

Paid Parking Pilot

Engagement Report – Phase 1

August 2025



Punangairi Visitors Centre, Dolomite Point. Source: Ngāti Waewae and Department of Conservation



Department of
Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	2
2	Introduction	3
2.1	Paid parking project overview	3
2.2	Purpose of report.....	4
3	Engagement activities.....	5
4	What we heard about the Paid Parking Pilot.....	5
4.1	Dolomite Point	6
4.2	Franz Josef	14
4.3	White Horse Hill	16
4.4	General feedback regarding paid parking.....	19
5	Treaty partners	24
6	Summary of national stakeholder and special interest group feedback	24
6.1	Conservation Boards	24
6.2	Recreation Sector Forum	25
6.3	New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) - Dolomite Point and Franz Josef.....	25
6.4	Buller District Mayor supported by Grey District Mayor – Dolomite Point.....	26
6.5	Bus Coach Association	26
6.6	Tourism Industry Aotearoa	26
6.7	Tourism Export Council - Dolomite Point and White Horse Hill.....	27
6.8	NZ Police	29
6.9	Meridian Energy	29
6.10	NZ Game Animal Council – White Horse Hill.....	30
6.11	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - White Horse Hill	30
6.12	NZ Alpine Club - White Horse Hill.....	31
6.13	Canterbury Mountain Club	31
6.14	Federated Mountain Clubs – White Horse Hill.....	32
7	What happens next?	32

1 Executive Summary

The Department of Conservation (DOC) is piloting paid carparking at three popular sites, including:

- Dolomite Point
- Franz Josef
- White Horse Hill

This report summarises engagement that occurred for Dolomite Point and Franz Josef between 26 May and 19 June and White Horse Hill between 12 June and 11 July 2025. White Horse Hill's timeframes are different due to parking capacity considerations. Feedback that was received up until 24 July for all sites is included within this report.

Engagement activities included in-person meetings and leaflets being emailed to stakeholders to gain an understanding of the views and local issues around paid car parking.

We heard from 158 submitters including Treaty Partners, community members, businesses, concession holders and stakeholders.

Overall, the main feedback themes have been:

- Opposition to paying for parking
- That locals need to be exempt from paid parking
- Considerations of a free parking period. Suggestions have ranged from 15 mins to 2 hours
- A few people supported paid parking
- And some have raised questions.

The results of this engagement will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that is being developed. Once the proposed pricing strategy is drafted, this will be shared with the community to seek further feedback in August and September prior to a final decision being made. Implementation is planned in October for Dolomite Point and Franz Josef and December for White Horse Hill.

2 Introduction

2.1 Paid parking project overview

DOC is planning a paid parking pilot at three high-use sites. This will help control parking pressures and increase financial support for our special cultural and natural areas.

Paid parking is a tool used globally to manage visitor numbers and contribute to the financial sustainability of popular natural sites.

The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:

- trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites
- improve visitor experience
- align with international best practices.

The pilot is funded by \$3.8 million from the International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL).

The pilot will be rolled out at three high-use visitor sites in the South Island:

- Punakaiki Pancake Rocks, Paparoa National Park
- Franz Josef Glacier, Westland Tai Poutini National Park
- White Horse Hill, Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park

The pilot will run for 9 months starting in October for Dolomite Point and Franz Josef and December for White Horse Hill.

Dolomite Point, Punakaiki

Dolomite Point is one of New Zealand's most popular tourism sites. In 2018, approximately 500,000 people visited the Pancake Rocks walkway. Numbers dropped significantly during COVID but are now recovering towards pre-COVID levels. The paid parking pilot at Dolomite Point includes two car parks, one north and one south of the visitor precinct. DOC will also extend and upgrade the southern car park. When complete there will be approximately 152 total car parks available. The car parks provide access to the Pancake Rocks that attract visitors to Punakaiki.

Franz Josef

In 2018, approximately 780,000 people visited the Franz Josef Glacier Valley. It is DOC's third most popular natural attraction in New Zealand. Visitor numbers dropped significantly during COVID but are now recovering. Access to the valley is important for the visitor economy of the West Coast and New Zealand. This car park is at the beginning of the popular Franz Josef Glacier/ Kā Roimata o Hine Hukatere Walk that attracts visitors to the area.

White Horse Hill

The pilot for White Horse Hill is proposed to be implemented in December and will run for approximately 9 months. This car park provides access to several popular day and overnight walks such as Hooker Valley Track, Kea Point Track, Mueller and Hooker huts. The White Horse Hill Campground next to the carpark is DOC's most visited campground and has 102 bookable campsites.

Car park capacity improvements are also being considered and are separate from the paid parking pilot. DOC is aware that the White Horse Hill car park is often at over-capacity with cars parking along Hooker Valley Road during peak periods. We acknowledge that running a paid parking pilot this coming summer won't immediately solve this issue. We want to use this pilot opportunity to investigate a range of options designed to improve the long-term car parking experience, such as:

- Travel demand management, including improved real-time visitor information and marketing.
- Maximising capacity at existing WHH carpark.
- Multiple locations for park and ride solutions.
- Operational improvements to restrict parking.

Implementation of the above options is dependent on available funding.



Figure 1: Paid Parking Pilot sites location map

2.2 Purpose of report

The purpose of this engagement report is to outline the approach taken during the initial phase 1 engagement for Dolomite Point, Franz Josef and White Horse Hill and share the key themes that emerged through partner, community, and stakeholder feedback.

3 Engagement activities

The aim of this initial engagement period was to allow Treaty Partners, stakeholders and those affected by the proposed paid parking pilot, the opportunity to provide feedback on any aspect of paid parking, to provide the team with insights to develop the proposed pricing strategy. To gain these insights the following engagement methods were used:

- Meetings were held with Treaty Partners, businesses adjacent to the sites, DOC's quarterly Recreation Sector Forum, and the relevant Conservation Boards.
- Media release: "DOC starts local conversation on paid parking pilots" (28 May 2025), and responses to several media requests seeking clarification on the process and timing.
- Leaflets for each site were distributed to key stakeholders via email.
- An email address and the DOC 0800 number were provided so people could provide their feedback or ask questions.
- Workshops were held with the District Offices to understand local operational information.

Signage was installed at the Dolomite Point car park at the request of a local business. The signs had a different email address to that on the leaflet; this alternate email was activated within 12 hours and both emails remain active to take any feedback. We have checked with the call centre and are unaware of anyone who had a bounce-back email or undelivered emails.

We acknowledge that one submitter experienced difficulty reaching support via the 0800 number. This was promptly followed up and found to be an isolated incident related to a staffing change. All other callers were successfully assisted.

4 What we heard about the Paid Parking Pilot

During the engagement period we heard from 158 submitters including mana whenua, businesses, stakeholders and community members. We have received the following feedback numbers by 24 July 2025:

- Treaty partner feedback - 2
- Stakeholder feedback– 15 plus the recreation sector forum presentation
- Dolomite Point feedback – 74
- Franz Josef feedback - 16
- Dolomite Point and Franz Josef feedback – 3
- White Horse Hill – 1 (some stakeholders only commented on White Horse Hill)
- General feedback regarding paid parking– 47

All feedback is tabled with individual's names and addresses redacted in Appendix A, the general themes from engagement are separated into the following 4 parts:

1. Feedback related to Dolomite Point.
2. Feedback related to Franz Josef.
3. Feedback related to White Horse Hill.
4. Feedback on paid parking generally that relates to all sites.

4.1 Dolomite Point

Summary of feedback themes

- Most of the feedback received about Dolomite Point requested that locals be exempt from paying for parking with suggestions on how this could be done. People explained how they use the location for getting their post, as a community hub and a popular place to stop for people traveling along the coast.
- Many people were opposed to the idea of paying for parking at all, noting that it risks people not stopping in the area and impacting local businesses and the community hub.
- Suggestions on a free parking period were made, ranging from 15 minutes to 2 hours.
- Suggestions were also made about free parking in the winter months to encourage visitors to stop.
- A few people supported the idea of paid parking explaining that in NZ it is easy to take advantage of the natural environment, and a user-pays model makes sense.

The table below outlines the key themes and feedback comments that supported those themes.

Feedback themes	DOC's response
Support for paid parking <ul style="list-style-type: none">- You pay in other countries.- In NZ we make it too easy for people to take advantage of our natural environment.- We spend a fortune on facilities but don't get revenue.- User-pays model makes sense.- Can see the need to find alternative funding streams for DOC.	Thank you for your feedback. These views are being considered as part of the pricing strategy development.
Supportive, but only if the locals are exempt <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The area is also accessed by volunteers for conservation work.- Locals defined as from Barrytown to north of the Fox River.- Locals to register at the Visitor Centre office.	We are currently looking at how locals can be taken into consideration in the proposed pricing strategy.
Locals shouldn't pay <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Locals should be exempt from paying for parking.- Locals visit the café regularly to connect, socialise and have open mic nights.- Buller District ratepayers shouldn't pay.- Locals are not tourists and already contribute enough in high-value rates and shouldn't be penalised.- Punakaiki has very limited services and, as such, our community mailboxes are vital.	We have heard the importance of Dolomite Point as a community hub and are currently looking at how locals can be taken into consideration in the pricing strategy.

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We believe locals (as defined by those who are Community Mailbox holders) should have unlimited free access to carparking at Dolomite Point. - In addition, some mailbox users have mobility issues, while others are families with young children. Putting time limits on their use of the carpark would seem particularly unfair. - Off-peak season should be a consideration for locals to keep the businesses open. - As a local, we visit the Dolomite point complex once every two weeks on average throughout the year, and occasionally more in summer. - It's the closest thing to a village centre that the locals have. 	
<p>Ideas for how locals could be exempt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There could be a downloadable sticker for locals. - Coupon on the dashboard of their car. - A code that could be sent to the pay machines. - As locals we typically stay for 30min in the coffee/ice-cream use case, and 1hour for the lunch/dinner use case. If the free parking period was up to 1hour, then we would not be impacted by your proposal in a significant way. - Free for locals from Whitehorse to Cargill Road, maybe the whole coast, including Greymouth to Westport for anyone that registers their vehicle. - Punangairi is the nearest public venue. - Accommodating local use through registering for a sticker or number plate camera entry could also be a way to offer locals either the free use of the parking, or an extended free parking period of up to 1hour. An alternative could be that the cafés can administer free parking bar codes on their receipts; if for example >\$10 is spent, or by mentioning that "we're local". They are already offering -10% for locals. - Charge tourists. 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p>
<p><u>Safety</u></p>	<p>The removal of parking spaces on SH6 at Punakaiki was initiated as part of the recent</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety impact if people start parking on the state highway. - My concern is the intention to remove the car parks opposite Punangairi. Fewer carparks is really foolish especially these ones. I often need to park here to deliver work to Punangairi and this will make the loading zone much more congested. Please leave those parks as is. 	<p>redevelopment of Dolomite Point - the Punangairi Visitor Experience Centre. As a part of this redevelopment, a traffic safety assessment in 2020 was completed which, in conjunction with the development of parking facilities off the state highway recommended the removal of the on-road state highway parking to improve safety. NZTA endorsed the recommendations of this assessment in 2022. The redevelopment project concluded in June 2025 with the removal of the parking spaces opposite the visitor centre.</p> <p>A monitoring plan for the Dolomite Point site is being developed to record any change in parking behaviour on the State Highway and can be shared with the road controlling authority.</p>
<p>Oppose</p> <p><u>Should allow free access for all</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paying for parking is too much. - I pay enough for rates. - Don't become like the UK where sites of beauty and interest are leveraged to extract the most out of their visitors. - Commit to preserving free, unfettered access to conservation land for all New Zealanders, and halt any future rollout of paid parking across DOC sites. - Many people comment that they appreciate visiting for free. - This is a gateway to education, community connection and appreciation for our natural heritage. - There is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis; it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. 	<p>We understand the concerns raised about paying for parking at this location.</p> <p>Paid parking is a tool used globally to manage visitor numbers and contribute to the financial sustainability of popular natural sites.</p> <p>The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites • improve visitor experience • align with international best practices. <p>Legislation does allow us to charge users fair and reasonable fees to use our facilities, which include campsites, backcountry huts and car parks.</p> <p>In a separate initiative, which is not linked to the paid parking pilot, the government has proposed changes that would make it legal for DOC to charge international visitors access fees at four iconic tourism sites. The Conservation Acts (Land Management) Amendment Bill will now be drafted and introduced to Parliament in 2026. This process will include further public</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p><u>People should pay to do the walk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better to get people to pay to go to do the pancake walks. <p><u>Tourists already pay</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourists already pay a tax, so why tax them further. - Visitors won't stop at the location. - Use of IVL Funds: If revenue from the International Visitor Levy (IVL) is being used to implement paid parking systems, this constitutes double charging without a service enhancement. <p><u>Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't put it in at Pancake rocks, Lake Kaniere and Arthurs Pass - Public Rights: Locals have used this parking since before Paparoa National Park's establishment. Charging fees infringes on those historic rights. <p><u>Social licence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental & Social License: DOC risks eroding its environmental credibility and its social licence to operate by financially penalising access to nature. <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An alternative would be to have limited car parks and move people on. - Only charge in the busy months. - Exploring ways for small businesses and contractors that use the car park not to pay would be beneficial. - The best way to manage visitor numbers is reduce the level of promotion and hope for less peak traffic. There will always be more vehicles than parking places at New Year when NZ goes on holiday. If the vehicles end up blocking SHW 6 - so be it, everyone has to slow down. 	<p>consultation on the draft Bill as part of the select committee process.</p>
<p>Price</p> <p><u>Rates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the price is too high, people won't stop. - Suggest the rates are \$2/hour or less, and that the paid car parking ceases at 5pm, allowing locals to enjoy dinner/jam night at the Pancake Rocks Cafe. 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p> <p>Please note no decisions were made on pricing before this engagement process. As per DOC's pricing policy, any fees proposed must be fair and reasonable and will be</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A widely circulated social media post has suggested parking fees could reach as high as \$20. Whether accurate or not, this rumour is causing considerable distress and resentment in the community. Such a fee is excessive and risks alienating both locals and domestic tourists. Many New Zealanders will simply choose not to stop here, which could result in a serious decline in business for local shops and cafes—undermining the sustainability of the community DOC is supposed to support. - Parking should be free in winter months. - Overnight parking should not be allowed as this is part of a 'No freedom camping' zone. - A big justification for the recent new developments here was to get people to stay longer. We now have at least 3 hours of activities based right at Dolomite Point: Pancake Rocks and Blowholes (30 min), a new bush walk up to view point (30 min), Ngāti Wae Wae Experience Centre (1 hour), browsing DOC and other retail (30 min) and refreshments etc (30 min). Not everyone will do all these, but we want to encourage as much as possible. So I think there should be at least 2 hours (if not 3) following the free period which is charged at a set fee and at a level such as to not be a barrier to too many New Zealand families – at the very most \$10 for the 2 or 3 hour period. - Preferably never – but otherwise fees can only be justified over the busy weeks (January – March). Accommodation and other businesses in the area fear that charging means Punakaiki becoming a less desirable stopping place, thus impacting their income which is already pretty lean in the long down season. - When in operation I think the system should operate at all times of day to keep it simple. <p><u>Free period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Free 15 minute period for those using café or toilet. - 15 minutes free is not an option as it takes time to walk from the carpark and get your order. - There is a risk 15 mins might not be enough for people to use the toilets, cafe and get information from DOC visitor centre. 	<p>benchmarked against car park prices in New Zealand and internationally.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 hour free so locals can go to the shops and café. - Free two hour period. - First hour free for locals and New Zealanders. - The proposed 15 minutes of free parking before being charged \$20.00 for 2 hours is not going to work up there. 15 minutes may not be long enough to stand in a queue for a take-away coffee or ice cream in peak season when there are buses etc and it will just make it an unaffordable option for locals such as ourselves to drop in up there. - Need longer than a free 15 minutes. - Don't think the first hour should be free as this would encourage visitors to whip around the blowholes and drive off without going to the cafés and experiencing local business. - Should be 2 hours of free parking. <p><u>Vehicle types</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would it be possible to just charge campervans, allocating discrete parking for these. <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider a donation amount to contribute to conservation. 	
<p>Disability access at the Southern Car Park as it is redeveloped. Careful consideration needs to go to the layout and the path.</p>	<p>The Southern car park is an existing asset that has been constructed as part of the Dolomite Point redevelopment project. These design concerns have been passed onto that team. DOC has included a small area of existing grit path to be surfaced with asphalt to improve access for people with mobility impairments.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinstate or maintain existing roadside parking, with time-limited free access where appropriate, eg 2 hours. - Ensure DOC is fully funded through existing public means, including the IVL (now set at \$100 per tourist). - There was talk of overflow parking down by the Punakaiki river. That would be a good free parking option, just with a longer walk. 	<p>The removal of parking spaces on SH6 at Punakaiki was initiated as part of the recent redevelopment of Dolomite Point - the Punangairi Visitor Experience Centre. As a part of this redevelopment, a traffic safety assessment in 2020 was completed which, in conjunction with the development of parking facilities off the state highway recommended the removal of the on-road state highway parking to improve safety. NZTA endorsed the</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
	<p>recommendations of this assessment in 2022. The redevelopment project concluded in June 2025 with the removal of the parking spaces opposite the visitor centre.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback.</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will electric vehicles pay? - What the intention is behind charging for car parking on a trial basis at Punakaiki and the glaciers on the West Coast from October 2025? - Is the trial potentially going to be expanded to include carparks at Great Walks? - Will the Pororari River and Punakaiki River [start of Great Walk] carparks will also be charged? - What are the charges going to be? - Has any consultation taken place about these charges? - What the fee will be, as if it is too high it will shorten the stay or prevent some people from visiting.? - Why there isn't also a free parking option. - Overnight long-term parking is likely an issue for the Paparoa Track. Having a safe place provided- with camera surveillance for the overnight parking of cars, just for these trampers, would possibly enhance the visitor experience for Paparoa Track 	<p>Yes, electric vehicles will still pay which aligns with common practice in other paid car parks with EV chargers.</p> <p>In mid-2024, the Minister of Conservation instructed DOC to prepare a business case for a car park charging pilot, with funding from the International Visitor Levy to cover capital investment and implementation of parking hardware. This business case identified the locations for the paid parking pilot. The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites • improve visitor experience • align with international best practices. <p>Once the pilot is completed and the outcomes have been reviewed, a decision will be made whether to expand car parking charges to other busy sites.</p> <p>The proposed pricing strategy will be shared with the community for feedback in August 2025.</p> <p>We will pass on feedback to the team that look after the Paparoa track. This is outside the scope of the paid parking pilot.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>users. They need to be able to leave their vehicle for a night or two without worry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What the length of free parking will be?(coffee queue). 	<p>The proposed pricing strategy will be shared with the community in August 2025 that will detail the length of free parking and charging rates.</p>
<p>Other comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been no consultation on this and introducing paid parking will take away the ability for people just to stop and enjoy what should be a free part of New Zealand. 	<p>Consultation is occurring through the two-phase engagement process. There will be another opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed pricing strategy in August 2025.</p>

4.2 Franz Josef

Summary of feedback themes

- Most of the feedback received about Franz Josef paid parking pilot was about understanding the need for paid parking and if locals would be exempt. The national park is the residents' 'backyard' and the area is used for people's daily or weekly recreational activities, including many families with young children of the area.
- Many people were opposed to the idea of paying for parking at all, particularly concessionaires or guides who already pay for their concession and don't have time to be waiting. There were suggestions for the proposed pricing strategy to including free pick up and drop offs and types of vehicles that are charged.
- A few people supported the idea of paid parking explaining that many places overseas charge and there are too few ratepayers to cover the costs.

The table below outlines the key themes and comments that supported those themes.

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>Outright support for paid parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Most places overseas already have paid parking at the tracks.- There are so few rate payers for the big area to maintain.- Hot spots like Franz Josef Glacier, Hokitika Gorge, Haast Blue Pools, Punakaiki Pancake Rocks etc are all a good idea.- I'd like to see smaller or less popular tracks remain free.- We pay for parking everywhere, need to pay to maintain them.- DOC needs all the support it can get.	<p>Thank you for your feedback. These views are being considered as part of the pricing strategy development.</p>
<p>Oppose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Concessionaires shouldn't be charged the same as tourists as they already pay a fee- Don't have time to be stuck in traffic as drivers will go over their hours.- Don't have time to muck around at a parking meter 5 times a day.- Guides don't have a way to pay.- Concern about how tourists will avoid paying for parking and park alongside already narrow access road, clogging up access.	<p>Commercial tourism operators with a concession will be able to apply for a permit online to exempt them from parking fees at the pilot sites. The application process will require operators to provide evidence of a concession. More information to follow on the Permit application process.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could move pressure to other locations during summer such as Canavans Knob. 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p>
<p>Understand the need to pay if locals don't have to pay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cost of living remotely is already high. - There are also limited activities for young children. - As a local the area gets used for recreational walks most days. - Children use this as one of the 'free' activity's tourists have access to. - It could be free for New Zealanders as well. 	<p>We are currently looking at how locals and frequent users can be taken into consideration in the proposed pricing strategy and have heard the importance of the area for the local community for recreation.</p>
<p>Ideas for how locals could be exempt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could get a discount card from the DOC centre. - Suggest a local pass or something to scan on meters. 	<p>We are currently looking at how locals can be taken into consideration in the proposed pricing strategy.</p>
<p>Pick up and drop off</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Free parking for drop off/pick up or short stays - Tour guides need a 30 minute drop off and loading time (from the time you go through the gate until you return) - Need to consider overnight campers here. 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p>
<p>Pricing strategy</p> <p><u>Different vehicle types</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be a different charge for vehicle types. - Buses should only be allowed up with a concession pass with an extension for a yearly fee for parking up there. <p><u>Price</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking should be 24/7 and prices set yearly - Unless the fee is low it could harm local tourism. - The current valley track is perceived as too short and distant from the glacier itself, often generating negative feedback from international and domestic guests alike. Introducing a parking charge on top 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>of this may amplify dissatisfaction and risk further damaging the reputation of our region.</p> <p><u>Alternative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doc already has an unpopular image on the West Coast. I think doing an about turn on this idea and perhaps installing electronic donation/koha points in each car park instead, would be a great feel-good PR decision. And could also be lucrative. 	
<p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People will park elsewhere unsafely or clog up other places 	<p>This will be monitored during the pilot.</p>
<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will this be able to pick up vehicles that have no concession to be operating as there are quite a lot up there with no concessions. - Would the paid parking also apply for the Alex Knob carpark? 	<p>The paid parking pilot will not be able to identify businesses that have not paid concession fees.</p>
<p>Other comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kea-proof the equipment. - For generating revenue we recommend a modest increase to hut fees or other user pays models. - A local workshop or collaborative session with tourism operators in the area could be valuable to work through some unique challenges in Franz Josef. - Appreciate the chance to contribute. - When there was a post online most people are supportive but the tone of the post was drumming up opposition. 	<p>Kea proofing is part of the requirements for our parking hardware provider. Hardware performance will be monitored as part of the pilot. The service agreement with the DOC preferred supplier allows for reporting of equipment malfunctions.</p> <p>The proposed pricing strategy will be shared in August. This will be followed by public drop-in sessions in mid-August, where people can discuss the proposal with DOC staff.</p>

4.3 White Horse Hill

White Horse Hill engagement occurred during a different timeframe to Dolomite Point and Franz Josef. The feedback for White Horse Hill closed on 11 July 2025 and 7 submissions were received. Most of the feedback came from stakeholder groups which has been summarised in the table below. For more

details on the feedback from the stakeholders refer to Section 6 and for full submissions refer to Appendix A.

The table below outlines the key themes and comments that supported those themes.

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>Support but implementation needs to consider associated effects such as traffic and increased vehicle movements in surrounding areas, noise, dust, and potential vibration. These are particularly important to consider in respect of impacts to archaeology and Māori heritage.</p>	<p>The introduction of paid parking requires the installation of cameras, payment machines and supporting signage infrastructure. The project design team is investigating potential paid parking traffic impacts and designing a pilot to manage impacts and safety.</p> <p>The project includes investigating a range of longer term parking improvement options. Implementation of longer term options is dependent on available funding. If longer term options are funded for implementation, work will include assessments of effects and any required approvals and consents.</p>
<p>Pricing strategy</p> <p><u>Price</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free parking for drop off/pick up or short stays. • The additional costs could result in reduction in hunter contributions to game animal management in the area, and those accessed through them, resulting in perverse conservation outcomes. • Most of our users are longer stay people (more than 1 or 2 days). We would hope that rates would be diminishing with amount of time you stay (they might be staying 3 – 5 days to do Ball Pass, Empress Hut, or ski touring up around Mueller). Many of them will be coming from Unwin lodge. • Our NZAC Club members (and other outdoor activists) tend to use the carpark for long (multiday) visits when ski touring in the Barron Saddle - Mueller area undertaking Ball Pass and Copland Pass crossings, 	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share and get feedback on in August.</p>

<p>climbing trips to the upper Hooker Valley and climbing Aoraki from the west side and completing the GT, Predator control. It is also often a starting point for long alpine traverses e.g Copland -Karangarua - Mueller. We would be a small % of those parking there but would be there for extended periods of time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wonder if there could be a permit system like at Mangatepopo so that climbers can still get into the backcountry without getting penalised, or could there be Club discounts for people. Most members would arrive in cars, so a steep differential on camper vans would make sense. • Locals should be exempt. 	
<p>Installation considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there is the potential for archaeological material to be uncovered, the installation of paid parking equipment, such as pay machines, would likely require minimal earthworks and the equipment could be moved to an alternative location should archaeological material be identified during works. If this approach is taken, and impact to archaeology can be avoided, proceeding under an Accidental Discovery Protocol should be sufficient. 	<p>An archaeological assessment has been completed for the White Horse Hill carpark.</p>
<p>Safety concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern there is a s a possible change in user behaviour meaning more people are walking on the road or biking between the lodge and the Hooker Valley end. This would pose safety issues. 	<p>DOC is aware of the current issues and the project design team is investigating potential paid parking traffic impacts and designing a pilot to manage impacts and safety.</p> <p>Behaviour and overflow impacts will be monitored, and assessed throughout the pilot.</p>
<p>Alternatives for capacity issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Something has to happen and probably the best solution would be to have a large open (paid) car park area with shuttle ride every 10 minutes up to the start of the Hooker 	<p>Feedback is noted and will be considered as part of the investigation into a range of longer-term parking improvement options.</p>

<p>Valley track / White Horse Camp existing carpark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Just charging people to stay in the existing carpark will not work. That will see more and more vehicles parking along the Hooker Valley access road all the way out to SH80. They already do when the existing car park is full. - Carpark building in the Village possibly? 	<p>The introduction of paid parking requires the installation of cameras, payment machines and supporting signage infrastructure. The project design team is investigating potential paid parking traffic impacts and designing a pilot to manage impacts and safety.</p>
---	---

4.4 General feedback regarding paid parking

Summary of feedback themes

- Most of the feedback opposed paid parking stating that the land should be free for all to access, that it's greedy to ask for more money and better use the funds that DOC already have access to.
- A few supported paid parking if locals were exempt from paying.

The table below outlines the key themes and comments that supported those themes.

