that parking in this area may be a problem for residences, I would suggest that increasing the P120 restrictions in this area will mean that students and staff looking for all day parking options will only move the problem further out, to Avonhead and Maidstone Roads and become a problem for residences in those areas. Furthermore the College of Education will be moving shortly onto the main university campus and that should alleviate the pressure in Area 3.
12747	Ben	Karalus	support the plan		CCC has introduced several cycleways linking the university with the city and CBD, which complement its existing public transport (buses). By reducing the availability of car parking around the Ilam campus this would push more students, the majority of whom are able-bodied, to consider alternative transportation options, such as biking/walking/catching the bus. This is also a preferable option for residents as it reduces congestion on the roads surrounding the campus.
12618	Olly	Powell	support the plan		<p>I generally support the plan. However I suggest that it would be more effective if there was at least some nominal charge for the privilege of parking in these locations, including for residents like myself. It is valuable public space, and most of the parking I see happening in front of my house is from lazy students who could easily ride a bike.</p> <p>An annual parking permit perhaps?</p> <p>The only difficulty I generally find with living in this area is when I get tradesmen to work on my house. It would be helpful if there was a simple system for such situations to exempt them from restrictions while they are actually working from critical machinery, e.g. tree trimming equipment, or in a more recent example I had to take four car parks for a few hours to get my rain gutters constructed on-site.</p>
13114	Ling	Hsu	do not support the plan		<p>The current restriction is already making it difficult for residents, renters and visitors finding off street parking during daytime. This is a residential area yet because of the university's needs, residents' needed to give in to give more parking space for the university. Students should be encouraged to use public transport, share ride or bike. The number of students going to summer school should be less than other time of the year, so we question the need to make the restriction all-year-round. Right now, summer time is the only time where we as residents can park offstreet without worrying about getting fined.</p> <p>Currently the restriction applies to the side closer to residential properties, and the opposite side has no restriction. But during daytime, both sides are fully occupied by students' cars. IF the council must change the restriction to all-year-round, we propose the council to give residents FREE parking permits (2/household) so residents can be exempted from the restriction.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12996	Kiri and Daniel	Hill-Dunne and Dunne	do not support the plan		Despite the project objective "to improve parking for residents and their visitors where possible", the proposed restrictions for Montana Avenue, which borders the University of Canterbury, will not improve parking for residents of Montana Avenue nor their visitors. The current restrictions prevent residents from parking outside their properties, since the restrictions are on the north side of the street where the majority of residents' properties are. They also prevent visitors or tradespeople attending residents' properties from parking on the street since the parks are almost always full. The proposed restrictions will not improve this, but will just extend the parking problems for residents to the summer months as well. This is particularly difficult for residents, such as us, with not enough off-street parking for their own cars, visitors and tradespeople attending to repairs (especially earthquake repairs) on the residential properties. The only way to improve the parking situation for residents is for the Council to offer free resident parking permits, which residents can put into their cars, as and when required, to park in the restricted parks free of charge. The street signage should then be labelled "P120 Mon-Fri 9am-5pm except for Resident Parking Permit holders." These permits should be free to residents and should not be restricted to only those residents who do not have any off-street parking. Residents should not be prevented from parking outside their own houses and should not have to bear the financial burden of the University putting up its parking charges. Please offer residents of Montana Avenue resident parking permits free of charge.
13139	Alana	Dawson	do not support the plan		See below for attachments I am writing to indicate that I DO NOT support the University Parking Plan Review - Area Three.  Extending the P120 has more implications for residents than as it currently stands. A lot of residents need to park on the street outside their homes. Only being able to park outside our homes for 2 hours at a time is very inconvenient.  Extending the P120 also affects the students as they will have to park even further away from both campuses.  It costs \$400 a year for a student to park in the University of Canterbury car parks. \$400 a year is completely out of reach for many students. As you can see from the photos attached (taken on Friday 16 March 2018 at 10am) the Dovedale campus carparks are virtually empty and the streets (Montclare Ave and Solway Ave) are fully lined with cars. If the University made parking more affordable, or free, then this would solve the parking issues on the streets surrounding the University. As it appears that very few students have purchase parking permits the University cannot be gathering much revenue from parking and empty car parks seems very wasteful. Lincoln University has free car parking for its students so I feel this is something that the University of Canterbury should consider.
13275	Kerry	Henderson	have some concerns		It appears from the plan that our residence will have P120 signs on both sides of Montclare immediately in front of us - we appear to be the overlap. We will have two vehicles as our son will be living with us. He is living with inoperable cancer and will have a vehicle. We also have a vehicle but only a single garage*. We consider it essential that we have a resident parking permit to allow one vehicle to have on street parking. We also note that Montclare is a bus route and there are already significant traffic congestion issues caused by buses. Fortunately, there is no bus stop in Montclare, something which we opposed as residents when the bus route was changed. We also have regular visits from young grandchildren and with Montclare a bus route safe accessible parking is an issue for them. However, I believe the proposal above is fundamentally flawed in its reasoning. There no longer exists a College of Education distinct from the University. The Dovedale campus is part of the University of Canterbury. As I understand the University's expansion plans, the planning is for no student lectures on the Dovedale site: it will become solely an administrative facility. And there is a huge amount of unused parking space on the Dovedale site. Even now It sits largely unused because of the hugely exorbitant parking fees charged by the University. In this sense, the University creates its own problems and it creates our resident problems. I suggest the council independently survey the utilisation of the on site Dovedale parking utilization at (say) 10.30am, 1.30pm and 3.30pm on three consecutive weekdays during term time so that it can be better informed as to the scale of that problem.  * If resident parking permits are not approved, I ask the council to provide curb/channelling/removal of berm to allow for an additional off road parking facility on the west side of our section.
13968	Edward	Wright	do not support the plan		The additional restrictions near the College of Education (Dovedale) campus would seem to be premature. I understand that the education functions will shortly move to the main Ilam campus. A better approach could be to assess what restrictions are needed once the new usage of the site has become clearer. For example, if there are more service units based on the campus the parking patterns will almost certainly differ to the current usage. The upcoming removal of the temporary buildings on the Dovedale field will also likely change usage patterns.  It would also make sense for the Christchurch City Council to work with the University to explore ways to increase the utilisation of the current off-street carparks on the campus. Since parking fees were introduced in the mid 2000s these carparks have never been fully used, and the amount of on street parking has increased. Indeed one carpark seems to be gradually turning into a container storage area!
12917	Mike	Stewart	do not support the plan		#1 - There should be more 120 limit car parks on dovedale avenue rather than having all day parks. It makes sense to have more 120 minute parking very close to the college.  #2 - The streets further out should be all day parking not 120 minute limit.  #3 - A lot of local residents rely on street parking, and if there is 120 minute limit for the majority of montclare They will have no where to park.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					I strongly oppose the current area three parking plan.
13146	N & K	Larkins	do not support the plan		We don't support this plan there was never any parking issues until the university decided to charge for parking.  Question as to who would pay for the signage? If it was to proceed
13477	Greg	Haslett	support the plan		
13726	Charles	Berridge	have some concerns		* No apparent need for parking restrictions beyond March to November in Montclare Avenue.  * The current policy of the University regarding parking charges on the campus is not working. The Council should require the University to establish a policy that ensures their carparks are fully utilised before vehicles spill over into neighbourhood streets.  * Since parking restrictions in the area are due to the University, they should bear the cost of signage rather than the cost falling on the ratepayers.
13953	Gemma	Carmichael	have some concerns		Montclare Ave is a narrow thoroughfare with parking on both sides meaning the carriageway is no wider than 5 metres when vehicles are parked on either side. It is also the route of 130 bus service which can create issues for passing traffic. Extending restricted parking UNLESS it is monitored for compliance will in my opinion create safety issues especially for traffic exiting properties on the street. It is unclear from your proposal what your intended outcome is viz. does this reduce casual parking for university visitors so they seek other forms of transport or alternative parking area? And what about the residents and their requirements?
12664	Logan	Cane	do not support the plan		It is hard to see how this plan benefits university staff or visitors. They generally stay for more than 2 hours and in either case prefer free parking. Here on our street the current parking restriction is highly under-utilised and instead a great deal of strain is put on the otherside of the road where parking is free, sometimes even pushing residents out from having their space to park. The alternative then is for these people to catch public transport. I think if parking restrictions were lifted altogether, there would be enough space for everyone to park.
12994	Bradley	Smith	do not support the plan		Our property is in Newbridge Place. We do not support the proposal to extend the restrictions to year round parking.  As home owners we are already disadvantaged by having restrictions in place outside our property. We have had our driveway resealed in the past 6 months and just finding a place to park with two small children was almost impossible. Trying to get permission to part outside our property without incurring a fine while our driveway was being sealed was ridiculous. Our only relief is over the holiday period when we can park outside our residence without having to worry about getting a parking ticket.  We pay our rates like many citizens of this city but we cannot park outside our own property for more than 120 mins.  Home owners should have residence permits to park outside there property. Students do not pay rates for our home or mow our lawns.  The holiday season as it stands allows us to use what we should be allocated to use all year around. Our own parking space outside our own residence.  The University is providing more summer programmes increasing the demand on our neighbourhood. Why should this become our problem?
13470	Anne	McMenamin	have some concerns		However I feel residents should have some form of identification to be able to park in front of their residence e.g. special sticker on a windscreen.
12718	Andrew	Flanagan	have some concerns		I understand the need to manage parking demand and can sympathise that local residents must feel frustrated with the lack of parking near their houses, however more must be done to provide alternatives to driving. Given that many thousands of students and staff travel to the university daily, and rising enrolment numbers, it is unsustainable to simply push the on-street parking problem out further from campus every few years.  The Uni-Cycle route is fantastic but the other cycling facilities around university are taken at best. Work on the Nor'West Arc (particularly Blenheim Rd to Memorial Ave) must be completed soon, and similar facilities around the city need to be provided to ensure that cycling is seen as a viable and safe transport option for students and staff.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>Similarly, using public transport to get to and from university is my usual method of choice and is generally satisfactory. However, the reliability in frequency and travel time is poor. There are roads with higher bus volumes for which better bus priority must be seriously considered, such as Riccarton Road, so that public transport is an option for more UC students and staff, without having to worry about travel time reliability.</p> <p>Furthermore, more housing closer to university for staff and students is essential, so that parking demand is not so high. Far too much of the land close to university is Residential Suburban Zone. The number of students who live in a short walking or cycling distance to university could be greatly increased by allowing for more terraced and medium density developments. It is especially absurd that most of the area bound by Creyke Rd, Puriri St, Riccarton Rd and Waimairi Rd is Residential Suburban Zone.</p> <p>From personal interactions, it seems that students at UC have a higher car ownership rate than students in Wellington and Auckland, and it would be great if more students felt as though they could enjoy life in Christchurch without depending on, or even owning, a car.</p> <p>For many students, particularly those who must work part-time to afford to study, driving is the only option available to them, which is a large contributor to the very high parking demand around the University of Canterbury. The cause of this high demand must be looked into, rather than simply the problem of on-street parking shortage on nearby roads.</p>
13176	DANIEL	R//OWE	support the plan	dan rowe decurators	<p>please make changes to this roading plan as it is very unsafe for children if a child cannot see as he or she is cycling out of the drive way as there vision is blocked from the parked cars right out side (which 9/10 cars are parked ova the boundry lines every day ). If there is an accident and a death occurs because of this, then certain partys will be held responsible especially now that a pertition has started and nothing is resolved to the parking plan it will go 2 ways civil and possibly depending on the inquiry criminal action if loss of life occurs all this can be sorted with a pot of yellow paint \$ 59 and a bit of labour to put yellow lines out side this prperty this could save lives DO IT! it is now your responsibiliy,</p>
13067	Peter & Julianne	Darling	do not support the plan		<p>RE [REDACTED] McLellan Street</p> <p>Have a large home - 5 bedrooms &amp; often tenanted to shift workers. Concerned that they would need to get up to move the car in morning and if home for the day, needing to keep reshifting the vehicle every 2 hours. Property only has room for 2 cars parking</p>
13464	Dr Rod	Carr, Vice Chancellor Tumu Whakarae		University of Canterbury	<p>Kia ora koutou</p> <p>The University of Canterbury is clearly identified as an area of the city where there is particular pressure for on street parking. Parking is a frequent topic of conversation at community meetings and other occasions when the University engages with its neighbours.</p> <p>A common view is that the University could improve the situation by reducing the cost of parking on campus. In setting fees at the current level the University Council has been mindful of keeping fees at a level reasonable enough for those parking on campus while still generating sufficient funds to cover maintenance, avoiding the use of revenue that would otherwise be spent on student tuition and research.</p> <p>The University does not believe a reduction of its on campus parking fees to anything other than zero would see any significant reduction of on street parking congestion. Car parking is well utilised on the Ilam campus already, and it is likely that those parking on the street would still do so, even if doing so only saved a small amount of money.</p> <p>Residents around the Dovedale campus often suggest that the car park there be made free. The University actively supports and promotes alternative means of transport and has often raised the issues with the Council.</p> <p>The University's long held view is that a resident parking scheme in the streets around the University is the best solution, with a lesser amount of non restricted parking available.</p> <p>Another alternative might be an increased number of P120 car parks in the streets around the University. This would cater for campus visitors and students attending one lecture, but would otherwise ensure car park turnover.</p> <p>Please note the Dovedale campus is no longer the location of the Christchurch College of Education, which ceased to exist when it became the University's College of Education in 2007. It is now known as the College of Education, Health and Human Development. Further, later this year the College will relocate to the Ilam campus. The site is more properly referred to as the Dovedale campus.</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>Nga mihi</p> <p>Dr Rod Carr</p> <p>Vice Chancellor Tumu Whakarae</p>
12906	Nicholas	Albers	do not support the plan		<p>This plan will worsen, rather than improve, my own and my flatmate's ability to park outside our house and the street congestion. As we are just outside one of the proposed p120 zones, long-term university related parking will move from down the street to directly outside our house. on the contrary, removing the current p120 restrictions would aid in congestion problems by freeing up more long-term parking near UC and Teachers College. Many students and staff who drive to university stay there for extended periods (more than 120 minutes), as can be seen by many of the current P120 areas near uni being empty during the 9-5 period, creating more of this type of parking when it is already underutilised serves no one.</p>
13051	Gordon	Spite	have some concerns		<p>1. Almost all of the parking issues around the Dovedale Campus have been created by the University when introduced a charge for parking. Almost all of the University car parks around Dovedale stay empty while the streets are clogged.</p> <p>2. I will have cars permanently parked outside my address at [REDACTED] Parkstone Ave which is just outside the restricted area. I would have no concerns if the restriction was extended further west</p>
13064	Lynette Hardie	Wills	have some concerns		<p>Lower Parkstone Ave from [REDACTED] to Brodie St is currently no parking &amp; should remain because of SAFETY &amp; CLEAR VISION, The opposite side of Lower Parkstone from Solway to Brodie should be proposed P120 restrictions Mon-Fri 9am - 5pm. (This means people can't park ALL DAY)</p> <p>PARKSTONE FROM SOLWAY TO AVONHEAD: One side needs P120 because cars so many flats &amp; it's not safe through DAY or night because of parked cars.</p> <p>Needs to be restricted P120 on one side &amp; no parking on the other side.</p> <p>Note: Problem on Parkstone needs attention - outside with [REDACTED] - need to restrict cars to other side of road because of vision &amp; Athol Tce safety issues if cars are parked both sides</p>
13092	Bronwyn	Leek	do not support the plan		<p>The roads around the university needs to be organised for residents and uni users not as a thru road by other drivers - there are other roads around the perimeter for this purpose. Parkstone Ave is a major thru road which makes it dangerous for parking, cycling and for school children especially as there is already a large volume of residential parking on the stree. I believe that parking restrictions are needed the full length of the street not as proposed on the map to make safe access for everyone. With other streets nearby proposed to have restrictions this will increase the cars trying to park on Parkstone Ave making the current situation even worse. The road also needs a ban on heavy vehicles to decrease the traffic, and access parking permits arranged for residents to make the street safer for all users.</p>
13099	Joanne	Pengelly	have some concerns		<p>I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and endorse the submission made.</p>
12745	Myles	Gardner	do not support the plan	Poolside Christchurch	<p>Ridiculous, I work on Clyde road but also go to uni. There is absolutely no where to park. Instead of wasting money on things like this why don't you spend it on proper and efficient parking for university students so there is no longer the problem of parking on the road. I can't even park outside my flat/home because of 120minute restricted parking. Absolutely ridiculous. Stop spending money on cycle ways and do something that will help Christchurch</p>
12846	JO	Pengelly	have some concerns		<p>I have no concerns in general with the P120 in Parkstone Ave being extended as sadly when we have visitors they can often not find a park. I do wonder if there is a way around this where each property can have one parking space designated for property owners where it can be unlimited time - realise this well not be consider. The residents of Parkstone Ave do have a major concern of the thru traffic from Brodie St roundabout down to Avonhead Rd. The speed of which these cars travel is unsafe to often sounds like boy racer type cars. We would like speed humps considered on Parkstone Ave to lessen speed of cars &amp; may also assist in cars avoid this street because of the speed humps.</p>
12913	Kara	Walker	do not support the plan		<p>As someone who lives on Parkstone Ave in a flat of 6 people the proposed parking changes would have a huge negative impact on our lives. We have four cars in the flat and aren't able to park all of them on the driveway. As we all don't drive to work/uni daily a parking restriction of 120 minutes during the day would make us move our cars from the street directly outside our house to a further street just to avoid fines. If there is some way to get a residential pass to avoid this and maintain our off street parking as residents on this street, that would be a good compromise. Otherwise extending the parking restrictions on this street would be very detrimental to all of the families and flatting groups on this street.</p>
12986	Catherine	Bishop	do not support the plan		<p>Parkstone Ave is not a straight road, has significant cycle traffic and school children on pavements. Cars accelerate out of the roundabout at Brodie rapidly round a slight bend near the road into the College of Education. At peak times there are often cars stopped in the current no stopping zone near Unlimited School. These circumstances present a hazard to cyclists, drivers and pedestrians. Introducing 120 minute parking in existing no-parking areas is would exacerbate this situation.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					The end of Parkstone near Avonhead road is also not straight and is near a busy route for school children attending Avonhead School. No parking should be enforced on one side of the road in this region.
12692	Nick	Jackson	have some concerns		You should offer residential permit parking, otherwise it becomes hard for residents to find parking near their houses. Many people also use this parking when they could easily walk/bike/other transport to get there so having free parking for such a long time incentivizes this so maybe consider reducing the time.
12622	Deborah	Jones	do not support the plan		As a rate payer who has worked at the University for a period of time, the areas proposed for 120 min parking during the day are actually required for staff and students to be able to access the University. There is insufficient parking on-campus therefore if the on street parking is removed it will only push people to park further away or make it inaccessible. In addition almost all of the properties around Dovedale campus (Area 3) have off street parking available and therefore should not be impacted. The university has been located there since 1957 and residents should have been aware of that when deciding to live there. I feel very strongly that parking should be available to allow all users of the university to park within a reasonable distance, as they contribute considerably to Christchurch as a whole, and as other methods of transport are not necessarily suited to those attending (health and disability issues, childcare requirements, or living in public transport inaccessible areas) etc then the parking options on street need to remain .
13059	Kathryn Therese	Williamson	support the plan		
13728	shona	mcdonald	support the plan		because of the emphasis on cycle lanes and road narrowing (twice around here) you managed to create this problem of parking. if only the public transport got as much thought and input perhaps the patronage would increase
12731	Louise	Clark	do not support the plan		I work at the College of Education in Dovedale Avenue. The University have made the cost of parking in the University car parks prohibitive. The cost is \$800 for 2018 and going up to \$1000 for 2019. Many of us can not justify paying this sort of money and have little choice but to park in the surrounding streets. I work from 9am to 5pm and as such most of the parks in surrounding streets have gone by the time I get to work so I have to search for a park as it is each day. I imagine if the the parking changes to 120 minutes, parking will be nearly impossible. I like biking but don not feel I have a safe pathway to work from the hills. If it is changed staff will use the 120m and then rush out after this time and move places, if there are places. I do feel for the neighbours but what choice do we have. I walk these streets everyday in my lunch hour and have noticed over the last 3 years a change in population from retired people on the whole to a lot of student flats. Patches of the area are becoming quite rundown. If you could convince the university to halve the cost of parking in the car parks it would probably bring staff back into University parking. I definitely do not support this plan.
12719	Ben	van Noorden	do not support the plan		Parking problems caused by students are still going to occur under the new plan. Students who drive, will still drive to university and will still need somewhere to park. There still aren't enough university parks available for people who purchase a parking permit (shown by the significant increase in price of a 9 month permit by the university for 2018) therefore there is still need for street parking elsewhere around the campus. If more P120 zones are introduced it will simply move the parking problem to other streets where there are no restrictions. These zones being enforced by the council are in no way improving the problem they are simply shifting the problem to different area. The only way to truly solve the issue is to provide enough cheap parking close to the university for the entire driving student population, parking time restrictions just isn't going to change anything/
12627	Michael	Summerfield	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	
13228	Paula	Green	do not support the plan	Ms	I currently work on the Dovedale Campus. Parking is not a huge issue in surrounding streets. I think this is just a money making scheme for the university so that people who go there will have to pay the parking fees which are exorbitant. The university will be able to collect a lot more money and places where you could easily park before will not be available. The most obvious solution would be for UC to lower their costs for parking on the Dovedale campus so they did not have empty parks. It is ludicrous that the car parks are empty due to the high costs.If the users could use the car parks there would be no need to restrict parking nearby. The university is not currently making much money out of parking on the Dovedale campus. With the proposed changes they will be. What about people who are older or not in good health. How do they get to the Dovedale campus. They either pay \$8 per day of \$800 per year. These changes assume that everyone has the ability to walk or bike there. If there is no where to park what are these people supposed to do
13063	Greg	Rhodes	do not support the plan		I own the white [REDACTED]. Half of the available parking between Rutherglen Ave and Lynfield Ave is in front of my house.  We DO NOT wish to have restricted parking on Dovedale Ave between Rutherglen and Lynfield Ave where you have indicated in red.  Reason: 1. It is currently not an issue 2. I work from home and very often have clients who are here for more than 2 hours 3. We park one off our own vehicles on the road during the day in front of our house as we have limited space at the rear s have received tickets when parked in Rutherglen Ave  Please note we are on holiday [REDACTED]

