

**CHURCH POINT PLAN OF MANAGEMENT  
EVALUATION OF CARPARK OPTIONS – MCCARRS CREEK ROAD – PRECINCT ONE**

**Review of Submissions**

Name	Points Raised	Comments
<b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association Stephen Richmond Vice President 27 May 2013 (Also Member of Church Point Friends Group)</b>	Lack of detail	<p><b><u>Project Detail</u></b> The adopted Plan of Management was developed through a Working Party that included key stakeholders in particular local mainland and offshore Community Associations and specialist input – this in itself was a detailed and extensive process that also included a peer review, and broader community consultation plus democratic process. The Hyder Report has added to that detail as part of gearing up for the detail design, tender and construction phases for the carpark</p>
	Carpark limited to offshore use and hence congestion not an issue – not like a shopping centre carpark	<p><b><u>Carpark users and ongoing amenity / safety</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new carpark is not solely dedicated to offshore use, it is also to be available for visitors who are likely to be casual infrequent users and as such be higher turn over</li> <li>• The carpark is being funded by a combination of Sticker Parking fee and Pay &amp; Display and as such it is equitable that it be available for the general public as well</li> <li>• There is scope to restrict parking in the McCarrs facility at peak times for Commuter use e.g. 5pm to 9am overnight</li> <li>• The only exclusive use is with the deck with its allocated spaces that will attract a higher user pay</li> <li>• The wider aisle also has added benefits to improve throughput / short standing and hence reduce congestion</li> </ul>
	Vehicle entry congestion not an issue	<p><b><u>Entry congestion is an issue</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue of congestion is a function of the narrower aisle of the CPF Option and on the basis of vehicles that may seek to stand while awaiting a spot to become available and block the aisle for others or need to ‘move on’ and circulate a number of times</li> <li>• If this congestion occurs at the entry which is just around from the bend then a vehicle could be stranded on the road and prone to a rear end collision</li> <li>• The wider aisle of the 90 / 90 although still one-way at least provides some ability to wait for a spot and not clog it for everyone else</li> <li>• The adopted PoM (Option 2) with its improved road curve layout also improves sight distance of the entry and turning into this entry from the west</li> </ul>

<b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b> <b>Stephen Richmond</b> <b>Vice President</b> <b>27 May 2013</b> <b>(Also Member of Church Point Friends Group)</b> <b>(cont'd)</b>	Mix of parallel and 45 degree carparking not an issue for regular users	<p><b><u>Mix of parking – better to be standardised</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, the offshore residents are not the only proposed users given that it is also available for visitors who during the day are likely to be casual users and be higher turnover.</li> <li>• it is therefore better to have a configuration that has standard rather than mixed parking arrangements along the one aisle</li> <li>• For a 90 degree carpark, in particular one way access, the wider carpark aisle is acceptable as a share way for pedestrians and as such there is no specific need for a separate path– this is the case with most carparks in this configuration</li> <li>• A separate pathway becomes necessary when you parallel park particularly next to landscaping or a drainage dish otherwise you do not have a hard surface or level area to alight on to. The CPF proposed parallel carparking is also on the ‘off-side’ and as such not a common approach to negotiate the parallel park.</li> </ul>
	Landscaping widths consistent with other walkways + need for guardrail. Pedestrian fence can be installed	<p><b><u>Landscaping &amp; separation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst narrow width, low height landscape elements do form part of the Bayview to Church Point scenic walkway, the iconic uninterrupted view of the foreshore activity and waterway are far more dominant characteristics.</li> <li>• Generally landscape areas along the foreshore walkway where they occur are only 1-1.5m in width with low height plantings.</li> <li>• There are considerable lengths without a landscape separation and this is not an impediment but rather adds to the overall experience providing clear lines of sight</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Along the subject section of McCarrs Creek Road no landscape separation between the road and the path currently exists and to a large extent this is part of the existing character again with clear line of sight from the road as a motorist or cyclist of the water</li> <li>• It is not seen as an essential component to provide a landscape separation given that Rostrevor Reserve immediately adjoins to the west which is where landscaping is better placed</li> <li>• Council (along with the Design Committee) could look at planters for intermittent landscaping along the walkway but as previously stated, the objective should be to retain the expansive view.</li> <li>• The physical separation between the walkway and roadway will be achieved through a special profile higher kerb as used through Newport and around the Baha’i Temple bend on Mona Vale Road along with suitable bollards/decorative pedestrian fences and planters.</li> <li>• It is further noted that the continuous headstock to the piers will also provide a further separation and delineation. This will effectively define the road edge. It was never envisaged that a guardrail would be used</li> <li>• The Church Point area will be suitably traffic calmed and made more pedestrian friendly with pedestrian refuges and speed reductions also utilised</li> </ul>
