

MINUTES

Policy and Services Committee

F22/55/05 – D25/5904

Date: Tuesday 25 February 2025 at 1.05PM
Venue: Council Chambers, 63 Miranda Street, Stratford

To hear and consider submissions to the

- Draft Parking Control Bylaw
- Draft Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw
- Draft Vehicle Crossing Bylaw

Present

The Deputy Mayor M McKay, (the Chairperson), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors: S J Beck, G W Boyde, A M C Dudley, V R Jones, A K Harris, E E Hall, W J Sandford and M J Watt.

In attendance

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director – Assets Mrs V Araba, the Director – Corporate Services – Mrs R Johnson, the Director – Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Committee Advisor and Executive Assistant – Mrs E Bishop, the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson, the Roading Manager – Mr S Bowden, the Environmental Health Manager – Ms R Otter (*part meeting*), the Roading Engineer – Mr F Hicks, the Property and Projects Manager – Mr S Taylor, one member of the media (Stratford Press) and five members of the public.

1. Welcome

The opening karakia was read.

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff, and the media.

The Deputy Mayor reiterated the health and safety message and emergency procedures.

2. Apologies

An approved leave of absence was noted for Councillor C M Tongaawhikau and an apology received from Councillor J M S Erwood

Recommendation

THAT the apologies be received.

DUDLEY/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/25/11

Councillor Hall joined the meeting at 1.07pm.



3. Announcements

Speakers to Submissions

It was reinforced to Councillors that the purpose of this meeting is to hear submissions on the draft Parking Control Bylaw, draft Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw and the draft Vehicle Crossing Bylaw.

Councillors were asked to hear all submissions with an open mind, to restrict their question time to the submitters to points of clarification or issues pertaining to subject matter. Councillors were requested not to get into direct dialogue with submitters. Councillors may take notes whilst submitters are speaking.

4. Declarations of members interest

Elected members were asked to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda. There were no conflicts of interest.

5. Attendance Schedule

The Attendance schedule for Policy and Services Committee meetings, including Hearings, was attached.

6. Acknowledgement of Submissions

Submissions – Pages 11-35

The 18 submissions received to the draft Parking Control Bylaw and the one submission received for the Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw were included in the agenda. . No submissions were received for the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw.

Recommendations

1. THAT the submissions to the draft Parking Control Bylaw and draft Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw be received.
2. THAT the submitters be advised of the outcome of their submission and notified that the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting, and subsequent meetings, will be available on Council's website.

HARRIS/HALL
Carried
P&S/25/12

Recommended Reason

So that each submission is formally received and the submitter provided with information on decisions made.

7. Submitters To Be Heard

There are four submitters wishing to speak.

Each submitter will be allocated five (5) minutes to present their submission and allowed five (5) minutes for questions.



Submission #	Name	Bylaw	Page Number	Time
1	Mark Cunniffe	Parking Control Bylaw	12	1.05pm
<p>Points noted in the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He has identified a hazard when you are approaching the new pedestrian crossing from travelling south. If there is a van or campervan in the last two carparks then the driver can't see the pedestrians as they are stepping onto the road meaning it is very last minute that you see them. • He felt it was lucky that drivers generally drive slow through Stratford and was unaware of any incidents happening but felt it was an accident waiting to happen. A lot of pedestrians just assume motorists are going to stop. • He noted the law says you can't park within 6meters of a pedestrian crossing so he was unsure why they are there. He suggested the disabled parks on the other side of the road could be replaced with normal parks. <p>Questions/Points of Clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Boyde agreed that these parks were an issue. He asked if the two parks were removed and replaced with motorcycle parks if that would be an issue? Mr Cunniffe did not think that would obstruct the view. • The District Mayor agreed there is an issue there. He thought the logical solution was removing some parks, he noted there did not seem to be a problem with the two parks in the northbound approach and asked why that would be? Mr Cunniffe was not sure but there was plenty of clear vision on that approach. The District Mayor asked if it was fair to say the disabled parks were not actually in use? Mr Cunniffe said it could be the only problem is when you are travelling south and there is a large vehicle parked there. 				
7	Nicole Chadwick	Parking Control Bylaw	22	1.15pm
<p>Points noted in the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms Chadwick noted she was speaking as an advocate for sport and recreation. She is a netball umpire and a NZ Umpire Coach Assessor. • She noted her serious concerns around the proposed plan for the 8 parks along Fenton Street which would disproportionately benefit the scouts at the expense of the other activities. She noted the irony that the scout committee did not support the change either. • Netball boasts the highest participation rates per capita, the parks are filled all along Portia and Fenton Streets and the War Memorial Carpark. • Those accessing the walking tracks would also be impacted. • She felt these changes contradicted the LTP outcomes of making Stratford a friendly place to visit. • The culminative impact has not been considered – netball, hockey, table tennis, marching and basketball will all be impacted. Prioritising one group undermines community spirit. • She urged councillors to reconsider this particular aspect to find a more balanced approach to acknowledge the needs of all users. <p>Questions/Points of Clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Dudley noted she understood the frustration and asked if a P120 or P180 would be a better alternative? Ms Chadwick said yes if council insists on having a restriction. Councillor Dudley asked if between certain hours would be better? Ms Chadwick asked council to consider what problem they were trying to solve. • Councillor Dudley noted one of the issues had been freedom camping. Ms Chadwick noted other councils had freedom camping bylaws to control those issues and that another submission had suggested signage that the area is not for freedom camping. • Mr Hanne asked if there was an issue with freedom campers taking up parking spaces for netball? Ms Chadwick stated there was no issue on Saturdays. 				
16	Peter Hartley	Parking Control Bylaw	31	1.25pm
<p>Points noted in the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Hartley noted the submission was to remove one angle parking space on the east side of Broadway being the first one north of the new pedestrian crossing to give more visibility, this could be replaced with a parallel park which would not be ideal but better than current situation. • Pedestrians are obscured until they step out because the footpath is lower than the road so people are not always obvious in advance. • Visibility is poor at any time but worse when a camper van or SUV is there. • Many are hesitant to use the crossing as they can't see if vehicles are approaching. • Some drivers drive too fast and some pedestrians don't look. 				