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					Please leave in front of our house as it is now. No restriction
12784	David & Ruth	Towns	support the plan		
13004	Keith	Dixon	have some concerns	Householder/observer/Te Whare WÄ nanga o Waitaha employee	<p>The two big problems re individuals are "addiction to cars" and "poor economic signals". The community problems are congestion, air pollution, greenhouse gases, pedestrian and cyclists safety, and unsightliness of roadside parking.</p> <p>The university is perfectly entitled to levy car park charges from a cost of provision point of view and an incentive to use public transport point of view. The council should follow suit by implementing virtual parking meters - virtually all the motorists have smart phones or similar. A charging regime similar to the short-stay multistorey at Christchurch Airport should work. Environment Canterbury should be given a guaranteed minimum income on condition it runs bus services to various parts of the city direct to and from Ilam Road and Dovedale Avenue to coincide with lectures starting on the hour and finishing just before the hour. The revenue from the parking meters should be used to fund this guarantee. Any excess should be used to fund walking and cycling routes separated from the roads and to fit chicanes on roads such as Waimairi Road, Clyde Road, Parkstone Avenue and Athol Terrace, because the signs with 50 in the middle of a red circle are ineffective.</p> <p>Submitters may be less annoyed if you make the link behind "Map Illustrating Area 3 (pdf)" open in a new window.</p>
13235	John	Mackintosh	have some concerns		<p>I endorse the Upper Riccarton Residents Association's submission. In addition I object to the idea of extending the current 120P restrictions to the full year, that is December to February. In my experience as a long term resident in the area I notice that parking from December to February is not a problem with students but is restrictive for the residents.</p> <p>I also see no need to extend the current restriction which according to the signs in the street is until 4pm rather than 5pm as set out in the material sent to us. In our experience there is no problem after 4pm.</p> <p>What is a problem with 120P is the difficulty for residents who need to park on the road sometimes. For example when having repairs to the drive or house or for guests at social occasions. It is also a problem for a resident's housekeeper or gardener or tradesperson. This type of visitor has been issued with infringement notices in Rutherglen Avenue.</p> <p>I therefore strongly support Residents Parking Permits in streets where both sides are 120P.</p>
12969	Wendy	Risdon	do not support the plan	Uni Health Centre	Parking in the University car parks has increased exponentially over the last 5 years to the point many staff are now opting to park off site and walk rather than pay for a staff/student parking permit. Staff wages have not increased by more than 1-2% and parking fees have gone up 250% or more, in the last 5 years. Personally, I travel 68 km to work so it is not possible to bus or bike as some would suggest. Changing the signs and times allowed will only shift the problem to another area. Why not work with the University to make parking more affordable?
12702	Lisa	Fry	do not support the plan		It's not fair on university students to have to walk for hours to get to classes especially if it's raining and we have to sit in wet clothes, as it is there is no close parking with no fees by Ilam campus. The public transport is not going to get me fair when I live on the other side of Christchurch. I can't walk either strongly don't support this plan
12724	Olivia	Duff	do not support the plan		Parking fees at the University of Canterbury are already incredibly high. To have to park 15 minutes walk from campus already negates the point of driving to University, and a 120 restriction on these streets will only increase the strain on streets where the restriction does not exist. We are broke students - enforcing this restriction will not cause us to "see the light" and begin paying the ridiculous campus parking fees - it will only exasperate the issue. Perhaps the council and its residents should approach this issue by considering why students park on residential streets in the first place. The fact is students cannot afford \$8/day parking when residents can comfortably park in their driveways or front lawns instead of the public streets.
13719	Nick	Lee	have some concerns	IURRA	<p>Dear sir/madam:</p> <p>This is a letter to the council that I am a supporter of the proposal put forth by the Ilam Upper Riccarton Resident Association.</p> <p>Nick Lee</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12714	Michael	Franks	support the plan		<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I have written in before on the 7th of February, but am disappointed I have not had a reply for a month!  I am writing to inquire about a parking permit for [REDACTED] Siska Place, Ilam, Christchurch 8041.  There are six tenants, all students, in my household with cars, and only three onsite parking spots, garage included.  The street we live on, Siska Place, is a heavily ticketed cul-de-sac next to the University of Canterbury. The street has over 40 houses on it, most with the same number of onsite parking as ours.  There are four parking spots at the end of the street that are free to the public, and have no time limit. The rest of the street is either a no-park zone, or a 120 minute limit during university hours and dates.  Since all six of the tenants in our household are students, we will be at university during the stated ticketed hours, and are worried there will be not enough parking to stop our cars from being ticketed.</p> <p>I understand the Transport Operations Unit may consider a residents parking permit if the following conditions are met:  -there is no off-street parking at all on your property and  -there is no space on the property that could be converted to off-street parking and  -there is no private parking within a reasonable distance that could be used and  -there are no other traffic engineering matters that would exclude this, such as parking meters.</p> <p>As stated above, while there is limited off-street parking, my household is three spaces short to fit all tenants vehicles on the property.</p> <p>We are renting the property we currently reside in, and there is no space on the property to be converted into off-street parking.</p> <p>There is little-to-no private parking within reasonable distance that can be used due to the spots being timed and ticketed.</p> <p>There are no other traffic engineering matters that would exclude this, such as parking meters.</p> <p>I understand you are not required to provide on-street parking where the amount of off-street parking is insufficient for the number of vehicles at a property, so I appeal to your kind-hearted nature to help a young group of budding students avoid paying out our ears for unavoidable parking fines, and help us scrape by on whatever we can muster from our many part-time jobs.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you, and thank you for your time.</p> <p>Michael Franks</p>
12861	Cameron	Kirk	do not support the plan		
13052	Peter	Ward	do not support the plan		<p>We extremely oppose the restricted parking outside our residence in Solway Avenue. As a ratepayer for [REDACTED] Solway Av it would not be right to take away our right to park outside our own residence. Both residences own two cars and as we share a driveway it would be impossible to cope without the right to park outside our own home.</p> <p>The only solution would be a residence sticker to allow us parking at any time.</p> <p>Also it doesn't solve 'parking problems'.</p>
13060	Tony	Hamilton	do not support the plan		