	Drop off bay construction – cost?	<p><b><u>Drop off Bay</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drop off bay construction is funded and rather than a suspended deck it could be part of the piled reclaimed area with the suspended walkway in front dependent on whole of life cost differences</li> <li>• A drop off bay is required for all options</li> </ul>

<b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b> <b>Stephen Richmond</b> <b>Vice President</b> <b>27 May 2013</b> <b>(Also Member of Church Point Friends Group)</b> <b>(cont'd)</b>	Totally against deck option	<p><b><u>Opposition to deck by BCPRA noted.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deck is single storey with no roof over and as such it is not a high structure and is at a scale in keeping with the higher cliff behind.</li> <li>• The front face of the carpark will have suitable landscaping and façade treatments in keeping with the local area. This will include the use of local endemic trees and timber elements to compliment the local character, in particular the maritime influence.</li> <li>• Council has prepared montages from differing perspectives depicting the deck and possible landscape/facade treatment</li> <li>• The deck is in fact a significantly more cost effective outcome in that it only costs \$33,000 for each of the additional 60 spaces and across the 120 spaces created reduces the cost per car space by \$17,000 each.</li> <li>• This is as a result of the far more effective use of the car park footprint already created 'at grade' and the doubling of the capacity of the carpark i.e. it amortises the costs over 120 spaces some of which can have a higher charge applied</li> <li>• The whole reason for the inclusion of the deck as an option in the McCarrs Ck Rd carpark project is to ameliorate the carpark pressure that already exists</li> <li>• Council in adopting the PoM also highlighted the importance of the deck component</li> </ul>
	Cost of project and funding	<p><b><u>Cost estimates</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preliminary cost estimates were provided as part of the PoM in 2009.</li> <li>• Latest more detailed cost estimates reflect price increases due to CPI and a more detailed analysis including geotechnical and structural advice and quantity survey</li> <li>• It should be noted that both the adopted PoM and the CP Friends alternative Option cost a similar amount. As such there is no cost advantage with the CPF option which also results in fewer car spaces and hence higher cost per space created. The CPF option also rules out any further consideration of additional carparking on a deck and hence no opportunity for additional spaces either now or in the future</li> <li>• The adopted PoM with the capability of another level of carparking for 60 more cars and hence 120 in total makes it substantially more cost effective and provides far superior carpark numbers and hence carpark relief.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b>  <b>Stephen Richmond</b>  <b>Vice President</b>  <b>27 May 2013</b>  <b>(Also Member of Church Point Friends Group)</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>		<p><b><u>Cost Breakdown</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreshore in this part of McCarrs Creek Road is already badly eroded and the footpath needs to be upgraded and as such a new seawall on a new alignment and upgraded foreshore footpath is required in any event. These upgrades, over the full run from the Mini Mart bend to Cargo Wharf, is likely to cost \$1.3M.</li> <li>• The carpark project requires a shift in the road and a change in the seawall alignment to accommodate the separate carpark cell.</li> <li>• On a pro-rata basis given the changed alignment required for the carpark project, Council will be funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The equivalent of 50% of the new sea wall cost = \$800,000 (this includes \$500k from the former EI Levy plus \$300k from the RMS handover funding)</li> <li>▪ total cost of the boardwalk as above = \$500,000 (to be funded by Council and reimbursed by local land sales)</li> <li>▪ Hence a total of \$1.3M of public infrastructure works will be funded by Council which comes off the total estimates for each of the options</li> <li>▪ For Option 3 (adopted PoM with deck) the net cost = \$6.1M</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The residual cost will be financed by a loan which will need to be repaid by user pays income from the Sticker Parking and Pay &amp; Display</li> <li>• With the deck option there is also the ability to offer dedicated spaces at a higher user pays rate to accelerated the pay back for the facility which in turn helps keep the sticker contribution down for all others</li> </ul>