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>Support for paid parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support a degree of charging as long as those funds are directed toward the location the charges are collected from and inequities are considered. - I would be in favour of a paid carpark pilot project if and only if there was in parallel a pilot project in which the 3 top jobs in the DOC management structure are put out to tender. This, in keeping with User Pays and Pay as You Earn credos. - Fully support introducing paid parking at DOC sites to manage demand and provide some much needed revenue to cover costs of providing facilities. Ensuring users contribute to the costs is a positive move. - Applaud the plan to introduce/trial parking fees at busy carparks in New Zealand. - We are too accommodating to tourists in this country. 	<p>Thank you for your feedback. These views are being considered as part of the pricing strategy development.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p>Oppose</p> <p><u>Should allow free access for all</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lands belong to the public – not to be used as a revenue stream. - Should be free public access. - Not the kiwi way. - Greedy. - It will stop people accessing the tracks. - DOC should remember its original purpose and stopped being focused on turning a profit. - Our environment shouldn't be seen only in an economic way. - Creates barriers for people accessing the bush with groups and extra admin. - This is breach of our highest law, the 1688 bill of rights. - Nobody should have the right to turn nature into a pay-to-enter experience. These lands belong to the public — not to be used as a revenue stream. - Reconsider this policy. - Conflict of Interest - Government seeking direct revenue at the expense of tax-paying businesses with anti-competitive behaviour. <p><u>DOC funding/spending</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DOC should review its budget and find other ways to generate funds. - DOC should be getting the right amount of funding. - Use fund from tourism levy. - Haven't taxes already paid for the parking. - The pattern of questionable DOC spending in recent years, with overspending. Should focus on tightening its spending and cutting back on low impact projects. <p><u>Fees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As this has not been transparent, there is no set fee and no doubt that those fees will only increase. - Creates inequalities. - It would monetise important icon nature tourism sites. - Associate paying of parking with cities not country sides. 	<p>We understand the concerns raised about paying for parking.</p> <p>Paid parking is a tool used globally to manage visitor numbers and contribute to the financial sustainability of popular natural sites.</p> <p>The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites • improve visitor experience • align with international best practices. <p>Legislation does allow us to charge users fair and reasonable fees to use our facilities, which include campsites, backcountry huts and car parks.</p> <p>In a separate initiative, which is not linked to the paid parking pilot, the government has proposed changes that would make it legal for DOC to charge international visitors access fees at four iconic tourism sites. The Conservation Acts (Land Management) Amendment Bill will now be drafted and introduced to Parliament in 2026. This process will include further public consultation on the draft Bill as part of the select committee process.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider a paid shuttle system to effectively manage visitor numbers while maintaining accessibility, this would be free for New Zealanders. - A user pay option is not the only option. Our tourism industry needs investment but not to the detriment of New Zealand's own people being penalised with more charges, particularly those on fixed incomes travelling in motor homes. <p><u>Concession holders</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It creates a huge amount of business uncertainty knowing DOC could increase parking fees at any time thereby reducing our customer numbers and makes investing back into our businesses very risky, again contradicting recent Government Policy supposedly promoting business growth. <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It doesn't need to be a lot due to the amount of people coming through. - Once we stop charging, we can't go back. 	
<p>Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety a concern for overflow cars at all sites. 	<p>Safety concerns are being taken seriously. Parking behaviour and overflow impacts will be monitored throughout the pilot, and adjustments will be made as needed.</p>
<p>Locals should be exempt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make tourists pay but not locals - This thinking will reinforce a class system where the have nots will be less likely to access our natural environment with all its benefits like mental health, well-being, physical fitness, etc. 	<p>We are currently looking at how locals can be taken into consideration in the proposed pricing strategy.</p>
<p>Price</p> <p><u>Overnight</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a cheaper overnight/multi day parking fees structure to access higher peaks without worrying about the money - Those doing multi day hikes shouldn't have to pay a lot of money. <p><u>Locals</u></p>	<p>These ideas will feed into the proposed pricing strategy that we will share in August.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe an annual pass linked to license plate for a small fee like \$15 for residents or citizens. <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than price to manage numbers, use a booking system as they do for huts. 	
<p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who would be enforcing the changes? What are the chances of someone parking dangerously to avoid the fee? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in more information. What are the charges going to be? Has any consultation taken place about these charges? What the intention is behind charging for car parking on a trial basis at Punakaiki and the glaciers on the West Coast from October 2025? Is the trial potentially going to be expanded to include carparks at Great Walks? What will DOC use the monies generated for? Will it stay local? How much of this money will go to conservation, how much to administration, how much siphoned off to IWI. 	<p>There will be cameras recording number plates of vehicles as they enter and exit the car parks. The company providing paid parking hardware will issue breach notices to vehicles for non-payment. A breach notice relies on debt collection for enforceability, similar to non-payment of DOC's hut or campsite fees. Parking behaviour will be monitored during the pilot period.</p> <p>More information will be available with the proposed pricing strategy in August, which will be open for further feedback.</p> <p>The Minister for Conservation directed DOC last year to pilot car parking charges at some busy sites. DOC is now engaging with local communities on how that can best be achieved. The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites improve visitor experience align with international best practices. <p>Once the pilot is completed and the outcomes have been reviewed, a decision will be made whether to expand car parking charges to other busy sites.</p> <p>The money generated will contribute to the facilities and nature visitors enjoy.</p>
<p>Other considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to allow space for tour coaches to be able to park and to turn around. Signage could help for this. 	<p>Thank you for your feedback. These views are being considered as part of the pricing strategy development.</p>

Feedback themes	DOC's response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of space for smaller sized commercial operator vehicles. - Use cameras at the gate to control how many vehicles are in the car park with a one in one out system and space for drop offs. - Milford Sound a good example of good car parking design. - Car parks need to be sealed and painted to reduce waste of space. - Travel demand management - Technology is now available that can provide differential pricing, enabling discounted or free parking for local residents. I've recently recommended this approach to Queenstown Lakes District, and it has been used by a council in Melbourne to manage foreshore parking demands (I've been involved in the review of it). This approach is likely to provide a more acceptable solution for some of the impacted communities, as well as much needed revenue for DOC. - This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road. 	

5 Treaty partners

Working with treaty partners creates greater opportunities for conservation and Kaitiakitanga.

In meetings with Ngāti Wae Wae there was support for paid parking. There was a preference for the paid parking price structure to encourage visitors to stay for longer to enjoy all that Dolomite Point has to offer including spending longer at the Punangairi Exhibition Centre.

We have shared initial information on Franz Josef with Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio, although to date we have had no feedback we welcome further engagement to understand their perspectives

Initial information has been shared with Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua, Te Rūnanga o Waihao and Te Rūnanga o Moeraki. We would like to work with mana whenua to get further insights on paid parking for White Horse Hill, given the significance of the site at Aoraki to mana whenua.

6 Summary of national stakeholder and special interest group feedback

For the full feedback received from stakeholders please refer to Appendix A, a summary of feedback is provided below with a brief response to the feedback. There will be further correspondence with stakeholders as the proposed parking strategy is shared.

6.1 Conservation Boards

Presentations on paid parking were shared to both the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board and the West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board.

The West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board noted that they are aware and concerned with the development of two paid parking pilots on the West Coast and the presentation was an opportunity to understand the issues relating to the proposed pilots. The Board looks forward to further information on charging structure and implementation in due course.

The Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board provided feedback for the White Horse Hill carpark which included seeking clarification on the objectives and who had been consulted. They also noted that displacement effects need to be considered with people parking for free on Hooker Valley Road, at Aoraki/ Mount Cook Village, Mount Cook Road, Terrace Road and Bowen Drive. More vehicles could also use Tasman Valley Road and visiting Tasman Glacier lookout. In regard to carpark capacity improvements the Board asked if there was any intention on making the carpark larger? The Board noted that they strongly support park and ride and travel demand management.

Response

DOC looks forward to sharing the proposed pricing strategy in August 2025.

The possible displacement effects and parking behaviour at White Horse Hill will be monitored as part of the parking pilot.

6.2 Recreation Sector Forum

The Recreation Sector Forum is a forum held regularly between DOC and the recreation sector. Included within the recreation sector are organisations such as the Back Country Trust, Tourism Industry Aotearoa, Outdoor Access Commission, NZ Deerstalkers, Cycle Trail, Trail Fund, Game Animal Council, NZ Alpine Club, Recreation Aotearoa, Fish and Game and Federated Mountain Club. While the discussion is recorded below individual groups could provide their own feedback and is therefore not counted in the stakeholder tally.

The discussion after the presentation included the following points:

- Suggestion that charges should be focused on international visitors.
- A few comments raised the need for clear messaging on where the money is going.
- Need to be mindful of unintended consequences like visitors rushing a visit to stay within a free parking period. Also suggested that they want people to take their time.
- Given complexity of the car park at Aoraki someone suggested a small delay in implementing parking at this site to allow learning from the other sites to inform the settings at Aoraki.
- DOC should be commercial in its approach and aim for a 40% profit margin. Should charge more for buses considering the higher visitor volumes, or less if we want to promote mass transit.
- Suggested the team talk to local councils on the impact of parking on visitors at a location.
- Need to consider charges in the context of other charges that international tourists face. Cat reminded everyone that parking isn't a new thing, it's just new for DOC.

Response

DOC looks forward to sharing the proposed pricing strategy in August 2025. DOC will be monitoring the impacts of the paid parking pilot.

6.3 New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) - Dolomite Point and Franz Josef

NZTA is in principle happy that the pilot proceeds as proposed. Questions were asked about how staff and business parking will be managed, the pricing structure and any time limits that may be applied during the pilot. In addition, they want further information on how the Department of Conservation will manage any impacts to the State Highway in the event that the pilots result in a shift in behaviour that results in an increased number of vehicles parking on the state highway, and any safety issues this may cause.

Please note, NZTA do not undertake parking enforcement, and where this pilot results in an unsafe situation on the state highway, the Department of Conservation will be responsible for undertaking all actions required to make safe. It is our expectation that if the pilot results in an increase in vehicles parking on the state highway creating unsafe operating conditions, that the pilot will be modified, or suspended, to prevent this occurring.

NZTA also request that they are included in the review of the outcomes of the pilot, to provide feedback on any impacts to the state highway network that may occur.

Response

Parking behaviour will be monitored as part of the parking pilot.

6.4 Buller District Mayor supported by Grey District Mayor – Dolomite Point

The Buller District Mayor provided feedback that was then supported by the Grey District Mayor. The feedback stated:

- Local use and community access is important at Dolomite Point as the community rely on the site as a central gathering place. The residents already bear the cost of supporting a visitor focussed infrastructure with their rates and locals paying for car parking risks the communities social licence.
- There are those that stay for a medium term in local accommodation that often return to Dolomite Point multiple times through their stay, having to pay repeatedly risks diminishing the appeal of Punakaiki as a destination.
- Community Events and accessibility – Council has used Dolomite Point venues for community event and local engagement initiatives. If locals are to pay for parking to attend these events they it will likely deter attendance and therefore engagement.
- Parking charges – suggested model. To balance the needs the suggestion is to have the first hour free parking to accommodate most of the local use
- I strongly support the Department’s continued investment in infrastructure and visitor experience at Punakaiki. However, the success of any paid parking initiative will hinge on retaining the goodwill and participation of local residents and businesses. Providing free short-term parking is a sensible and proven method to protect community use, encourage longer visitor stays, and maintain the area’s appeal without compromising its economic or social sustainability.

Response

We have heard the importance of Dolomite Point as a community hub and are currently looking at how locals can be taken into consideration in the pricing strategy. These ideas are informing the development of the proposed pricing strategy, which will be shared for further feedback in August.

6.5 Bus Coach Association

The Bus Coach Association (BCA) is supportive of what is trying to be achieved but have questions about how charges will be enforced. They also raised concern about Concessionaires with a valid DOC parking card are not double charged and how this will be managed during the pilot. BCA would appreciate good communication through the trial so they can provide feedback on what they are seeing.

Response

There will be cameras recording number plates of vehicles as they enter and exit the car parks. The company providing paid parking hardware will issue breach notices to vehicles for non-payment. A breach notice relies on debt collection for enforceability and parking behaviour will be monitored during the pilot period.

Commercial tourism operators with a concession will be able to apply for a permit online to exempt them from parking fees at the pilot sites. The application process will require operators to provide evidence of a concession. More information to follow on the Permit application process.

6.6 Tourism Industry Aotearoa

TIA provided a comprehensive submission on DOC’s consultation on conservation land management and exploring charging for access to some public conservation lands. On the matter of charging for

access, TIA submitted that when considering access charging (or other charging) the total cumulative cost incurred by visitors across the funding environment must be considered before any new charges are established. TIA highlighted the risk of visitors essentially paying via multiple channels, including having paid:

- The \$100 International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL)
- A concessionaire for an activity or experience; or
- Other user charges such as hut, camping or Great Walk fees.

On the matter of access charging, TIA recommended:

DOC to prepare proposed revenue plans for the selected places or sites being considered for an access charge, looking at the mix of revenue sources, visitor types and investment needs and other relevant criteria, and these could well be the potential sites identified in the consultation document.

While a charge for a service is different to an access charge, the principle of equity for visitors is a central consideration and we recommend this is factored into the paid parking pilots.

Response

Paid Parking will help control parking pressures and increase financial support for our special cultural and natural areas. Paid parking is a tool used globally to manage visitor numbers and contribute to the financial sustainability of popular natural sites.

The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:

- trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites
- improve visitor experience
- align with international best practices.

The pilot is funded by \$3.8 million from the International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL).

We acknowledge concerns about the IVL and are committed to ensuring transparency around how funds are used. The pilot is funded by IVL to explore sustainable funding options for high-use sites, and feedback on perceived double charging is being considered.

Legislation does allow DOC to charge users fair and reasonable fees to use our facilities, which include campsites, backcountry huts and car parks.

In a separate initiative, which is not linked to the paid parking pilot, the government has proposed changes that would make it legal for DOC to charge international visitors access fees at four iconic tourism sites. The Conservation Acts (Land Management) Amendment Bill will now be drafted and introduced to Parliament in 2026. This process will include further public consultation on the draft Bill as part of the select committee process.

6.7 Tourism Export Council - Dolomite Point and White Horse Hill

The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) acknowledges and supports government's growth agenda and appreciate tourism being identified as part of the growth strategy. However,

- TECNZ acknowledges the role the Department of Conservation (DOC) has as one of the country's largest participants and supporters of the visitor economy and acknowledge the great work DOC does for New Zealanders and international visitors.
- TECNZ recognizes DOC needs more investment to support its strategic outcomes and provide a safe and resilient visitor network of infrastructure, facilities and services.
- We ask our submission and ideas be considered seriously. TECNZ represents the private sector involved with growing and developing New Zealand's international tourism offering.
- TECNZ represents 75 Inbound Member companies (who bring in over 60% of all international visitors) and 256 tourism companies. All TECNZ members have a high ratio (normally 60% or more) of their business deriving income from international visitors. Our members are those that

drove and influenced New Zealand's international tourism result pre-Covid of generating 3.9 million visitors and \$17.5 billion in export receipts.

- Our submission represents the majority of tourism businesses that have a high dollar investment (\$) level in building New Zealand's visitor proposition and attracting and hosting international visitors. This includes private sector investment in selling and promoting New Zealand to the world to generate demand (Inbound Tour Operators), investment in accommodation (hotels, luxury lodges, motel bed and breakfast), transport (airlines, helicopter, fixed wing aircraft, vessels) and activity / attraction development and infrastructure to support growth of tourism to present New Zealand's world class offering to attract international visitors.
- Our submission and views only relate to impact of carparking charges on international visitors.
- TECNZ is not supportive of ad hoc additional charges or fees (like access fees or carparking fees) being forced upon international visitors. We believe the International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL) revenue derived from international visitors (excluding Australian visitors) has created adequate revenue for DOC to help cover operational costs.
- The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand has given considerable thought to proposed carparking fees and impact on international visitors.
- Our first response is that we do not support carparking fees being implemented for international visitors. The reason for this is due to the \$100 per person fee that almost all international visitors are paying with the IVL fee with revenue going to 50% to visitor infrastructure needs and 50% to the Department of Conservation for 'visitor' services and infrastructure needs, maintenance and biodiversity projects and initiatives.
- We acknowledge the Department of Conservation is exploring carparking fees that may capture Australian and other countries currently exempt from paying the IVL fee and to use international visitors to generate revenue for the Department of Conservation.
- TECNZ cautions any new visitor fees for access to key attraction areas and implementing carparking fees could result in a continued 'stall' of international visitors returning to New Zealand.
- In taking many things into consideration, in the event implementing carparking fees are to be implemented, we strongly recommend the following.
 - Existing DOC concession holders including Inbound Tour Operators (and organised group tours), Bus & Coach Association (BCA) coach operators, Pro Guide driver/tour operators, and activity/attraction/transport concession holders are EXEMPT from paying a carparking fee. During the visitor season these businesses are travelling and hosting visitors to the areas on a daily basis. Most will be existing concession holders and should not have to pay another fee.
 - DOC concession holders already pay the Department of Conservation a considerable amount of funds to host visitors on the DOC estate. If DOC does not exempt existing concession holders the Department will be charging concession double or triple charging. This is unfair to businesses trying to host international visitors on their journey around New Zealand.
 - From a group touring perspective, DOC currently receives a fee from the Inbound Tour Operator, the BCA coach operator and Pro Guides if the ITO contracts the Pro Guide to be the Tour Leader/Guide hosting the group as they travel around New Zealand. In the eventuality that carparking fees are implemented, TECNZ believes international visitors that should be targeted on those that travel via motorhome, campervan, rental vehicles and private vehicles to be charged.
 - TECNZ strongly recommends any carparking revenue generated in key attraction areas has funds hypothecated (targeted) and returned to the local community for upkeep of the local. TECNZ strongly disagrees with carparking funds in key attraction areas going

into the main operational account of DOC. All funds generated should go back to the local community for upkeep and maintenance of the carpark in the area/region.

Response

Commercial tourism operators with a concession will be able to apply for a permit online to exempt them from parking fees at the pilot sites. The application process will require operators to provide evidence of a concession. More information to follow on the Permit application process.

Paid parking is a tool used globally to manage visitor numbers and contribute to the financial sustainability of popular natural sites.

The purpose of the DOC pilot is to:

- trial a way for visitors to contribute to costs at high-use sites
- improve visitor experience
- align with international best practices.

The pilot is funded by \$3.8 million from the International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL). We acknowledge concerns about the IVL and are committed to ensuring transparency around how funds are used. The pilot is funded by IVL to explore sustainable funding options for high-use sites, and feedback on perceived double charging is being considered.

Legislation does allow DOC to charge users fair and reasonable fees to use our facilities, which include campsites, backcountry huts and car parks. The money generated will contribute to the facilities and nature visitors enjoy.

In a separate initiative, which is not linked to the paid parking pilot, the government has proposed changes that would make it legal for DOC to charge international visitors access fees at four iconic tourism sites. The Conservation Acts (Land Management) Amendment Bill will now be drafted and introduced to Parliament in 2026. This process will include further public consultation on the draft Bill as part of the select committee process.

6.8 NZ Police

Concerns were raised about tourists and hikers parking on the already slim side of road in area to avoid payment at Dolomite Point. How will this be managed?

Would Police, Ambulance, Search and Rescue etc be given a card for access at all times given the 24 hour times we access this area from an emergency response perspective?

Response

Parking behaviour is planned to be monitored as part of the parking pilot, and Emergency services will always have access to the pilot sites.

6.9 Meridian Energy

Request to exclude EV charging spots from the trial as introducing paid parking (on top of paying for charging) disincentivises sustainable transport choices.

Response

Yes, electric vehicles will still pay which aligns with common practice in other paid car parks with EV chargers, we are aware that there are EV charging stations at the Dolomite Point northern carpark.

6.10 NZ Game Animal Council – White Horse Hill

The NZ Game Animal Council (GAC) is pleased to see that Tahr Lodge users are exempt from paid parking pilot projects at White Horse Hill car park at Aoraki/Mt Cook. This will support some continued hunter contribution to game animal management and conservation in this area.

We encourage you to consider how the proposed paid parking pilot project can be used to enable hunter feedback from those who are not using tahr lodge, but still accessing the area to hunt, and how DOC can continue to enable as many hunters as possible to continue contributing to conservation outcomes in this area. The GAC is concerned that additional cost to access hunting areas could reduce hunter contributions to game animal management in these areas, and those accessed through them, resulting in perverse conservation outcomes.

Please see the GAC submission on ‘Exploring charging for access to some conservation land’ for further context around our feedback: [GAC-Submission-Exploring-charging-for-access-to-some-public-conservation-land.pdf](#)

Response

These ideas are informing the development of the proposed pricing strategy, which will be shared for further feedback in September.

6.11 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - White Horse Hill

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) is an autonomous Crown Entity with statutory responsibility under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) for the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand’s historic heritage. The Department of Conservation (DOC) is proposing to pilot paid car parking at the White Horse Hill carpark in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.

White Horse Hill carpark is located in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park and serves as a carparking area for access to White Horse Hill campground and several walking trails such as Hooker Valley Track, Kea Point Track, Mueller and Hooker Huts. HNZPT supports the overall proposal to pilot paid carparking at White Horse Hill carpark, but advises that careful consideration is made of any associated effects such as traffic and increased vehicle movements in surrounding areas, noise, dust, and potential vibration. These are particularly important to consider in respect of impacts to archaeology and Māori heritage as a result of implementing paid carparking.

Ngāi Tahu hold the rangatiratanga and mana within the takiwā of Ngāi Tahu Whānui, which includes the National Park. Aoraki is considered the most sacred of ancestors to Ngāi Tahu and represents the link between the cosmological world and the present-day generation, reinforcing the sense of identity and continuity across generations. Aoraki contains a Deed of Recognition under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998, acknowledging Te Rūnanga’s statement of Ngāi Tahu’s cultural, spiritual, historic and/or traditional association to Aoraki. Although there is the potential for archaeological material to be uncovered, the installation of paid parking equipment, such as pay machines, would likely require minimal earthworks and the equipment could be moved to an alternative location should archaeological material be identified during works. If this approach is taken, and impact to archaeology can be avoided, proceeding under an Accidental Discovery Protocol (attached as Appendix 1) should be sufficient. If the works are more than minor and/or the equipment cannot be relocated in the event archaeological material is identified, then an application for an Archaeological Authority should be considered ahead of the works.

Piloting paid carparking is likely to result in visitors exploring alternative carparking options off road or in any surrounding areas. As such, HNZPT advises that the potential effects of off-road parking on archaeological features (yet to be recorded) are also considered, particularly where ground conditions are sodden as vehicles have the potential to cause significant damage to subsurface features, if present.

In respect of the above, HNZPT expresses its support for the proposal to pilot paid car parking, beginning summer 2025/2026, but also wishes to highlight the importance of a thorough assessment of any direct, indirect, actual and potential effects on the carpark and its surrounding environment, with respect to archaeology and Māori heritage.

Response

An archaeological assessment has been completed for the White Horse Hill carpark.

6.12 NZ Alpine Club - White Horse Hill

Most of our users are longer stay people (more than 1 or 2 days). We would hope that rates would be diminishing with amount of time you stay (they might be staying 3 – 5 days to do Ball Pass, Empress Hut, or ski touring up around Mueller). Many of them will be coming from Unwin lodge.

Our main concern is a possible change in user behaviour meaning more people are walking on the road or biking between the lodge and the Hooker Valley end. This would pose safety issues.

A lesser consequence, that this leads to much more roadside rubbish with rangers often having to stop on a main road to pick up dumped rubbish.

Our NZAC Club members (and other outdoor activists) tend to use the carpark for long (multi-day) visits when ski touring in the Barron Saddle - Mueller area undertaking Ball Pass and Copland Pass crossings, climbing trips to the upper Hooker Valley and climbing Aoraki from the west side and completing the GT, Predator control. It is also often a starting point for long alpine traverses e.g Copland -Karangarua - Mueller. We would be a small percentage of those parking there but would be there for extended periods of time.

Wonder if there could be a permit system like at Mangatepopo so that climbers can still get into the backcountry without getting penalised, or could there be Club discounts for people. Most members would arrive in cars, so a steep differential on camper vans would make sense.

Response

DOC is aware of the current concerns and the project design team is investigating potential paid parking traffic impacts and designing mitigations to best manage impacts and safety. Traffic and pedestrian behaviour will be monitored as part of the pilot, and adjustments will be made as needed.

These ideas are informing the development of the proposed pricing strategy, which will be shared for further feedback in September.

6.13 Canterbury Mountain Club

Would like confirmation of the intentions for the access to Wyn Irwin Lodge during the trial period.

Response

We will follow up with the Canterbury Mountain Club about the lodge.

6.14 Federated Mountain Clubs – White Horse Hill

Federated Mountain Clubs was founded in 1931 and advocates for the backcountry and outdoor recreation on behalf of over 22,000 members in 96 clubs. FMC speaks also for the many other New Zealanders who enjoy our backcountry.

We would like to see the pricing strategy, especially related to how this will impact those users who embark on multi-day backcountry trips from this location. The volume of these users is tiny compared to the volume of day users - with the latter being the cause of the current congestion issues.

As a general rule nationally where car parking charges are being introduced, it is important to also facilitate an exemption for volunteers involved in hut and track maintenance or conservation work - they donate their own time and expenditure in the pursuit of activities that support the Department, so should never have to pay carpark charges as part of their volunteer mahi.

Response

These ideas are informing the development of the proposed pricing strategy, which will be shared for further feedback in September.

7 What happens next?

All feedback is being passed onto the project team and decision makers as they develop the proposed pricing strategy. Once the strategy is drafted, DOC will share it with the communities of Dolomite Point and Franz Josef in August and White Horse Hill in September. There will be an opportunity for further feedback prior to the pilot being installed. During August we are planning to update submitters via email and hold community drop-in sessions at each location to allow for further feedback.

Appendix A – Submissions Received

The table below contains the feedback received up to the 24 July 2025 for the paid parking pilot phase 1 engagement. Please note names, addresses and complaints have been redacted to protect the privacy of submitters.