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13069	Helen	Gardiner	do not support the plan		<p>We extremely oppose the restricted parking outside our residence in Solway Av. As a rate payer for two properties [REDACTED] Solway it is very unjust to take away the right to park outside our own property. As both residences own two cars it would be impossible to cope with, as we share the driveway</p> <p>The only solution would be a residence sticker to allow us parking at any time. Also it doesn't solve "parking problems" only creates more</p>
13090	yang	li	do not support the plan		<p>we need park our car outside my house on roadside more than 2 hours during the day.</p> <p>Constant traffica turnover during the day.</p>
13123	Richard	Hudson	have some concerns		<p>I am concerned about the complete underutilisation of both campus car parks on Solway Avenue. Students are required to purchase a permit for \$400 a year to park in those car parks but with being mostly empty, students are opting to park on the streets near the campus. This seems to be an illogical but unsuccessful strategy by Canterbury University to raise revenue which is major contributing factor to parking issues in the area. These car parks should be available to students at no cost as was the case when I studied at the campus previously. The additions of parking restrictions without addressing the underutilisation of those car parks would undermine the reasoning that underpins the review. Address this first and the review parking issues once that is sorted. I am not a student, just a resident but it I feel sorry for students being forced into parking further away or buying a permit for a car parks that are otherwise empty. The university should be a good neighbour and look at what it can do minimise parking issues first.</p>
13088	James and Gabrielle	McKee	have some concerns	IURRA	<p>We are members of the IURRA and support the views expressed through their submission below.</p> <p>The current proposals do not go far enough, the issue of parking will only increase given intentions by UC to expand numbers.</p> <p>Enforcement of parking restrictions is indeed lax.</p> <p>A personal concern is the servicing of the green box outside our home when contractors have parked across and even into our driveway on more than one occasion. We have suggested contact be made between Enable and UC but have been informed that no consent has been given for even a temporary parking space to be allocated to assist contractors.</p> <p>It seems that inconveniencing residents is in order both for UC and Enable.</p> <p>We also have concerns in respect to safety when negotiating from Solway through Montclare to Avonhead Road when the buses try to move through (with great difficulty), leaving drivers coming from the opposite direction, no alternative but to attempt to utilise driveways to avoid a crash into the bus.</p> <p>Another concern is the placement by UC of numerous containers on the Dovedale carpark, an unsightly inconvenience to residents given the professed insistence by UC that it does not intend to provide parking spaces for their staff who work there daily and their students who pay a hefty levy for student amenities such as internet/ library which we would have thought would have been included in the fees. It is all too evident that UC is being run by those with a banking rather than an education background. Whilst profit is required for economic survival, UC proposals tend to seek more effort into ensuring the former.</p> <p>IURRA submission which we endorse:</p> <p>'The current plan is very dated and needs to be established for at least the next 5 years. Current student numbers have eclipsed pre earthquake levels and the University is on an aggressive growth plan and strategy. Our Committee has given the matter much urgent thought and discussion and is unanimous in its views. We agree with the circulated proposal but are adamant it does not go far enough to address serious problems in Area 3.</p> <p>Our first consideration was to determine why we need a parking plan, and we think it is required for at least 5 different reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety. Current congestion and illegal parking over entranceways is making egress from and into properties dangerous.</li> <li>2. Access. For residents to their own properties, visitors, service and emergency vehicles</li> <li>3. Quiet and reasonable enjoyment of ones property and environs for rate and rent payers</li> <li>4. Congestion</li> </ol>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>5. The need for an expanding and progressive modern city to do all it can to encourage its citizens to utilize public transport and embrace the many new cycleways in which council has invested enormously.</p> <p>Cuirrent restrictions have done little to tackle this issue. A P120 on just one side of these streets enables students to park, attend their one lecture or do a limited amount on campus and depart again. Those wishing to stay longer and usually the full academic day then take ALL of the parking on the side opposite. It is also our experience that enforcement in the area is lax currently.</p> <p>We believe that in the streets nearest the University that restrictions should apply to both sides of the street, and that residents should have permits, a maximum of 2 per residence which would grant them exemptions in these areas. Rutherglen currently enjoys these limitations and consequently has much lesser stress regarding traffic. Alternatively if there are restrictions on but one side of the street, the other should be "Residents Only" parking. There are many examples around New Zealand where this works successfully, Kelburn in Wellington is one that comes readily to mind.</p> <p>We believe for the 5 reasons stated above restrictions should extend the full length of Parkstone Avenue and into the busy thoroughfare of Athol Terrace.</p> <p>Our Association is quite adamant about these submissions and would suggest if Council don't approve our extension of the proposal, residents should have a chance to meet publicly with City Council traffic engineers to hear and discuss the full rationale of their proposal or refusal to extend such.'</p>
13122	Audrey	Sia	do not support the plan		<p>By supporting the plan, it will have constant traffic turnover, making the road even busier than what it currently is, which is busy enough.</p> <p>May we request for white lines for the side street parking to be marked especially between driveways? At the moment, some are not marked. I've experienced problem in getting into my driveway as 2 cars were parked too close to my driveway.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Audrey</p>
13223	Alison	Mackintosh	have some concerns	Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association	<p>I endorse the Upper Riccarton Residents Association's submission. In addition I object to the idea of extending the current 120P restrictions to the full year, that is December to February. In my experience as a long term resident in the area I notice that parking from December to February is not a problem with students but is restrictive for the residents.</p> <p>What is a problem with 120P is the difficulty for residents who need to park on the road sometimes. For example when having repairs to the drive or house or for guests at social occasions. It is also a problem for a resident's housekeeper or gardener or tradesperson. This type of person has been issued with tickets in Rutherglen Avenue.</p> <p>I believe the restrictions should extend the full length of the portion of Solway Avenue between Maidstone Road and Dovedale Avenue.</p> <p>I therefore strongly support Residents Parking Permits in streets where both sides are 120P. If there is parking only on one side of the street the other should be Residents Only parking.</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
13908	Malcolm	McConnell	do not support the plan		See below for attachments Most people park in Solway Avenue all day. Introducing a 2 hour parking restriction will mean that every two hours there will be a mass movement of cars, and potential chaos. The issue for me is one of car owners running late, and who find a space by parking over house owners driveways. See attached photo.
13964	Toni	Carter	do not support the plan		We are members of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and endorse the submission presented on behalf of IURRA
13416	Russell	Clark	do not support the plan		We live at ■■■ Solway Street. There a 3 adults that work at different times. I do night shift so I have to leave my car out on the street so the others can go to work. We never have problems with any uni students parking there cars at our end as they think its to far to walk. if you need to put in restrictions have for residence's only and they can apply for a card or proof that they live there.  Once again my concerns are I have a short driveway and 3 large cars to park.  One Question. Why not build more car park buildings first, charge the students to use them. Put cheaper bus fares on as in free for uni students between 7-5 etc.  To me this is unnecessary and put more burden on all students
12980	Alison	Holcroft	do not support the plan	Personal submission	I work at the University and commute by car - there are few alternative options from where I live. Yes, I could drive to a Rangiora Bus Stop, take the bus into Papanui, and change to an Orbiter. That's about an hour and a half. On occasion I get dropped off at Northcote and cycle. However the car has to be my main method of commute. From time to time I buy parking stickers for the somewhat expensive university car park - this is a considerable cost because I am not one of the highly paid elite to whom parking fees are a negligible consideration. The rest of the time I park and walk. Yes, I realise that this may be a source of annoyance to the local homeowners but wait a moment! Proximity to the University sends up their values and, even if it did not, I wonder just when residents got 'property rights' over the bit of road outside their house? It's not like people are camping overnight, dumping rubbish and using private property for their personal and digestive needs. (A problem in other areas.) I do accept the possibility that it might be helpful to allow some shorter parking times (one hour?) adjacent to public parks but I am not sure that I see this in the plan.
12643	Joy	Bowley	do not support the plan	University of canterbury	This is a crazy plan, the cars will just park further out and the same issues will arise with the neighbours. For goodness sake talk to the UC Council and get them to start thinking sensibly about encouraging staff to use the car parks. No wonder the neighbours get upset as they are seeing these all empty. Students cannot afford such ridiculous costs for parking
12987	Glenn	Fyall	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury, School of Health Sciences	It is my view that University policy to increase their 'on-campus' parking fees for students and staff has resulted in a significant under utilisation of these spaces and resulted in external pressure on the wider community streets. Both Ilam and Dovedale campus in particular, have significant vast acres of car parking spaces unfilled during 9am-5pm parking and this spills out into the neighbouring streets. As the student numbers are increasing back to pre quake levels this has a direct correlation to the increase pressure on the surrounding community. If the university were to decrease their obsession with revenue gaining from car parking and make these spaces available at more reasonable costs, I am sure that this would help alleviate some of the external pressure put on the community streets.
12963	Sophie	Guy	have some concerns		I study at the University and work at the University, although I try to cycle to work, sometimes I am forced to drive in. On these days I choose to park on the street due to a lack of available parking on campus and to reduce costs. it is \$8 per day to park on campus which is extremely high for someone working part time, and would be even harder to afford for a full time student. Parking within walking distance is something that is needed for the University as it is expanding fast and already hasn't got enough parks to service the number of students and staff attending.
13093	Ruth	Emmens	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	I empathise with the neighbours surrounding the College of Education as I live on Stourbridge street and have the  same problem with employees from Barrington Mall parking on my street but it is something that I accept as I chose to live close to the Mall. When I commenced at the University we were based on Ilam campus and the parking fees on campus were very reasonable and I was able to afford this on my salary. After the earthquakes we were relocated to Dovedale units and I was able to take advantage of the street parking. We will be relocating back to Ilam this week and as the University has increased the parking fees I am unable to afford a parking voucher. Once we move there will be less people on this side but with the parking fees at University so high and continuing to rise I think that you will still have a high number of staff/students parking on the streets and if the plan for area three goes ahead then you will just move the street parking problem to another area. Just wondering if the council can work with the University as I would not like to see the number of students coming to UC to go down, because parking is a big part of being able to attend and if there is no where to park and no convenient way of getting here, they will consider going to another University. I am lucky that I can catch the bus to work but this is not always convenient and as I exercise after work and need a car to get there. Whenever I have caught the bus it is so busy full of school children that I have to stand up as children these days no longer seem to offer their seats to older people.
12738	Rachel	Martin	do not support the plan		The parking issue complaints have not been specified. What is the complaint? Cars parking on the street from 9.00am -5.00pm? The streets are empty after this time. The University has increased their parking fees, (people can't afford them anymore) has had rebuild issues (earthquaked buildings) meaning less parking spaces available, and College of Education is moving over to the University of Canterbury Campus in a year's time. You do not need to change the timings on the area around College of Education. When College of Education moves spaces will become living spaces for students and they will have car parking attached. In the meantime people that can't afford parking will just move further out to park outside the next peoples houses. There is currently a secondary school attached to College of

