



STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Committee

FROM: Neil Jackson, Policy Planner

REFERENCE: T202

SUBJECT: **PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IN CAR PARK AREAS - EP06/11/06 -**
Report Prepared for Meeting of 15 November 2006

1. BACKGROUND

Community groups have raised with Kirsty Barr, Council's Road Safety Co-Ordinator, an issue about pedestrian safety in car park areas.

There is a high level of pedestrian activity between parked cars and the shops or facilities they serve, and a high level of traffic movement in car park areas. This includes reversing manoeuvres, for which many drivers have a reduced level of vision. Pedestrians include children and elderly people, who may have reduced awareness of vehicle movements and limited ability to get out of their way.

Council currently has no requirements regarding pedestrian safety in car park areas. New requirements could be applied to new developments. For existing car park areas, improved pedestrian safety could be provided voluntarily by car park owners. New requirements could not be imposed retrospectively on existing car parks.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to a variation to TRMP, to include provision for pedestrian safety to be considered where large car park areas are required.

3. ASSESSMENT

Pedestrian movement in car parks is obviously inevitable – people need to get between parked cars and the shops, work or business destination of their trip, crossing the aisles where vehicles manoeuvre. Many pedestrians will take the shortest route to their destination, and will not necessarily use any pedestrian route or crossing facility that is provided. Pedestrian routes or crossings may be useful to people with children, and to elderly people. Car parks are busy areas. Both drivers and pedestrians need to be alert.

The size, shape and layout of car park areas vary widely, making it impractical to write a rule specification for pedestrian safety.

The alternative is for TRMP to require consent where a parking area has more than x car parks, and have pedestrian safety within the car park as a matter to be considered in deciding the consent.

Parking that satisfies TRMP rule 16.2.3 and Fig.16.2D is currently a permitted activity – consent is not required. A new rule where parking which satisfied those requirements was assured of obtaining consent, but which allowed consideration of how pedestrian safety could be promoted within those parking areas, would be appropriate.

It is acknowledged that some pedestrian facilities such as marked or formed pedestrian crossings, or walkways between parked cars, take up space at the expense of parking spaces. Other safety measures, such as signs and speed humps, do not affect space available for parking.

There is a degree of arbitrariness in deciding what the trigger level should be. A brief check on five car parks in Nelson showed:

Woolworths: approximately 200 car parks, with one painted pedestrian crossing. (There are an additional 50+ car parks at the adjoining Library).

Countdown / Warehouse: car parks not counted, but there are speed humps, three painted pedestrian crossings, and one section with a walkway between parallel rows of car parks.

Wakatu Square: approximately 140 car parks, with raised crossings for pedestrians.

Stoke: approximately 180 car parks, no pedestrian facilities.

Mitre 10: approximately 220 car parks. six painted pedestrian crossings, raised concrete 'aprons' leading to the painted crossings, speed humps, and a walkway between the central parallel rows of car parks.

Annesbrooke Church also has a large parking area with no pedestrian facilities, but this is not a high public use car park.

From this simple survey, a trigger figure in the range of 100 – 150 car parks seems appropriate.

4. PROPOSAL

A new TRMP rule is proposed:

“16.2.3A:

Any land use that complies with the car parking requirements of Fig.16.2A, where the number of car parks exceeds 120, is a controlled activity.

A resource consent is required, and must be granted, but may include conditions on the following matter over which Council has reserved control:

1. The safety of pedestrians in any parking area. Safety measures may include, but are not limited to:
 - a) painted access routes for pedestrians;

- b) the use of material different from the car park surface material, for pedestrian access routes;
- c) a raised surface for pedestrian access routes;
- d) signs
 - warning drivers about pedestrians;
 - directing pedestrians to preferred access routes;
- e) traffic calming measures.”

An amendment to rule 16.2.6 is also proposed, adding the same matter as a new item of discretion:

“(4D) The safety of pedestrians in any parking area. Safety measures may include, but are not limited to:

- a) painted access routes for pedestrians;
- b) the use of material different from the car park surface material, for pedestrian access routes;
- c) a raised surface for pedestrian access routes;
- d) signs
 - warning drivers about pedestrians;
 - directing pedestrians to preferred access routes;
- e) traffic calming measures.”

5. RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopt the new TRMP rule 16.2.3A, and the new matter (4D) for existing rule 16.2.6, as proposed above, as a variation (or plan change, depending on the status of TRMP at the time of notification).

Neil Jackson
Policy Planner