Submitter number	Feedback
1	Concerns re the wheelchair access to the southern carpark. I know this is going to be sealed but we may need to pay careful attention to the way vehicles can park and the layout of disabled parking the quality of the crossing needs to be improved and the surface of the path heading to the experience centre.
2	<p>Hi</p> <p>I own a bach at Punakaiki and have been a regular visitor for decades.</p> <p>I fully support the paid parking initiative. I believe that we make things far too easy in NZ for people to take advantage of our natural environment and built infrastructure at little or no cost to themselves. Anywhere else in the world you pay a fortune to park at places far less attractive than Punakaiki.</p> <p>We need to wise up and charge what these places are worth. We spend a fortune as a nation on things like the new visitor centre and the walkways and huts and get almost no revenue in return. The user-pays model makes a lot more sense in my view. Why should I as a taxpayer fork out for some traveller sleeping in his HiAce van and not contributing much to our economy?</p> <p>Bring it on.</p> <p>Thanks</p>

3	<p>Hi folk,</p> <p>Can I please ask a few questions to aid with discussion next week and subsequent provision of feedback on the attached.</p> <p>Our initial position is we are supportive of what DOC is trying to achieve here. However, our current understanding is such charges can't be enforced without a law change which appears to be where the recent consultation on Access Charging will eventually take us. Is that correct or do you have a current mechanism to enforce parking charges during the trials?</p> <p>I note mention that charges would apply to passenger service vehicles like buses and we are again supportive subject to how fairly pricing is set. The specific concern I've previously expressed through the Concessionaire Reference Group is what mechanism is used to ensure buses with a valid DOC parking card issued under our concession (____) are not double charged. If you can share your thinking on how that will be managed through the trials please? Alternatively, we are happy to discuss if this hasn't been worked through yet.</p> <p>BCA see trials as a great way to test and adjust before wider roll-out. So, they don't need to be perfect, but we would appreciate good communication through the trials so we can in turn let members know of teething issues or provide you feedback on what we are seeing.</p> <p>Finally, with google maps a little out of date, do you have any drawings of the Dolomite Point car parks, currently or better still showing the future expansion? I'm interested in what bus bays exist if any or if its only the roadside bus stops that are available.</p> <p>Kind regards, =</p>
4	<p>Subject: Paid parking at Dolomite Point</p> <p>Hello....</p> <p>I feel the need to pay for car parking is just too much!</p> <p>Much better to get visitors to pay to walk to the pancake rocks. - which is why they mostly go in my opinion to that area anyway.</p> <p>If paid parking goes ahead maybe local rate payers could apply for a code (from BDC) which they could enter into the pay machines and exempt them from paying.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment</p>

5	<p>Subject: Re: Media Release - DOC starts local conversations on paid parking pilots</p> <p>Good morning Paid Parking Team/ DOC Media Team.</p> <p>Are you able to provide more information for the plan for Punakaiki?</p> <p>I presume there must be information on the number of paid parking sites, the parking cost and period being considered for feedback?</p> <p>Will there be free parking near the toilets ?</p> <p>Are the concessions for staff or locals wanting to use the meeting facilities etc?</p> <p>Appreciate any specific information for plans at Dolomite Point - with the understanding they are up for discussion and input from local businesses.</p> <p>Best wishes</p>
6	<p>Support paid parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Preference is payment for a block of time -High portion of people enter the exhibition centre building, a lot of people unaware of experience available and haven't allowed enough time to stay for longer -Working on marketing to improve awareness of exhibition experience -Aim to increase the number of people buying tickets for the exhibition experience. Currently around 5% of people buy tickets that enter the building -Strategically want visitors to stay for longer at Dolomite Point -Typically people stay for 40min, want to increase length of stay to 1.5hours -No wait time for the exhibition experience, buy a ticket then a minimum of 40 minutes for paid exhibition experience

7	<p>Hi Wayne and team</p> <p>Thanks for sending through info on this. We have already voiced our opinion to the engineer on this, but here are the main points below</p> <p>We don't feel we should be charged parking at all</p> <p>If we are charged, then we shouldn't be charged the same as tourists (we already pay 7.5% concession fees so this should be deducted/taken into account from the total)</p> <p>We don't have time to wait in cues as our tours are set at strict times and any traffic hold ups may result in our staff not getting their legal breaks etc</p> <p>We don't have time to go to a parking meter and muck around paying x5 times a day, with clients in tow waiting. Our guides don't have a way to pay and I'm not getting them a credit card each ☹️</p> <p>For the above 2 - suggest a card access with 'miss the cue' section for us.)</p> <p>We suggest kea-proofing all installation equipment</p> <p>thanks Ngā mihi (kind regards)</p>
8	<p>What ever the decision...which I do believe has already been made.</p> <p>Locals should NOT have to pay for parking at Dolomite point.</p> <p>Regards</p>
9	<p>Afternoon</p> <p>If DoC introduce paid parking at Dolomite Point without an exemption for locals, who frequent the cafe (open mic nights) and take visitors to the blowholes and visitor center, I will stop visiting. And then them elsewhere.</p> <p>cheers</p>

10	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>For nearly 25 years my family have been a landowner at Fox river / Kaipakati point (since 2001).</p> <p>We believe Buller district rate payers should not have to pay for parking at the Punakaiki visitor centre cafe and Pancake rocks car park. We often spend time visiting the cafe and supporting locals at the new visitor centre as well as living in the area and are part of the local community, we are not tourists nor should be classified as such, we pay / contribute enough in high value rates annually and should not be penalised and included in a user pay scheme in such a remote but beautiful of New Zealand which has been further encouraged / designed as a tourist attraction.</p> <p>A local rate payer coupon could be identified by a downloadable sticker / coupon sent to rate payers to display on the dash of their car. Or a code sent out that is entered into pay machines if that route is taken by DOC to police the carpark.</p> <p>Please could you pass in our feedback</p> <p>Thank you so much, Ngā mihi nui</p>
----	--

11	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I understand that paid parking is to be installed at Punakaiki. I think this is a flawed idea, as there is no mention of locals that visit this area being able to park for free. I understand that along with Franz and Mt Cook you are aiming at the huge number of foreign visitors to pay these charges, otherwise why not include other less visited places.</p> <p>You have picked out 3 too visited attractions. Foreigners already pay a tax for visiting on their arrival in NZ. Why do you need to tax them again.?</p> <p>My suggestion is 1 hour free parking then payment...that would enable locals who visit the area to frequent the cafe and shops. A 15 minute limit to get a coffee is not an option because it takes time to walk from the carpark to the cafe and you can wait for a good 10 minutes before you get your order.</p> <p>What about people charging their electric cars at the newly installed charging stations, do they pay ??</p> <p>I suggest with a hefty fee people will give this attraction a miss, which would not be good for the DOC office in the new visitor centre and the Pounamu Pathway Sent from my iPhone</p>
----	---

12	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thank you for providing details of the proposed paid parking pilot on Department of Conservation estate at Dolomite Point to NZTA. We understand from the information provided that there are no changes to the existing parking arrangements on the state highway outside the Dolomite Point visitors centre.</p> <p>On behalf of NZTA I advise that NZTA is in principle happy that the pilot proceeds as proposed. To provide further feedback on this proposal and any anticipated impacts on state highway operation, we need more information around how staff and business parking will be managed, the pricing structure and any time limits that may be applied during the pilot. In addition, we request further information on how the Department of Conservation will manage any impacts to the State Highway in the event that the pilots result in a shift in behaviour that results in an increased number of vehicles parking on the state highway, and any safety issues this may cause.</p> <p>Please note, NZTA do not undertake parking enforcement, and where this pilot results in an unsafe situation on the state highway, the Department of Conservation will be responsible for undertaking all actions required to make safe. It is our expectation that if the pilot results in an increase in vehicles parking on the state highway creating unsafe operating conditions, that the pilot will be modified, or suspended, to prevent this occurring.</p> <p>NZTA also request that we are included in the review of the outcomes of the pilot, to provide feedback on any impacts to the state highway network that may occur.</p> <p>Regards,</p>
----	---

13	<p>Hi</p> <p>As a frequent visitor to New Zealand in am emailing to say I'm am very opposed to the introduction of car parking charges. The lack of parking charges in most locations is something I always talk about to people when back home in the uk. People should be encouraged into the great outdoors and to visit sites of interest. Parking charges are a retrograde step. Please don't become like the UK where sites of beauty and interest are leveraged to extract the most out of their visitors. I can assure you that paid parking does and will put some people off visiting sites. What next no free sun screen at sporting events expensive bottled water in restaurants, please don't lose your wonderful Kiwi charm. Yours sincerely</p>
14	<p>Such a bad idea to have payed parking. Just greedy.</p> <p>Really not the kiwi way. Very disappointing if it goes ahead.</p> <p>DOC arn't really being given much choice though I suspect.</p> <p>Our environment shouldn't be seen only in an economic way and we've been moving towards that ideology for many years now.</p> <p>This thinking will reinforce a class system where the have nots will be less likely to access our natural environment with all its benefits like mental health, well-being, physical fitness, etc.</p>

15	<p>OFFICE OF THE MAYOR</p> <p>Department of Conservation Proposed Paid Parking Trial – Dolomite Point Punakaiki</p> <p>5 June 2025</p> <p>Sent via email: paidcarparking@doc.govt.nz</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide early feedback on the proposed paid parking trial at Dolomite Point, Punakaiki. I would like to acknowledge and commend the Department of Conservation (DoC) for the significant investment and quality improvements made in the area. DoC continues to play a vital role in our region’s economic, social, and environmental well-being and remains a valued partner to our community. Having reviewed the factsheet outlining the intentions of the proposed trial and some direct community conversations, I wish to offer the following feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Use – Community Access <p>There are two key elements to consider under the banner of “local use.”Firstly, there are local residents who rely on Dolomite Point as a central gathering space and service hub – including post boxes, meeting points, and business services. These residents already bear the cost of supporting a visitor-focused infrastructure through their rates. For example, while I understand the Council water supply does not directly service Dolomite Point, local ratepayers still contribute toward the wider infrastructure required for the influx of visitors. Introducing paid parking risks undermining the community’s social licence to host and support the visitor economy. A perceived lack of recognition for this contribution could create resentment among residents. Secondly, consideration should be given to medium-term visitors who stay locally in accommodation such as baches or motels. These visitors often return to Dolomite Point multiple times during their stay—for example, for morning coffee, blowhole viewings at high tide, or social meet-ups. Being charged each time they park risks diminishing the appeal of Punakaiki as a destination and may inadvertently discourage return visits or extended stays, ultimately impacting local business.</p> 2. Community Events and Accessibility <p>Council has historically used Dolomite Point precinct venues for community events, drop-in sessions, and local engagement initiatives. If locals are required to pay for parking in order to attend these events, it is likely to deter attendance and engagement. This would necessitate a shift to alternative venues that offer free parking, reducing the practicality and visibility of community outreach within the area most directly affected.</p> 3. Parking Charges – Suggested Model <p>To balance the needs of residents, visitors, and local businesses, I propose that the Department consider implementing a first-hour free parking period as part of any paid parking model. This approach would accommodate the majority of local use scenarios and has proven successful in other high-visitation areas. There are many examples of paid parking exemptions or free</p>
----	---

parking at highly visited sites. A few examples include:

- Nelson City, Blenheim, and Picton CBDs, which offer the first hour of parking free in areas heavily frequented by tourists and locals alike.
- Highly visited environmental attractions such as the Christchurch Botanic Gardens and Hamilton Gardens in the Waikato, which offer free parking options near their mixed commercial and visitor facilities. These models strike a thoughtful balance between revenue generation and accessibility, and could serve as a template for implementation at Dolomite Point.

Summary

I strongly support the Department's continued investment in infrastructure and visitor experience at Punakaiki. However, the success of any paid parking initiative will hinge on retaining the goodwill and participation of local residents and businesses.

Providing free short-term parking is a sensible and proven method to protect community use, encourage longer visitor stays, and maintain the area's appeal without compromising its economic or social sustainability. Thank you for considering this feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Jamie Cleine | Mayor

16	<p>Hi Project team,</p> <p>Here are our thoughts on the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A free parking period for vehicles making drop offs/pickups or short stays. • As we have been operating a shuttle service to and from the Glacier car park, we would need a free parking period of 30 minutes to drop and load. • Taking this as being from the time you go through the gate until you return pass the gate on the way out. It also allows for giving way to traffic at the speed bumps. • Fee structure options including fixed length of stay rates, daily rates, and multi-day rates. <p>As we see people are overnighiting up there this wouldn't come under any of these categories unless monitored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options for charging based on vehicle category that includes buses and motorbikes. <p>Yes, feel a different charge should be for vehicle categories as this would help maintain the costs of roading repairs.</p> <p>I would suggest Buses- should be only allowed up there if they have a concession pass with an extension for a yearly fee for parking up there. This may be a different ticket issued to them in conjunction with there concession ticket.</p> <p>Cars, motorbikes, Motorhomes, and Bicycles -all pay a fee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the pricing should be in effect, including off peak pricing options and time of day options. • Should be all year around 24/7 • Prices should be set yearly. • How to accommodate local use. • They get a discount card from DOC centre. <p>Other comments.</p> <p>Will this be able to pick up vehicles that have no concession to be operating as there are quite a lot up there with no concessions.</p> <p>If this isn't 24/7 then in Summer especially it is daylight to nearly 10pm then you will find a lot of people up there after hours.</p>
----	---

17	<p>I think its terrible that you are planning to charge for parking in Punakaiki. Especially after the horrendous amount of money that was spent on the visitor center.</p> <p>Charging for parking will mean kiwis wont stop which will hurt the area</p> <p>At the very min why don't you just charge during the busiest months</p>
----	---

18	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a Queenstown based hiking guide who works for a guiding concession holder in Westland, Aoraki/Mount Cook, Mt Aspiring and Fiordland National Parks and other conservation areas. I would like to express my feedback and concerns about the introduction of paid parking trials at Punakaiki, Franz Josef and White Horse Hill car parks in Spring 2025.</p> <p>I don't oppose the introduction of paid parking as long as it is reasonably priced, however I believe that the following four points need to be considered and need to explore some solutions.</p> <p>1) Commercial concession holder parkings</p> <p>There are currently designated parkings for tour coaches and they need to keep maintained or to be upgraded. As a hiking guide/bus driver, we are struggling to find parking lots for operating our guided tours as non-commercial vehicles park up at designated parking spaces for us. Empty space in front of coach parking is crucial for turning the coach around but recently people started parking and giving us a very hard time.</p> <p>Electing clear signages like "commercial buses and vans only" "turning area" with using traffic cones to block the area is a short term solution. A clear painting of parking space on carpark ground and redesign the layout to "front in front out" for a long term. One of great successful examples is the coach and public car park next to the bridge by the Church of Good Shepherd in Tekapo.</p> <p>I have seen there is a lack of parkings for smaller sized commercial operator vehicles recently. Due to our guiding concession, our group is smaller than coach tour groups (mostly less than 10) and I often use a van to access the walk as a part of reducing carbon emission. Since Covid, there are also a lot of tour companies shifted to smaller sized vehicles eg Mercedes Sprinter or Toyota HiAce rather than 50 seater coaches. It would be very helpful if you provide some commercial parking spaces designated for smaller vehicles with clear signages like "permit holders only" or "commercial operators only". From my observation last summer, typical commercial vehicle numbers at the White Horse Hill in January are 5 to 7 ish commercial HiAce/Sprinters, 5 ish Rosa+trailers and 5 ish large coaches at a time (between 10am and 5pm).</p> <p>2) Mitigating overflow vehicles</p> <p>Even when paid parking is introduced, I assume vehicles would overflow out of the main paid car park and people would start parking on verges along the access road during the peak season. Some smart people may start parking on the verge to avoid paying parking fees and others follow. This is not fair to people paying the fees and potentially very hazardous if this happens along the major state highway in Punakaiki.</p> <p>Short term solution would be setting up the gate like the Remarkables ski field introduced for their toll road instead of the rego recognition payment system? So the gate can control how many vehicles are in the carpark and they can go with a one in one out system (but please</p>
----	---

maintain drop off/pick up access at all times and commercial vehicle access without queuing). Location of the gate/camera may affect parking behaviour?

This would require a long term solution and it depends on budget, but construction of free large public parks some distance away and a walkway linking between the parking and the destination would be an ultimate solution.

Although it is at capacity, Milford Sound has a great effective example of car park design - the closest car parks for tour coaches and commercial vans, the second closest for public paid parking then the furthest is for public free parking (and there is free shuttle service). A huge signage informs the allocation. I believe all future DOC paid car parks should be like this layout. Ski fields recently introduced a priority parking system and this is a similar concept.

3) Maximise the car park capacity

The car parks need to be sealed and parking lot lines need to be painted. Currently there are no lines to identify each parking lot and there is always a huge gap between vehicles. I always feel this is a waste of space and am annoyed if I have to park up further from the track entrance. Also painting the lines stops some people parking in the middle of the corridor and blocks the whole carpark section. The current settings are not clear to overseas tourists who are unfamiliar with our common sense.

4) Long term parking fees

As a mountaineer/tramper, it would be great if you create a cheaper overnight/multi day parking fees structure to access higher peaks without worrying about the money.

Thanks for spending time with this feedback.

Please feel free to get in touch with me if you have any questions regarding this.

19	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>I recently saw discussion in a hiking group about DOC's intention to begin charging for certain parking lot access at trailheads.</p> <p>I am 29 years old, have a degree and formal training in adventure tourism (Bachelor of Sustainability and Outdoor Education), have worked for many years in various guiding and conservation fields around NZ, and spend a lot of personal time in our backcountry. I, and many people in my community, would be very inhibited by charges on parking.</p> <p>Hiking is a very accessible activity once you have the basic gear. People can choose to stay in larger huts if they want the support and relative luxury, or go for small bivvies or tents if they want something less costly.</p> <p>As someone who frequently plans hikes for myself as a solo hiker, and as a group organiser, the admin around parking would be a huge barrier to finding spontaneous weather windows and getting out in the bush, as well as planning large trips ahead of time and then needing to cancel because of weather or other circumstances; in either case, having the extra admin of arranging parking on short notice OR needing to call off a trip for safety reasons but potentially going ahead with it anyway (think of how many people do the Tongariro Crossing in inadvisable conditions because they booked transport for that day and won't have another chance).</p> <p>Furthermore I'd be thinking about the secondary effects of introducing such a rule to even a few parking locations; who would be enforcing the parking fee? What are the chances of people parking in dangerous locations outside of the official parking area to avoid the cost?</p> <p>To be blunt, DOC should be getting enough funding that you don't need to do this.</p> <p>I know you don't, but you should be.</p> <p>I would be raising more public attention about the gargantuan financial void between what you are provided with, and what you are expected to do. I understand nothing is likely to change under the current government; but in the longterm I want to see DOC, as the government organisation it is, receiving appropriate funding for all the areas you cover in managing our tourism industry and holding up the majority of all conservation work.</p> <p>Ultimately, creating further barriers between people and our wilderness will cause longterm harm for both.</p>
----	---

	<p>Thank you for your time</p>
20	<p>Hi there.</p> <p>I am emailing in regards to the proposal of paid car parks around DOC sites.</p> <p>As this has not been transparent, there is no set fee and no doubt that those fees will only increase, I am writing in my vote is opposed.</p> <p>I would be interested in more information on this if I could be please.</p>
21	<p>Please don't ...it will affect many people's travel plans and impact the tourist attractions and surrounding businesses.</p>
22	<p>Please don't put paid parking at our beautiful places like Pancake Rocks. Lake Kaniere and Authers Pass.</p>
23	<p>Kia Ora</p> <p>It is with sadness that I've learned about your proposal about paid parking at DOC parking areas.</p> <p>Personally, I will think twice before stopping at these areas and sure all local visitors will do. This will have an impact on businesses in these areas.</p> <p>I'm confident that there are other streams to fill the money pot's. Make the overseas visitors pay a levy, but not locals.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>

24	<p>I would like to know what the intention is behind charging for car parking on a trial basis at Punakaiki and the glaciers on the West Coast from October 2025?</p> <p>Is the trial potentially going to be expanded to include carparks at Great Walks?</p> <p>What are the charges going to be?</p> <p>Has any consultation taken place about these charges?</p> <p>Thank you for your time, I look forward to hearing from you soon.</p>
25	<p>I am seeking further information as to what is actually proposed at both sites so that I can provide an informed submission .can you send me the proposal details please Regards</p>

26	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thanks for sharing this.</p> <p>If possible, we would like to request to be excluded from the paid parking trial for the following reasons:</p> <p>introducing paid parking (on top of paying for charging) disincentivises sustainable transport choices managing multiple payment introduces friction from a customer experience perspective penalises those who drive vehicles requiring longer charges</p> <p>keeping our EV charging spots separate would allow your pilot to focus on general visitor parking behaviour without introducing other variables</p> <p>Please let me know the outcome.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited</p>
27	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I would like to share my feedback on the proposed paid carparking for the glacier valley carpark</p> <p>I think it is an excellent idea to implement paid carparking for visitors to the area, but I believe it should remain free for local residents. The cost of living in such a remote area is already high and it would be a shame to have an added cost prevent local residents from enjoying the local attractions. There are also limited activities suitable for young children in the area and the added cost of parking could reduce these further.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read through this email,</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p>

28	<p>I think this is absolutely outrageous! It will impact on the few shops in Punakaiki as well as that ridiculous huge lsite! How much did that cost???? And given away! Why Not charge to visit the rocks, rather than car parking? Which I believe is going to cost \$3.8million! Ridiculous! I think the whole thing is an outrageous waste of money!</p>
29	<p>18 June 2025</p> <p>Managing the Visitors</p> <p>The Department of Conservation [DOC] Paid Parking flyer states the pilot is to “help manage visitor numbers”. The best way to manage visitor numbers is reduce the level of promotion and hope for less peak traffic. There will always be more vehicles than parking places at New Year when NZ goes on holiday. If the vehicles end up blocking SHW 6 - so be it everyone has to slow down. By placing a parking fee at Dolomite Point (and reducing the number of car parks on SHW 6) more people will park illegally on the side of SHW 6 to the north and south of Dolomite Point - the law of unintended consequences - good luck managing this.</p> <p>The introduction of Paid Parking for the peak of season will result in most people thinking they will have to pay all year round. This will result in less local people visiting Dolomite Point in the off season.</p> <p>If I am passing in my electric vehicle [EV] will I have to pay a parking fee in order to access the EV chargers?</p> <p>Will motor bikes have to pay? If not why not? They are very noisy and disrupt the wildlife and they should be “managed” (reduced).</p> <p>The Money</p> <p>The unstated reality is that the purpose of the pilot is to generate revenue. There is no information on the budget: for capital outlay; cost of consultation; planning; budgeted income; expenditure or expected profit per annum. Why not? We’re in the dark here comrades.</p> <p>Reserves Act</p> <p>Prior to 2012 the land parcel ID 368 2538 that makes up the northern car park was gazetted as scenic reserve. It underwent a change of classification in 2012 and became a Local Purposes (Public Utility) Reserve.</p> <p>The Reserves Act reads: Local Purposes Reserves...that would impede the right of the public freely to pass and repass over the reserve on foot, unless the administering body determines that access should be prohibited or restricted to preserve the stability of the land or the biological values of the reserve.</p> <p>Given that almost all of the 500,000 people who arrive at Dolomite Point do so in a motor vehicle of some description, is the right of free access being denied because there is nowhere to park to enable one to exercise this right?</p> <p>AF8 Scenario</p> <p>The car parks are all full and there are 300 plus people at Dolomite Point when an AF8 earthquake strikes the West Coast. The people (and</p>

vehicles) are trapped at Dolomite Point by rockfall to the north and south. Where are these people going to be accommodated? What provision has been made to feed and shelter these people. If DOC is charging them to parking surely DOC has a duty of care to provide for them in an emergency. Will Punangairi become a public shelter/welfare centre?

Tourism

More tourism generates more greenhouse gases in the atmosphere producing more heating of the planet, leading to warmer oceans and more ice melting. In order to keep global heating to a level that humans can survive on the planet we need to reduce tourism. We need less not more of “thoughtless, heedless” tourism. How might we reduce the emissions from international air travel? Simple, have less of it.

Community Facility

The northern car park land has a long history of being a public space. During the 1920’s the Punakaiki School was located here. See image below.

On the basis that this land was set aside for “Local Purposes”, the Punakaiki Community sought permission from DOC to construct a Community Facility on this site as part of the Dolomite Point Redevelopment Project.

After some debate the community was instructed by DOC (via Phil Rossiter DOC Project Manager and Glen Irving BDC Projects Manager), to apply for a concession over a small parcel of land on the northern side of this Local Purposes Reserve. The BDC made the consent application on behalf of the community.

The concession application hearing was held in Westport in January 2020. Some months later the then head of DOC on the West Coast (Mark Davies) phoned the acting CEO of the BDC (Rachael Townrow) and convinced her to withdraw the application as he said it was going to cost a lot more money and not going to be successful. DOC management undermined their own due process. Is this how the Crown operates?

The community will continue to pursue the option of a Community Facility off the northern car park - we live here.

Recreation Reserves in Punakaiki

The DOC workshop was the original Recreation Reserve (1924 subdivision). Primary Parcel ID 3685475 is now classified as Government Buildings.

The DOC owned house currently housing DOC staff is sited on a Recreation Reserve land of 2620 sqm being Primary Parcel ID 3697332.