		<p><b><u>Cost per car space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Option 1 with approx. 54 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$76,000. Note the suggested carpark yield has been reduced to provide disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces would also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required for CPF option.</li> <li>• For the adopted PoM layout (Option 2) with 60 car spaces the cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces the average cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> </ul>
		<p><b><u>Value for money/cost-benefit</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a consolidated footprint to accommodate up to 120 additional car spaces to relieve carparking pressure at Church Point, including the local streets</li> <li>▪ With the deck option the construction cost per space is approx \$51,000</li> <li>▪ The area of land required for the core of the carpark is approx. 1,800sqm and for 120 cars = approx. 15 sqm per car</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In comparison in this same locality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the multiple vehicle access immediately above McCarrs Creek Road uses approx 1,000 sqm of public reserve land for approx. 8 properties or 16 cars (on basis of DA requirement for 2 spaces) = 62 sqm of public reserve land used per car. This is an alternative to direct driveway access to each property which would be impractical and cost prohibitive.</li> <li>▪ add to this the private driveway and garaging components and the land required adds about another 2,000 sqm. Hence about 3,000 sqm of land is required to provide access and accommodate 16 cars or 190 sqm per car. Over and above the land involved the construction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>cost has/would be substantial.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Even for the 11 properties directly opposite Church Point Reserve the driveways over the road reserve require 650 sqm for 22 cars = 30 sqm per vehicle of steep driveway construction. Add to this approx. 1200 sqm for private driveway and garaging and the total land required is approx. 1,800 sqm for 22 cars = approx. 80 sqm per car which again would be expensive to construct per car space.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What this demonstrates is that the collective facility for up to 120 cars is a much more efficient use of public land for the number of spaces accommodated and the cost per car space would not be dissimilar to what adjoining properties have already constructed and maintain.</li> <li>• The fundamental difference is that the offshore Pittwater residents don't have the ability to accommodate their vehicles offshore otherwise they would be up for the same carparking requirement at similar or probably higher mainland expense – the defacto is a spatially removed collective carpark that uses a consolidated footprint</li> </ul>
	<p>Need most economic and environmentally sensitive solution</p>	<p><b><u>Most economic &amp; environmentally sensitive outcome</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The carpark project needs to adhere to Sustainability principles and in particular Triple Bottom Line impacts</li> <li>• <b>From an environmental perspective:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The adopted PoM took the environmental issues into account in deriving the Masterplan precinct outcomes</li> <li>○ A Part V Assessment along with a REF will be carried out for the project which will specifically address environmental issues and amelioration measures as part of the design as well as both during and subsequent to construction.</li> <li>○ As is the case with most projects there will be a change from the current environment to the future and suitable mitigation and enhancement works will be carried out</li> <li>○ For the McCarrs Creek Road project the current foreshore in part is badly eroded and as a minimum rectification works are required to address this as well as improve the overall walkway</li> <li>○ As a parallel example the provision of the foreshore scenic walkway also involved a change from the former to current environment and the finished result has been broadly accepted.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>From a social perspective</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As identified in the adopted PoM as a primary issue to be resolved there is a pressing need to provide additional carparking to relieve the current pressures at Church Point.</li> <li>○ A primary user cohort are Pittwater residents who live 'off-shore' who are seeking to park their car in order to get home each evening – this is not an unreasonable requirement</li> <li>○ The location on McCarrs Creek Road was selected after considering a number of alternatives including impact on mainland residents</li> <li>○ The adopted PoM took the social issues into account in deriving the Masterplan precinct outcomes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>From an economic perspective</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The adopted PoM carpark facility that provides additional parking for up to 120 vehicles is affordable on the basis of user pays funding to pay off a 20 year loan</li> <li>○ For the decked carpark outcome the cost per car space created is approx. \$51,000 which is not dissimilar to the cost per car space that adjoining Church Point residents need to fund to provide each driveway access and off street car accommodation for each car.