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					Education as well because of the earthquakes which creates traffic due to drop offs and pick ups. This will also be gone soon. Review what is currently already there. For example there is a 15 minute park on one side of the road on Athol Tce. This has not been changed since the factory was demolished and the New World shopping centre and home for the elderly was built. There is parking space for the residents inside and New World has their own parking why is this a 15 minute (can't remember whether it is 10 or 15 minutes) space. There are no residents there. It is not worth changing the parking limits as this will all change again in one years time. Wait until you see what the parking patterns are once College of Education moves.
12694	kelsie	harris	do not support the plan		parking at university costs \$400 annually and will continue to rise each year. it is unaffordable for most students to pay this fee each year. Also on top of paying for parking, you are not guaranteed a park and due to earthquake repairs still continuing, it is very hard to get a park at the university and it's outskirts after the tradesmen arrive each day around 8am. this signage would severely inhibit university students who cannot afford to pay for parking by eliminating even more places we can park with the 120 signs. please don't put this unnecessary burden on UC students, or at least talk to the university about parking arrangements
12837	Bobbie	Henderson	have some concerns		Parking restrictions are becoming common around New Zealand cities which is all good but the Christchurch City Council needs to provide the property owners / residents with a parking permit and visitors permit to allow them to park without infringement.
12893	Matt	Rogers	support the plan		Residents need protection from inconsiderate and dangerous parking. Unless the rules are enforced the public will continue with the general attitude that nothing really matters or that rules are only applicable to less important people.
12663	rob	stowell	do not support the plan	university of canterbury	This plan fails to address the parking needs of university students, staff, and visitors. It seeks to push the problem further away from the university, but fails to address the underlying issue: the university's failure to provide adequate parking, and over-charging for existing parking.
12687	Liam	Cosgrove	do not support the plan		I use the Maidstone Rd parking in question as I drive from home to uni and then onwards to my workplace in the city centre.  This plan would make it incredibly difficult or prohibitively expensive to travel effectively. I can see myself continuing to park in the 2 hour zones and taking the risk of a fine as this is still less than the cost of a uni parking permit  The people living near the university should not really complain seeing as they knew it was there when they bought their homes. This would also have been factored into the price they paid.
12693	Gabby	Watson	do not support the plan		This doesn't actually help solve the problem, if you moves the students/staff of UC on they will park somewhere else and annoy someone else. The problem is that parking at UC used to be free over the summer when the vast majority of students were on break however the university is now charging over that period increasing the number of people trying to park on the streets. Even if staff/students fork out for the parking fees there is no guarantee they will get a space as the parking on campus is very limited and massively under proportioned for the number of people who drive to university. With buses not accessing all suburbs and Christchurch not being the most cycle friendly city it is clear why people would choose to drive. What is needed is more parking available for these staff and students and then they will most likely stop parking outside people's houses.
13001	Mike	Flaws	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	I am on the staff at the university and park on the road because the parking fees at the university are excessive.  The March/November restrictions would work if theuniversity allowed free parking in the off season. The university carparks are empty then but people still have to park on the streets to get free parking.  More restricted parking will just push the problem further out. I use a bike from my car to the university.
12821	Jaye	Atkin	do not support the plan		I live in a property on [REDACTED], if this plan happens as proposed I will likely not be able to park my car outside where I live during the day because of the parking time restrictions - I have my car parked on Ilkey Place either outside the front gate of the property or on the opposite side of the street. One side of Ilkey Place will be ok to park on but with the number of residents cars in this area there is not enough space for everyone - having to move my car elsewhere during the day or get a parking fine for being parked outside the property I live in is not a solution I am happy with. Another option could be making some areas residents only parking, so university students will not park there. Imposing time restrictions just makes things more difficult for residents who the parking plan is supposed to benefit.
13071	Andrea	Garrick	have some concerns		P-90 minutes is adequate  Permanent home owners in Wadeley should have a parking sticker to park in their street.  The proposed P120 is on the northside of Wadley which is predominantly student flats - they will not submit a form as restrictions will inhibit the student 6x cars - owner of the flats not interested - only in getting the rent.  South side properties are mostly owner occupied therefore a more accurate submission from those who live in the street
13147	Elizabeth	Campbell	have some concerns		I tried to have my say online - I don't want to create an acct - (Firefox, Thunderbird)  I live in Wadeley Rd [REDACTED] so the proposed changes apply to the other side from me. I will accept this and suggest perhaps restrictions should be extended to my side

