



Church Point Community Meeting 6 March 2016

The community meeting commenced at 3:30 PM and completed at 5:20 PM. There were 32 residents present.

David Hegarty facilitated the meeting.

It was established that there would be 4 issues on the agenda after checking with the residents present.

- a. Priority parking
- b. Alternatives
- c. Aesthetics
- d. Fees

PRIORITY PARKING

Sharon Kinnison argued that the survey question that should have been asked is that if residents pay \$300 or \$500, this payment should be connected to priority parking (also referred to Demand Management in the past. She said that it is very important that people understand that they are connected. Should the decision be made to build before the priority question is resolved?

Michael Ager asked if it would be possible with a priority scheme now. Hubert van Mierlo said that this was possible and not expensive. SIRA reached a joint position with all associations two years ago and wrote to Council. However Council did not do this. Hubert van Mierlo said that if Council makes a decision tomorrow they should do that knowing that their intention is to approve priority parking for residents in April.

Bill Gye said that in the last motion related to the car park accepted by council included a statement saying a review should take place and the "review seek to optimise the Church Point parking permit through availability of overnight parking within the 2 main car park areas".

A question was raised regarding the funding, where is the money coming from? Hubert van Mierlo said that as users are paying \$8.5 million out of \$11.5 million, CPPP are generating around \$3.5 million, there should be something in return for that investment.

Jenny Cullen said that we are now trusting that at this very last minute Council will decide to deliver the priority parking we are asking for. We should be asking for priority parking to be implemented now. The reason for asking for priority in evenings now is that it will be shifting the goal posts now and this will mean there are better chances of a good outcome in the long term.

Bill Gye: We had a good meeting with council staff, they seem to be receptive to the idea. There is a need for Council to have a way to put priority parking in place and one way would be to introduce this during the construction phase.

Emmie Collins was wondering if it is the right time to make the decision. The amalgamation discussion is in place and the Council will probably change. At the same time there seems to be an effect on patrons of the waterfront café who are cancelling bookings as they realise there is no parking. A shuttle bus could generate different patterns. We should our priority in place now, before the Pasadena is redeveloped. Developed.

ALTERNATIVES

Sharon Kinnison said that the world is not going to stop if the car park is not built now. There are alternatives that are cheaper which can be implemented.

Steve Crosby said he agreed that there is a need for more carpark. The current plan is to build 120 new spaces which will produce only a gain of 30 public spaces. The concrete seawall is really expensive as it is big, the height is higher than the Pasadena. His alternative plan (extra rows on in fill in front of the current car park) is much cheaper, which was also confirmed by Council. There is also no issue with Fisheries as the sea grass areas would not be effected.

Hubert van Mierlo said that from the Council papers for the meeting, it can be derived that the tenders for the current plan already caused the construction costs to go over budget. We don't know with how much. Are we taking too much risk and should we wait another 2 years for an alternative plan to be approved and developed?

Bill Gye said it will take a long time to implement an alternative plan, especially since there needs to be a new round of public consultation. He quoted the Council's GM saying he thought it would take up to 5 years. There would also be a perception from the onshore communities that it would be uglier than the current design, just imagine what the foreshore would look like. The onshore community (in particular those looking out on the current carpark) will not be in favour of this and will fight it. This is what happened during the years leading of the POM as well. Fisheries will also be a problem (disagreeing with what Steve Crosby said).

Paul Kinnison said that the use of massive amounts of concrete would also mean that the construction would contribute a lot to greenhouse gas emissions.

AESTHETICS

Bill Gye introduced the topic saying that the carpark would have the characteristics of a car park and that there would be a need for a working group of residents to look at ways to improve the look of the infrastructure.

Jenny Cullen said that the two-level car park and adjacent road will be raised up to 1.0m above existing levels, significantly increasing the visual impact. The boardwalk will sit up to 3.5m above Mean Low Water tide level, an unprecedented height for a seawall in Pittwater and there is no traditional sandstone block seawall to hide the concrete. Nobody could imagine we would be getting this current design and it is now too late for changes as the tender is completed and therefore the design. Visuals are showing plants, however people have not seen any realistic image of the plan

that has been put to tender. Most people will be shocked at the sheer size and amount of concrete that will reshape the landscape. The issue is that many of these things cannot be changed due to regulations, for example plants can't be more than 300mm, the height of a ruler and the need for a one metre high marine grade aluminium handrail along boardwalk.

FEES

When arriving at this topic, the time was past 5pm, so there was no more time for this topic. Hubert van Mierlo mentioned that the budget had been accepted by Council and that there may be possibility to change some parts of the fees, such as the cost of the second car fee, however it seems not realistic to accept that the current fees can be maintained if the build of the carpark goes ahead.

Mike Ager said that there are a lot of residents that would struggle with the increased fees and that this would make living here an issue for some of them.

In regard to the proposal for a higher fee for second CPPP. Bill Gye said that we should propose to Council that they adopt a 'wait and see' policy to first find out the number of permits sold before settling on the fee structure. Because the current Council budget for this project assumes that the number of CPPP sold as 350 at the base rate and 100 at the higher rate, if in fact 500 are purchased at the base rate, this is the equivalent in dollar value and thus there is no need for the higher fee (noting that for the past several years more than 500 CPPPs have been sold).

Bill Gye also stated that, as has been done previously, we request that Council provide a special discount CPPP Fee rate for people in receipt of a Pension (Disability, Veterans, Aged) as these Pensions are already fully means tested.