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b>  <b>David Williams</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>10 June 2013</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed submission incorporated into Church Point Friends submission (6 June)</li> <li>Do not support deck due to aesthetic/cost reasons</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Deck Option aesthetics/cost</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposition to carpark deck by BCPRA is noted.</li> <li>The carpark deck is a single storey addition without a roof and as such is not a high structure.</li> <li>the aesthetics can be suitably addressed with landscaping and façade treatments, in particular use of local endemic trees and a maritime theme using timbers as cladding and other design elements</li> <li>Council has prepared montages depicting the deck and landscape/facade treatment</li> <li>The deck is in fact a significantly more cost effective outcome in that it reduces the cost per car space by \$17,000 each for the adopted PoM layout (Option 2).</li> <li>Compared to CPF Option 1 (with its 54 car spaces) the cost per space reduction with Option 3 is \$25,000 and you get 66 more cars as well</li> <li>This is as a result of the far more effective use of the car park footprint already created ‘at grade’ and the doubling of the capacity of the carpark i.e. it amortises the costs over 120 spaces some of which can also have a higher charge applied as well which will assist general user charges</li> </ul>
	<p>Alarm at cost estimates</p>	<p><b><u>Cost estimates</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost estimates were provided as part of the PoM in 2009 – these were developed with the information available at that time.</li> <li>Latest cost estimates reflect price increases due to CPI and a more detailed analysis including geotechnical and structural advice and quantity survey – this is a logical progression.</li> <li>It should be noted that both the adopted PoM layout and the CP Friends alternative Option cost a similar amount. As such there is no cost advantage with the CPF option which also results in fewer car spaces and hence higher cost per space created. The CPF option also rules out any further consideration of additional carparking on a deck</li> <li>The adopted PoM with the capability of another level of carparking for 60 more cars makes it substantially more cost effective</li> <li>For what is a relatively minor difference in seawall alignment and infill between option 1 and option 2, it makes far more sense to keep flexibility in the design layout noting that one of the major objectives is to provide additional carparking.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b>  <b>David Williams</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>10 June 2013</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Breakdown of costs – who's paying for what</p>	<p><b><u>Cost Breakdown</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreshore in this part of McCarrs Creek Road is already badly eroded and the footpath needs to be upgraded as a matter of some urgency (even more so now that Council is the Road Authority) and as such a new seawall on a new alignment and upgraded foreshore footpath is required in any event. These upgrades, over the full run from the Mini Mart bend to Cargo Wharf, is likely to cost \$1.3M.</li> <li>• The carpark project requires a shift in the road and as such a change in the seawall alignment to accommodate the separate carpark cell. The \$1.3M has therefore been rolled into the overall project as the public domain contribution toward upgrade already required</li> <li>• On this pro-rata basis, given the changed alignment required for the carpark project, Council will be funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The equivalent of 50% of the new sea wall cost = \$800,000 (this includes \$500k from the former EI Levy plus \$300k from the RMS handover funding)</li> <li>▪ total cost of the boardwalk = \$500,000 (to be funded by Council and reimbursed by local land sales)</li> <li>▪ Hence a total of \$1.3M of public infrastructure works will be funded by Council which comes off the total estimates for each of the options</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The residual costs to be funded by user pays income are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For Option 1 (Friends) and Option 2 (adopted PoM) the net cost is similar = \$4.1M</li> <li>▪ For Option 3 (adopted PoM with deck) the net cost = \$6.1M</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The residual cost will be financed by a loan which will need to be repaid by user pays income from the sticker parking and Pay &amp; Display</li> <li>• With the deck option there is also the ability to offer dedicated spaces at a much higher user pays rate to accelerated the pay back for the facility which in turn helps keep the general sticker contribution down.</li> </ul>