	<p>The main Punakaiki Recreation Reserve is now the Beach Camp Camp that generates income for the BDC.</p> <p>Recreation Reserves are established...: “for the purpose of providing areas for the recreation and sporting activities and the physical welfare and enjoyment of the public”. That is unless the Crown (DOC) has other plans for the land and the community gets sidelined.</p> <p>DOC Income Generation at Dolomite Point</p> <p>In 1991 the Minister of Finance delivered the mother of all budgets, which reduced the annual operational funding for DOC. DOC was told to earn more of their own income. The Punakaiki Visitor Centre began retailing in direct competition with Punakaiki Crafts. Retailing became a bigger and bigger part of the DOC operation and Punakaiki Crafts lost some of the income stream that paid the staff.</p> <p>The original Visitor Centre (1984) was designed with geological, natural history plus Māori and Pākehā stories. But these stories became hidden behind a clutter of commercial stuff once retail became the main event and eventually ...a bigger space was required.</p> <p>So here we are today. Punangairi has been gifted to Ngāti Waewae and the current DOC retailing activities do not cover the rental cost of being a tenant in Punangairi. The next opportunity is charging for car parks. Bingo!</p> <p>Bio Diversity All care should be taken so there is no negative impact on the Goats that reside in the forest vegetation to the north and west of the car parks.</p>
30	<p>Hi.</p> <p>I think charging for parking at Pancake Rocks is ridiculous and very detrimental to the businesses operating there.</p> <p>As a local from Barrytown I strongly object to this plan, but if it absolutely must happen, then 2 hours of free parking should be allowed.</p> <p>I regularly visit the Cafe there for a quick bite but if there are parking charges, it'd probably be more economic to go into Greymouth instead.</p> <p>Please don't charge for parking unless there is a 2hr gratis period.</p>

31	<p>No to paid parking.</p> <p>There is not enough, safe road side parking, for those unwilling to pay. I believe it will create dodgy parking antics out on the main highway. Not safe for all.</p>
32	<p>Feedback on paid parking at Dolomite Point, Punakaiki</p> <p>I'm providing feedback on behalf of myself and my partner,. We have lived at Te Miko at the northern end of Punakaiki for the past 10 years. I have previously worked for DOC as media and communications advisor for the Western South Island based in the Punakaiki VC office.</p> <p>We want to comment on local use of the carpark.</p> <p>Punakaiki has very limited services and, as such, our community mail boxes are vital.</p> <p>Our community was mostly very supportive and patient with the Dolomite Point Redevelopment Project and the years it took to complete. This was despite some inconvenience, such as around the moving of the community mail boxes and the inordinate amount of time it took to establish the new location in the northern carpark.</p> <p>We're aware the paid parking is completely separate from that project but, as both are led by DOC they are inevitably conflated in the minds of most of the community.</p> <p>We believe locals (as defined by those who are Community Mail Box holders) should have unlimited free access to carparking at Dolomite Point. Many of us, when we pick up our mail, also use that as an opportunity to catch up with other members of our scattered community as it's the place we're most likely to come across each other. We want to support Ngati Waewae, and the fabulous Punangairi centre we're so fortunate to have, so people frequently move on from the mail box house to Punangairi for a cuppa and something to eat, and check out what's happening there. We don't want to use the carpark for an inordinately long time but neither should we be under pressure to race back. In addition some mail box users have mobility issues, while others are families with young children. Putting time limits on their use of the carpark would seem particularly unfair.</p> <p>Added to that many of us are involved in local predator control such as monitoring traplines, for example Truman Track, and goat hunting plus other conservation initiatives including the Westland Petrel Patrol which operates every night during the fledgling season November to January. Having to pay for parking, particularly when we might be using a trip to the mailbox as an opportunity to check in with the VC about trapping or the petrel patrol etc would negatively affect DOC's social licence.</p> <p>Locals make Punakaiki what it is. We are most definitely not a problem which paid car parking may be trying to address. Please respect us and ensure we have free parking.</p>

33	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing in regards to the paid parking pilot scheme scheduled for Punakaiki.</p> <p>As a keen advocate for the area, and always trying to support what few shops we have left out this way, I am very concerned about the future of the small businesses out here. The Pancake Rocks Cafe is iconic in Punakaiki, I have very fond memories of coming out for a walk around the blowholes and ducking into the cafe for an ice block afterward as a child. This is something that many of the families who live out this way also take part in, as do families from Greymouth and Westport. The Cafe in particular is one of the few places where locals can meet up, By introducing the paid parking, many families will not be able to afford this. In the long run this will have a major impact on the small businesses and my fear is they will close the doors, leaving Punankai basically run by major corporate businesses.</p> <p>I believe there needs to be some consideration for locals who keep the doors open so to speak, especially in the off peak season, who take visitors out to the area. Paying for parking in the financial climate we are currently in means that many will not be able to afford this.</p>
34	<p>To whom it may concern..</p> <p>As a keen NZ walker/ tramper, I am dead against having to pay for parking to access any DoC tracks or sites in NZ. This is so against the ethos of allowing all NZ'ers to participate and enjoy the great outdoors. It's time DoC remembered it's original purpose and stopped being focused on turning a profit. I understand government funding has continued to dwindle and DoC does what it can to minimise the impacts of reducing budgets, but it's time DoC reviewed it's budget and found other ways to generate funds. For instance, there is no way solar powered lights are needed in huts and this in fact quite detrimental to one of the original aims of having a conservation estate, that being the very beneficial effects on peoples health, well-being and sanity provided by nature and getting away from "civilisation".</p> <p>Think again DoC!</p>

35	<p>Dear Doc,</p> <p>I'm current a resident of Franz Josef town and used to live in mt cook village. I agree that parking charges will help infrastructure but I'd light to highlight my concern for the enjoyment of locals who will have to pay for facilities on their doorstep. Moreover what about persons parking overnight in order to go up mountain for a few days going between hits, it seems unfair to be stung with hefty parking charges for multiple days if you're doing overnights. I'm Western Australia you can buy a parks pass which gives you free parking for locals and long term visitors whilst true tourists pay for the privilege of visiting said sights.</p>
36	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Something has to happen and probably the best solution would be to have a large open (paid) car park area with shuttle ride every 10 minutes up to the start of the Hooker Valley track / White Horse Camp existing carpark.</p> <p>Just charging people to stay in the existing carpark will not work. That will see more and more vehicles parking along the Hooker Valley access road all the way out to SH80. They already do when the existing car park is full.</p> <p>Carpark building in the Village possibly? Should not be an issue as DOC were quite happy with The Hermitage going up 10 levels.</p> <p>Regards</p>
37	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I would like to submit that I support paid car parking at Dolomite Point, if the rates are \$2/hour or less, and if the paid car parking ceases at 5pm, allowing locals to enjoy dinner/jam night at the Pancake Rocks Cafe. Some short term parking (up to 15 minutes) should be available for people to grab takeaway coffee/snacks and check mail.</p> <p>I'm not sure what the flow-on effects of paid car parking will be for the residents of Punakaiki. I suspect the less well-heeled travellers will take to parking in local streets, which has the potential to clog up streets in the summer, and increase the risk of traffic accidents. But I don't want to discourage young travellers - they also spend money in local cafes, supermarkets, petrol stations etc. Would it be possible to just charge campervans, allocating discrete parking for these?</p> <p>Good luck, can see the need to find alternative funding streams for DOC!</p> <p>Cheers,</p>

38	<p>Hi there</p> <p>Sorry this is nearly on the deadline, but see attached our submission for the paid parking proposal written specifically for our local Franz Josef Glacier Valley tracks.</p> <p>Thanks and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.</p> <p>18th June 2025 Department of Conservation West Coast Tai Poutini Region Re: Feedback on Proposed Paid Parking at Franz Josef Glacier Car Park</p> <p>Tēnā koutou,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Department of Conservation’s proposal to introduce paid parking at the Franz Josef Glacier car park.</p> <p>As long-standing National Park concessionaires operating kayak and boat tours on Lake Mapourika for over a decade, we work closely with DOC and hold deep respect for the work being done to protect and enhance our natural heritage. We also understand and support the need for sustainable funding models to maintain and improve national park infrastructure.</p> <p>That said, we have concerns about introducing a parking fee at the Franz Josef Glacier access point specifically. While paid parking may be a practical and acceptable solution in other locations—such as popular walks like the Copland Track or Hokitika Gorge—the Franz Josef Glacier access is already a point of contention with visitors. The current valley track is perceived as too short and distant from the glacier itself, often generating negative feedback from international and domestic guests alike. Introducing a parking charge on top of this may amplify dissatisfaction and risk further damaging the reputation of our region.</p> <p>Unless the proposed fee is very minimal, we believe this move could harm local tourism recovery efforts. Franz Josef is already facing a difficult transition as the glacier recedes and visitor expectations shift. We are increasingly losing ground to the Mt Cook region, where glacier access remains more intact and visitor experience is perceived to be better value. Adding a fee at Franz Josef, without simultaneously enhancing the walk or viewing opportunities, risks pushing the region further backwards. We understand there had been past discussion around rerouting the valley track closer to the glacier terminal face. If this were to go ahead, and a more rewarding experience were reinstated, then a small parking fee may be more acceptable and justifiable to visitors. In the meantime, we would encourage DOC to explore alternative revenue sources such as modest increases to hut fees, or other user-pays models that don’t put additional strain on a sensitive and currently underwhelming site. A local workshop or collaborative session with tourism operators in the area could be a valuable way to identify solutions that align with the unique challenges Franz Josef faces.</p>
----	--

	<p>We appreciate the chance to contribute our perspective and would be happy to discuss this further or participate in any consultation efforts.</p> <p>Ngā mihi nui,</p>
39	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I just was informed that car parks might start to be charged.</p> <p>I hike because of the beauty of NZ and as this is the only free activity available. I donate to the doc when I can and try to save for an overnight a year as just the camping fees in some places are a lot to pay on top of petrol, food and gear.</p> <p>At my level a paid carpark would stop me from being able to enjoy your amazing tracks.</p> <p>I know you need funds and understand the reason behind this change. However for a few of the people surrounding me (Pakeha and Maori) Hiking is the only way to be active and to enjoy the amazing Aotearoa Whenua. Charging carpark would reduce our possibility of access this.</p> <p>Maybe a yearly pass like to the license plate, with a small fee like \$15 for resident and citizen?</p> <p>If you could please reconsider this would be much appreciated.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this.</p>
40	<p>I totally oppose this car park charge idea, as an elderly outdoors walker/tramper more and more of our freedom is being taken from us.</p> <p>Who thought up this very stupid idea??</p>

41	<p>I do not support the current proposal.</p> <p>The idea of charging for car parking as way to manage visitor numbers is obvious but fundamentally inequitable and therefore flawed.</p> <p>The problem of using pricing to control numbers is the inequity it creates. By design, charges have to high enough to deter visitors. The wealthy have no problem finding the money, while the less well-off who cannot afford the fees are forced to find alternates. Unfortunately, the pressure is being created by international tourists, who are wealthy enough to fly to New Zealand taking extended holidays. Using cost to manage numbers inevitably leaves the average New Zealander is shut out of DOC estate in prime locations, leaving New Zealanders as second class citizens only able to access sub-prime locations. The support for DOC and its conservation efforts is be materially affected if New Zealander cannot see how we benefit from DOC funding.</p> <p>A better solution than relying on charging to manage numbers is a booking system. DOC already has such a system that works well for camp sites and back country huts. I see no difference between a carpark and campsite. You limit numbers by manging the bookings, not by charging at a rate that will high enough to be effective. This would allow DOC to provide preferential or lower cost access for New Zealanders to the estate DOC manages on their behalf, should DOC decide equity and social responsibility lie within its mandate.</p> <p>I understand that DOC is being expected to do more with less funding as successive governments have allowed the tourist industry to the steal the profits and socialise the costs. While fixing this problem is beyond the scope of simple car parks, it is reasonable for DOC to consider the entire social equity picture when making these decisions. I support a degree of carpark charging to cover costs - provided those funds are directed towards the location the charges are collected and towards conservation of that location.</p> <p>Regards</p>
----	---

42	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I live in the area (Okarito) and work in Franz Josef as well as go there on days off for supermarket shopping etc and also for exercise & recreation year round.</p> <p>I support parking for visitors but would like to see a locals exemption. I would use the Alex knob carpark most, for ½ or all day walks, and have also used the glacier carpark to run after work.</p> <p>I believe this is also going to be trialed in other area. I support this in the Punakaiki pancake rocks park, but less so in the Paparoa track parks as this is used a great deal by NZ ers and my impression is, much less by visitors.</p> <p>Numbers would be interesting. Also, users are already paying track/hut fees.</p> <p>Perhaps a locals pass, or something we could scan on the meters?</p> <p>Many thanks for considering this</p>
----	--

43	<p>Submission on the Department of Conservation’s Paid Parking Policy at Punakaiki (Pancake Rocks)</p> <p>Overview This submission opposes the Department of Conservation’s (DOC) introduction of paid car parking at Punakaiki, home to the iconic Pancake Rocks walk. This decision undermines equitable access to public conservation land, particularly for West Coast locals and domestic visitors, and sets a concerning precedent for the future of free public access across New Zealand’s National Parks.</p> <p>Background For over a century, both New Zealanders and visitors have freely parked and walked the Pancake Rocks loop, long before the establishment of Paparoa National Park. The area has historically offered essential facilities for rest, recreation, and community connection. Local businesses have relied on accessible public parking to support tourism and economic sustainability.</p> <p>DOC now holds an exclusive position as the sole provider of car parking at this site. Through agreements with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), all previously accessible roadside parking is being removed, creating an artificial monopoly. The introduction of parking charges restricts access, disproportionately affects West Coast residents and local businesses and imposes indirect entry fees on publicly owned conservation land.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>Monopoly Use: DOC’s exclusive control over parking spaces—created in part by advocating for the removal of alternative options—raises equity and fairness concerns.</p> <p>Barrier to Access: With 95% of visitors relying on the DOC-managed car park, paid parking functions as a quasi-entry fee, likely to deter spontaneous visits and shorter stops by Kiwis and West Coasters alike.</p> <p>Public Survey: Extensive visitor surveys carried out during the Experience Centre business case did not show support for paid car parking.</p> <p>Contradiction of DOC Goals: The stated intention behind DOC’s \$46 million investment in the Punakaiki visitor centre was to encourage longer stays. Paid parking conflicts with this objective by discouraging visitation.</p> <p>Public Rights: Locals have used this parking since before Paparoa National Park’s establishment. Charging fees infringes on those historic rights.</p>
----	--

	<p>Use of IVL Funds: If revenue from the International Visitor Levy (IVL) is being used to implement paid parking systems, this constitutes double charging without a service enhancement.</p> <p>Environmental & Social License: DOC risks eroding its environmental credibility and its social license to operate by financially penalising access to nature.</p> <p>Road Safety: State Highway 6 is hazardous. The Pancake Rocks car park provides a safe rest stop to mitigate driver fatigue. Removing or charging for this function compromises road safety.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>Reinstate or maintain existing roadside parking, with time-limited free access where appropriate, eg 2 hours.</p> <p>Provide a minimum of 2 hours' free parking at DOC-managed car parks.</p> <p>Ensure DOC is fully funded through existing public means, including the IVL (now set at \$100 per tourist).</p> <p>Commit to preserving free, unfettered access to conservation land for all New Zealanders, and halt any future rollout of paid parking across DOC sites.</p> <p>Free access to nature is a cornerstone of New Zealand's identity. DOC's paid parking policy risks undermining public trust, local economies, and our shared relationship with conservation land. I urge the government to reverse this decision, uphold DOC's public mandate, and invest in solutions that enhance access—not limit it.</p> <p>Additional points raised in further emails:</p> <p>In addition, it has come to light that there have been discussions regarding revenue sharing with local iwi in Punakaiki. My understanding is that the fundamental reasoning behind paid parking is that DOC is short of funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why would the NZ taxpayer fund DOC to build car parks and not get a full ROI due to revenue sharing?• Why has this aspect not been communicated to the public and stakeholders?
--	--

	<p>Our fundamental concern is that paid parking is a such massive change for DOC that effected stakeholders and in fact all Kiwis should be well consulted on this.</p> <p>Due to a monopoly on car parks this is effectively an entry fee for the Pancake Rocks.</p> <p>Can you please let me know if DOC has evaluated if the Commerce Commission will have any issues with them creating a car park monopoly (by facilitating the removal of free roadside car parks) and then charging for car parking?</p> <p>FYI, we held a public meeting today and had 20 locals and many apologies (there are only about 40 people who live in the village, so quite a good turnout for 2pm on a Thursday) who were upset about West Coaster and New Zealand's being charged for parking at the Pancake Rocks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like genuine consultation and communication (We note it is very difficult to find any information on the DOC website or facebook page) with New Zealanders on this fundamental change. • We feel that New Zealanders in general should be asked to comment on what amounts to a fundamental change in direction for DOC from protecting and restoring nature to a car parking business similar to Wilsons Parking. • We would also like public meetings rather than drop in sessions <p>DOC is steamrolling this idea of "Paid Parking" and has shown an unwillingness to listen to community feedback, which is impacting its social license to operate in the area. (Car park monopoly)</p> <p>Regarding the roadside parking at the Pancake Rocks. Can you please advocate for these carparks to remain?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There has been no issue with visitors using this parking since the development was completed. · Removing these carparks gives DOC a total monopoly on carparking in this location. · It is more cost-effective for the taxpayer to save some money by leaving these carparks unchanged. <p>The removal of free street parking at Dolomite Point for no obvious reason other than improving DOC's monopoly has not been mentioned in any of the correspondence.</p>
--	---

44	<p>Re your paid parking survey:</p> <p>We are not in favour of charging for parking. To fund more parking, can DOC apply to use funds from the levy that the government charges tourists.</p> <p>We feel it could affect visitor attitude to the area and discourage visits.</p> <p>Regards</p>
45	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>We are supportive of the paid parking at Franz Josef. I have actually brought this up several times since moving back to the West Coast about 7yrs ago.</p> <p>Most places I've been overseas have paid parking at nearly all tracks. I'd like to see our popular tracks with paid parking. Even a minimal cost at these hot spots will help the West Coast. It has so few rate payers and such a big area to maintain.</p> <p>Hot spots like Franz Josef Glacier, Hokitika Gorge, Haast Blue Pools, Punakaiki Pancake Rocks etc are all a good idea. Id like to see the smaller less popular / less used tracks stay free.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

46	<p>Yes, N Zee might merely blindly bumble it's way into following overseas trends.</p> <p>An unimaginative no-brainer - if you believe that users can be endlessly relied on to support whatever overheads are deemed 'necessary' by whatever compliant or conflicted consultants.</p> <p>But the trend that you'all are possibly missing, is that in the world leading USA - a whole tranche of environmental staff are being terminated by a supposedly populist new regime intent on culling waste fraud and inefficiency...</p> <p>Inspired by this problem actually being an opportunity in disguise, I propose that instead of simply dinking around with a relatively small nett return (after equipment costs, monitoring & enforcement are deducted) that instead you each have your own tenures opened to those same market forces that would determine pricing for parking (and whatever else can potentially be hocked off for profit).</p> <p>In keeping with responsible governance and leadership principles, starting from the top down: each departmental role be auctioned off on the international market.</p> <p>Rather than marketing as a bundle, spin off the Director-General of the Department of Conservation and take bids separately for Chief Executive of the Department of Conservation.</p> <p>It could be that instead of just e.g. one tech refugee looking to buy their way into a salary not to be sneezed at (and an inside running on securing personal safari rights), that a second north American, or perhaps a cashed up Russian oligarch, would separately snatch up the other role (towards citizenship and bunker building rights on top of whatever earnings?).</p> <p>And so on all the way down the line...</p> <p>Time to think outside the car park markings box</p> <p>Even a receptionist position can be worth \$70k to a motivated buyer (as documented here:https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/533495/immigration-adviser-on-tape-offering-job-for-70k)</p> <p>Sale of DG, CEO, and hundreds of other roles could bring in mega bucks of hard currency. Unethical not to?!</p> <p>I know - yes, I should be claiming a commission.</p>
----	--

But as a simple sucker (decadal loyal ex staff member of a forerunner to the present 21st Century department) I have vestigial delusions of public spirit, and am offering this corporate opportunity FoC.

So, don't leave the estate in 'park'.

Break free of present petty restrictions and bound forward into a profitable pay-for-play future(s) and options market in positions, parks, reserves, toanga, IP, minds, hearts, spirits, tracks, huts, boots, and all...

Respectfully,

Reciprocating the spirit of the times,

In case there was room for doubt - I would be in favour of a paid carpark pilot project if and only if there was in parallel a pilot project in which the 3 top jobs in the DOC management structure are put out to tender. This, in keeping with User Pays and Pay As You Earn credos.

Perhaps though, instead of pricing enough people out of using the car park (in order to "manage visitor numbers") the supposedly desired reduction in use could be achieved in the form of "hardware" consisting simply of a sign at the turnoff that states how much of a hike it is to actually get see the glacier now, and what (small) percentage of 2018 carpark users had in fact got the pay off of seeing it (other than from aircraft)?

Surely it could not escape management that having stated that visitors are "important to the visitor economy", it is basic economics that the visitor spending that the Department would be collecting for parking, would come partly at the expense of discretionary spending that is at present going to the likes of local hospitality and small tour businesses.

Sustainability? At some point, further squeezing the golden goose may backfire and piss certain visitor demographics off into slagging NZ to their peers and diverting future travel trends to as yet less mercenary destinations?

47	<p>We've lived in the area for 30 years, I often park at the cafe for visiting the cafe, visitors centre and the pancake rocks.</p> <p>I understand the need to recoup the cost of the upgrade however this had to be paid for by the tourists. Not the locals.</p> <p>Locals should have access to punakaiki resident sticker which would make them exempt from paying for parking.</p> <p>Charging the locals would be unfair and push them away from the only amenities and shops for 40 kms.</p>
----	--

48	<p>Good morning.</p> <p>Paid car parking in Punakaiki and at the Glaciers would be a big mistake. I am vehemently opposed.</p> <p>It would:</p> <p>1) Urbanise and overly monetise two of our most important icon nature Tourism sites in New Zealand- paid car parking is something people associate with cities not country sites. And people visit both the West Coast, The Punakaiki and Glacier Regions for nature and wilderness experiences and adventure. Its a hassle, having to clock watch for your park. We want people to enjoy their short or long stay here, without the stress of a paid car park.</p> <p>2)Punakaiki , my home town, has just been given a lot more pavements, buildings at Dolomite Point. I've watch nature slowly get cleared further back over the years and the nature experience just around the Pancake Rock walk, is now dominated by man -made structures. Which is fine, in some ways. A new visitor centre was well needed. But chuck paid parking on that and there will be many , visitors , domestic ones especially, who come here regularly that will find that pretty a negative change. I mean who sees paid carparking as positive?</p> <p>2a) Actually, hang on, there's that old argument.... haven't our taxes already paid for these car parks???</p> <p>3)Unpleasant visitor ratings=less visitors so the damage/reverberations of stickler parking regimes could go on for a long time. Visitor recommendations and experiences that are positive, fuel our tourism flow. It is well known in the tourism industry that people visit places that people recommend, and REPUTATION as a nature spot, a pleasant place etc, is THE most important thing.</p> <p>4) Don't do it also, as you will further damage Doc's already unpopular image here on the West Coast. I think doing an about turn on this idea and perhaps installing electronic donation/.koha points in each car park instead, would be a great feel good PR decision. And could also be lucrative.</p> <p>5) The Glacier's experience they can provide to visitors, has already been impacted by ice melt and glacier inaccessibility these days, don't throw unfun paid carparking into the mix. They want as many visitors to like their experience as possible.</p> <p>6) Parking has just been increased by a massive margin in Punakaiki. THis was to have enough space for folks around Dolomite Point. Wait and see how this copes with traffic first would be my advice and then have maybe suggested minute parking signs if there are issues.</p>
----	--

7)The parks still need to be open and accessible for people to get to the Pancake Rocks after hours. Lots of locals and others enjoy the pancake rock/blowholes at night as it is a spectacular and popular thing to do. The Aural experience, even on a calm night is great. So you will need to retain parking at night for this. Please keep this as an easy and unpaid thing for people. I worked as a freedom camping officer for BDC a couple of years ago in Punakaiki, and know that overnight parking up at the Pancake Rock area/Doc carpark is not particularly desirable/ or done. Most people want to camp overnight near a beach.

8) Overnight long term parking is likely an issue for the Paparoa Track. Having a safe place provided- with camera surveillance for the overnight parking of cars, just for these trampers, would possibly enhance the visitor experience for Paparoa Track users. They need to be able to leave their vehicle for a night or two without worry. Talk to the Visitor Centre front counter staff about this as they will know what the issues are. I think the track end at Punakaiki valley would be the most likely place this would be appreciated.

9) Please please re-think this one. Scrap the idea of charging for parking. There are better ways to make money. And it will unnecessary complicate the experience of what has always been an easy short-stop place with a cruisy and natural feel.

I am an ex Visitor Centre Information Officer and at one time Team Leader, at the previous Information I-site and Paparoa National Park visitor centre. I worked in Punakaiki talking to visitors for many many seasons over a span of nearly 20 years.

Thanks for your consideration and please keep me in the loop on this one .

And the last comment is: 10) I think you would hurt local short stop business having paid parks. Punakaiki is a tourism feast and famine place - all businesses making ALL of their money in summer., and there are tumbleweeds blowing down the streets in winter (ie next to no punters in off-season). If even a handful of people are driven away each day, instead of stopping for a quick refreshment etc in summer, due to being put off /not wanting to go through the process or pay for parking. It could quickly add up for these businesses and really impact them financially.

Thanks

49	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am not particularly against this idea, however I do have a few concerns.</p> <p>1/ What the length of free parking will be(coffee queue)</p> <p>2/ What the fee will be, as if it is too high it will shorten the stay or prevent some people from visiting.</p> <p>3/ Why there isn't also a free parking option.</p> <p>There was talk of overflow parking down by the Punakaiki river. That would be a good free parking option, just with a longer walk.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Submission regarding Punakaiki Paid Parking Pilot Submitted by: Andrew Beaumont, Resident of Punakaiki Village</p> <p>In my initial submission, I expressed support for the introduction of paid parking for tourists to Punakaiki. However, I would like to reiterate the importance of ensuring that free or priority parking options are available for local residents, particularly near the Pancake Rocks Café.</p> <p>This café is more than just a place for coffee—it is the only community hub where locals regularly gather, connect, and socialise. If parking fees are implemented without exemptions for residents, this important community space may become inaccessible to those who live here.</p> <p>I urge the decision-makers to consider:</p> <p>Free or priority parking for local residents near Pancake Rocks Café. A system for implementing priority parking for locals only exemptions from parking fees diligent consideration for the social wellbeing of a cohesive local body Thank you for considering this submission in support of local community needs.</p>
----	--

50	<p>Could you please confirm what the intentions for the access to Wyn Irwin Lodge would be during this trial period?</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
51	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I would like to put a submission forward regarding the new Paid parking proposal .</p> <p>We would like to voice that although it will be great for tourist and visitors to contribute towards , we would hope that this wouldn't effect our local communities / families from enjoying the beauty Franz has to offer due to parking .</p> <p>The walks and cycleway there have proved an invaluable resource to entertain, engage and keep our young children active, as there isn't a kindergarten in our township anymore, and activities for preschoolers are scarce.</p> <p>Irrespective of the amount in question, I feel that having to pay for car parking will not only encourage visitors to flood other car parks or park unsafely, but also will put off locals from visiting as often as they would otherwise. We are fortunate to live in an area of such exceptional beauty, but this doesn't come without its challenges, mainly logistical and monetary. It would be a shame to let a parking charge deter local families from enjoying this natural asset.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our feedback on this project.</p>

52	<p data-bbox="338 235 495 256">Good evening,</p> <p data-bbox="338 305 1677 326">I am writing to register a submission with my opinion about the proposed paid parking pilot at the Franz Josef Glacier Car Park.</p> <p data-bbox="338 375 1843 467">We are a family of four who frequently visit the Franz Josef Glacier Valley. The walks and cycleway there have proved an invaluable resource to entertain, engage and keep our young children active, as there isn't a kindergarten in our township anymore, and activities for preschoolers are scarce.</p> <p data-bbox="338 516 1843 646">Irrespective of the amount in question, I feel that having to pay for car parking will not only encourage visitors to flood other car parks or park unsafely, but also will put off locals from visiting as often as they would otherwise. We are fortunate to live in an area of such exceptional beauty, but this doesn't come without its challenges, mainly logistical and monetary. It would be a shame to let a parking charge deter people (mainly New Zealanders, particularly West Coasters and fundamentally Franz Josef residents) from enjoying this natural asset.</p> <p data-bbox="338 695 926 716">Thank you for considering our feedback on this project.</p> <p data-bbox="338 764 478 786">Kind regards,</p>
----	--

53	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am writing in regards to the proposal of introducing a paid carpark at the Glacier Valley.</p> <p>While I can understand the benefit from an economical perspective, I would like to request that locals who own properties and live in Franz Josef get an free annual pass. I feel this should be part of the benefit of living locally, as we already pay increasing rates from the councils. I have 2 boys who go to the local school and regularly jump on their bikes and this is part of their heritage, they should be able to go explore the Glacier track and valley whenever they feel like it whether on a bike or by car.</p> <p>Additionally, from a tourist perspective, this is one of the very few "free" activities tourists have access to. They come to Franz to see the Glacier and not all can afford a helicopter flight. I think they deserve to see the Glacier's progress or regress without an additional fee.</p> <p>A major concern I have is how tourists wl try to avoid the fee by parking alongside the already narrow road and clogging up the access. Alex knob carport is already too small as it is for the usual amount of tourists, and is becoming a problem on a busy day to navigate through it.</p> <p>I trust you will take my opinion into consideration.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
----	--

54	<p data-bbox="338 233 489 258">Good evening</p> <p data-bbox="338 305 1457 329">This message is to register a submission regarding the paid parking pilot for the Franz Josef Glacier Valley.</p> <p data-bbox="338 376 1843 433">While we acknowledge the idea of paid parking by visitors to contribute towards upkeep of the facilities & access road, It is of our opinion that there should be no cost for New Zealanders. It should only be applied to only international visitors.</p> <p data-bbox="338 480 1822 537">We are a active family of two not far from retirement and don't need any more barriers to us introducing our grandsons to their national Park as we did with our own son's.</p> <p data-bbox="338 584 1186 609">Thank you for collecting feedback and considering our feedback on this project.</p> <p data-bbox="338 656 474 680">Kind regards</p>
----	---