Handwritten signatures in the bottom right corner of the page, including a signature that appears to be 'NW' and another signature below it.

Submission #	Name	Bylaw	Page Number	Time
17	Jack Hywood	Parking Control Bylaw	32	1.35pm
Mr Hywood did not attend the meeting.				

8. Decision Report – Parking Control Bylaw 2025 – Deliberation and Adoption
D25/4758 Page 36

Council needs to consider submissions as part of the consultation process.

<p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. THAT the report be received. <p style="text-align: right;">DUDLEY/McKAY <u>Carried</u> <u>P&S/25/13</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. THAT the Parking Control Bylaw 2025, including the changes outlined in Appendix 4 of this report with amendments as per the minutes below, be adopted. 3. <u>THAT</u> the commencement date of the Parking Control Bylaw 2025 be 1 May 2025. <p style="text-align: right;">BOYDE/HALL <u>Carried</u> <u>P&S/25/14</u></p> <p>Recommended Reason</p> <p>Having gone through the public consultation process required by Section 83 of the Local Government Act (2002), the public submissions received on the <i>Draft</i> Parking Control Bylaw 2025 consultation must be considered by the committee. Following consideration, a decision must be made on the final Parking Control Bylaw 2025.</p>

Deliberation and Discussion:

Submission 1 and 16

- The District Mayor noted there were a number of submissions regarding the pedestrian crossing and visibility on the south bound lane. He supported the officers suggestion of removing two carparks. If not two it definitely needed to be one. He noted the proliferation of disabled parking in the area having gone from having not many to an excessive amount. There are 7 disabled parks within 50meters of the crossing. He presented a map of Broadway and noted expanding out to 100meters there are an additional 2 outside TSB Bank and 2 more outside the Library, expanding out to 200meters there are actually 16 disabled parks in the proximity. He would be happy to see the two in the northbound approach removed as his observation is that these are unused. He felt these could be replaced with open parking to replace the two on the eastern side.
- Councillor Boyde agreed with removing the two parking spots as proposed but asked what the effect of replacing them with motorcycle parking would be? Mr Bowden noted the whole issue was parking should not be within 6meters of the crossing as a bare minimum but we had been urged to retain as much parking when completing the consultation for the pedestrian crossing. Ideally the two parks identified should be removed.
- Councillor Hall supported removing the two parks. She asked if the two disabled parks on the north bound approach were located for accessibility to the footpath and if there were specifications for disabled parks? Mr Bowden clarified this had always been an existing disabled park however the motorcycle parking next to it had been removed. Some of the disabled bays could be removed and reverted back to timed parking if that was the request of council however the accessibility bays are wider than a standard bay and typically take up 4meters. Visibility is clearer as they are bigger bays but it comes down to the size of the vehicle.
- The District Mayor asked if the camber of the road impacted compliance of the parking bays? Mr Bowden noted that a number of people do find it difficult to get in and out because of the shape of the road but would need to confirm whether this impacted the compliance of the parking bays.

- Mr Bowden confirmed there should be a 6meter gap on either side of the crossing. He clarified that the 6 meters comes from the pedestrian crossing itself and is the approach to the crossing and not beyond.
- The Deputy Mayor asked if the committee supported the recommendation to reduce the number of parks by two to free up the approach to the crossing? This was supported.
- Councillor Boyde asked if this created the opportunity to have motorcycle parks? Mr Bowden noted that would mean converting one of the disabled parks to a motorcycle park. The District Mayor suggested this could be brought back by officers to discuss. The Chief Executive noted there had been no community feedback requesting the creation of motorbike parking during this consultation.