	<p>Per car space cost extremely high</p>	<p><b><u>Cost per car space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Option 1 with approx. 54 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$76,000. Note the carpark yield has been reduced to provide disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces will also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required for CPF option.</li> <li>• For Option 2 with 60 car spaces the cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces the cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> <li>• Whilst this may appear high it needs to be considered in its overall context, including lack of current spaces/demand, lack of suitable alternatives, costs defrayed over a large number of users, centralised facility and hence an effective use of space created and comparison with the equivalent cost per car space for mainland carparking (see below)</li> </ul>

<p><b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b>  <b>David Williams</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>10 June 2013</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Poor value for money</p>	<p><u><b>Value for money/cost-benefit</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adopted PoM layout (Option 2 + Option 3) McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a consolidated footprint to accommodate up to 120 additional car spaces to relieve carparking pressure at Church Point, including the local streets</li> <li>▪ With the deck option the construction cost per space is approx \$51,000</li> <li>▪ The area of land required for the core of the carpark is approx. 1,800sqm and for 120 cars = approx. 15 sqm per car</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In comparison in this same locality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the multiple vehicle access (MVA) immediately above McCarrs Creek Road uses approx 1,000 sqm of public reserve land for approx. 8 properties or 16 cars (on basis of DA requirement for 2 spaces) = 62 sqm of public reserve land used per car. This MVA is an alternative to direct driveway access to each property which would be impractical and cost prohibitive up the cliff.</li> <li>▪ add to this the private driveway and garaging components and the land required adds about another 2,000 sqm. Hence about 3,000 sqm of land is required to provide access and accommodate 16 cars or 190 sqm per car. Over and above the land consumed the construction cost has/would be substantial.</li> <li>▪ Even for the 11 properties directly opposite Church Point Reserve the driveways over the road reserve require collectively approx. 650 sqm for 22 cars = 30 sqm per vehicle of steep driveway construction. Add to this approx. 1200 sqm for private driveway and garaging and the total land required is approx. 1,800 sqm for 22 cars = approx. 80 sqm per car which again would be expensive to construct per car accommodated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What this demonstrates is that the collective facility on McCarrs Creek Road for up to 120 cars is a much more efficient use of public land for the number of spaces accommodated and the cost per car space would not be dissimilar to what adjoining properties have already constructed and maintain.</li> <li>• The fundamental difference is that the offshore Pittwater residents don't have the ability to accommodate their vehicles offshore and if they could they would be up for the same carparking requirement at probably higher than mainland expense given the added water access construction difficulty</li> <li>• Hence the defacto carpark is a spatially removed collective carpark that uses a consolidated footprint with the cost defrayed over approx. 600 sticker users and Pay &amp; Display. The additional spaces will also generate potentially more P&amp;D income</li> <li>• As such the proposed carpark is not poor value for money and is affordable from a user perspective</li> </ul>
---	-----------------------------	---

<p><b>Bayview-Church Point Residents Association</b>  <b>David Williams</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>10 June 2013</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Local Church Point residents feel alienated / rates being used to subsidise this project</p>	<p><b><u>Church Point Resident involvement</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pittwater Council has always kept the BCPRA/CPRA associations along with the Offshore Associations informed of the PoM, its progress and resultant discussions. The current consultation process that is geared to comparing the adopted PoM layout with the CPF alternative is via the Working Group.</li> <li>• The adopted PoM was prepared through an extensive community consultation and democratic process – it is a very comprehensive document that also had direct State Government involvement, specialist technical involvement, as well as being subject to an independent Peer Review. As part of the process it considered a number of alternatives. It was put on public exhibition and all submissions were considered. Its adoption by Council as part of the democratic process marked the culmination of many years if not decades of ongoing discussion, testing of options and deliberation.</li> <li>• The adopted precinct Masterplans clearly show the works involved and as such there are no surprises</li> <li>• A number of alternatives were considered as part of the PoM formulation and some of these were not dissimilar to what is now being put forward as alternatives and again being requested to be assessed.</li> <li>• Rates are not being used to subsidise the project. The core of the project is being funded from user pays. The only rate component is toward the cost of the seawall which needs to be rebuilt to support the edge of road and footpath.</li> </ul>