55	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>This message is to register a submission regarding the paid parking pilot for the Franz Josef Glacier Valley.</p> <p>While I acknowledge the idea of paid parking by visitors to contribute towards upkeep of the facilities & access road, It is of my opinion that locals should be excluded from any fees. There should be no cost for West Coast residents. It could even be applied to only international visitors so all New Zealanders can visit at no cost.</p> <p>We are an active family of four with two young children. We use the walking tracks and cycleway in the Glacier Valley frequently throughout the year. It is a easily accessible area with a variety of grades of tracks, so it is popular with local families.</p> <p>I also think that traffic and parking management at the beginning of the access road will be vital to manage those visitors who do not wish to pay and choose to park and walk. Congestion and dangerous parking is inevitable.</p> <p>Thank you for collecting feedback and considering our feedback on this project.</p> <p>Nga mihi,</p>
56	<p>Good afternoon.</p> <p>I am writing in support and to endorse Mayor Jamie Cleine's letter attached, regarding Proposed Paid Parking Trial-Dolomite Point. I reiterate his comments and know that there is public concern about high cost parking fees potentially becoming a hindrance and deterrent for local Punakaiki residents and the broader districts people of Buller and Grey who frequently visit Punakaiki.</p>

57	<p>Submission to the Department of Conservation – Opposing Paid Parking for Locals in Punakaiki</p> <p>I am writing about the proposal to introduce paid parking in Punakaiki, particularly for local residents. While I understand the need to manage visitor impact and potentially generate funds through international tourism, local residents should be exempt from any parking fees in our own community.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not just a tourist destination—it is our home. We use the village regularly to collect mail, drop off goods, meet others, and take part in essential community interactions. With no community centre or central hub, our town serves as the vital heart of local connection. It is a space that supports not just practical needs but also mental well-being and social cohesion in a small, isolated community.</p> <p>I am an active community volunteer and give countless hours to conservation efforts including night patrols during Westland petrel fledgling season, maintaining the penguin fence year-round, regularly picking up rubbish, and often saving trapped wildlife in the process. It is disheartening to think I would have to pay to park while pausing in our small village or even while stopping briefly for a coffee or to drop off stock to a local retailer.</p> <p>If DOC feels that parking charges must be introduced, I urge you to adopt a system that exempts locals—such as through a resident pass, sticker, or card. The burden should not fall on the very people who care for this place year-round, often without recognition or compensation. Also a widely circulated social media post has suggested parking fees could reach as high as \$20. Whether accurate or not, this rumour is causing considerable distress and resentment in the community. Such a fee is excessive and risks alienating both locals and domestic tourists. Many New Zealanders will simply choose not to stop here, which could result in a serious decline in business for local shops and cafes—undermining the sustainability of the community DOC is supposed to support.</p> <p>Please reconsider this proposal. Introduce a system that recognises the difference between international visitors and those who call Punakaiki home. We are not tourists—we are the caretakers of this land.</p> <p>I would like to be informed of any further consultation or discussions.</p> <p>Regards</p>
----	---

58	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I am writing to provide feedback on the proposed paid parking pilot for the Franz Josef Glacier Valley.</p> <p>While I understand the rationale behind asking visitors to contribute toward the upkeep of facilities and the access road, I strongly believe that local residents should be exempt from any parking fees. There should be no cost for West Coast residents. Ideally, the fee structure could apply only to international visitors, allowing all New Zealanders to access this iconic area freely.</p> <p>Our family of four, including two young children, regularly uses the walking tracks and cycleway in the Glacier Valley throughout the year. It is a uniquely and safe accessible area for all. The smooth paths make it easy to use with a stroller and bikes, which is not always the case elsewhere. This makes it an ideal space for local families to enjoy nature, stay active, and raise children who value the outdoors.</p> <p>Spaces like the Glacier Valley contribute meaningfully to community wellbeing as well. They support mental and physical health, provide opportunities for connection, and enhance our quality of life, particularly in remote communities like ours.</p> <p>Thank you for gathering community feedback and for considering our views on this important matter.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p>
59	<p>I am writing to object to the introduction of paid parking in Punakaiki. This will dramatically decrease the amount of tourists wanting to stop in the area and visit the businesses. Also it is extremely unfair to make the locals pay for simply parking.</p> <p>Regards</p>
60	<p>When I first heard that DOC had put out a statement saying they were going to start charging for car parking I thought how sad is that so you are telling me I will now have to pay to enjoy a local coffee and to collect my mail. Paid parking will kill all the business at the rocks so please for once think about the locals and at least allow 1 free hour for parking.</p>

61	<p data-bbox="338 233 365 254">Hi</p> <p data-bbox="338 305 1638 326">As a Punakaiki local, I don't support the proposal for paid parking at Dolomite Point especially for locals/domestic visitors.</p> <p data-bbox="338 376 1801 430">It is unreasonable that locals would be expected to pay - outside of the first 15 minutes for free - to access community facilities as well as local businesses.</p> <p data-bbox="338 480 1644 501">It would also increase pressure on Punakaiki Village as people will choose to park in that area to avoid paying a parking fee.</p> <p data-bbox="338 552 1782 643">Consideration should be given to alternatives such as free local parking. Also, has there been any discussion about people paying to accessing the pancake rocks as a popular visitors site? Many international tourists are surprised that there is not cost associated to this experience.</p> <p data-bbox="338 693 1409 714">It would also be good to have further discussions/meetings with the community to identify solutions.</p> <p data-bbox="338 764 474 786">Kind regards</p>
----	--

62	<p>i live in Greymouth, my daughter lives in Punakaiki so i will be paying a parking fee virtually every time I go and see her. Is this fair? it seems like the government desires to tax everything that moves and especially tourists but is this fair on locals caught in the net. Sorry that is a mixed metaphor as parked cars are stationary.</p> <p>You say that free parking is available if you walk . Where exactly pray?</p> <p>I live in Greymouth, my daughter lives in Punakaiki , no I don't do the Blowholes walk very often but it still means I will still be paying for car parking .As most times I visit her as we go out for coffee , um used to go out for coffee . Is that fair?</p> <p>It seems the Government's ambition is to tax everything that moves especially tourists. But this is scarcely fair on locals caught up in the rush, could we please be exempt?. Um I notice this is a mixed metaphor as parked cars don't move but you know what I mean.</p> <p>I applaud the intention to put the money to Conservation but hang on a minute. It is a sacred right that New Zealanders can visit National Parks for free. This virtually abrogates this right. You say there is free parking nearby if you are prepared to walk..... exactly where is this free parking??</p> <p>So please in your stampede to raise more money please consider the effect us poor citizens who live here and are caught in the rush</p>
----	--

63	<p>Hi there, I say NO to paying for parking at Pancake Rocks. Really how greedy are you? Plus that is money you are costing local businesses and how many locals will refuse to stop there if we have to pay. Get a grip and pull your heads out of the sand. It is time you were forensically audited you are going too far with your idiocy.</p> <p>Regards</p>
64	<p>Kia ora DOC team,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the introduction of paid parking at Pancake Rocks, Franz Josef Glacier, and the wider rollout across the conservation estate.</p> <p>Nobody should have the right to turn nature into a pay-to-enter experience. These lands belong to the public — not to be used as a revenue stream. DOC's plan to impose parking fees across key sites effectively turns free public access into something people must purchase. This goes against the very idea of what conservation land stands for.</p> <p>DOC controls the majority of access points to natural areas in New Zealand. That makes this a monopoly by default. When there are no alternative options — no public transport, no nearby free parking — it's not a fee by choice. It's a barrier to entry.</p> <p>Other countries with strong conservation values—like Norway, Scotland, and Canada—do not treat access to nature as a privilege for those who can afford it, and New Zealand shouldn't either.</p> <p>This is not the future New Zealanders want for our outdoors. This approach must be reconsidered.</p> <p>Please consider what this will mean for New Zealanders.</p>

65	<p>hi</p> <p>I visit punakaiki regularly I don't think I should pay for parking</p> <p>I pay enough rates</p> <p>Thus is revenue gathering from a captive tourist audience</p> <p>It costs enough to eat there let alone park</p> <p>Why. It tax punakaiki rocks walk instead keep the parking free</p>
66	<p>Morning</p> <p>I would like to express my concern about the possibility of paid car parking at our most visited tourist attraction on the highway between Westport and Greymouth.</p> <p>1: NZ is almost one of the most expensive destinations in the world, it is expensive to get here, it is expensive to travel while here, all these additional charges are going to drive tourist Out of the province's.</p> <p>2: it will have an impact on the business's at the Punakaiki stop and people will not get time to even have a toilet stop let alone shop and spend</p> <p>3: what is logic of taking away the few parking spots on the highway, forcing people into paid parking will force them to keep going.</p> <p>4: the new build in Punakaiki needs as many people through it as possible and hopefully they will spend while in there.</p> <p>5: the West Coast needs the tourist's and this is just another nail on the pocket of all travellers be they from overseas or New Zealand which pushes</p> <p>People to stay at home or for NZ'ers travel overseas and spend in someone else country.</p> <p>The money grab must stop or we will be a dying region</p> <p>Thank you for reading my email.</p>

67	<p>Just ensuring that voices from both sides of the fence are heard. I fully support introducing paid parking at DOC sites to manage demand and provide some much needed revenue to cover costs of providing facilities. Ensuring users contribute to the costs is a positive move.</p> <p>Many thanks,</p>
68	<p>Hi Department of Conservation,</p> <p>This email is in response to your request for feedback on paid parking at Dolomite point. I would like to elaborate on two discussion points, accommodating local use and tourism use. I would also like to mention that we have no opinion on the necessity to extend or restrict access to the parking by making it paid. Your department would be the best judge of the affluence. I can offer our observation that over the previous summer we had no difficulties to find parking spaces in busy periods. For context, our family live on _____road in proximity to _____road. We visit the Dolomite point complex once every two weeks on average throughout the year, and occasionally more in summer.</p> <p>1. Local use</p> <p>The services at Dolomite point are our closest convenience outing, and our typical stay is for coffee, lunch/dinner and ice cream. We visit both the café inside the Department of Conservation building, and the Pancake rocks café. We very rarely visit the pancake rocks themselves unless accompanied by friends or family. We are a modest family with very limited income, and already we find that the prices of the services themselves are at the very upper limit of what we can afford. Therefore we are simply concerned about making parking paid for local use would prohibit this activity for our family.</p> <p>In reading your proposals, we find that you potentially address our concern through two aspects; a free parking period, and, accommodating local use.</p> <p>For the free parking period, this would depend on the associated modalities. Our use case of coffee and ice-cream may be admissible in your proposal of the free parking period, but our use case for lunch/dinner may not. Naturally, this depends on the length of the period. In our usage, we typically stay for 30min in the coffee/ice-cream use case, and 1hour for the lunch/dinner use case. If the free parking period was up to 1hour, then we would not be impacted by your proposal in a significant way.</p> <p>Accommodating local use through registering for a sticker or number plate camera entry could also be a way to offer locals either the free use of the parking, or an extended free parking period of up to 1hour. Another manner, could be that the cafés can administer free parking bar</p>

	<p>codes on their receipts if for example >\$10 is spent, or by mentioning that “we’re local” - they are already offering -10% for locals. Let’s not forget that the parking allows visitors proximity access to the tourist site, and encourages consumption through the (potentially local) business of snacks/meals as a convenient rest stop for tourists and locals.</p> <p>Paid parking will unfortunately significantly reduce or stop completely our use of Dolomite point’s services. Which would be a bit sad indeed.</p> <p>2. Tourism use</p> <p>I have had the opportunity to be a tourist myself, both earlier in life as a backpacker on a shoestring budget and later in life with a modest budget. Here I wish to share two cases on the potential impacts by making the parking paid.</p> <p>The first being dissuasion to visit the site, i.e. those who do not want to pay for parking and therefore will not visit the site. Making the parking paid will reduce overall visitor numbers (or reduce the growth rate), as there is a non-negligible number of people who do not want to pay for parking. This may be the desired outcome, but this is a potential side-effect.</p> <p>Secondly, which is more concerning, will be those who do not want to pay for parking and will still visit the site. This demographic will seek to find free parking in proximity. This leads to roadside parking, parking on footpaths, etc. This brings road safety concerns with people walking along roadsides etc., and additional enforcement requirements e.g. yellow lines, parking control etc.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my feedback submission, and please feel free to reply back to me with any questions.</p>
69	<p>I am writing about the proposal to introduce paid parking in Punakaiki.</p> <p>Being a local resident I think is completely out of hand for us residents to have to pay as Punakaki is not a ‘tourist attraction for us. We actually have no community location as such, so for us to pay every time we park at our local gathering/mail/social location is not for this community.</p> <p>I would like to see some waiver system for us that live here.</p> <p>Regards</p>

70	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I hereby would like to make a submission regarding the proposed paid parking pilot at the Franz Josef Glacier Car Park.</p> <p>As a local family we take our kids often to this particular area to either walk the Alex Knobb, Roberts Point or the Peter's Pool track. We regularly take the kids to cycle the cycle trail there as well that starts at the Glacier Car park.</p> <p>As rate payers, it is already extremely expensive to live in this part of the country. You can imagine the level of financial stress the current council rates of the work on the stopbank which have been put on rate payers.</p> <p>On top of this we are feeding our family with groceries purchased at the local FourSquare, as unfortunately no other more economical supermarket chains are close by. Another huge cost we as families who bring up their kids here is the travel costs we are faced with for our kids to attend school events, sports, airports, etc.</p> <p>One of the few 'free' things we can do to get out and about with our kids, is heading over to the Glacier valley carpark for a quick sunset walk or day trip.</p> <p>I understand the need for paid parking, but I strongly object for locals to get charged for this! Going ahead charging locals it'll see a great loss of local people and families using the tracks and educate our kids of the outdoors.</p> <p>I am also fearful that the first part of the Glacier valley road side (plus both gravel carparks on either downstream side of the Waiho river) will be clogged up with parked cars from people who are trying to avoid the parking fee, will will create all sorts of hazards.</p> <p>I trust that my submission will be taken into consideration..</p>
----	--

71	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I would share my opinion about the proposed paid parking pilot at the Franz Josef Glacier Car Park.</p> <p>With our two young girls and part of our local playgroup, we are using the tracks in the Franz Josef Valley frequently. They are a great way to explore the outdoors with the kids and enjoy our beautiful backyard.</p> <p>I understand the need for paid parking, but in my opinion, locals should be excluded.</p> <p>I hope our submissions will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
72	<p>I DO NOT SUPPORT PAID PARKING FOR FRANZ JOSEF GLACIER EXPERIENCE.</p>
73	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>If you attempt to charge people to pay to park, they won't come. They won't stop at all these beautiful places. I drive along the West Coast and I need to stop when I'm tired to rest. If you insist on charging, I won't be stopping at those places. Nor will any other locals.</p> <p>Charging for parking will stop tourists from stopping, soon we will have all these places that people will pass through.</p> <p>This is the stupidest idea and will not help West Coast tourism.</p>

74	<p>I am writing as a concerned New Zealander who strongly opposes the Department of Conservation’s proposal to introduce car parking charges at public conservation areas.</p> <p>DOC land belongs to all New Zealanders. Charging Kiwis simply to access the outdoors is a direct hit to the very lifestyle we’re proud of—free access to nature, freedom to explore, and enjoying our country’s unique beauty without cost barriers. This move risks turning our public spaces into pay-to-play zones, especially for families, young people, and those already struggling with the rising cost of living.</p> <p>What makes this more frustrating is the pattern of questionable DOC spending in recent years. Millions were spent broadcasting whale song to trees in an attempt to “rewild” a forest—an experiment with little proven benefit. Then there’s the tens of millions used to build the Whakapapa Visitor Centre, only to hand it over to iwi and lease it back at taxpayer expense. These decisions don’t align with fiscal responsibility, and yet now DOC wants to recover costs from everyday Kiwis heading out for a walk, a fish, or a family picnic.</p> <p>Instead of introducing parking fees, DOC should focus on tightening its spending and cutting back on low-impact projects. Conservation is absolutely vital, but it should not come at the expense of the public’s right to access the land we collectively own.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this policy. It’s a step in the wrong direction and undermines DOC’s mission of connecting people with nature.</p>
----	---

75	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Whilst I am not opposed to charging tourists for parking at Punakaiki; as a local, I have a real concern about parking for those who live in the area.</p> <p>Punakaiki is central point for Coast Road residents and the visitor centre and cafes are a hub for meeting and socialising.</p> <p>Punakaiki area also needs to be accessed for voluntary conservation work: eg: predator trapping and Westland Petrel Patrol.</p> <p>A solution to this problem is to issue a parking fee exemption sticker for all Coast Road residents who request one.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
76	<p>I, _____oppose any paid car parking on doc land. This is breach of our highest law, the 1688 bill of rights.</p> <p>If you continue with this repugnant action, a high court action against, will be lodged.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

77	<p>As born New Zealanders who pay taxes which fund DOC, we object to having to pay (essentially another tax) parking fees at sites, such as Punakaiki and Franz Josef, which we have already funded.</p> <p>Would this parking fee also be charged to Tour companies using the carparks who already pay concessions to visit?</p> <p>You will be removing access to New Zealand's beautiful outdoors from many middle and low income earning families - particularly in a time of economic difficulty, leaving only overseas tourists and high end traveller's. This is publicly owned and funded land that will restrict the public who own it from accessing it. DOC need to remember who actually owns the land and who pays DOC to manage it.</p> <p>We used to have a slogan in NZ saying "Don't leave home until you see the country". This is a change that creates "Stay home, because you can't afford to see the country".</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
78	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I urge doc to keep any parking fees at Punakaiki to a minimum.</p> <p>Working in Punakaiki for a few years, I reflect back how many people commented and appreciated that visiting the Rocks was FREE.</p> <p>As I understand that a 'donation' like amount for conservation is good, however, I would think that the many locals would restrict their stops if a parking fee would be charged.</p> <p>I propose that (like in Nelson City), the first hour is free and a charge may apply after that?</p> <p>Sincerely</p>

79	<p>To Whom it may Concern</p> <p>Introducing paid parking to Punakaiki will have an impact on all travellers, local residents and West Coasters.</p> <p>Please have free parking available for short stay visitors who may wish to buy a coffee, use the bathroom facilities, or visit the new Punangairi Visitor Experience Centre. It is important that Kiwis can also freely access the pancake rocks without paying.</p> <p>The local residents who use the café as a place to meet with friends would be majorly impacted if paid parking was introduced and will disrupt the social fabric of this small community.</p> <p>There has been no consultation on this and introducing paid parking will take away the ability for people just to stop and enjoy what should be a free part of New Zealand.</p> <p>Providing a model of the “first hour free” will allow those local travellers (ie Kiwis), and mostly importantly, the locals to continue to enjoy what is rightfully theirs to enjoy, without paid parking.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>
----	--

80	<p data-bbox="338 233 365 254">Hi</p> <p data-bbox="338 269 1661 290">I saw parts of the proposal on West Coast community and wahine tramping and hiking and I am in support of DOCs proposal</p> <p data-bbox="338 339 1253 360">We pay for parking everywhere, including hospitals. Carparks cost money to maintain.</p> <p data-bbox="338 409 1732 469">Unless people wish to volunteer for monitoring and maintenance to keep it free (eg like our hardworking hut and track maintenance volunteers that are often taken for granted).</p> <p data-bbox="338 518 732 539">DOC needs all the support it can get.</p> <p data-bbox="338 587 1822 609">Where this has been posted online - most people replying are actually in support, and the tone of the post was trying to build up opposition.</p>
----	---

81	<p>Good morning.</p> <p>I recently received an email telling me about the proposed introduction of paid car parking by DOC. I am emailing to ask that this be given further consideration and not be approved.</p> <p>Charges could lead to huge potential damage and income loss to small Kiwi businesses in areas by tracks where people currently park. If there is a cost involved, people may choose to simply not go. For some businesses these tracks are a lifeline to a regular income. If these businesses fail then the services provided to track users falter and the whole system will break down.</p> <p>One of the many joys of walking in Aotearoa in the bush is that it is largely accessible by many and not related to your income. So many people who love the outdoors and are already struggling due to the cost of living crisis would simply not be able to afford using tracks if parking was an additional cost.</p> <p>I urge DOC to reconsider the parking charges and think of the ethos and philosophy that has always existed for New Zealanders and guests being out in the bush, that it is for all of us to enjoy. It should not be yet another example where people are limited by their bank balance.</p> <p>Than you for taking the time to read this.</p> <p>Regards,</p>
82	<p>The introduction of paid parking at the pancake rocks and other DOC areas is going to create an on going night mare - the locals who frequent the coffee shops catch up with friends are going to be pushed out.</p> <p>Tourists are already paying extra to arrive in NZ and now we're going to tax them more???</p> <p>DOC WAKE UP - you're going to kill the tourism experience for many. NZ families included.</p> <p>Sent from</p>
83	<p>Very happy for DOC to charge for car parking however local residences should be exempt from these charges.</p> <p>Perhaps DOC providing each household a dashboard card like the NZ disability card or similar. Not sure of how DOC are going to manage this but locals should not have to pay for the car parks. In most areas in New Zealand and around the world locals are usually accommodated financially in some way.</p>

84	<p>Kia ora DOC team,</p> <p>I'm writing to strongly oppose DOC's plans to introduce paid parking at sites like Pancake Rocks and Franz Josef Glacier and to express grave concern about the broader rollout of charges across New Zealand's public conservation land.</p> <p>Public conservation land is a shared heritage, protected for the benefit of every New Zealander. Charging for access through parking fees undermines the principle that nature should be free and accessible to all, regardless of income or background.</p> <p>Nobody should have the right to turn nature into a pay-to-enter experience. These places are protected for everyone's benefit, not for DOC to monetise through car park fees — especially without alternative transport options or accountability mechanisms.</p> <p>A paid shuttle system would be more effective at managing visitor numbers to sites whilst maintaining accessibility. During peak seasons these charges could apply to the shuttle service, especially for visitors, but should continue to be free for New Zealanders.</p> <p>I urge DOC to stop this plan before it expands further. It's not in the public interest and does not serve the purpose for which DOC was created.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p>
----	--

85	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am writing as a full time Coast Road resident (Fox River) and professional artist who stocks work at Punagairi Doc Office to strongly oppose any paid parking up at Dolomite Point.</p> <p>Parking should be free for anyone that wants to appreciate the pancake rocks not just restricted to rich tourists!</p> <p>Also it will severely compromise sales at Punagairi which are essential for my ability to make ends meet. Most of my sales are to kiwi tourists who will be especially put off by the fee and will most likely carry on down the road for free parking in Punakaki and not bother with the shop.</p> <p>As a local I will also no longer be able to support local business or go to my local cafe, as not only can I not afford the extra money for parking but also will not pay on principle.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
----	---

86	<p>Kia ora koutou.</p> <p>I write with regard to</p> <p>a) The Department's proposal to install paid carparking at the two DoC administered car parks at Punakaiki, used by domestic and international visitors to Paparoa National Park and the carpark at Franz Josef Glacier. .</p> <p>b) The proposal to remove the road-side car parking outside the Punakaiki Pancake Rocks visitor attraction.</p> <p>1. I oppose the removal of the roadside parking as it will push the vehicle traffic onto roadsides into the Punakaiki village and on the SH6 leading from both north and south directions i.e., from the Poroarari and Punakaiki Rivers. I consider this would lead to congestion and compromise pedestrian safety even more than now.</p> <p>2. I oppose paid parking for Buller and Grey District residents and those who need to access the NZ Post mailboxes located at the back of the northern carpark. . .</p> <p>3. I understand completely the need for DOC to raise revenue but under the principle of free access to New Zealand's National Parks I oppose the proposal to have paid parking for visitors to Paparoa National Park and at Franz Josef, whether or not the carparks are in the National Park, on stewardship land or national, regional or local Transit NZ or body roads..</p> <p>I am sure the Department can come up with much more innovative ways to raise revenue.</p> <p>I think the proposal would likely impact on visitation to the new Punangaire Visitor Centre, the Pancake Rocks and the Franz Josef Glacier, two of NZ's key visitor sites.</p> <p>Ka mihi nui.</p>
----	---

87	<p>Gidday.</p> <p>I run a small website and design firm situated on the Coast Road. I frequently visit a client at Dolomite Point for meetings. Occasionally, additional suppliers, such as a signwriter, may also attend these meetings.</p> <p>Paid parking would be an inconvenience, particularly considering that parking in Greymouth is free.</p> <p>Perhaps the minimum parking duration could be an hour. Alternatively, exploring ways for businesses like mine to avoid the parking fee would be beneficial.</p> <p>It is important to note that there will be other businesses, suppliers, and contractors in a similar situation to myself.</p> <p>I am also a local resident and frequently visit with friends for a lunch and refreshments. Having to pay each time isn't fair.</p> <p>I'm supportive of paid parking for one-off visits for tourists passing through.</p> <p>Cheers,</p>
----	--

88

Kia ora

My main issue is that parking should be free for “locals” on the grounds that many of us are frequent visitors to that area for a number of reasons.

Defined perhaps as residents from Barrytown to just north of Fox River.

We could register at the VC office; many of us are known personally by DoC staff and other locals could validate their status with, for example, a rates invoice.

There are at least two options available, depending on the system used by DoC.

- If parking is camera-based then we would register our vehicle number plates.
- For other non-camera systems, vehicles could carry a small windshield sticker.

89	<p>Department of Conservation New Zealand Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>If there is limited parking at Punakaiki around the visitor centre – shops complex, so be it. With all the new ‘ra ra’ that’s been allowed there, you should have either planned more parking slots or stop advertising it as a ‘must visit’ place.</p> <p>Whatever, I am totally opposed to any plans to charge people to park at Punakaiki for any reason – viewing Pancake Rocks, Truman Track, making toilet stop, visiting shops, cafes.</p> <p>As a local person (I live 20kms south at Runanga) I visit or go through Punakaiki regularly, sometimes taking my visitors there. As I’ve lived here now for 47 years that’s quite a few visits.</p> <p>I consider that your paid parking plans are a total recipe for driving LOCAL PEOPLE away.</p> <p>I would far prefer to have to pay to visit the Pancake Rocks or other National Park sites than pay for parking. Then those wanting a toilet stop, quick visit to the DOC counter (e.g. to pick up a caving permit), or buy something quickly at one of the shops should not have to pay to do so! An alternative for you is to have LIMITED parking places and patrol the carparks, move people on.</p>
90	another money grab.
91	<p>I hope I am not too late to send feedback regarding parking at Dolomite Point. My concern is the intention to remove the car parks opposite Punangairi. Less carparks is really foolish especially these ones. I often need to park here to deliver work to Punangairi and this will make the loading zone much more congested. Please leave those parks as is</p>

92	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>Please find attached the submission of Tourism Industry Aotearoa on DOC's paid parking pilot. We would be most happy to engage further on the matters that we raise.</p> <p>WELLINGTON 6140</p> <p>By email: paidcarparking@doc.govt.nz</p> <p>Kia ora</p> <p>Feedback on Piloting Paid Parking at Dolomite Point and Franz Josef Tourism Industry Aotearoa welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Department of Conservation's pilot for paid parking at Dolomite Point, Franz Josef and we understand at White Horse Hill in Aoraki Mount Cook. The feedback TIA wishes to convey is common to each, so one overall submission is provided. TIA is the peak body for the tourism industry in Aotearoa New Zealand, with around 1,200 tourism businesses as its members. This membership covers a range of tourism-related activities including hospitality, accommodation, adventure activities, attractions, retail, airports and airlines, transport, as well as related-tourism services. TIA works with DOC across many workstreams, and we value the role the Department plays in the tourism industry in enabling visitation to Aotearoa New Zealand's special places and for providing concessions for tourism businesses to operate on conservation lands and waters. TIA provided a comprehensive submission on DOC's consultation on conservation land management and exploring charging for access to some public conservation lands. On the matter of charging for access, TIA submitted that when considering access charging (or other charging) the total cumulative cost incurred by visitors across the funding environment must be considered before any new charges are established. TIA highlighted the risk of visitors essentially paying via multiple channels, including having paid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The \$100 International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL) • A concessionaire for an activity or experience; or • Other user charges such as hut, camping or Great Walk fees. <p>On the matter of access charging, TIA recommended:</p> <p>DOC to prepare proposed revenue plans for the selected places or sites being considered for an access charge, looking at the mix of revenue sources, visitor types and investment needs and other relevant criteria, and these could well be the potential sites identified in the consultation document. While a charge for a service is different to an access charge, the principle of equity for visitors is a central consideration and we recommend this is factored into the paid parking pilots.</p> <p>TIA Feedback</p> <p>In principle, TIA is comfortable that DOC pilot a modest charge for services provided, such as car parking, but how this is done must be equitable for visitors. Areas of consideration for TIA are:</p>
----	---

1. Commercial arrangements with concessionaires. Concessionaires cannot be expected to pay for parking on top of their existing concession fee.