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					of the road.  For me it is very difficult to drive out of my drive as there are always cars parked there during the day. Visibility is greatly reduced and the car has to drive onto the road in such a way that you feel very vulnerable to traffic coming from the left
14061	Liz	Taylor	support the plan		
13595	Roger	Coop	do not support the plan		We should be able to put our car on the road and leave it all day if necessary.
13166	Chloe	Dick	have some concerns		<p>I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and I support their submission. In particular I have concerns about the rights of residents to access on street parking for visitors and overflow resident vehicles.</p> <p>This area has changed over recent years and there are now many more rented houses. This has meant that there is often not enough car parking spaces on the rented property. This is because the property owner has only to make room for 2 car parking spaces. This is the case in our section of Waimairi Rd. I will give you three examples in our immediate area but there are many more in surrounding streets.</p> <p>■■■■ Waimairi on our shared drive has been converted by a landlord into a five bedroom student flat and the residents have 5 cars with barely enough room to park. (He converted the two car garage to two bedrooms).</p> <p>■■■■ Waimairi Rd was a 4 bedroom home but a landlord has converted it to a 6 bedroom student flat and there are 6 cars. These students use a nearby vacant piece of land to park their cars and this section has now turned into a complete tip, filled with rubbish and overgrown.</p> <p>■■■■ Waimairi Rd which was consented by the CCC for a landlord to build a 6 bed ensuite house even though there were objections from neighbours .....has 6 students and 6 cars.</p> <p>There are further student houses right up Waimairi RD. I request limited parking on both sides of Waimairi Rd in Area 3 with residents being able to apply for permits.</p>
12619	Michael	Welsh	support the plan	Bishop Julius Hall	I live at ■■■ Waimairi Road and we get a lot of permanent parking from students at College House. Often they are well over the meter mark from the edge of the driveway and on numerous occasions I have had to call CCC re-parking. One weekend I couldn't leave the house because of inconsiderate parking. Bishop Julius Hall has currently the right number of parks for their students.
12803	Sanky	Meng	have some concerns		<p>I generally support the plan but I do have some concerns. We can only park 2 cars inside of our yard. However, we have more than 2 cars from the tenants in our house. We defiantly need extra places to park around the property. There are no parking places on the west side of Waimairi Road outside my property. We have to use the parking area on Dovedale Ave and Wadeley Rd. If we (as residents) do park at 2 hours area on days off because there is no car park for whole day park available, we would be fined. Could residents around this area have a label that claims that we do stay here and we can be exempted from this regulation?</p> <p>The reality is there is insufficient car park area available given the increasing students numbers. The proposal above is only a short term solution (parking demand). For long run, please kindly setup a new car park area for uni staffs or uni students - just like hospital park and ride which is a brilliant idea (this will ease the congestion around Ilam area and save fuels too - reduces carbon emission). Hospital 'park and ride' project is really successful.</p>
12845	Brendon	Bradley	support the plan		
12914	Evan and Sue	Maguire	support the plan		<p>Edited to add email received: Further to our submission earlier, we advise that we are members of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and that we endorse their submission made earlier.</p> <p>Regards, Evan and Sue Maguire</p>
12993	Jeremy	Clark	do not support the plan		<p>Thanks for the chance to make a submission.</p> <p>The university plans to keep ramping up its parking charges while not replacing parking spaces it used to offer. So much of this problem is of its making.</p> <p>As residents at ■■■ Waimairi Road, we are quite concerned that increased parking restrictions in our area already make it difficult for visitors to park their cars when they come to our home. In 2012, the council already yellow lined parking on our side of Waimairi Road. (We were opposed, but were away in 2012 for my work, and though we gave the council a forwarding address in Nelson, they only put materials in our letterbox that never got to us.)</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>The current proposal would also ban visitor parking on Maydell Street, which is one of the nearest places that visitors to our home can park. SO WE ARE OPPOSED TO MAYDELL SREET BEING INCLUDED IN THE PARKING BAN AREA.</p> <p>More generally, we don't support increased parking restrictions in our area, since this will thwart students and staff of the university who are trying to find parks for work/study as the university chooses to under-provide parking.</p> <p>But if the plan does go ahead, we ask that Maydell Street not be included in it.</p> <p>Sincerely,Jeremy and Nicola Clark</p>
13098	Hugh	Taylor	have some concerns		I am a member of the Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association and I endorse the submission submitted by Phil McGoldrick on behalf of the this organisation. I strongly support the provision of residents' parking or residents' permits in Area 3.
13108	Shelley	McAlavey	have some concerns		While the 2 hour restriction has made a difference, there is no room for visitors or residents to access parking outside their homes. As I have clients coming to my home, it is imperative that they can access parking within a close vicinity to my home. Currently, there is still no room for these clients during the day - many university students seem to have a 'swapping arrangement' so that, when they are leaving, their 'mate' is ready to take over the park. Often, they will coordinate their cars and it has just become an exercise in having a different car in a different park, but the same students every day - so as to avoid parking wardens/tickets etc. Residents permits would be extremely useful, as would one side being for 'residents only'.
14054	Suzanne Cuff & Tony Muir	None	do not support the plan		As residents where do we park. During university time we struggle for parking now, if we go down the road. We are on corner [REDACTED] Currently 3 people living in flat 3 cars
13128	Ashleigh	Parrott	do not support the plan	Ilam Upper Riccarton Residents Association	I see how and why the extended parking can be an issue for residents in this area. However, as a student living in this area, I know and understand the stresses of having to find a car park anywhere in the Ilam area. There is limited car parks available to purchase parking permits for on campus and even if you purchase a permit you may not be able to find a free park. For people who travel in daily this can be a stressful and expensive time. By restricting both sides of the road to 120 minutes, it means that any student that wishes to stay at the University for a full day, must be looking to move their car regularly (which is incredibly disruptive to study) or park a large distance from the university which come winter months can prove unsafe (there has been several incidents in the last few years about people being approached or attacked in this area when walking to their cars in the evening). Ultimately this is a largely student populated area, and there needs to be some consideration made for people who cannot afford to live in this area (it's expensive due to its proximity to the University) and need to travel in on a daily basis. Unless the university is prepared to offer more student parking, it would simply come across as a revenue making scheme to restrict all the on street parking to 120 minutes.
12715	Lois	Tonkin	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	Sometime this year-currently June but perhaps a little later- the entire College of Education (which has not, but the way, been Christchurch College of Education for *many* years) will move to the Ilam site. At that point many of those who currently park in the streets around the Dovedale site will no longer do so, and the parking patterns there can be expected to change radically. It could then be that residents are stuck with 120 min zones outside their homes unnecessarily, and in fact to their own detriment. I think it is extremely short sighted, expensive, and foolish to make radical changes to the parking zoning in that area when there will shortly be a big change in the number of staff working in the vicinity of the College if Education.
12989	Michael	Tarren-Sweeney	have some concerns	University of Canterbury	UC's radical parking fees is the cause of parking overflowing into residential streets. Several years ago, when parking fees were reasonable, the UC carparks were overflowing. Now, since parking fees have been increased by several hundred percent, they are half or three quarters empty. Take a look at the UC carparks off Solway avenue, and compare them to the number of cars parked on Solway avenue itself and the neighbouring streets. The university is disingenuous in its reasons for increasing parking fees. They say it is to encourage use of public transport and to help the environment. But if that was a viable option for UC students and staff then why are they still driving cars to the university. The answer is that many of us live in places that don't have feasible public transport connections to the university. For example, I live in West Melton. How am I meant to get to work other than by private car? Some people suggest that UC raised its parking fees to increase income to the university. But if you look at the reduction in cars parking on campus, that clearly isn't the case, even when taking into account the higher fees. I would think that their overall parking revenue has fallen. I believe the real reason for the massive hike in parking fees is so they can eventually close some of the campus car parks and use the land for other purposes. If that is correct, then UC is effectively shifting one of the costs of running a university (namely, parking facilities) to the community and council. When I first moved to UC from the University of Newcastle in 2006, a yearly staff parking at UC (around \$150) was half the cost of a yearly permit at Newcastle (around \$300). Now it is the reverse, the UC yearly permit (\$800) is twice the cost of the Newcastle University permit (\$400).
12754	Sarah	Vergeer	do not support the plan		<p>There is not enough university parkings for students and teachers</p> <p>Students already have big enough loans generally students who live far away from University park there, needing to do so for the day (helps with the money situation) it's not possible for a lot of them to go back to their car three hours later and</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					change their park - when you are working you don't get time in the day to look for a new park every two hours - university is the equivalent to a full time job during the week for a lot of us
12912	Craig	Mennie	support the plan		
12891	Nicola	Cody	support the plan		As I live in a neighbouring area to the university I have become increasingly concerned about the parking in this area.  As cars are parked over or close to driveways it is becoming difficult to get a clear view as to what oncoming traffic when departing. I have also seen many cars left for days unattended also obstructing driveways.
12723	Chris	Coey	do not support the plan		The reasons why pressure has gone on to the local streets is largely due to the cost of parking provided by the University which has gone up 15% each year over the past 5 years and which is due to go up by a further 15% for the next 2 years. Remember this is paying only for the right to "hunt" for a park without a guarantee of actual parking.  Compounding the parking issue could also be due to the University's decision last year to charge for parking all year (removing free on-site parking from December to end of February).  The suggestion to make further restrictions on streets near the University will only push the problem out to other streets and cost the rate payers more for replacing signage.  A better solution could be to paint lines by entrance ways to help residents and motorists ensure clear entry to properties. Also, perhaps encourage the University to provide more parking at a more realistic cost to encourage people to park on-site rather than on the street.  By understanding the underlying issue, residents will hopefully start to understand the reason why there has been an increase in on street parking. Should the suggested changes proceed, the reduction of long term parking could be seen by some as assisting the University to continue increasing parking charges.
12668	Rachel	Dillon	do not support the plan		I believe that the March to Nov restrictions should come back into force. I don't believe that the summer school warrants complete all year round restrictions. I can imagine it's very frustrating for local residents to see year round parking problems when Dec-Feb the campus carparks are empty. FYI, they are empty Dec-Feb and I know this because I'm on campus every day and thought to myself it's ridiculous and felt genuinely sorry for local residents.
13950	Robert	Hurst	do not support the plan		On the west side of the College of Education campu, we have seen a steady increase in demand for street parking in recent years. However we do not support the proposed parking restrictions, particularly on the west side of the Dovedale campus. This would presumably push parking pressure further outward from the campus, and if extended out as far as Westmont St, it would considerably inconvenience residents there, as well as Uni staff and students.  One observation which we believe is relevant is the very low utilisation of parking spaces in the University Carparks Nos. 1 and 2. Between them they make available in excess of 300 parking spaces (excluding the area of Carpark 1 currently in use for container storage). A count of the actual cars using these on 4 representative days (21, 22, 26, 27 March), during the Uni working day, and in a range of weather conditions (warm and sunny to cold and rainy) gives figures in the range 25 - 45, usually toward the lower end. More comprehensive utilisation would be expected to ease the situation on Dovedale, Solway, and Parkstone Avenues, where typically 97-100% of parking spaces were occupied at these same times. The situation is presumably the result of University car parking charges being fairly high. While I appreciate that CCC may not be in a position to influence the University policies on carpark management, it would seem simply to make good business sense for the University to substantially lower charges in order to get more customers, not necessarily losing money in the process, and the Uni might gain some "good neighbour" kudos.
12852	Anne	Fogarty			I think this is " A bridge too far", you want to turn our suburbs into a commercial area. Our visitors could be fined for parking outside our homes! That is not acceptable in the suburbs. It is something confined to mid city places and should remain there. It is up to the university to get car parks. They have a lot of property.
13070	Carol Ella	Harris	do not support the plan		I'm not happy with the proposed parking on Westmont St outside my place, its going to be very inconvenient to my visitors and people that come all day, not to mention, its going to be difficult to get in and out of driveway if cars are parking in parked areas there, right outside my place.  I like it the way it is right now and certainly would not have bought this property if I'd known this parking was going to happen. I'm very concerned about it.
13072	Ron	Marriott	have some concerns		1. I think the P120 parking is a good idea and should help residents in the affected area. I reside at ■■■ Westmont St which at present is not marked out for parking. If the P120 plan is implemented I feel that the existing problem will move into our area which is a real concern.  These streets weren't designed to have vehicles parked on both sides of the road. If this takes place there is only room left for one vehicle to move through.  Safety. It is my concern as if anyone opens a car door while someone is passing or a second car comes along there is no room to pass or pull over.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					2. It annoys me that the university car park on Dovedale Avenue has vacant lots, while student maybe for cost reasons park on the street.
13151	D	Rastrick	have some concerns		<p>1. Put P120 restrictions on both sides of Westmont St from Glendise Ave to Monteclare Ave</p> <p>2. Switch bus route out of Monteclare Ave the Parkside Ave as Montclare Ave is to narrow and often with cars parked both sides it is only one way. (i.e. down Parkside Ave and long Solway Ave)</p> <p>3. There should be 'no parking' on West side of Brodie St from opposite Athol Tce to Parkstone Ave.</p> <p>(Right turning traffic from Athol Tce create real danger to cars currently parked there)</p>
13155	Avril	Wootton	do not support the plan		<p>1. I object to changes as people would use unmarked car parks rather than timed one across the road.</p> <p>2. There is carpark in Solyway Ave not use to it's potential</p> <p>3. [REDACTED] The only family contact I have is when they come in January to stay. They need parking not just for two hours. I have no other family support.</p> <p>4. I need available parking outside my place for Nurse Maude</p> <p>5. I have the front unit of three properties which share the street parking with all 6 rubbish bins on frontage. if cars are parked there rubbish truck would not access them</p> <p>6. There has not been any notable student parking in Westmont St, Student parking fluctuates near Montclair St, depending on the time of year.</p> <p>7. There are shift workers with a different shifts over road &amp; behind me. Where are they meant to park.</p> <p>8. Drainage is poor in Westmont St, in Autumn road swipers go round cars. Leaves built up = block drains.</p> <p>9. Backing car our driveway differcult for back sections and poorly positioned drive ways. Elderly find this hardest and their friends will not come if they have to back out drive way instead of parking on road.</p> <p>10. Elderly neighbour legally blind - difficulty walking to a care re state of foot paths if no access to parking outside her place</p>
13469	Eamon and Jean	Jackson	do not support the plan		<p>We object to the plan. We regularly walk around these streets and we think the parking restrictions are unnecessary in Westmont Street. Especially when the car park at the College of Education sits mostly unused because of high charges.</p> <p>We have had cause to call for ambulance assistance in the past few years and may well need to again. Ambulance drivers had difficulty navigating our narrow drive so had to park in the street to administer assistance. We are over 65 years old as are many of our neighbours who have elderly visitors and very young grandchildren visiting who have to park nearby. These visitors stay longer than 2 hours. Our drive is very narrow and my own car is parked in the road at times to avoid reversing down the drive.</p> <p>Also in making this area multiple occupancy has led to landlords dazzled by dollar signs, making family homes into multi bedroom, what only can be called hostels with no provision for parking on their property. Parking spaces on site for each rented room should be a requirement, and also reasonable maintenance of gardens.</p> <p>Last year at a property on the corner of Maidstone Road and Avonhead Road had cars parked from their garage across the footpath to the road. We will see more of this until landlords provide more parking for their tenants. Pedestrians were forced to walk in the road, at a roundabout to get past, very awkward for people in wheelchairs, prams, and little children, making this for pedestrians and drivers alike a dangerous situation.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this letter. Yours faithfully Eamon and Jean Jackson</p>
14052	Philip	Jones	do not support the plan		<p>Utilise university car parks to remove students from having to park on our streets. Absolutely ridiculous they are 90% empty, the university car parks.</p> <p>Remove all white lines from Westmont Street</p> <p>More than happy to discuss</p>