	<p>Review of all parking possibilities between Mona Vale and Church Point particularly with increased demand from commercial development</p>	<p><b><u>Other Parking possibilities have already been explored</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PoM considered decentralisation options between Mona Vale and Church Point and even as far as McCarrs Creek Reserve and none of these were considered viable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mona Vale Town Centre was considered however there would be a major impact on businesses and hence would require the construction of a separate facility with commuter shuttle.</li> <li>▪ Rowland Reserve was considered however there would be a major impact on boat activities, given that this is major regional boat launching facility and its peak use is on weekends and holiday times when offshore parking need is likely to be greatest</li> <li>▪ McCarrs Creek Reserve was too remote and less safe and again requiring a shuttle service – it is also popular at weekends for recreation</li> <li>▪ Then there was the issue and cost of a shuttle bus service or another commuter wharf and the aversion of yet another transport modal change</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hence the adopted PoM has already concluded that parking issues at Church Point need to be resolved at Church Point</li> <li>• As an adjunct Pittwater Council has supported the GoGet shared use car scheme and additional motor bike parking</li> <li>• Commercial operators will need to address their carparking requirements as part of DA assessment / consent</li> <li>• The introduction of Sticker Parking and the Pittwater Parking Sticker not applying is also a form of demand management</li> </ul>

Name	Points Raised	Comments
Cathy Kubany	Need to consider use of public art	<p><b><u>Public Art will be considered</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Art is an important feature and a finer detail for all of the precincts, in particular Precinct 2 (Thomas Stevens Reserve)</li> <li>• Public Art can be further considered as part of the public works component of the boardwalk and the treatment of the columns and façade of the carpark – this could easily take on a complementary maritime theme</li> <li>• An art strategy can be developed in conjunction with the ‘Design Group’ and others in the community and the outcome managed accordingly – this does not impede progressing the carpark facility</li> <li>• Of importance is the need to not take away current uninterrupted views of the waterway either as a pedestrian, motorist or cyclist. Hence the use of taller vegetation or a tall concrete art wall separation between the road and the boardwalk is not supported. The iconic appeal is the current lack of obstruction and clear line of sight.</li> <li>• Again a maritime theme would be suggested for this location to highlight its past and current connections with the waterway and its central commuter/transport node and can be further incorporated into the construction and landscape detail elements such as bollards, planter boxes, decking, railings, façade, etc. The front row of carpark columns could provide the opportunity to be totems or be clad with recycled wharf timbers along with the parapets and provide motifs to depict Church Point as per your suggestion</li> </ul>
	\$5.4 million for 35-40 spaces (\$135,000 per carspace)	<p><b><u>Total Cost of project and cost per space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quoted figures by Ms Kubany need to be clarified</li> <li>• The total net cost is not \$5.4M as this includes public domain works of \$1.3M that are already required and are to be separately funded – see below</li> <li>• The net cost is \$4.1M and for the adopted PoM layout (Option2) this provides 60 spaces not 35 to 40 – see below for details</li> <li>• For Option 3 the net cost is \$6.1M and provides 120 spaces</li> <li>• For CPF Option 1 with approx. 54 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$76,000. Note the carpark yield has been reduced to provide disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces will also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required for CPF option.</li> <li>• For Option 2 with 60 car spaces the cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces the cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> <li>• Whilst this may appear high it needs to be considered in its overall context, including lack of current spaces/demand, lack of suitable alternatives, costs defrayed over a large number of users, centralised facility and hence an effective use of space created and comparison with the equivalent cost per car space for mainland carparking (see below)</li> </ul>