A concession allows a service provider to operate on an agreed set of terms. Any additional charge risks charging the concessionaire twice for the same right to operate and by imposing a new cost that the concessionaire cannot easily pass on to their clients. The way the tourism distribution system works is that operators sell an itinerary to their clients or to intermediaries such as travel agents or inbound operators well ahead of the travel. This requires prices to be set often years ahead of time. New charges, such as for parking, cannot be easily recovered from clients. Given that an itinerary may involve multiple parking charges, this can add up. TIA Recommendation: Exclude tourism concessionaires from the paid carparking requirement where parking and access is part of the concession they hold.

2. The IVL is important. All DOC charging initiatives must be considered in the context of the IVL where international visitors are paying \$100 for ‘facilities and the natural environment they use.’ When visitors pay the IVL, the documentation states: “The number of visitors coming to New Zealand has grown strongly over the past few years and growth is expected to continue. The IVL is your contribution to maintaining the facilities and natural environment you will use and enjoy during your stay”. The Government has set out how the IVL will be used. For DOC, this is \$55m new spending for conservation, and there is a further amount estimated to be around \$40m for DOC to replace existing Crown funding.¹ This amounts to around \$95m per annum for DOC from the IVL. International visitors (excluding Australia and some Pacific countries) are contributing significantly to the operations of DOC. Accordingly, most international visitors have paid for facilities that they use, such as car parks. This must be factored into consideration of any new charge.

TIA Recommendation: DOC to undertake analysis on the demand for the proposed paid parking pilots to determine the expected usage by those visitors who have already paid the IVL.

3. Nature of the pilot. How the pilot will be undertaken is not clear. For instance, the level of the parking fee, how different durations of parking will be managed (such as people doing multi-day activities), how the expectations of service from paying parkers will be met, how infringements will be set and managed, and how and where revenue from the trial will be utilised.

On these points, for the pilot, we consider that the price level should be at the cost of the delivery of the pilot and not higher, infringement fines should not be applied through the pilot and cost recovery revenue gained must be reinvested in the service provided at that place to ensure visitors (and future visitors) benefit from the parking fee. We also consider that there will need to be robust and clear communications to notify visitors and the tourism industry of the pilot and why it is being undertaken, and a clear report following the pilot that shows the impact on safety, experience, demand, cost recovery income, and the supporting community. TIA Recommendation. DOC to set out the details of the pilot programme and seek stakeholder feedback on the proposed approach. That any charge is set based on cost recovery only.

Overall, our substantive concern is around the cumulative costs our international visitors face across multiple charging points.

	<p>1 Budget 2025/26 documents forecasts \$190m IVL revenue to be used as follow: 1) \$90m new spending \$35 for tourism and \$55 for conservation); 2) \$4.8m administration costs; 3) \$95.2m to replace existing Crown funding for cycle trails, Tourism New Zealand and DOC. Tourism is an internationally competitive industry, and Aotearoa New Zealand must remain attractive to people considering our country as a place to visit. Adding cost to visitation to and within our country is something that we must take great care with and with cognisance of the overall charges that visitors are required to pay. Accordingly, and as set out in our earlier submission, we submit that any initiative to charge for either access or a service must be supported by a revenue plan for that place, looking at its revenue opportunities, visitor types and origins, investment needs and how and where revenue will be spent.</p> <p>We would be very happy to engage with you on the points we raise in this submission.</p>
--	--

93	<p>I do not agree with the proposal for paid parking to be introduced at Dolomite Point, Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is lazy revenue gathering by DOC. Approximately 500,000 people visit the Pancake Rocks tourist attraction every year. Charge an entry for going into the tourist attraction itself.</p> <p>There are other businesses at Dolomite Point and their customers use the car parks. These people should not be made to pay for the lack of funding DOC receives from the government.</p> <p>Charge visitors for entry to the Pancake Rocks tourist attraction only. Other tourist attractions charge entry and there could easily be a two level price, one price for international tourists and one for New Zealanders.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>
----	--

94	<p>Hi</p> <p>I would like to take the opportunity to make a couple of points regarding the paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>We are a family living in Barrytown who like to support the local businesses in Punakaiki. The proposed 15 minutes of free parking before being charged \$20.00 for 2 hours is not going to work up there. 15 minutes may not be long enough to stand in a queue for a take away coffee or icecream in peak season when there are buses etc and it will just make it an unaffordable option for locals such as ourselves to drop in up there.</p> <p>Parking should be free in the winter months or else it's going to kill the business up there when they are more reliant on regular locals. \$20.00 for two hours is too much to charge, if tourists are spending this on parking they will spend less in the shops and cafes, how does this help our West Coast Tourist economy?</p> <p>Free parking time needs to be extended to an hour, (but even then it will only give tourists a chance to either walk the blowhole track or go to a cafe / shop up there, won't be time to do both, businesses will miss out).</p> <p>Maybe time to consider a charge for the track instead, or looking at how the existing tourist tax for international visitors is distributed amongst our regions.</p>
----	---

95	<p>I would like to put a submission in re the proposed paid parking for Punakaiki.</p> <p>Being a local bach owner I think there should be a dispensation for locals. Besides anything else we pay a ludicrous amount in rates already to reside here so I believe parking should be free for us.</p> <p>We don't just use the parking to run in and pick up mail, but also enjoy having coffee or lunch, having a look around and purchasing at the shops along with taking a walk to the blowholes all which takes more than a mere 15 minutes.</p> <p>While in the busy tourist season this may not seem to have a huge impact on the businesses, but in the off season losing the local trade will have a huge effect.</p>
96	<p>Kia Ora,</p> <p>I'm a Franz Josef local and was wondering what the proposed paid parking situation would be for locals? Would we have an exemption?</p> <p>Would the paid parking also apply for the Alex Knob carpark?</p>

97	<p>Good morning</p> <p>My wife and I along with several friends and our children regularly frequent the barriers doc camps and walk around NZ. Out was with great concern that I learnt that DOC are planning to implement parking fees at many off these sites. I am very strongly against taking such measures as a way to obtain revenue. As an older person, I visit these sites to have an affordable vacation. A better option would be to more robustly check on the people that cannot in DOC facilities without paying. This is evident throughout the country in particular over public and school holidays. I think charging for car parking is the last and easier option for obtaining revenue but does not serve the interests of those enjoying NZ nature. I strongly urge you to please reconsider and not go ahead with these proposed parking levies.</p> <p>Regards</p>
98	<p>Hi DOC team,</p> <p>I'm really disappointed to hear about the plan to introduce paid parking at places like Pancake Rocks and Franz Josef Glacier, with the possibility of it expanding to more DOC sites.</p> <p>These spots are meant to be for everyone. Adding parking fees will put people off, especially those already feeling the pinch, and it's likely to hurt local businesses too. It feels wrong to charge New Zealanders just to enjoy their own back yard.</p> <p>Please don't turn access to nature into a revenue stream. I'm strongly against this plan.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>

99	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I make my feedback comments in bold under each of the quotes from the link noted above.</p> <p>From your website link regarding this topic:</p> <p>“These three car parks are among our busiest. We can’t just keep building bigger car parks – it doesn’t solve the issue or uphold these outstanding areas. We have to modernise and innovate to deliver for nature and for New Zealand.</p> <p>I agree in many places it is not practical to keep building bigger car parks but only where the land will not allow for extensions. Punakaikai has extended to meet parking demand.</p> <p>“A user pays approach for DOC car parks has long been mooted as a sensible solution – with the goal of reducing pressure and generating revenue at our popular sites.</p> <p>A user pay option is not the only option. Our tourism industry needs investment but not to the detriment of New Zealand's own people being penalised with more charges. Look at the motor home sector. Many pay \$200 every 6 months for COF costs, increasing motorhome insurance, on-road assistance insurance, road user charges and the fuel costs that increase more than decrease.</p> <p>Putting another charge on top of this for parking will see my sector avoid DOC sites, encourage freedom parking whether Certified self - contained (CSC or not). This works against the Freedom Parking Act conditions.</p> <p>It is getting too expensive. The local tourists especially motor home owners are superannuitants on fixed incomes. Many have worked all their lives for this new adventure in their retirement years.</p> <p>“The approach brings us in line with overseas solutions for similar issues. By contributing to costs at high use sites, visitors give back to the places they enjoy, helping create a more regenerative model to sustain New Zealand’s precious biodiversity.</p> <p>How would the income from the new income of parking charges equate to a more regenerative model to sustain biodiversity? How will that be transparent?</p> <p>What this looks like is an indirect advantage of a new income stream from parking charges but we would not see the advantage to our biodiversity.</p> <p>The government's new strategy is to increase inboard tourism budget by \$35 million but only \$4 million of this to be invested on one only site being Milford. I think DOC needs to advocate for specific budget increase to improve parking in many sites.</p> <p>OTHER SOLUTIONS:</p> <p>Offer local tourist (New Zealanders) off peak (early use and off season) zero car parking at pressured sites.</p> <p>Incentives that encourage local tourists to visit DOC sites. There are thousands of them.</p> <p>Many overseas tourists are renting motor homes. At the site of renting motor homes they can pay for car parking charges in the regions they are visited upfront. These rental companies are huge businesses and would have capacity to do this.</p>
----	--

My personal situation:

I fit in the fixed income (superannuitant) sector. Now I finally have the chance to see more of my own country but I'm finding the cost of local travel using my motor home very expensive. Like all New Zealanders I face rising costs across all living costs - property rates, insurances, food and power. Like many in my sector we are worried about financial sustainability. If I sell the motor home I won't use local tour operators because they are very expensive, so that leaves me the only option - some travel overseas on the proceeds of selling my motor home.

Like my sector I want to do this while I have the health to do any travel at all. Please don't plan to put another cost of local travel on New Zealanders. Charge the inbound tourists - that sector is where the pressure on parking is impacting.

Thank you.

100	<p>What the **** are you starting here.. the whole of NZ will do it next.. **** off.</p> <p>Every way possible to take more money of people. The country is screwed enough now. The rich don't care. Tell the hole world then ha? Tourists will talk. The tourists spots... shops and entertainment that are at these places should pay for allocated parking. Just like shop rents etc.</p> <p>**** money hungry sucker's. So wrong. *****grow up. Pull your heads in</p>
101	<p>Kia ora DOC team,</p> <p>I'm emailing to strongly oppose the plan to introduce paid parking at sites like Pancake Rocks and Franz Josef Glacier, and the wider rollout across NZ.</p> <p>These places should be free and accessible for everyone. Charging to park will put people off visiting—especially locals and families—and hurt small businesses nearby that rely on tourism. Nature should never become a pay-to-enter experience.</p> <p>This appears to be the beginning of a slippery slope toward commercialising access to public land. I do not support DOC becoming a car-parking business at the expense of equitable access to nature. Our conservation land should not be monetised in this way.</p> <p>I urge DOC to reconsider this proposal and look at alternative ways to fund operations—ways that do not discourage public use or penalise those who already contribute through taxes and community support.</p> <p>Please rethink this. It's not fair, and it's not in line with what DOC stands for.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p>

102	<p data-bbox="338 233 432 256">Hi there,</p> <p data-bbox="338 305 1770 363">I strongly disagree with the idea of having paid parking in such a remote yet well visited part of our country. The west coast needs these beautiful tourist attractions to remain free and accessible for all people.</p> <p data-bbox="338 410 659 433">Please do not let this happen!</p> <p data-bbox="338 482 424 505">Thanks!</p>
-----	--

103	<p>Christchurch 13 June 2025</p> <p>Department of Conservation</p> <p>Dear Minister,</p> <p>Re: DOC Car Parking Charging at Punakaiki Pancake Rocks</p> <p>I am writing to you to oppose paid car parking at Punakaiki. Punakaiki is rurally located on the West Coast of the South Island and needs small tourism businesses to provide jobs and inject revenue into the community.</p> <p>DOC plans to introduce a paid parking pilot at Dolomite Point, Pancake Rocks, Punakaiki from October 2025 which will hugely negatively impact visitor numbers, reduce accessibility and impact our adjacent family-owned businesses - Pancake Rocks Cafe (purchased 1999) and Coast Road Store. You are also using the tourist-funded International Visitor Levy (IVL) to pay for an unreasonable Government car-parking business monopoly and in a location where you are also a vendor. Tourist's are told "The IVL is your contribution to maintaining the facilities and natural environment", they are not told it is being used to implement further ways to being charged - you are double-dipping creating an anti-competitive conflict of interest. In contrast to your recent announcement where you are using the IVL to market for more tourists, and having paid \$45M+ for a new Visitor/Experience Centre here (which you then gave away), you are now going to ensure less people visit.</p> <p>1. Free Public Land Accessibility for all New Zealanders</p> <p>I disagree with DOC commercializing public land and using their monopoly to charge, especially where there are no other options for parking and little public transport. I fear this is the start of DOC rolling out parking charges across the country, reducing access and New Zealanders either be unable to afford or be unwilling to pay to enjoy our National Parks and other conservation areas. This is being introduced as a quasi-National Park entry fee, disguised as a car parking charge. This location has offered free car parking for visitors to the Pancake Rocks long before the formation of the Paparoa National Park and 1987 and long before DOC took over management of the area. DOC can now exploits it's monopoly on land.</p> <p>Charging for parking will deter tourists and passing drivers from stopping, create driver safety implications and disadvantage locals, while</p>
-----	--

acting as a barrier and taking DOC's focus off it's core purpose of Conservation and providing access for everyone to enjoy nature. Ability to pay should not be a barrier to access DOC areas.

As part of the Government's plan to 'Get our Country Back on Track', it has a Boosting Tourism policy: " National wants to see tourism develop around the country to help support local businesses, jobs and communities". Paid car parking at Punakaiki will cause us to reduce staffing, let-down our suppliers, pay less tax including gst and invest less back into the community.

One of the documented intentions of your \$45M+ investment at Punakaiki was to encourage visitors to stay longer in the area, however by charging visitors to park they will either not stop at all or reduce their time spent. They also won't have multiple return trips if they are staying in local accommodation - they won't come back to Dolomite Point for dinner, come back for shopping, come back to see the Experience Centre, come back again at high tide for the Blowholes etc.

This particular location has been poorly chosen for parking charging, there is little overnight accommodation and so it is not a destination location as such but more of a natural stopping point along the way, being 3-4 hours drive from Nelson, Christchurch or the Glaciers. It is also part-way on the journey between Westport and Greymouth which Coasters must frequent for medical trips, business and shopping. SH6 is often voted as one of the top scenic road trips in the world but it is a narrow and winding road requiring driver focus and the Pancake Rocks offers the perfect place for driver's to rest. I believe many people will now choose not to stop and pay for a mere 20 minute walk or a coffee, particularly in such a high rainfall area.

2. Conflict of Interest - Government seeking direct revenue at the expense of tax-paying businesses with anti-competitive behaviour

DOC has confirmed it did not consider the effect on neighboring Tourism businesses in it's planning. DOC is wanting to raise direct revenue at the expense of tax-paying businesses.

As per DOC correspondence as part of a OIA request:

Wild Coast Ltd: "Do you know if any consideration has been given to our Dolomite business, which this project will substantially impact? i.e was this part of the business case presented to the minister?"

Catherine Wilson, Director, Heritage and Visitors Department of Conservation: "The impact on surrounding facilities was not part of the business case and not considered within the proposal."

While we understand the need for revenue gathering, the Government should not be pursuing direct revenue at the expense of and with no regard to existing business neighbours by entering into a car parking business monopoly. Punakaiki is rurally located on the West Coast of the South Island and needs tourism businesses to provide jobs and inject revenue into the community. Your role should be to advocate and assist with infrastructure for rural South Island businesses. This week, you are promoting the allocation of \$13.5M of IVL to Tourism Marketing as a boost to tourism to increase visitor numbers, however policies like the paid car parking are about your revenue at the expense of ours and will in fact result in less visitors.

At the Pancake Rocks in particular, DOC entering into a car parking business monopoly will mean they can easily change pricing/hours of payment at any time giving them complete control over visitor numbers to this area and consequently access to our business. In competition, DOC has it's own retail business there and this charging policy is anti-competitive. Our business is reliant on people stopping to visit the Pancake Rocks and there is no doubt that charging for car parking will reduce visitor numbers, particularly noticeable over the shoulder season and winter months. Due to this and also the impacts we are already seeing from #3 below, we will be forced to close next winter. Currently winter is loss-making and we only stay open to maintain continuity of staff and service, completely closing will be negative for our staff, suppliers, the community and ourselves.

It creates a huge amount of business uncertainty knowing DOC could increase parking fees at any time thereby reducing our customer numbers and makes investing back into our businesses very risky, again contradicting recent Government Policy supposedly promoting business growth. It is very disillusioning knowing from Catherine Wilson above that our business failure is of no consideration to DOC. Note we have weathered 2.5 years of closed international borders over Covid and international arrivals are not yet back up to pre-covid levels. For those who do still stop, money spent on car parking will not then be spent at local businesses.

3. Un-level playing field

We are operating and trying to survive under an already hugely un-level playing field. DOC was allocated \$26M of Provincial Growth Fund which ballooned to \$45.5M+ with extra DOC funding for an Information and Experience Centre, which they built and then donated to Ngati Waewae to operate commercially from late 2024. This brand new free building includes a government-funded café and retail space that now unfairly competes with it's pre-existing neighbours, as well as having lwi tax status. In order to mitigate the effects on our existing business and not breach one of the main pillars of the PGF which was 'not to duplicate existing efforts', we have a signed agreement from DOC and Ngati Waewae limiting their operation to a snack bar with accessible seating only - this agreement has been blatantly ignored by them since opening day (Ombudsman inquiry pending). Understandably, this has caused us to lose all faith in the integrity of stakeholder consultation with DOC.

For us, the tax-payer PGF money did not even address many of the infrastructure concerns at this remote location with a low rating-base, and in fact storm water run-off is worse. DOC are now about to abuse their public land monopoly and Social Licence to operate by directly charging the people of New Zealand and our much-needed visitors. Instead of using the intention of the IVL to assist low rating-base locations with infrastructure, you are using it to even further charge tourists.

Between the new tax-payer funded cafe and retail, and soon paid car parking, at best it will likely cause us to shut over future winters (best

case) or worse case completely destroy our business. Regarding parking stakeholder consultation, Ngāti Waewae is being granted significantly more involvement, and likely being granted special treatment. I reiterate we are long-standing adjacent neighbours, there was a Cafe here long before the formation of the National Park, yet we feel the Government is doing it's best to financially ruin us.

4. Requested Outcomes:

DOC removes their car parking policy that uses it's monopoly on land ownership against the public and contradicts it's Social Licence to operate

DOC ensures fair consultation and adherence to agreements

DOC must consider the consequences on neighbouring existing businesses when implementing new policies

We receive equal treatment in parking agreements to other neighbours

If charging is unavoidable, I urge a fair rate—excluding winter and evenings, with 2-hour free initial parking. Comparably, Christchurch Botanic Gardens is \$2 first hour and \$1.30 second hour. Comparably, on the West Coast parking is \$0.00. The trial information states it will run for 9 months from October which indicates you will charge into winter. As per your document if your charging intention is to help manage visitor numbers, rather than unfairly increase your revenue in an anti-competitive manner then this is only necessary from 26 Dec - February. At a bare minimum, I suggest two hour free parking.

I am extremely concerned about the Government's continual efforts to thwart our legitimate business efforts and urge DOC to consider other options in it's pursuit of extra revenue then this quasi-National Park entry fee under the veil of car-parking. I am extremely concerned that this is only the beginning of the Nationwide rollout and many Kiwis will stop visiting these wonderful places with the additional cost of what has always been free access to places which are owned by all of us.

This parking policy on top of the new Government-funded cafe will really impact on us and I implore you to assist. I expect to get your response on how you will help stop DOC financially undermining our legitimate tax-paying business.

Regards,

104	<p>J'm just writing to express my disgust and disapproval of the idea of parking charges at DOC sites. I also disapprove of the recent increase of charges at camping sites. As a senior citizen, now on the pension, born and bred kiwi who has worked from school leaving non stop through to retirement and paid copious amounts of taxes my entire life, much of which has gone to supporting government depts. like DOC, I feel I have paid enough. Add to that the underlying principle of NZ being my country and along with every other citizen we should have the unencumbered right to enjoy the wilderness, sights, and beauty of OUR country anytime, anywhere that is part of the public domain. I along with many others will fight this tooth and nail.</p> <p>Regards.</p>
105	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I feel like it will in courage people to park their vehicles on the south / North hills heading up to he blowholes as has happened in the recent summers when car parks have been full. Which could potentially lead to other issues. I am against paid parking in the dolomite point area.</p>

106

To whom it concerns

In regards to doc operating a paid parking facilities at its walks and where ever this is just wrong as doc is tax payer funded we as taxpayers have all ready paid for these parks to be built and you want to double dip by making everyone pay again this is blatantly wrong and morally corrupt as well come on stop ripping the taxpayers off .

Cheers

107	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>We, _____ are residents at _____, located approximately 7 kilometers from Punakaiki.</p> <p>As locals and ratepayers, we are writing to express our concerns about the potential introduction of paid parking at the Punakaiki car park and to request that free parking be preserved for local residents and those supporting local businesses.</p> <p>The Punakaiki cafe area is a vital hub for our community. Residents regularly use this area to meet at the local cafes for social gatherings, for business discussions, or to support the local economy.</p> <p>This cafe area fosters a strong sense of community, serving as a central meeting point for locals to connect and engage.</p> <p>Introducing paid parking would be detrimental, particularly for residents who cannot afford additional costs. It risks eroding the sense of community that makes Punakaiki special.</p> <p>While we understand the appeal of charging tourists visiting attractions like the Pancake Rocks and Blowholes, it feels deeply unfair that local ratepayers, who already contribute to the upkeep of the region through rates paid to the Grey District or Buller District or the regional council, would face additional parking fees as a consequence of tourism. Such a policy could alienate locals and create unfavourable sentiment towards tourists.</p> <p>We respectfully request that you implement a policy ensuring free parking for local residents and those patronizing Punakaiki's cafes and businesses, regardless of whether they are visiting the tourist attractions. This could be achieved through resident permits or exemptions for cafe patrons, ensuring equitable access for the community while supporting local commerce.</p> <p>Please note, in regards to residents permits, while we are ratepayers at Grey District Council we only live 7 km from Punakaiki cafe, we consider ourselves locals and often support the cafe, especially in winter when there are no tourists to support the local businesses.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the needs of local residents and ratepayers. We trust you will prioritize the community's wellbeing and preserve the accessibility of this essential local hub.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
-----	---

108	<p>As local Punakaiki area residents we make use of car parking in Punakaiki to collect mail, have a coffee, visit the Visitor Centre, and to connect with friends local and from away on a regular basis - Punakaiki is our local social centre.</p> <p>We therefore object to this paid parking proposal.</p>
109	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>This submission outlines our opposition to the proposed car parking charge at Dolomite Point. We are submitting this on behalf of the following businesses operating in Punakaiki:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Pancake Rocks Cafe * Paparoa Park Motel * Tasman Sea Retreat * Coast Road Store <p>We believe the proposed car parking charge contradicts the goal of encouraging visitors to stay longer in Punakaiki, especially given the significant investment in the new \$45 million visitor center.</p> <p>Our reasons for opposing the charge are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impact on Tourist Stays: Tourists who stay longer in Punakaiki often visit the Pancake Rocks and visitor center multiple times during their stay to account for weather changes, high tides, or to enjoy meals and snacks. It is unlikely that visitors will be willing to pay parking fees multiple times within a short period. * Displacement of Parking: We anticipate that vehicles will be parked along the road and within the village to avoid the parking fee, leading to congestion and inconvenience. * Effect on Local Access: The charge will negatively impact locals and those traveling between Greymouth and Westport who wish to make a brief stop for coffee, lunch, or a walk around the Pancake Rocks.

* **Impact on Community Events:** Local community events, such as council meetings and jam nights, will also be affected by the proposed parking fees.

For the reasons outlined above, we strongly advocate for at least **two hours of free car parking** at Dolomite Point in case the project goes ahead

Sincerely,

Additional points raised in further emails:

Can you please confirm if both email addresses you circulated are still active for receiving submissions? Additionally, will submissions be accepted until the end of August?

We noticed that the northern car park adjacent to the new visitor center seems to be excluded from the paid parking proposal. Could you please confirm if this is correct?