Remove the two car parks nearest the crossing on the south bound approach as per officers recommendation.

Submission 2, 11, 13 and 14

- Councillor Hall noted submission 2 provided real life feedback about how this space is used and was supportive of the feedback being provided.
- The Deputy Mayor noted officers recommendation was to remove one parking bay and replace with a disabled park. Councillor Boyde supported the recommendation.
- The District Mayor noted that this added to the cluster of disabled parks and suggested relocating a current park rather than another in addition to what we already have. He also noted that the recommendation by officers to install P60 in this area and confirmed he has witnessed the parking issues on Miranda Street on a daily basis as a number of staff from businesses park there, these people could be parking in the War Memorial Carpark. He supported a time restriction of P60 but felt P120 would be more appropriate for appointments at both the Optometrist and MSD.
- Councillor Hall noted we had completed consultation on the parking control bylaw but asked if there was a way to consult with affected groups such as those who use the accessibility parking? Mr Hanne noted these discussion usually included disability advocacy groups and officers have actively engaged with these groups in the past. Councillor Hall felt she would rather hear from these groups about where these parks should be rather than making decisions as abled people.
- It was noted there were not currently any P120 parking areas in Stratford at the moment. This can be done but would mean an amendment to section 10 of the bylaw as well.
- Mr Hanne noted the Bylaw allowed for partial reviews so a review of disabled parking spaces could be added to matters outstanding and reviewed at a later stage.

Two parks to be removed on Miranda Street outside MSD/Stratford Optometrists to be converted into one disabled park and P90 timeframes to be installed to all parks within that block.

Submission 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 15

- It was noted that the officers recommendation was to change the proposed P60 at all times on Fenton Street to P180 Monday to Friday.
- Councillor Dudley noted that she did not agree with this recommendation as it would not stop freedom camping issues over the weekend. She suggested the installation of 'No Freedom Parking' signage as a first attempt and review if this does not help the issues. Mr Hanne clarified that these signs would have no legal standing.
- Councillor Beck noted that he had contacted Mr Bruce Jamieson, a previous submitter on this issue, and he was worried about having a permanent time limit impacting overnight stays at the scout den. The problem was still freedom camping.
- Councillor Hall noted this was raised when elected members had requested solutions for freedom camping in this area and did not think the suggestions will solve this while resulting in a heap of affected parties because of it. The recommendation to P180 Monday to Friday will not address the camping issues but officers will need something they can enforce.
- The Deputy Mayor asked if there is an issue with freedom camping in Stratford. Mr Hanne noted there was not an issue. He noted that the scouts have been offered access through the Malones Gates for events and unloading vehicles which was a perfectly viable option.
- Councillor Hall felt putting a time limit would create a disenfranchise, and won't be getting a ticket, so suggested flagging the time limit for this area altogether.
- The District Mayor noted Ms Chadwick's question to elected members "What problem are you trying to fix"?. He noted Stratford was officially recognised and certified as a campervan friendly town and one of the reasons this was achieved was the flexibility of where people can park. One of the attractions to this area is the general surround, being able to walk their dog and the proximity to the public toilet. He questioned if we do have a problem and noted that netball do not think so, nor do other users of the scout den or park users. He would support removing this altogether leaving as it is. He noted the point of time limits is to solve congestion issues and there is not a congestion problem there.

Handwritten initials: NH
Handwritten initials: BH

- Councillor Jones supported leaving it as it is.

No change to current parking on Fenton Street.

Submission 4

- The disabled parks located outside Wai o Rua – Stratford Aquatic Centre can not be added to the schedule as they are located on private property.
- **Disabled parking on Broadway will be updated on the map.**
- **General map update requests to be completed.**
- **Removal of carparks on Portia Street (7 parks south of the pool) for the construction of a new crossing facility.**
- The Director – Assets noted the updated schedule had resolved all matters raised and included the suggestions for approval.

Submission 6 and 17

- This was agreeing with the changes proposed to be made on Broadway in front of Mountain Motors.
- It was clarified there are currently no time restrictions in this area and the issues are workers of surrounding businesses parking in these spaces.
- The recommendation was to put P60 limits in this area. The District Mayor asked if P90 would be more appropriate as this area does not have high foot traffic.
- Councillor Dudley noted her concern that if limits were installed on one side the problem will move to the other side so asked if it needed to be extended to both sides right up to Seyton Street.
- Councillor Beck suggested it being P90 to give the customers time.
- Councillor Sandford noted no other businesses have complained and felt we were creating these limits when we did not have a problem there and are not going to police it.
- Councillor Hall noted that being complaint based this will impact on council staff time. She asked if this can be revisited if businesses asked for it and it was confirmed the bylaw allows for partial reviews if required.
- Councillor Boyde and Councillor Dudley supported a time limit being put in place.
- Councillor Jones noted his preference for Broadway to be standardised and have a set time limit from one end to the other.