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12776	Traci	Stanbury	do not support the plan		As staff at the UC College of Education Dovedale Ave site, I choose to park on these streets surrounding the area. In the past ten years, the University has raised car parking costs from \$99 per year to now \$800 per year, and soon to be \$1000 per year at the Dovedale Ave site. If you look at the allocated car parks within the Dovedale Ave site on any weekday, you will find 80% of them empty, with staff and students choosing to park on the streets rather than pay exorbitant parking fees. If you change the proposed streets to timed parking, you will find the same staff and students will just park further away, as they are very price sensitive, so it doesn't actually solve the problem, just shifts it elsewhere. The College of Education will move to the main University Ilam campus within 12 months, so this move will solve parking issues surrounding the Dovedale Ave site, and make parking surrounding the Ilam campus worse by another 2000 cars. The University of Canterbury is adamant that it has no additional need for more on-site parking for another ten years. I believe the University has a responsibility to provide more parking (and should be required to), at a reasonable rate, for it's staff and students so that they do not inconvenience local residents.
12698	Tessa	Donaldson	do not support the plan		Residents have off street parking available. Students do not, paid parking is not available in the proposed area and is far from main campus that parking there and walking is time consuming, also a danger at night walking from Dovedale to main campus car parks. The cost of parking for an entire year on campus is \$400 which for students is simply not affordable. The decision to extend the 120minute limit to the entire year is excessive and unnecessary as the amount of students drops drastically compared to the normal university year. By limiting parking further you are simply pushing students further away from the campus, not solving the problem.
12642	Paul	Strange	do not support the plan	The Dovedale temporary Units will go this winter	My understanding is the temporary room on the Dovedale site will go and the 500 university staff will move back to Ilam. this problem may go away this winter. The university has a reasonability to provide parks for its staff and students. The university then charges \$800 for use of the park for this year 2018. The Council should presser the university to help solve this problem and use up its empty car parks.
12690	Connod	Rogers	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	University carparks are full and cost \$800 per year. It is full and to expensive so students have very little other choice but to park on the street. This is a real deterant to attending university if we can't park there.
12651	Paul	O'Flaherty	have some concerns		<p>I am an employee of the University of Canterbury who works mainly on the Dovedale side of its campus.</p> <p>My submission is as a private citizen and is about the parking in streets around the Dovedale side of the University's campus.</p> <p>There has been no Christchurch College of Education for seven years. The Dovedale side of the University's campus is the home of the University's College of Education, Health and Human Development (College of EHHD).</p> <p>By the end of 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The College of EHHD (approx 300 staff and 2500 students) will move to the Ilam side of the University's campus</li> <li>- Ao Tawhiti Unlimited Discovery School, a temporary tenant of the Dovedale campus, will have moved to its new St Asaph Street premises</li> <li>- The large pre-fab village on the corner of Waimari Road and Dovedale Village will have been removed and not replaced</li> <li>- Only about 200 University staff will have their usual place of work on the Dovedale side of the of campus, some of whom don't commute by car, and some of whom will choose to park in campus carparks.</li> </ul> <p>I acknowledge the concerns of local residents. The streets have been cluttered in the post-earthquakes years.</p> <p>I also acknowledge that some of the College of EHHD staff and students may choose to continue to park in streets around the Dovedale campus, although I doubt that will be many. (It is a 30 minute walk to and from their new place of work, and not an attractive proposition in winter).</p> <p>I recommend that changes be made to parking provisions in the streets around the Dovedale side of campus until some analysis can be made in 2019 of any changes in parking behaviour around that area resulting from the above changes in working arrangements at the University. This is for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- So as to not disadvantage the much smaller number of car-using University staff remaining on the Dovedale side of campus in 2019 and beyond</li> <li>- So as not to spend unnecessary ratepayers' funds on parking changes that may not be necessary because of those much smaller University staff numbers in the area</li> </ul>
13097	Barbara	Smith	do not support the plan	Ilam Upper Riccarton Reidents Assoc	I am a member of IURRA, and I support fully the submission made by IURRA.