110	<p>To DOC,</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the proposal to introduce paid parking at Dolomites Point. It is outrageous to use tourist levy funds for this purpose, as it feels like a rip-off to locals who use these car parks regularly and send visitors up there. Everything is already so expensive, and it feels unjust to charge a fee on such a vast national park. I believe a one-hour free parking area and no fees in the evening would be a more appropriate solution.</p> <p>I regret to inform you that I only heard about this proposal two days ago, so I am writing to strongly object to it at short notice.</p> <p>Regards</p>
111	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>_____ from Punakaiki here, I just want to write I support the paid parking initiative I think it will be great for the Pancake rock experience.</p>
112	<p>Hi</p> <p>I think it's a good idea to charge for parking at Punakaiki and Franz Josef but locals (west coasters) should be free. It doesn't need to be a lot but because the amount of people coming through will help a lot.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

113	<p>Good Afternoon. We wish to submit against the proposed car parking fees at Punakaiki.</p> <p>We own a residence at _____ and intend to retire there shortly. We are both pensioners and regularly use the local shops for our basic food needs. The nearest townships Greymouth and Hokitika which are 45 minutes drive. We regularly use the local shops and if a car parking fee was charged would make smaller purchases uneconomic. As we get older it will become more difficult to walk from our residence to the shops and we would require car parking . We we consider that the proposed parking fee is unfair to those local residents. We note that the maintenance of the Seawall protection structure north of the pancake rocks is fully paid for by those residents who are part of the Punakaiki special rating district. The resident have no way of recovering any costs from visitors using the Seawall . We believe local residents should be provided with an exemption card allowing free car parking. if any charge was to be made we believe this should be at the entrance way to the pancake rocks as this would not affect any of the local businesses including the visit experience centre which already has an entry fee.</p> <p>To Summarise we believe if I fee was to be charged local residence should have an exemption card and further believe that any charge should be at the gate to the pancake rocks so that does not have a detrimental effect on those businesses. The other alternative is to use the IVL - international visitor Levy to fund the alternative to the car parking.</p> <p>Regards</p>
-----	---

114	<p>Kia Ora Tatou,</p> <p>I am writing about the plans to introduce payments for parking at Dolomite Point and I am against such a move although it all seems to be going ahead no matter what I say. I first visited Punakaiki in 1956 while taking part in the Runanga Miners Picnic and I have returned many times over the years. Our family purchased a property in 1969 and I have lived in Punakaiki since 2013. I have always been supportive of actions by the Lands and Survey Dept and more lately the Department of Conservation in the management of our land. However, I do not support plans to charge for parking at Dolomite Point. It is a big step down a slippery slope when you have to pay to visit a natural feature in New Zealand. It will also encourage people to develop strategies to avoid paying what they see as an unjust fee and some of these schemes will cause problems for the locals and visitors. All New Zealanders pay tax and overseas visitors pay the Visitor Levy and DoC should not be endeavoring to add to the cost of visiting a natural feature in our environment. I believe a donation box in each car-park would be a much simpler solution to whatever the perceived problem appears to be to the promoters of this scheme. The biggest losers will be the families who regularly travel the Coast Road and always call into Punakaiki for a walk to the Blowholes and an ice cream or some-such at the shop. The parking fee will act as a major disincentive to many. I have left it a bit late to make my comments so all the best and may God bless you in your decision-making.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
-----	--

115	<p data-bbox="338 238 611 261">To whom it may concern,</p> <p data-bbox="338 310 1770 365">I understand we are moving with the times & there's not much in the way of free fun for a family these days but paid parking at our local Punakaiki township really saddens me.</p> <p data-bbox="338 414 1839 508">A trip out the Coast Road on a summers day or a winter trip on a stormy day to see the blowholes - whatever the day, Punakaiki has always been a favourite amongst us locals. Supporting the local shops/galleries or a stop off for an ice cream - paid parking for locals will change the shape of what Punakaiki represents for me. A family day out, enjoying life's simple treats in nature.</p> <p data-bbox="338 557 856 579">We pay our rates and they're ever increasing too!</p> <p data-bbox="338 628 686 683">Paid parking for locals - I say No! Kind regards,</p>
-----	--

116	<p>Kia ora DOC team,</p> <p>I'm writing to share my strong opposition to the plan to introduce paid parking at places like Pancake Rocks, Franz Josef Glacier, and more widely across conservation areas.</p> <p>Nature shouldn't come with a price tag. These places belong to all of us, and charging for parking feels like turning public land into a source of income. It goes against what conservation land is supposed to be about — open, free access for everyone.</p> <p>Because DOC manages most of the access to these spots, this kind of move feels like a monopoly. When there's no public transport or free alternatives nearby, it's not really a choice to pay — it's the only option. That's a real barrier for many people.</p> <p>Other countries that value nature — like Norway, Scotland, and Canada — don't treat it as something only available to those who can pay. New Zealand shouldn't either.</p> <p>This isn't the kind of future most Kiwis want for our outdoors. I really hope you'll rethink this direction and consider the bigger picture.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p>
-----	---

117	<p>As a local community group who brings tamariki up to explore Punakaiki on holiday programs we utilise the car park to park for over 3+hours at a time while we under go the activities of Dolomite point an the punangairi centre. These programs are based around local activities an local business support to make this a low cost affordable option for the kids of the coast road,</p> <p>Having to factor in c cv at parking or the possibility of a fine if get timing wrong would almost have us straight away looking elsewhere to explore.</p> <p>But then again that's probably what your after anyway, its not our local money you want it's the tourist dollars...</p> <p>What will doc use the monies generated for?</p> <p>Will it stay local ?</p> <p>What happened to doc being the department of conservation? Not department of parking</p> <p>Thanks</p>
-----	---

118	<p>Kia ora DOC team,</p> <p>I'm writing to strongly oppose the proposed introduction of paid parking at Pancake Rocks, Franz Josef Glacier, and other DOC-managed sites.</p> <p>Public conservation land is not a product to be sold back to the people who already fund it. These are shared spaces, protected for everyone's benefit — not assets to be commercialised through compulsory parking fees.</p> <p>DOC controlling most access points to the outdoors effectively creates a nationwide monopoly. People will have no choice but to pay to visit the very places that belong to all of us. And with no public transport alternatives available, this model disproportionately affects those with fewer options or limited means.</p> <p>Charging to park in natural spaces sends the wrong message: nature is only for those who can afford it. In countries like Scotland, Sweden, and Canada, access to national parks and walking trails remains free — because nature is seen as a right, not a revenue stream.</p> <p>Please reconsider. Once public access becomes transactional, it's very difficult to go back. This is not what conservation should look like.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p>
-----	---

119	<p>Tourism Export Council of New Zealand Submission</p> <p>Seeking feedback on paid parking at Dolomite Point</p> <p>19 June 2025</p> <p>Department of Conservation</p> <p>WELLINGTON</p> <p>By email: paidcarparking@doc.govt.nz</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide some feedback on the proposal by the Department of Conservation (DOC) to run a pilot paid carparking initiative at Dolomite Point car park. DOC says the pilot is to run from October 2025 for nine months.</p> <p>This is part of a pilot at three popular sites to help manage visitor numbers.</p> <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) acknowledges and supports government's growth agenda and appreciate tourism being identified as part of the growth strategy. • TECNZ acknowledges the role the Department of Conservation (DOC) has as one of the country's largest participants and supporters of the visitor economy and acknowledge the great work DOC does for New Zealanders and international visitors. • TECNZ recognizes DOC needs more investment to support its strategic outcomes and provide a safe and resilient visitor network of infrastructure, facilities and services. • We ask our submission and ideas be considered seriously. TECNZ represents the private sector involved with growing and developing New Zealand's international tourism offering. TECNZ represents 75 Inbound Member companies (who bring in over 60% of all international visitors) and 256 tourism companies. All TECNZ members have a high ratio (normally 60% or more) of their business deriving income from international visitors. Our members are those that drove and influenced New Zealand's international tourism result pre-Covid of generating 3.9million visitors and \$17.5billion in export receipts. • Our submission represents the majority of tourism businesses that have a high dollar investment (\$) level in building New Zealand's visitor proposition and attracting and hosting international visitors. This includes private sector investment in selling and promoting New Zealand to the world to generate demand (Inbound Tour Operators), investment in accommodation (hotels, luxury lodges, motel bed and breakfast), transport (airlines,
-----	---

helicopter, fixed wing aircraft, vessels) and activity / attraction development and infrastructure to support growth of tourism to present New Zealand's world class offering to attract international visitors.

2

- Our submission and views only relate to impact of carparking charges on international visitors.
- TECNZ is not supportive of adhoc additional charges or fees (like access fees or carparking fees) being forced upon international visitors. We believe the International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy (IVL) revenue derived from international visitors (excluding Australian visitors) has created adequate revenue for DOC to help cover operational costs.
- The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand has given considerable thought to proposed carparking fees and impact on international visitors.
- Our first response is that we do not support carparking fees being implemented for international visitors. The reason for this is due to the \$100 per person fee that almost all international visitors are paying with the IVL fee with revenue going to 50% to visitor infrastructure needs and 50% to the Department of Conservation for 'visitor' services and infrastructure needs, maintenance and biodiversity projects and initiatives.
- We acknowledge the Department of Conservation is exploring carparking fees that may capture Australian and other countries currently exempt from paying the IVL fee and to use international visitors to generate revenue for the Department of Conservation.
- TECNZ cautions any new visitor fees for access to key attraction areas and implementing carparking fees could result in a continued 'stall' of international visitors returning to New Zealand.
- In taking many things into consideration, in the event implementing carparking fees are to be implemented, we strongly recommend the following.
 - o Existing DOC concession holders including Inbound Tour Operators (and organised group tours), Bus & Coach Association (BCA) coach operators, Pro Guide driver/tour operators, and activity/attraction/transport concession holders are EXEMPT from paying a carparking fee. During the visitor season these businesses are travelling and hosting visitors to the areas on a daily basis. Most will be existing concession holders and should not have to pay another fee.
 - o DOC concession holders already pay the Department of Conservation a considerable amount of funds to host visitors on the DOC estate. If DOC does not exempt existing

concession holders the Department will be charging concession double or triple charging. This is unfair to businesses trying to host international visitors on their journey around New Zealand.

- o From a group touring perspective, DOC currently receives a fee from the Inbound Tour Operator, the BCA coach operator and Pro Guides if the ITO contracts the Pro Guide to be the Tour Leader/Guide hosting the group as they travel around New Zealand.
- o In the eventuality that carparking fees are implemented, TECNZ believes international visitors that should be targeted on those that travel via motorhome, campervan, rental vehicles and private vehicles to be charged.
- o TECNZ strongly recommends any carparking revenue generated in key attraction areas has funds hypothecated (targeted) and returned to the local community for upkeep of the local.
- o TECNZ strongly disagrees with carparking funds in key attraction areas going into the main operational account of DOC. All funds generated should go back to the local community for upkeep and maintenance of the carpark in the area/region.

3

1.0 Who is the Tourism Export Council of New Zealand?

Thank you for providing an extensive consultation document that raises many issues affecting the future of funding for the great work that the Department of Conservation undertakes as a major participant in the visitor economy.

The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) is a trade association that has represented the interests of the international tourism industry since 1971. TECNZ members founded New Zealand's world-class visitor proposition and contributed to New Zealand's number one export industry generating \$17.5billion in export receipts (March 2020). TECNZ members (330) are the specialists in international tourism.

ITOs market NZ to the world and commercially package up NZ tourism suppliers into easy to purchase itineraries/tours of NZ for offshore tour wholesalers and travel agency chains. This includes itineraries for visitors travelling independently, on a group tour, or part of a conference or incentive group.

TECNZ's membership includes Inbound Tour Operators (ITOs) and attraction, activity, accommodation, transport suppliers, regional tourism organisations and tourism services providers (Allied Members). The majority of our members pre-Covid would have had >60-70% (or higher) of

revenue derived from international visitors. www.tourismexportcouncil.org.nz.

2.0 New Zealand has a problem, international visitation has stalled

At the end of the 2024-2025 visitor season (31 March 2025) international visitors tracked at 86% of prepandemic arrivals (3.9million visitors).

Most other countries around the world have recovered or exceeded pre-Covid international arrivals.

International tourism recovers pre-pandemic levels in 2024

“With 1.4 billion international tourist arrivals recorded globally, 2024 marked the recovery of international tourism from the worst crisis in the sector’s history. A majority of destinations welcomed more international tourists in 2024 than they did before the pandemic, while visitor spending also continued to grow strongly.

According to the latest World Tourism Barometer from UN Tourism, an estimated 1.4 billion tourists travelled internationally in 2024, indicating a virtual recovery 99% of pre-pandemic levels. Results driven by strong post-pandemic demand, robust performance from large source markets and the ongoing recovery of destinations in Asia and the Pacific.”

3.0 Feedback on Matters relating to Proposed Carparking fees

You are asking for feedback on the following areas:

- A free parking period for vehicles making drop offs/pickups or short stays.
 - o Current concession holders and coach group tours should be exempted from being charged because they are already paying to host visitors on the DOC estate.
- Fee structure options including fixed length of stay rates, daily rates and multi-day rates.
 - o TECNZ does not have any recommendation in this area. This is something that DOC must develop and implement.
 - o In saying that, we strongly ask that \$millions of dollars are not spent on developing software or systems needed that could be spent elsewhere.

4

- Options for charging based on vehicle category that includes buses and motorbikes.
 - o As noted previously, group tour operators and coach operators are already paying a concession fee through the TECNZ and BCA concessions and should be exempt from any additional charges.
 - o We have no comment on motorbikes.
- When the pricing should be in effect, including off peak pricing options and time of day options.

o Given the seasonality aspect of international travel, we suggest any carparking fees should only relate to the 'height of the visitor season' being from 1 December to 31 March each year.

- How to accommodate local use.

o Local community, ratepayers and local concession holders should be exempt from paying a parking fee.

For further information please contact:

Tourism Export Council of New Zealand

120	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing as a homeschooling parent to appeal to the Department of Conservation and express my deep concern over the proposed removal of free parking at Pancake Rocks Café in Punakaiki. As a family that frequently visits Pancake Rocks both for recreational holidays and for hands-on, place-based learning in geology and environmental science, we believe this change would be detrimental to our ability to continue accessing this unique educational resource.</p> <p>Our visits to Pancake Rocks are very important to our homeschool curriculum. The site provides a rich, real-world context for teaching geology, marine ecosystems, and conservation. Being able to travel as a family and explore the formations, observe wildlife, and engage in self-directed learning without the added cost of parking has made this an accessible and valued part of our children's education.</p> <p>Removing free parking adds a financial barrier that will limit the frequency and spontaneity of these visits or cause them to not happen at all. As a homeschooling family, we already budget carefully for educational outings, as I am a fulltime homeschool mum, and my husband is doing teacher training at present. Paid parking, especially if implemented without community input, feels like a penalty for those of us trying to give our children a meaningful, hands-on education outside the traditional classroom, on a tight budget.</p> <p>Additionally, Pancake Rocks holds special value for us as a vacation destination. As a child I frequently visited this place with my family on vacation and I hope to give my children this same cultural experience. It is one of the few places where we can combine leisure and learning in a natural, welcoming environment. Paid parking would undermine this, making us think twice about visiting or potentially cutting our trips altogether, which in turn affects the local economy and businesses like Pancake Rocks Café, that my family members have supported for years.</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Department of Conservation to reconsider this proposal. Free parking at Pancake Rocks is more than a convenience, it is a gateway to education, community connection, and appreciation for our natural heritage.</p> <p>It will also have a detrimental impact on small local businesses, for example, the Pancake Rocks Café is a cornerstone of the Punakaiki community, offering essential hospitality services to both domestic and international tourists. Removing free parking will discourage spontaneous visits and deter customers who may choose to go elsewhere rather than pay to park, especially when alternative free parking options exist in other West Coast destinations. Free parking ensures the site remains accessible and welcoming to all New Zealanders and overseas visitors alike.</p> <p>If this decision is moving forward without meaningful community consultation, it undermines public trust in DOC's decision-making</p>
-----	--

processes. Local stakeholders deserve a voice in matters that directly affect their livelihoods and public assets. We are part of our land.

In light of the above, I strongly urge the Department of Conservation to reconsider its decision and retain free parking at Pancake Rocks Café. Instead, DOC should explore alternative revenue models that do not place undue burden on small businesses or the general public.

121	<p>Kia Ora,</p> <p>As a long term resident of the Coast Road, I do NOT support the paid parking trial, particularly in terms of local access of Punakaiki.</p> <p>Perhaps there could be a tourist/visitor fee for booking, and a seperate local/ residents non fee parking arrangement.</p> <p>Available for further feedback,</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
-----	--

122

Hello

Sorry I have missed the 19 deadline but I still wanted to add my feedback.

I'm in favour of the paid parking trial for the coming summer.

My only concern is could the cost to park a car deter some intended users to seek out and use other local free options e.g. Canavans Knob. This could place additional pressure on this car park during the summer.

Another unintended consequence could be the popular Fox Glacier South Side Walk could see additional car parking pressure while the trial is underway, due to visitors opting for a free option. Quite often this car park is full with overflow car parking occurring on the state highway 6 road side which is not ideal from a safety perspective.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

123	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thanks for sharing this with me. I am sorry I am in Wellington at the moment and can't be at this important meeting. Please record my strong disapproval for there being no parks available for locals. I understand that DOC see this as an easy way to get revenue as there's no other parking nearby. But this is so inappropriate and unfair in a rural environment in particular for people who work there and the locals who support these businesses. Locals have no other choice nearby for a coffee or lunch etc.</p> <p>At the very least the roadside parks should be available only for locals. Perhaps a local sticker permit or registration of local numberplates would suffice.</p>
124	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I'm aware you are currently undertaking consultation on paid parking at popular DOC sites. I recently received an email through a bulk mailing list from a business in Punakaiki who are concerned about the impact paid parking will have on local residents.</p> <p>I work at Stantec and specialise in parking management. Technology is now available that can provide differential pricing, enabling discounted or free parking for local residents. I've recently recommended this approach to Queenstown Lakes District, and it has been used by a council in Melbourne to manage foreshore parking demands (I've been involved in the review of it). This approach is likely to provide a more acceptable solution for some of the impacted communities, as well as much needed revenue for DOC.</p> <p>Please reach out if you're interested in finding out more.</p>

125	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p>
-----	--

	<p>This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
126	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I</p>

can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.

Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.

This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.

Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.

Thanks,

127	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p>
-----	--

This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.

Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, ____, 4 votes from ____, ____, ____ and ____, 2 votes from ____ and ____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.

Thanks,

128	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p>
-----	--

	<p>This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.</p> <p>Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
129	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p>

	<p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p> <p>This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.</p> <p>Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
130	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will</p>

now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!

The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.

This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.

And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.

Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.

This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.

Please formally register 3 individual submissions from _____ and _____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.

Thanks,

131	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p> <p>This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.</p>
-----	---

	<p>Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
132	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our</p>

whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!

The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.

This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.

And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.

Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.

This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.

Please formally register 3 individual submissions from _____ and _____, _____, 4 votes from _____, _____, _____ and _____, 2 votes from _____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.

Thanks,

133	<p>DOC,</p> <p>I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms, the proposal to introduce paid parking at Punakaiki.</p> <p>This is not just a car parking matter. This is a deliberate move to commercialise access to public conservation land - land that belongs to all New Zealanders, not to DOC's revenue stream.</p> <p>Let's call it what it is? A user-pays entry fee disguised as a car park charge. Locals who have called this area home for generations will now be forced to pay to visit their own backyard, with no free alternative or means of getting there without their vehicle (given from Rapahoe to Punakaiki is a very rural area) after DOC quietly removed the only remaining roadside parks. Removing the only free roadside parks is underhanded. You're deliberately cutting off the last accessible option for residents and regular users, many of whom spend time here every weekend, work in the area and support these businesses. This kind of "consultation" feels like a formality after decisions have already been made, a tick box exercise - I strongly urge you to consider the impact to the locals of this area who live around here and the Coast Road - we keep this a vibrant community with projects, activities and initiatives. We can't do this if we're charged to be parking in our township. We're absolutely NOT paying to come into our village and park our cars, even if you try to impose it, no one will pay and you can try and debt collect it but it will be challenged with full force of the law on our side, given our local solicitors have voiced their support for the people on this. Read the room - there is no public transport option, you are suggesting an extra barrier for people who are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, it actually becomes an equity issue and putting people off coming in and getting fresh air, exercising their right to wellbeing on our whenua - some people might have the disposable income to cover a regular parking fee but the reality is a lot of people in our area don't even have a spare \$50 a fortnight for the basics, especially with the increasing cost of fuel again attributed to the war in the Middle East affecting oil prices. To come into Punakaiki to post my mail and pick it up from the visitors centre and purchase a coffee to support our local cafe will now cost me in parking? NOT A F*CKING CHANCE!</p> <p>The National Parks Act guarantees free access to national parks. That principle is being trampled on. You will not implement this without being legally challenged, which our community will initiate.</p> <p>This isn't consultation. This is a calculated rollout of a car parking business model, trialled at Punakaiki, Mt Cook, and Franz Josef, soon to be imposed nationwide. The fact that DOC is moving ahead with this with minimal public input is insulting and undemocratic.</p> <p>And let me be absolutely clear the backlash to this will be significant. You're going to alienate the very communities who care for and protect these places. The anger is real, and sadly, it's inevitable that DOC will face vandalism, non-compliance, and extreme public resistance and I can promise, any future support for your organisation from these communities will diminish. The money you're hoping to gain in parking fees will likely be eaten up in damage control and enforcement costs.</p> <p>Punakaiki is not Disneyland. It's Paparoa National Park - our taonga. You do not get to quietly fence it off and profit from it, for whatever "good" reason you think might cover it. Stop double dipping in international visitors entry fee territory and the district and regional rates bucket.</p> <p>This is a line in the sand. Keep access free. Restore the roadside parking. Respect the intent of the law and the communities you're supposed to serve. Do your job and let the councils stick to roads guys.</p>
-----	---

	<p>Please formally register 3 individual submissions from ____ and ____, _____, 4 votes from _____, ____, ____ and _____, 2 votes from ____ and _____ to put your bad idea in the rubbish bin.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
--	---

134	<p>What a load of twisted logic.</p> <p>You spend \$31 million to build a new building and then give it away and lease it back. Now you want to charge for parking to generate money for "conservation" being the excuse.</p> <p>1/4 hr doesn't give enough time to do anything except get out of your car and then get back in. Free parking is just somebody's attempt to feel good.</p> <p>Everything is expensive in the info center and the shops. Punakaiki will probably die you are being to greedy on a suspect reason. \$10 an hour to charge an EV ☹️ on top of the charge fee. \$10 a hour on top of the shop charge for food.</p> <p>Charge an entrance fee to the blow hole.</p> <p>How much of this money will go to conservation, how much to administration, how much siphoned off to IWI.</p> <p>Can you be trusted as I don't think you are being open and honest.</p>
135	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <p>The NZ Game Animal Council (GAC) is pleased to see that Tahr Lodge users are exempt from paid parking pilot projects at White Horse Hill car park at Aoraki/Mt Cook. This will support some continued hunter contribution to game animal management and conservation in this area.</p> <p>We encourage you to consider how the proposed paid parking pilot project can be used to enable hunter feedback from those who are not using tahr lodge, but still accessing the area to hunt, and how DOC can continue to enable as many hunters as possible to continue</p>

contributing to conservation outcomes in this area. The GAC is concerned that additional cost to access hunting areas could reduce hunter contributions to game animal management in these areas, and those accessed through them, resulting in perverse conservation outcomes.

Please see the GAC submission on 'Exploring charging for access to some conservation land' for further context around our feedback: [GAC-Submission-Exploring-charging-for-access-to-some-public-conservation-land.pdf](#)

Ngā mihi,

New Zealand Game Animal Council

136

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the potential implementation of car parking charges at Punakaiki. As a frequent visitor to our national parks, I have always appreciated the Department's commitment to keeping these natural treasures accessible to all, free of charge.

Introducing parking fees at Punakaiki contradicts this principle and poses a significant barrier to accessibility. Given the lack of alternative parking options and public transport to the site, these charges effectively limit public access to the park.

I urge the Department to reconsider this decision and uphold the values of free and open access to our national parks.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

137	<p>To the folk at DOC,</p> <p>I am a local resident/mother in Punakaiki and wish to express a request for considering the Punakaiki residents use of the car park.</p> <p>As a new mum, I often spend time at the Dolomite Point area whether it's an outing for a hot drink or lunch at one of the cafes or browsing the gift shops or walking around the rocks and soon to be new walk up to the Dolomite Point lookout. I am also checking my mail weekly at the Community mail box located in the car park. Quite often I'll also be showing visiting friends and family through the new visitor centre. Most of the time I walk up with the pram from the village but there are equally just as many times that I'll head up in the car during the weather - Or because I am attending an open mic music night at the Cafe in the evening.</p> <p>For these reasons I believe it is essential that there be a free parking option for local residents. I have read about a possible amount of time that would be free but as a mother feel this would be frustrating to have to stick to a limited time schedule. I moved to this very rural part of the country to get away from things like paid parking. I feel that paid parking could be something that works for visitors but there are a lot of things that need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Aside from the locals having access to free parking.. it could create unsafe traffic at the entrance and next point to what is already a very busy car park.</p> <p>Thanks for taking the time to read my quick submission.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
-----	--

138

There is no sane reason safety or otherwise to paint out the seaward side parks at punakaiki. Not is there a good reason to force not fully able people to walk more than 1km uphill in often unpleasant weather to visit the pancake rocks. After all there is a shortage of free paved areas to park elsewhere. Neither is there an excuse to now make people pay to visit/use our natural resources freely. This is tokenization/monetization of our natural resource. Our birthright is to visit often and unimpeded these places. I see the hand of corporate greed in this as huge corporations will no doubt be supplying and maintaining the machines used to fleece us.

Sincerely

The contrast needs to be made between an attraction like Shantytown and natural attractions like Dolomite Point. Shantytown is built by human hands and is on land with the legal status to allow a charge to enter. The Pancake Rocks is not, nor is the carpark. If revenue collecting machines are installed they must not impede entry or exit without payment. In other words payment should be optional in perpetuity.

139

Kia Ora,

I applaud the plan to introduce/trial parking fees at busy carparks in New Zealand.

We are too accommodating to tourists in this country. As stated, other countries charge for parking and/or National Park car entry.

Canada, for example, has a permit system, where visitors obtain a car sticker when a permit fee is paid. This covers a bunch of National Parks, not just one. This then allows their entry via a gate which may be staffed or car is scanned - unsure.

In New Zealand there could be a South Island and North Island version perhaps.

Good luck with the pilot programme and I look forward to hearing of the plan going forward.

Nga mihi

140	<p>Hi,</p> <p>We have a wee cabin and spend plenty of time in the Punakaiki area. The new parking area and DoC building in Punakaiki is fabulous and a real asset to the community, region and DoC.</p> <p>The economy only flourishes in summer as your DoC numbers will show.</p> <p>It seems a real shame to be adding costs to DoC and visitors over the busy period and discouraging drivers from parking in designated parks, and encouraging parking on the side of the road further down the road and causing traffic chaos.</p> <p>Please reconsider this trail, and consider other options working with our local community to make Punakaiki an affordable and attractive option for tourists to stop at year round.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
141	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I feel like it will in courage people to park their vehicles on the south / North hills heading up to he blowholes as has happened in the recent summers when car parks have been full. Which could potentially lead to other issues. I am against paid parking in the dolomite point area.</p> <p>Regards</p>

142	<p>PAID CARPARKING FEEDBACK -</p> <p>Please note I am giving feedback as an individual, not as the _____. The views here are my own.</p> <p>Visitors</p> <p>It is reasonable to charge visitors for parking. International visitors, and domestic visitors who have travelled, are used to paying for parking at tourist spots.</p> <p>I don't think the first half hour should be free. This might encourage visitors just to whip round the blowholes and then drive off, rather than taking time to explore the local businesses, have a coffee and something to eat, go through the Paparoa Experience, stroll up to the lookout.</p> <p>Overnight parking should not be allowed. This is part of the 'No Freedom Camping' zone and overnight camping would be to the detriment of the visitor experience.</p> <p>Locals</p> <p>Parking should be free for locals. A definition of local? Definitely the wider Punakaiki community from say Whitehorse to Cargill Road, but preferably the whole Coast Road from and including Greymouth to Westport, for anyone who makes the effort to register a vehicle.</p> <p>We want to encourage those driving from one town to the other on business, to stop in for a break. And, to encourage Coast Road people to take a day trip, especially if they are bringing visitors.</p> <p>Dolomite Point is not just a tourist stop. It is a vital meeting place for the Punakaiki community. We need to be able to spend time without worrying about the cost of parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's the closest we have to a 'village centre' where we might collect our mail, walk round to post a letter, stop for a coffee, bump into a neighbour, stay for a yarn, check in with DOC and/or Ngāti Waewae staff... • Locals with artwork for sale in Punangairi need to deliver goods, check on sales, terms, displays etc. • As a Civil Defence co-ordinator, I often meet with DOC and/or Ngāti Waewae staff. Other community members will have other reasons for meetings at Punangairi. • Punangairi is the nearest our community has to a public venue. We don't have a true public space so sometimes meet there [eg the Petrel Patrol meeting with DOC staff Dec 2024]; events such as the DOC Marine Wildlife seminar in March – a splendid public use of the new building. <p>Notes -</p> <p>There is no parking outside any of the businesses, so this always involves a walk, which means time, especially for those less abled.</p> <p>Many locals support DOC and conservation values through unpaid work, including predator control [eg Coast Road Dawn Chorus; Truman Trappers; goat hunting]; reporting damage to Bullock Creek Road and environs; planting trees. Enabling us to park at Dolomite Point free of charge is a way of acknowledging this, especially</p>
-----	---

as some of this work involves parking there. Making us pay, on the other hand, would feel unfair.