<p><b>Cathy Kubany (cont'd)</b></p>		<p><b><u>Cost Breakdown</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreshore is already badly eroded and the footpath needs to be upgraded and as such Council will be funding 50% of the sea wall cost = \$800,000 and the total cost of the boardwalk = \$500,000. Hence \$1.3M comes off the total estimates for each of the options</li> <li>• The residual/net cost for Option 1 (Friends) and Option 2 (adopted PoM are similar = \$4.1M</li> <li>• For Option 3 (adopted PoM with deck) the net cost = \$6.1M</li> </ul>
	<p>Need proper study of demand management options</p>	<p><b><u>Demand management &amp; Other Parking possibilities already explored</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PoM considered decentralisation options between Mona Vale and Church Point and even as far as McCarrs Creek Reserve and none of these were considered viable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mona Vale Town Centre was considered however there would be a major impact on businesses and hence would require the construction of a separate facility with commuter shuttle.</li> <li>▪ Rowland Reserve was considered however there would be a major impact on boat activities, given that this is major regional boat launching facility and its peak use is on weekends and holiday times when offshore parking need is likely to be greatest</li> <li>▪ McCarrs Creek Reserve was too remote and less safe and again requiring a shuttle service – it is also popular at weekends for recreation</li> <li>▪ Then there was the issue and cost of a shuttle bus service or another commuter wharf and the aversion of yet another transport modal change</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hence the adopted PoM has already concluded that parking issues at Church Point need to be resolved at Church Point</li> <li>• As an adjunct Pittwater Council has supported the GoGet shared use car scheme and additional motor bike parking</li> <li>• Commercial operators will need to address carparking requirements as part of DA consent</li> <li>• Demand management in part is being applied through the carpark user pays system that includes Sticker parking and Pay &amp; Display</li> <li>• It is clear however that with the number of offshore properties there is a need for additional car spaces to be provided at Church Point. This is the major issue identified in the adopted PoM and the new McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility seeks to improve upon the adverse current situation.</li> </ul>
	<p>Need for study addressing aesthetic/recreational</p>	<p><b><u>Aesthetics/recreational</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has in-house landscape specialists and draws upon external specialist input as well as the Working Group / community to assist with the finer detailing –this can still occur</li> <li>• Pittwater Council successfully completed the many kilometres associated with the Bayview to Church Point scenic foreshore walkway and we seek to build upon and extend it further to the west through the Church Point precincts</li> <li>• The whole walkway is in fact a linear reserve with different local experiences and break out points with the fundamental appeal being the close proximity to the waters-edge and those magnificent uninterrupted Pittwater and maritime views, including views as a motorist, bus user or cyclist.</li> </ul>

<b>Cathy Kubany (cont'd)</b>	Incentives for public transport	<p><b><u>Incentive for public transport</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From our understanding, offshore residents (and others) already make a value choice as to their mode of transport, including public transport. A public bus and private ferry /taxi service already exists along with the 'Go Get' car scheme.</li> <li>• The problem for offshore commuters is multiple modal / nodal changes and interchange delays which can reduce effectiveness and convenience and act as a deterrent</li> <li>• It would also be interesting to survey how many mainland residents use public transport rather than the convenience of their car and hypothetically add to that the additional modal changes associated with more remote parking, water only access and long /steep walks at the other end of the journey with children and shopping in tow to add to the degree of difficulty.</li> </ul>
	Circumstances related to PoM have changed	<p><b><u>Adopted PoM is still valid</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is not aware of changes that would warrant a review of the adopted PoM</li> <li>• The adopted PoM was endorsed only 4 years ago and given the extensive input, consultation and analysis it still remains valid with the recommendations within the PoM progressively being actioned. Progress to date includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improved lighting at Church Point Reserve carpark</li> <li>▪ Church Point Wharf rebuilt in keeping with heritage precinct</li> <li>▪ Commuter Wharf upgraded and substantially increased in capacity to improve safety and amenity</li> <li>▪ Reconfiguration of carpark spaces and footpath safety improvement at McCarrs Creek Road above Holmeport</li> <li>▪ As per the PoM, land identified at Church Point is being progressed through the appropriate processes with the objective to achieve a sale and use the proceeds to fund identified PoM outcomes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The current requirement is to compare an alternative Option by CPF with the adopted PoM design for the McCarrs Creek carpark and not to revisit the adopted PoM.