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12641	Grant	Bush	do not support the plan		This plan is only going to push the problem into areas outside Area 3, people still need to park. This problem is caused by the University of Canterbury, why does the Council not put pressure on the University to provide free parking for its staff and visitors
12646	Bernadine	Aulavemai	have some concerns		<p>The name of this plan is incorrect as it refers to an area that is mostly in Ilam, not in Dovedale.</p> <p>This plan is only going to push the parking issue into the wider community and outside the Area 3 map. The main issue is being caused by the University of Canterbury and the exorbitant parking fees they now charge (which many staff cannot afford, let alone the students), and by a lack of a good bus service where people do not need to leave home 2 hours before work to catch 3 buses to arrive on time. The University should do more to alleviate the issue and provide some free parking for visitors but also a discount on parking for those who are financially in need.</p> <p>Also, the University of Canterbury and the Christchurch College of Education are one and the same, not 2 separate entities. They are merely on 2 campuses.</p>
12670	Joby	Joseph	do not support the plan		
12682	Rebecca	Truscott	have some concerns		I would like to say that I do not completely support the proposal. I have friends that live in the area that you are wanting to change to limit the time restrictions on the parking on the street. These restrictions means I can only stay a limited time to visit my friends that live in this area. I think there should be some permits perhaps per household to allow for when friends visit or when residents want to park their own cars in front of their houses. My friend lives in a flat with 3 other people and they each own a car so it is impossible for them all to park up the driveway as well as visitors when we go to visit them. Please consider the consequences for the residents and visitors if these people that live in these areas. Thank you
12684	Ryan	Coey	do not support the plan		
12685	Bree	Oorthuis	do not support the plan	Student at UC	It's hard enough to get a park at uni with a parking permit so why take away space that we could be parking in. You should be supporting future generations in going to university and getting degrees to better our country rather than either making them pay more for parking or skipping classes to go move their car! Rediculous
12688	Alice	McIntyre	do not support the plan		The parking in the area is already insufficient for UC students. This needs to be discussed with UC to ensure there won't be further problems. Introducing more P120s is very inconvenient as most students have days longer than 2 hours, and I am not sure where we are expected to park otherwise. I live in Prebbleton therefore I cannot bike or walk to university, and public transport options are limited. If I purchase an on-campus parking permit, I am not guaranteed a park and can expect to spend up to 20 minutes if not more trying to find a park. For the past three years, I have been walking at least ten minutes from my park to get to university everyday and I would not like this to increase.
12691	Chi	Saunders	have some concerns	Student	<p>I am currently a student at the University and parking is a major issue. I understand that parking in the streets can be frustrating for the residents. However, there needs to be an area where students can park with no restrictions around the university. Many lectures are two hours long or longer. The proposed restrictions will mean many students who have to drive will have nowhere to park, will receive tickets, or will have to park even further away to get a park with no restrictions.</p> <p>Yes, there is campus parking, but this is extremely limited, and is unaffordable for many students as the University keeps raising the price. I believe this is to encourage students to use alternative transport, but this method does not seem to be working, as parking is still a problem, and is now under review by the council.</p> <p>I believe that the proposal will not have significant benefits for the residents as students will need somewhere to park. Unless the parking problem for students is addressed (eg. Council negotiate with University to build a new parking building that is affordable for students), street parking will continue to inconvenience the residents around this area.</p>
12695	Ollie	Chick	do not support the plan		I don't think the new restrictions should be introduced.
12701	Alana	Saunders	support the plan		Sometimes it's raining and I want to go to the gym so I take my car but I can't find a park. Or I have a 10 minute meeting. Meanwhile, someone has parked there for the whole day.
12703	Megan	Goodrich	do not support the plan		University parking is a cost far out of reach for many students including myself and while I understand resident claims, this would just be another barrier in transport to uni. Already walking 15 minutes from a park is a pain and I do not believe this will incentivise people to use alternative transport
12711	Amanda	Dunn	do not support the plan		I attend University of Canterbury. By parking around Dovedale area I am already having to walk 20 minutes to get to uni. By pushing the parking boundary back further how long is it going to take me and other people like me to walk to uni. I shouldn't have to remind you of the fact that Winter is on it's way which will mean I'll be finishing some of my classes when it's dark. Yes we have the option of UC Security walking us to our cars (which is a great idea) but they're going to have to walk us 30-40 minutes away in the cold.



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12712	Nicole	Crow	do not support the plan		As a student at the University of Canterbury I do not support this proposal. The parking for university students is already terribly limited. For those that buy a parking permit there are many cases of still not being able to secure a park. I understand that there is a big push to get more people biking and using public transport but for some of us that is just not feasible. I work on the other side of town everyday after uni and both options do not work for me. I also know of many parents at uni who have school drop offs and picks up. Unless there was a parking facility built for students how can you take away more of our parking options without providing an alternative? As it is I am getting to uni at 7.30am everyday just to get a park. Even sometime when I don't have any classes until the afternoon. This is a ridiculous proposal.
12717	Ella	Latham	have some concerns		As a student on the dovedale campus we really struggle to find parking, and it is really annoying to see the parking that you have to pay for always empty. Maybe an idea could be making the spaces in the parking lot available for 120 minutes as well as road parking.
12725	Jamie	TeHeuheu	do not support the plan		
12726	Ben	Nicholls	do not support the plan		
12730	Rosanna	Buckley	do not support the plan		It is absolutely ridiculous to be targeting University students when our parking that we pay \$400 a year for leaves us with no where to park. There is nowhere near enough parking on campus to cater for the thousands of people who are trying to get qualifications for the future of our people. Personally it is completely unrealistic for me to use any other transport as I live in Southshore. It takes upwards of two hours each way to catch a bus and I can't even imagine how long it would take to cycle to uni. After a half an hour drive, I have to park nearly two suburbs over from uni to avoid accumulating a parking fine, and I can't even park outside my boyfriend's house in Fendalton because the 120 parking was added there last year. He himself has been ticketed numerous times for being parked outside his own house! It's completely unfair that the council is just trying to make money out of everyone by making it impossible to park anywhere without getting a fine.
12732	Maddy	Glen	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	<p>Although this may not effect the outcome of this decision I desperately want to voice my concern for this plan. As an administrator at the University my income is not large. A parking permit for staff at the University is currently \$800 and will increase for 2019, as I'm sure you know. This cost is very prohibitive for me and my family and my situation and distance from home would make it impossible to walk/bike or take public transport.</p> <p>I understand the concern from some residents in the area, however when purchasing or renting property in the area you are aware the street parking is high-use during work hours. I know people who live on some of the streets surrounding Dovedale Ave that have noted their neighbours have become increasingly obsessive about patrolling their area as they have the time and willpower to do so, while many residents are not concerned at all.</p> <p>Changing to P120s for that whole block will have an increased negative impact on residents in the area as student and staff who can not afford parking on-campus will resort to moving their cars every two hours. This will increase foot-traffic, increase the possible risk of traffic-related injuries, and create more disturbance.</p> <p>I hope the person making this decision understands why this would be a potential disaster for the area and the staff/ students at UC who continue to contribute positively to Christchurch and its growth.</p>
12744	Kiana	Angel	do not support the plan		I am a first year student studying at the uni this year and paying for parking at the uni is incredibly ridiculous especially when you aren't even guaranteed a parking spot when you arrive, especially if people have late lectures on as I have heard it's very difficult. Taking away some parking that is already very limited is ridiculous as us students who are mostly already poor, waste fuel driving around to find parks. Most of the time, lectures last all day so 120 min parking is kind of ridiculous when you have 5 hours of lectures and tutorials back to back. I've already had a \$40 ticket for parking in a no parking zone on the 1st of March, not realising what date it was. I can understand from residents point of view that it's frustrating to have so many cars parked in front of their house but it's something they would've known when renting/purchasing the house. I've known that heaps to people turn up late to lectures due to parking struggles. I beg that you please reconsider this parking review. Thanks
12749	bryony	legge	do not support the plan		for someone that is already paying a lot of money to attend uni, to get there 5 days a week with a part time job, gas being so expensive its not easy. we make a commitment to attend uni and less people will show if these plans get put into action. its bad enough having to go across town in peak traffic to then drive around for 20 minutes to get a park, walk 15 minutes to get to class. its not even in the wet season yet and we complain.
12760	Georgia	Taylor	do not support the plan		
12762	Cameron	Gruschow	do not support the plan		<p>To Whom it May Concern</p> <p>I am opposed to any of the proposed P120 parking restrictions set out in the zone around the University of Canterbury. Existing transport problems for students to get to the Ilam Campus have not been resolved to make this plan viable.</p> <p>Firstly, the current amount of carpark supplies in the University itself are far less than the demand for them at peak lecture times. This means that students, who pay</p>



Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
					<p>to use the carparks in the form of a parking permit, cannot find any free, and have to park on the street anyway. The University is not willing to accept increasing the number of supplies available, but instead look to increase the price of their permits, in the hope that this will promote public transport use, and lower demand. What will actually happen, is that students will simply park further away from the campus, spreading out to other areas of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Secondly, a typical full-time University student will be on campus for lectures, research, tutorials, meetings and general study for longer than a two (2) hour period. The number of students are growing, which means there needs to be long-term parking options available around Campus.</p> <p>Thirdly, the current public transport system is simply not good enough to move students to campus efficiently. Why would I take 2 buses to get to a destination in the middle of winter, when I can drive directly and have a short walk to campus? Not everybody lives on a bus route, or near a bus stop. Additionally, our public transport infrastructure is not reliable enough as far as leaving on time. The Council had an opportunity to create a light rail network, which from memory, included an Airport-University link. Instead, this has been shelved, and we are left with a backwards looking city in this regard (look at Auckland, Wellington with their train services to the suburbs).</p> <p>Overall, the vast majority of students do not need to use vehicles to get to university unless there is no other alternative. Many of us are time precious individuals, who have multiple commitments around the city, which unfortunately, public transport cannot get us to as quickly as a personal vehicle parked nearby campus, or even at all. Simply introducing these restrictions will please the residents affected on the streets, but will spread the problem outward around Ilam.</p> <p>I do not condone vehicles illegally parked over access ways for residents, and clearly there are issues around this. I see it walking down the street to Campus on most days. However, the better way to mitigate this problem would be to improve road design. Put barriers in front of driveways to prevent vehicles parking over them for example. Build a carparking building on or near Campus, with the University lowering prices to balance supply and demand, and lower the number of cars on the streets. Another solution is to make the area around the university cheaper to live in for students, so that they can just walk to Campus.</p> <p>The Council cannot bully people to cycle or use public transport for everything (including study). If you want less of an impact, have better facilities to mitigate the problem. Putting up signs will not solve any problems in the long-term to the area.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this submission.</p>
12770	Dave	Quennell	do not support the plan		I walk around this area all the time, the parking situation isn't really the end of the world, I suspect there's a few vocal moaners. There are in reality usually heaps of carparks 200m away from where the cars are generally clustered. This is a knee jerk reaction. There is an expanding university here, it's been here for long time, it's about students having somewhere to park.
12779	Bronwyn	Beukes	do not support the plan		I work in Rolleston and have to commute to UC. The parking here on campus is exorbitant for the privilege to look for a parking.. so many are forced to park on the street. If you are trying to reduce the cars out on the street.. I believe there are a few possibilities a) Put pressure on the University to make the parkings more affordable... there is a whole parking place on Dovedale Campus that is not being used at the moment and would reduce the street parking significantly. b) For those coming from outer areas like myself a more direct bus service to the University would be advantageous... at present we have to catch 2 buses into town to get here using precious time and money. It is still cheaper to use a car.
12827	Leonard	Claridge	do not support the plan		As a commuter to the area, I find that it is already quite difficult finding sufficient all day parking. Changing to 120minute parking will be disruptive.
12877	Martin	Creagh	support the plan		We have seen several close misses of our grandchildren and ourselves when trying to turn into our family's driveway - this is due to cars from the university staff and students parked over our driveway - obstructing safe entry and exit and the view on a bend - this is an extreme safety issue and needs urgent attention
12880	Mike	Sharp	support the plan		Fantastic - you the council are finally addressing a pressing issue that is causing danger in our community
12881	Terrence	Creagh	support the plan		Area 3 parking plan is a great idea to provide better access for residents and their visitors - much safer for cyclists and other road users

Submission ID	First name	Last name	I / We	Organisation	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views
12883	Anne	Creagh	support the plan		Dangerous and difficult entering and exiting driveway. No doubt there will be serious accident if not sorted.
12884	Carl	Graham	support the plan		We pick up friends children from this area and it can very dangerous. Cars parked right up to drive ways block vision for driver exiting the address.
12885	Debbie	Kinder	support the plan		
12886	Stephen	Kinder	support the plan		Two hour parking is needed in this area
12889	Jayne	Graham	support the plan		
12894	Rebecca	Methven	support the plan		Very difficult to see oncoming traffic especially cyclists
12895	James	Lynch	support the plan		
12897	Juliet	Ayrey	support the plan		
12905	Mike	Methven	support the plan		
12929	scott	Taylor	support the plan		Access to the driveway is restricted with parked cars making it hard to see moving traffic causing a major danger to cyclists as you have to pull out into the cycle lane to see if its clear to go. This then puts the cyclists at risk and cannot be long before someone gets hurt. These parking restrictions will help reduce the number of parked cars making it clearer to see and a step in the right direction.
12964	Ropeta	Mene-Tulia	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	
12978	Michael	Albrow	do not support the plan		
13000	Jenny	Owens	do not support the plan	University of Canterbury	I do not support this plan.  1. Making 2 hour parking restrictions all year round - this is not necessary. The demand for parking decreases dramatically over summer. The bulk of students are not on campus, staff take a lot of leave, more people cycle/walk due to better weather.  2. Making red zones in area 3 into 2 hour parks - I am really against this proposal. I cycle to the University every day. Having 2 hour parks increases the chance of cycle accidents because more cars are entering and exiting parks during the day, and this is a hazard to cyclists. Also the few times a year I do bring the car to work I park by Ray Blank park. I do this out of consideration for residents, there are no houses I am parking outside. By making 2 hour parks more prevalent you are forcing cars further away from the university and affecting more residential streets. The majority of people who drive are staff and they need all day parks. You also need to consider part time staff at the University. Those people often can't afford the parking permits so a high proportion of part time staff park on the streets. They need more than 2 hours, and it can be impossible to get a park within 10-15 min walk after 9am.
13082	Kylie	Rochford	support the plan		
13116	Paul	Bealing	do not support the plan		While it may seem a good idea to shut down even more areas to parking this is only going to shift the problem to another suburb. The crux of the matter is that the University is the problem here and the residents need to support staff in order to change the Universities current parking permit policy. The only reason parking habits have changed is because the University has gone from free parking to \$800 parking. Who in their right mind would not park off campus. In addition the university made its permits all year around instead of just in term time. This is why parking has increased over summer - it is not summer courses - these have actually reduced over the past 5 years. I do not support the plan to force staff to have to pay to park on campus.









Car Park 2



UC Education Plus



↑ Main Entrance Dovedale Ave



ID: 13089 and 13139





Alana Dawson  
23 Montclare Ave  
Ilam  
Christchurch

19 March 2018

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to indicate that I **do not** support the University Parking Plan Review – Area Three.

Extending the P120 has more implications for residents than as it currently stands. A lot of residents need to park on the street outside their homes. Only being able to park outside our homes for 2 hours at a time is very inconvenient.

Extending the P120 also affects the students as they will have to park even further away from both campuses.

It costs \$400 a year for a student to park in the University of Canterbury car parks. \$400 a year is completely out of reach for many students. As you can see from the photos attached (taken on Friday 16 March 2018 at 10am) the Dovedale campus carparks are virtually empty and the streets (Montclare Ave and Solway Ave) are fully lined with cars. If the University made parking more affordable, or free, then this would solve the parking issues on the streets surrounding the University. As it appears that very few students have purchased parking permits the University cannot be gathering much revenue from parking and empty car parks seems very wasteful. Lincoln University has free car parking for its students so I feel this is something that the University of Canterbury should consider.

Yours faithfully



Alana Dawson  
027 3107991  
alanadawson@gmail.com



Dovedale Campos

10am - 16/3/18





Dovedale campus

10am - ~~18~~ 16/3/18



Solway Ave

10 am - 16/3/18





Montclare Ave  
10 am - 16/3/18





27/03/2018

Submission From: Bupa Parkstone Retirement Village  
2 Athol Terrace, Ilam, Christchurch

**Parkstone Retirement Village**  
2 Athol Terrace  
Ilam  
Christchurch 8041

T +64 3 341 1273  
parkstonevillage@bupa.co.nz  
www.bupa.co.nz

Re: Proposed Review University Parking Plan – Area 3

We are a relatively new retirement village situated on the old Feltex Carpet factory site and once completed will consist of 240 apartments and added amenities. Our residents numbers once fully occupied will be around 340 people plus 10 staff.

We have a number of different visitors coming into our village site daily - residents visitors/families, care givers, service providers, contractors, staff members and while we have factored into our building design considerable parking on site there will be occasions when there is a necessity to use street parking. There is no public bus transport available near the village for residents to utilize therefore they are holding onto their vehicles longer.

Athol Terrace between Peer Street and Brodie Street is a particularly busy street during the day.

At the moment on Athol Terrace the parking is 15 minutes on the south side and unlimited on the north side. We find that the unlimited parking is taken up by the university students and staff which only leaves the 15 minutes parking area and this is not adequate for elderly people to use because of the short time that vehicles can be parked here and the distance they need to walk from the road to the village main entrance.

We would request your consideration under the proposed review of the current parking plan for the following:

Bupa Residents And Their Visitors Parking Only on the south side of Athol Terrace between Peer Street and Brodie Street 9:00am to 3:00pm, 6:00pm to 7:00am and weekends

No Parking on South Side of Athol Terrace between Peer Street and Brodie Street – Mon-Frid 7:00am to 9:00am and 3:00pm to 6:00pm

We appreciate the opportunity to submit our proposal to you and we look forward to your favorable reply.

Yours sincerely

**Kathy Reece**  
**Parkstone Retirement Village**  
027 404 4751



ID:13908





ID: 13949





ID: 13949



20