BTW ...

I have been told of two rumours wild on social media, one that parking will be free for everyone for 15mins, then \$20. The other is that the Pororari River and Punakaiki River [start of Great Walk] car parks will also be charged parking. DOC may -or may not - want to address these rumours. Thanks for the opportunity to give feedback.

143	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>I'm writing to share my thoughts on the proposed paid parking pilot at the Franz Josef Glacier Car Park.</p> <p>As an Ōkārito resident and parent of two young children, we frequently visit the Glacier Valley to enjoy the walking tracks and cycleways. With limited recreational options for preschoolers in our area, these spaces have become an important part of our family's recreational activities, offering accessible and engaging ways to keep active.</p> <p>While I understand the goal of having visitors contribute to the upkeep of the facilities and access road, I believe locals (a definition which I am open for interpretation), should be exempt from parking charges. A fee waiver will allow locals to continue enjoying this special place without barriers. Introducing charges risks reducing local use and weakening community connection to this taonga.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about likely congestion and unsafe parking if visitors try to avoid the charges. Careful traffic and parking management at the access road entrance will be essential.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to share feedback on this proposal.</p> <p>Ngā mihi nui,</p>
144	<p>While I have no concerns directly related to the pay-parking project, there are likely to be spillover effects with some people using the highway roadside, and the rest area by the Punakaiki Lagoon for parking.</p> <p>In a way we have to wait and see what becomes apparent here.</p> <p>Please though, understand the basis on which we supply off-highway parking at the Punakaiki lagoon.</p> <p>We try to keep this an unoccupied space, in the sense of no campers and, preferably, no large cumbersome and unsightly vehicles.</p> <p>In our minds at least, this provides for a shared sense of ownership of the beach and river which lets people recreate there comfortably.</p> <p>We manage the area to some extent, however it's mostly self-organised by beach users.</p> <p>You might keep these thoughts in mind as you consider the wider area over the time of your project at Dolomites Point.</p>

145	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I would like to fill out the survey/questionnaire about the parking fee proposal for Punakaiki and can't find it on your website. Could you email me the link?</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>I am not totally against charging for parking at Dolomite Point however I think locals should not be charged.</p> <p>I frequently walk the Pororari — Punakaiki rivers loop. Including stopping for lunch and enjoying a coffee afterwards this takes me four hours. There is no way I want to pay for that privilege. Punakaiki is part of my backyard.</p> <p>Why not charge to walk out to the blowholes? I realise DoC is not in favour of this option but it seems only fair to charge tourists to view this incredible phenomenon. It even states in the "Seeking feedback" brochure that national parks and tourism sites in other countries charge. This is sometimes true but our local population needs to be exempt from these charges.</p>
-----	---

146	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>I am writing this from my work email because it is under my work I will be most affected. I like many people travel up the Coast Road for work. Specifically I travel twice a week to Westport from Greymouth and back.</p> <p>Previously I have been able to stop on the way up, using the carparks on the sea side of the road to park and go in briefly and use the toilet. These have now been removed.</p> <p>On the way back it is not unusual for me to stop and use the toilet, walk around, buy food and drink. I have been told that the first 15 minutes will be free. The carparks are not actually close to the toilets, however potentially in 15 minutes I might be able to use the toilet and get back to my car, but I would not be able to by food and drink and potentially eat it there. I am sure there are many people that travel the road for work stopping in to grab food and drink that just won't anymore if they have to pay for parking as well as higher prices for food and drink than elsewhere.</p> <p>My own issues aside, I have noticed in front of the new toilets is now a bus stop and the disabled car parking is further away, across the road that goes into the car park, meaning people with wheelchairs, crutches and other walking difficulties have to work further than able bodied people using a bus.</p>
-----	---

147	<p>Tena Koutou</p> <p>It is after the 19th, but carpark charging has become a hot topic around Punakaiki and so I send you my thoughts. I am not in principle against a modest charge for car parking to help towards recreation costs and hopefully spare a little more for conservation. However getting a fair and practical system here does seem fraught with difficulties.</p> <p>I will comment on your discussion bullet points:</p> <p>Free period</p> <p>This is certainly needed - for the reasons you give (drop offs, pick ups, mail) as well as for getting information from DOC, toileting (we definitely don't want travellers to be discouraged from using these facilities where provided) and for those who find there is no room in the carpark when it's busy.</p> <p>So the free period needs to be long enough for any of the above, including for the less mobile. 15 minutes, say, could be pushing it. However much more than that and it risks a significant number just racing around the Pancakes Rocks and leaving without being charged – rather defeating the purpose of the scheme?</p> <p>Fee structure</p> <p>A big justification for the recent new developments here was to get people to stay longer(!) We now have at least 3 hours of activities based right at Dolomite Point: Pancake Rocks and Blowholes (30 min), a new bush walk up to view point (30 min), Ngati WaeWae Experience Centre (1 hour), browsing DOC and other retail (30 min) and refreshments etc (30 min). Not everyone will do all these, but we want to encourage as much as possible. So I think there should be at least 2 hours (if not 3) following the free period which is charged at a set fee and at a level such as to not be a barrier to too many New Zealand families – at the very most \$10 for the 2 or 3 hour period.</p> <p>After this there could probably be hourly rates at a higher level so as to help clear the space for other users.</p> <p>And then there are the visitors who stay overnight (or longer - again to be encouraged) in the Seventeen Mile to Whitehorse Hill area – they often split the above activities over more than one day, or may return to say view the Blowholes in different conditions. It would be good if technology could cater for this without them paying more than once. (A charge would be a good incentive for some who stay nearby to walk, but distance and conditions preclude this for many.)</p>
-----	---

Vehicle category

I don't see reason to distinguish here.

Times of pricing

Preferably never(?) – but otherwise I think fees can only be justified over the busy weeks (January – March). Accommodation and other businesses in the area fear that charging means Punakaiki becoming a less desirable stopping place, thus impacting their income which is already pretty lean in the long down season.

When in operation I think the system should operate at all times of day to keep it simple. For example a busy time can be around the high tide which varies each day and can be quite late during

the long evenings of summer. Charges continuing overnight would also have the bonus of discouraging freedom campers.

However there would need to be a way to cater for local functions...

Local Use

This is a big one. The main push-back to charging is coming from locals as well as those who regularly drive the Greymouth – Westport highway.

Residents from Seventeen Mile to Whitehorse tend to see Dolomite Point as a central community space, especially with the lack of any other such facility (Barrytown Hall is a lot further south). It is their informal social area, a Civil Defence depot, a site for organised meetings and for regular music evenings at the café. Their lifestyle feels unnecessarily under threat. Maybe the technology will allow for continued local use?

Another concern is that there will be a return to inappropriate and dangerous parking along SHW6 and in the village as drivers (mainly budget travellers and West Coasters?) endeavour to avoid paying for their parks. Bus parks which are at a premium may also be more often obstructed. And any less fluid entry to the carparks (even if just from signs) is likely to cause traffic safety problems on the highway.

148	<p>Kia ora,</p> <p>Thank – you for the awareness of this pilot.</p> <p>Can see this creating problems on tourists and hikers parking on the already slim side of road in area to avoid payment.</p> <p>How will DOC staff manage this?</p> <p>Would Police, Ambo, Search and Rescue etc be given a card for access at all times given the 24 hour times we access this area from an emergency response perspective?</p> <p>Happy to catch up in person at some stage and help in any way I can.</p>
149	<p>As a New Zealander I’m not keen on having to pay to see part of my own country , which is happening more frequently and to hear that DOC paid for the building at Punakaiki to then give it to the Maori people, you are certainly making this country of ours into 2 different races of people, we are all meant to be ONE ,, same with the tracks around NZ being shut or temporary closed with no reasons given ,, what’s going on ..</p> <p>If you need money 🙏 then put a tax on all tourists coming into our country</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>A true New Zealander</p>
150	<p>Tēnā koe,</p> <p>FEEDBACK FROM HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND POUHERE TAONGA ON THE PROOSAL TO PILOT PAID CARPARKING AT WHITE HORSE HILL CARPARK</p> <p>Proposal</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) is an autonomous Crown Entity with statutory responsibility under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) for the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand’s historic heritage. 2. The Department of Conservation (DOC) is proposing to pilot paid car parking at the White Horse Hill carpark in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. 3. White Horse Hill carpark is located in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park and serves as a carparking area for access to White Horse Hill campground and several walking trails such as Hooker Valley Track, Kea Point Track, Mueller and Hooker Huts.

4. HNZPT supports the overall proposal to pilot paid carparking at White Horse Hill carpark, but advises that careful consideration is made of any associated effects such as traffic and increased vehicle movements in surrounding areas, noise, dust, and potential vibration. These are particularly important to consider in respect of impacts to archaeology and Māori heritage as a result of implementing paid carparking.

Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park

5. Ngāi Tahu hold the rangatiratanga and mana within the takiwā of Ngāi Tahu Whānui, which includes the National Park. Aoraki is considered the most sacred of ancestors to Ngāi Tahu and represents the link between the cosmological world and the present-day generation, reinforcing the sense of identity and continuity across generations.

6. Aoraki contains a Deed of Recognition under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998, acknowledging Te Rūnanga's statement of Ngāi Tahu's cultural, spiritual, historic and/or traditional association to Aoraki.

7. Aoraki/Mount Cook is home to New Zealand's highest mountain. The National Park comprises a range of dramatic features and landforms such as mountains and glaciers, among many others. Historic features, scientific importance and physical features contribute to the local, national and international significance of the National Park. Aoraki/Mount Cook also forms a key part of the larger South West New Zealand (Te Wāhipounamo) World Heritage Area, recognised by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisations (UNESCO) as one of the world's outstanding natural areas.

8. The Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park also has a long history of tourism. The range of natural features, scenic landscape, recreational activities and alpine environment of the National Park are some of the main attractions that have appealed to tourists and recreationalists alike.

9. Under the Mackenzie District Plan, White Horse Hill Carpark is zoned Natural Open Space Zone and is located within Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, specifically SASM57 (Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park). The site also contains the Site of Old Hermitage which is a scheduled heritage item (Item no H43).

Archaeology

10. An archaeological site under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is defined as any place occupied prior to 1900 that may provide archaeological information on the history of New Zealand. An Archaeological Authority is required for any works that may modify or destroy an archaeological site.

11. There are three archaeological sites in the vicinity of the White Horse Hill carpark. These relate to the first Hermitage building constructed 1884. The three sites record include the remains of the original Hermitage itself (H36/9), the remains of the Hermitage stable buildings (H36/8), and artefacts and middens (Pākehā refuse) associated with its occupation (H36/1). The hermitage was abandoned after severe flooding in 1914.

12. Although there is the potential for archaeological material to be uncovered, the installation of paid parking equipment, such as pay machines, would likely require minimal earthworks and the equipment could be moved to an alternative location should archaeological material be identified during works. If this approach is taken, and impact to archaeology can be avoided, proceeding under an Accidental Discovery Protocol (attached as Appendix 1) should be sufficient.

13. If the works are more than minor and/or the equipment cannot be relocated in the event archaeological material is identified, then an application for an Archaeological Authority should be considered ahead of the works.

14. Piloting paid carparking is likely to result in visitors exploring alternative carparking options off road or in any surrounding areas. As such, HNZPT advises that the potential effects of off-road parking on archaeological features (yet to be recorded) are also considered, particularly where ground conditions are soddened as vehicles have the potential to cause significant damage to subsurface features, if present.

15. In respect of the above, HNZPT expresses its support for the proposal to pilot paid carpaking, beginning summer 2025/2026, but also wishes to highlight the importance of a thorough assessment of any direct, indirect, actual and potential effects on the carpark and its surrounding environment, with respect to archaeology and Māori heritage.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

(64 3) 363 1880 Southern Regional and Canterbury/West Coast Area Office PO Box 4403, Christchurch Mail Centre 8140 heritage.org.nz

Ngā mihi,

151	<p>Hi team,</p> <p>Some collated feedback from NZAC here.</p> <p>Most of our users are longer stay people (more than 1 or 2 days). We would hope that rates would be diminishing with amount of time you stay (they might be staying 3 – 5 days to do Ball Pass, Empress Hut, or ski touring up around Mueller). Many of them will be coming from Unwin lodge. Our main concern is a possible change in user behaviour meaning more people are walking on the road or biking between the lodge and the Hooker Valley end. This would pose safety issues.</p> <p>Other feedback:</p> <p>As I had already mentioned to you my main concern was around the additional usage of walkers and or bikers on the main highway.</p> <p>In my experience at Tongariro the park and ride worked reasonably well but lead to people walking the main highway to save a dollar putting them in a slightly risky situation. The other side affect was that people who may not have even been up to walking the length of the crossing we sometimes adding up to 12km to their already 21km journey, again putting them at risk due to the additional distance they were trying to cover.</p> <p>A lesser consequence was that this lead to much more roadside rubbish with rangers often having to stop on the highway to pick up dumped rubbish. I don't think this will be as much of a problem in Aoraki as visitors seem to be more respectful of this area, maybe it's lack of proximity to larger centres where people are picking up takeaways etc. has something to do with this but it was considerable the amount of time we had to spend on the side of a highway picking up rubbish in an effort to keep the park clean.</p> <p>Our NZAC Club members (and other outdoor activists) tend to use the carpark for long (multiday) visits when ski touring in the Barron Saddle - Mueller area undertaking Ball Pass and Copland Pass crossings, climbing trips to the upper Hooker Valley and climbing Aoraki from the west side and completing the GT, Predator control. It is also often a starting point for long alpine traverses e.g Copland -Karangarua - Mueller. We would be a small % of those parking there but would be there for extended periods of time.</p> <p>Wonder if there could be a permit system like at Mangatepopo so that climbers can still get into the backcountry without getting penalised, or could there be Club discounts for people. Most members would arrive in cars, so a steep differential on camper vans would make sense.</p>
-----	--

152	<p>Federated Mountain Clubs of New Zealand Inc. White Horse Hill Carpark Charging Feedback</p> <p>Kia ora,</p> <p>Federated Mountain Clubs was founded in 1931 and advocates for the backcountry and outdoor recreation on behalf of over 22,000 members in 96 clubs. FMC speaks, also for the many other New Zealanders who enjoy our backcountry.</p> <p>FMC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Department of Conservation’s proposal received 12 June 2025 to conduct a pilot of car parking charges at White Horse Hill carpark at Aoraki/Mount Cook.</p> <p>Backcountry User Impact</p> <p>We note that your pricing model is still under consideration, with a number of options to be considered.</p> <p>This is the area of most interest to us, especially related to how this will impact those users who embark on multi-day backcountry trips from this location. The volume of these users is tiny compared to the volume of day users - with the latter being the cause of the current congestion issues.</p> <p>We will therefore be very keen to review the proposed pricing model once it is available, to ensure that multi-day trip participants are not penalised because of an issue they don’t noticeably contribute to.</p> <p>As a general rule nationally where car parking charges are being introduced, it is important to also facilitate an exemption for volunteers involved in hut and track maintenance or conservation work - they donate their own time and expenditure in the pursuit of activities that support the Department, so should never have to pay carpark charges as part of their volunteer mahi.</p> <p>Federated Mountain Clubs of NZ PO Box 1604 Wellington 6104 New Zealand/Aotearoa</p> <p>DOC Considerations</p>
-----	--

There are a lot of components to this proposal, and we trust that you are taking all of these into account, balancing the costs and expected revenue, so that there is a net gain to the Department.

This includes:

- The pricing model complexity, leading to costs and time frame for design, development, testing and ongoing maintenance (people time and software)
- Clear and transparent costs and processes that identify whether this will be cost neutral to merely control volume of people and cars to this area, or whether net financial gain is planned and where this will be spent e.g. local infrastructure, tracks, huts and so on (which we would prefer), or elsewhere regionally or nationally which should be specifically clarified.
- Compliance monitoring will be a significant issue, requiring staff and funding. Given your intention to have an open payment approach, how will you manage the expected proportion of people who will park without paying, given some of these people will only be in the country for a short time ?
- Will a regular or occasional on-site parking warden be able to determine which vehicles have in fact paid ?
- The costs of implementing this in terms of systems, people, on site hardware, signage and site physical modifications will be significant, with ongoing maintenance required. Do these stack up against realistic revenue projections ?
- Given the information that you will be capturing, will there be an option for potential visitors to remotely check for the availability of car park spaces ?
- You note that vehicles may try to park for free on Hooker Valley Road as they currently do especially in summer peak season and you are looking into this. We suggest that you extend consideration of this issue to Mt Cook Village and beyond, where parking may become congested, vehicles may shuttle back & forth between WHH and the Village, such that WHH parking will merely be displaced to Hooker Valley Road, the Village, and beyond, causing yet more congestion and potential road traffic incidents. Such consideration may include collaboration with tourism operators.

We look forward to receiving the pilot design to be shared with stakeholders around September,2025 and providing constructive feedback.

Yours faithfully,

153	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide some feedback on the proposal by the Department of Conservation (DOC) to run a pilot paid carparking initiative at White Horse Hill carpark at Aoraki / Mount Cook. DOC says the pilot is to run from October 2025 for nine months. This is part of a pilot at three popular sites to help manage visitor numbers.</p> <hr/> <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) acknowledges and supports government's growth agenda and appreciate tourism being identified as part of the growth strategy. • TECNZ acknowledges the role the Department of Conservation (DOC) has as one of the county's largest participants and supporters of the visitor economy and acknowledge the great work DOC does for New Zealanders and international visitors. • TECNZ recognizes DOC needs more investment to support its strategic outcomes and provide a safe and resilient visitor network of infrastructure, facilities and services. • We ask our submission and ideas be considered seriously. TECNZ represents the private sector involved with growing and developing New Zealand's international tourism offering. TECNZ represents 75 Inbound Member companies (who bring in over 60% of all international visitors) and 256 tourism companies. All TECNZ members have a high ratio (normally 60% or more) of their business deriving income from international visitors. Our members are those that drove and influenced New Zealand's international tourism result pre-Covid of generating 3.9million visitors and \$17.5billion in export receipts. • Our submission represents the majority of tourism businesses that have a high dollar investment (\$) level in building New Zealand's visitor proposition and attracting and hosting international visitors. This includes private sector investment in selling and promoting New Zealand to the world to generate demand (Inbound Tour Operators), investment in accommodation (hotels, luxury lodges, motel bed and breakfast), transport (airlines, helicopter, fixed wing aircraft, vessels) and activity / attraction development and infrastructure to support growth of tourism to present New Zealand's world class offering to attract international visitors. • Our submission and views only relate to impact of carparking charges on international visitors. • TECNZ is not supportive of adhoc additional charges or fees (like access fees or carparking fees) being forced upon international visitors. We believe the International Visitor Conservation
-----	--

and Tourism Levy (IVL) revenue derived from international visitors (excluding Australian visitors) has created adequate revenue for DOC to help cover operational costs.

- The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand has given considerable thought to proposed carparking fees and impact on international visitors.

- Our first response is that we do not support carparking fees being implemented for international visitors. The reason for this is due to the \$100 per person fee that almost all international visitors are paying with the IVL fee with revenue going to 50% to visitor infrastructure needs and 50% to the Department of Conservation for 'visitor' services and infrastructure needs, maintenance and biodiversity projects and initiatives.

- We acknowledge the Department of Conservation is exploring carparking fees that may capture Australian and other countries currently exempt from paying the IVL fee and to use international visitors to generate revenue for the Department of Conservation.

- TECNZ cautions any new visitor fees for access to key attraction areas and implementing carparking fees could result in a continued 'stall' of international visitors returning to New Zealand.

- In taking many things into consideration, in the event implementing carparking fees are to be implemented, we strongly recommend the following.

- o Existing DOC concession holders including Inbound Tour Operators (and organised group tours), Bus & Coach Association (BCA) coach operators, Pro Guide driver/tour operators, and activity/attraction/transport concession holders are EXEMPT from paying a carparking fee. During the visitor season these businesses are travelling and hosting visitors to the areas on a daily basis. Most will be existing concession holders and should not have to pay another fee.

- o DOC concession holders already pay the Department of Conservation a considerable amount of funds to host visitors on the DOC estate. If DOC does not exempt existing concession holders the Department will be charging concession double or triple charging. This is unfair to businesses trying to host international visitors on their journey around New Zealand.

- o From a group touring perspective, DOC currently receives a fee from the Inbound Tour Operator, the BCA coach operator and Pro Guides if the ITO contracts the Pro Guide to be the Tour Leader/Guide hosting the group as they travel around New Zealand.

- o In the eventuality that carparking fees are implemented, TECNZ believes international

visitors that should be targeted on those that travel via motorhome, campervan, rental vehicles and private vehicles to be charged.

o TECNZ strongly recommends any carparking revenue generated in key attraction areas has funds hypothecated (targeted) and returned to the local community for upkeep of the local.

3

o TECNZ strongly disagrees with carparking funds in key attraction areas going into the main operational account of DOC. All funds generated should go back to the local community for upkeep and maintenance of the carpark in the area/region.

1.0 Who is the Tourism Export Council of New Zealand?

Thank you for providing an extensive consultation document that raises many issues affecting the future of funding for the great work that the Department of Conservation undertakes as a major participant in the visitor economy.

The Tourism Export Council of New Zealand (TECNZ) is a trade association that has represented the interests of the international tourism industry since 1971. TECNZ members founded New Zealand's world-class visitor proposition and contributed to New Zealand's number one export industry generating \$17.5billion in export receipts (March 2020). TECNZ members (330) are the specialists in international tourism.

ITOs market NZ to the world and commercially package up NZ tourism suppliers into easy to purchase itineraries/tours of NZ for offshore tour wholesalers and travel agency chains. This includes itineraries for visitors travelling independently, on a group tour, or part of a conference or incentive group.

TECNZ's membership includes Inbound Tour Operators (ITOs) and attraction, activity, accommodation, transport suppliers, regional tourism organisations and tourism services providers (Allied Members). The majority of our members pre-Covid would have had >60-70% (or higher) of revenue derived from international visitors. www.tourismexportcouncil.org.nz.

2.0 New Zealand has a problem, international visitation has stalled

At the end of the 2024-2025 visitor season (31 March 2025) international visitors tracked at 86% of prepandemic arrivals (3.9million visitors).

Most other countries around the world have recovered or exceeded pre-Covid international arrivals.

International tourism recovers pre-pandemic levels in 2024

"With 1.4 billion international tourist arrivals recorded globally, 2024 marked the recovery of

international tourism from the worst crisis in the sector’s history. A majority of destinations welcomed more international tourists in 2024 than they did before the pandemic, while visitor spending also continued to grow strongly.

According to the latest World Tourism Barometer from UN Tourism, an estimated 1.4 billion tourists travelled internationally in 2024, indicating a virtual recovery 99% of pre-pandemic levels. Results driven by strong post-pandemic demand, robust performance from large source markets and the ongoing recovery of destinations in Asia and the Pacific.”

3.0 Feedback on Matters relating to Proposed Carparking fees

You are asking for feedback on the following areas:

- A free parking period for vehicles making drop offs/pickups or short stays.

o Current concession holders and coach group tours should be exempted from being charged because they are already paying to host visitors on the DOC estate.

- Fee structure options including fixed length of stay rates, daily rates and multi-day rates.

o TECNZ does not have any recommendation in this area. This is something that DOC must develop and implement.

o In saying that, we strongly ask that \$millions of dollars are not spent on developing software or systems needed that could be spent elsewhere.

- Options for charging based on vehicle category that includes buses and motorbikes.

o As noted previously, group tour operators and coach operators are already paying a concession fee through the TECNZ and BCA concessions and should be exempt from any additional charges.

o We have no comment on motorbikes.

- When the pricing should be in effect, including off peak pricing options and time of day options.

o Given the seasonality aspect of international travel, we suggest any carparking fees should only relate to the ‘height of the visitor season’ being from 1 December to 31 March each year.

- How to accommodate local use.

o Local community, ratepayers and local concession holders should be exempt from paying a parking fee

154	Nothing to add thanks.
155	<p>Kia ora ,</p> <p>Paid parking pilots</p> <p>On behalf of the West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board I would like to convey the Board's appreciation for your presentation relating to the paid parking pilots.</p> <p>The Board is aware and concerned with the development of two paid parking pilots on the West Coast and your presentation was an opportunity to understand the issues relating to the proposed pilots. As you indicated this has had a varied response from the local communities, but it is still a 'work in progress'.</p> <p>The Board looks forward to further information on charging structure and implementation in due course.</p> <p>Ngā mihi</p>
156	<p>PAID PARKING PILOT</p> <p>White Horse Hill Carpark, Aoraki/Mount Cook</p> <p>Feedback from the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board</p> <p>Following receipt of the 'White Horse Hill' leaflet on 13 June 2025, and an in-person update on 24 June 2025 by Sally Jones, Operations Manager, Mt Cook and John Dore, Senior Project Manager, North Canterbury; the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board (the Board) provides the following feedback on the Department of Conservation's (DOC) approach to a paid parking pilot at White Horse Hill carpark - Aoraki/Mount Cook.</p> <p>1) What are the Objectives of the Paid Pilot?</p> <p>Are they?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Revenue raising · Reducing congestion

· Vehicle and pedestrian safety

· Visitor convenience

· Climate change impacts

· Management of visitor numbers

· Amenity and scenery of the valley

2) Displacement effects to consider

· More vehicles for free on the Hooker Valley Road

· More vehicles parking for free in Aoraki/Mount Cook Village and on Mount Cook Road, Terrace Road, and Bowen Drive

· More vehicles using Tasman Valley Road and visiting Tasman Glacier lookout

3) Consultation – who is being consulted?

· Ngāi Tahu and manawhenua rūnanga dialogue -is that proceeding?

· Aoraki/Mount Cook Village residents

· Mackenzie District Council

· NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

· Concessionaires

· What other comparative examples in New Zealand and overseas have been considered? Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board Te Rūnanga Papa Atawhai o Waitaha me Aoraki Private Bag 4715, Christchurch Mail Centre, CHRISTCHURCH 8140 Tel: 027-5416663 Email: canterburyaorakiboard@doc.govt.nz

4) What are the Pricing Purposes?

· To maximise revenue?

· For demand management?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · How will prices respond to displacement effects? · Can there be differential pricing for passenger numbers to encourage carpooling? <p>5) Carpark Capacity Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Maximising capacity – is there any intention to make the carpark larger? · Park and Ride is strongly supported by the Board · Travel demand management is also supported · What is the timeline for this capacity alternatives evaluation? <p>Objectives of the Pilot</p> <p>Could you please provide the Board with a copy of the 'Terms of Reference' for the paid parking pilot at White Horse Hill carpark – Aoraki/Mount Cook?</p>
157	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to recoup some of the costs in building and maintaining facilities at Punakaiki However I think that residents should be given some form of concession. Maybe the first hour is free for example. Residents would apply to DOC for a concession voucher / sticker to be placed on their windscreen. Or nominate a number plate if it is likely to be fully electronic.</p> <p>Regards</p>
158	<p>I have no interest in stopping at Punakaiki if I have to pay for parking. Nor does his wife.</p>