No time restriction to be added.

Submission 12

- Mr Bowden noted this was to increase the parks from P60 to P90 outside Taranaki Physiotherapy, to allow a bit more time for appointments.
- **Approved.**

Submission 18

- Mr Bowden noted the issue from this submitter was trucks parking on residential streets overnight and then starting up at 4am which upsets residents. The bylaw has introduced a clause to restrict particular types of vehicles from parking on a street by resolutions of council. He noted there had not been many complaints received about truck drivers parking on residential streets and there would also be an issue policing this. If armouguard were to police the whole town every night it would cost approximately \$300,000, for armouguard to police one section a night it would cost \$100,000 and to call them out case by case would be \$110 each call, the infringement for this would be \$40.
- Councillor Boyde noted the trucks parking at the bike park frustrated him the most.
- Councillor Hall noted that in this scenario someone has reached out to say they have a problem in this area when we have asked for feedback. This issue has been talked about quite a bit by council and although enforcement does sound unreasonable, something does need to be done. Mr Hanne noted this was the wrong tool and a restricted vehicle bylaw would be more appropriate. It was requested that this be added to the matters outstanding for further investigations into a solution.

General

- Councillor Jones noted that as a farming district there were a lot of vehicles with trailers and he had noted in the bylaw that these must park in designated areas. He asked if this would be left as complaint based. Mr Hanne noted it was the intent of the bylaw that vehicles are parked in a tidy, legal and manoeuvrable space. The War Memorial Carpark does not fall within this bylaw as it is not a road. Councillor Jones asked if council intends to start enforcing this on Broadway when



people park across carparks in town and Mr Hanne noted this was for elected members to decide to enforce these restrictions.

The Environmental Health Manager left the meeting at 2.31pm.

9. **Decision Report – Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025 – Deliberation and Adoption**
D25/4484 Page 118

Council needs to consider submissions as part of the consultation process.

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

McKAY/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/25/15

2. THAT the committee considers the submission received as part of the public consultation process of the *draft* Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025.

BOYDE/HALL
Carried
P&S/25/16

3. THAT the committee adopt the Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025.

4. THAT the commencement date of the Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw be 1 May 2025.

HARRIS/McKAY
Carried
P&S/25/17

Recommended Reason

The *draft* Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025 has gone through the public consultation process, required by Section 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002. One submission was received as a result of the public consultation process. The committee is now required to consider this submission.

10. **Decision Report – Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025 – Deliberation and Adoption**
D25/4483 Page 134

Council needs to consider submissions as part of the consultation process.

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

DUDLEY/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/25/18

2. THAT subject to any new information highlighted at the Deliberation, the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025 be adopted.

3. THAT the commencement date of the Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025 be 1 May 2025.

DUDLEY/HALL
Carried
P&S/25/19

Recommended Reason

The *draft* Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025 has gone through the public consultation process, required by Section 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002. No submissions were received as a result of the public consultation process.



Questions/Points of Clarification:

- It was clarified that this bylaw covered the whole district, half round pipes are for where there is old fashioned kerb and channel and full round pipes are required for rural crossings. It will be broken out within the bylaw to ensure this is clear.
- Councillor Jones noted that property owners are given the opportunity for their vehicle crossing to be formed or repaired at 50% of council contract rates and stated he did not think many rural properties were offered this rate for their road reserve property. Mr Bowden noted in the road was being resealed then council could offer this opportunity. The minimum requirement is 3 meters off the seal edge but it would ideally be 6 meters or to the property boundary. This would come out of the reseat budget and then charged to the individual property. Seals can be either concrete or tar seat but concrete is preferred as it is longer lasting.
- Councillor Jones noted that Fonterra would like to see an increase of sealed driveways and he would like to see retrospective consideration for these as well. Sealed driveways mean the tankers are not bringing stones and rocks onto the road. Mr Bowden noted that Fonterra had been approached to see if they would assist with upgrades to tanker entrances if required and they said no.
- The District Mayor noted this item had been out for consultation and had not received any submissions so there was no trigger for this discussion or amendments.
- Councillor Jones felt the fees and charges were unclear as to what the inspection fees would be for a vehicle crossing.

11. Closing Karakia

D21/40748

Page 147

The closing karakia was read.

The meeting closed at 2.46pm



M McKay
Chair

Confirmed this 25th day of March 2025.



N C Volzke
District Mayor