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Cathy Kubany (cont'd)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to re-evaluate option without deck</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>The carpark with a deck must be considered</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PoM included the single deck and it must be considered given that it provides a number of cost and carpark amenity advantages given that in association with Option 2 it can double the number of car spaces for only 50% more cost. This is a far more cost effective and efficient use of the carpark footprint created. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>With option 1 there is no ability to provide a deck as a current or future expansion of carparking</b> – this eliminates any flexibility to increase overall carpark number – and you would not retrofit yet another seawall so what is accommodated at grade is all you can consider now and in the future.</li> <li>○ <b>With Option 2 there is the flexibility to provide a deck as a current or future expansion of carparking</b> – this greatly increases the flexibility of the carpark to double its capacity without adjustment to the seawall.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The deck option also provides the opportunity to introduce a variable fee dependent upon the exclusivity of use</p> <p>The cost per car space associated with the deck component on its own is approx. \$33,000 per each of the additional 60 spaces</p>
-------------------------------------	---	--

Name	Points Raised	Comments
<p><b>Church Point Reserve Association</b>  <b>Peter Altona</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>11 June 2013</b>  <b>(Also member of Church Point Friends Group)</b></p>	<p>Two key aspects – extent of infill into deep water (financial/environmental implications) concerns) and lack of landscape separation between proposed cycleway/boardwalk/road</p>	<p><b><u>Extent of infill and landscape separation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Options require infill to accommodate the carpark footprint and both are estimated to cost a similar amount</li> <li>• Discussions and subsequent approvals with/from Fisheries have outlined issues to be addressed and mitigation measures to address any environmental impacts – a number of these were also considered/carried out as part of the recently completed Commuter Wharf project.</li> <li>• Whilst low key landscape elements do form part of the Bayview to Church Point walkway, the current iconic uninterrupted view is a far more dominant characteristic at this part of McCarrs Creek Road. Generally landscape areas along the foreshore walkway where they occur are only 1-1.5m in width with low height plantings. There are considerable lengths without a landscape separation and this is not an impediment but rather adds to the overall experience</li> <li>• There is no landscape separation between the road and the path at present and it is not seen as an essential component to provide a landscape separation given that Rostrevor Reserve immediately adjoins to the west and the main reserve to the east which is where landscaping is better placed</li> <li>• Council (along with the Design Committee) could look at planters for intermittent landscaping along the walkway but as previously stated, should retain the expansive view.</li> <li>• The physical separation between the walkway and roadway can be achieved through a special profile kerb as used through Newport and around the Baha'i Temple bend on Mona Vale Road and bollards in keeping with the area e.g. Wharf timbers. It was never envisaged that a guardrail would be installed</li> <li>• The Church Point area will also be suitably traffic calmed</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deck contentious</li> <li>• Deck would be visual blight</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Carpark Deck component – visual/demand</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deck is single storey with no roof over and as such it is not a high structure and is at a scale in keeping with the higher cliff behind.</li> <li>• The front face of the carpark will have suitable landscaping and cladding treatments in keeping with the local area. This will include the use of timber elements and murals to compliment the local heritage, in particular the maritime influence.</li> <li>• Montages have been prepared to depict what the deck will generally look like with these measures in place</li> </ul>
	<p>Drive increased demand for carparking and services at Church .Point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole reason for the inclusion of the McCarrs Ck Rd carpark project in the PoM is to address the carpark demand that already exists and is already exceeded and the added pressures and angst this creates</li> <li>• Services at Church Point are already constrained and the provision of the proposed additional spaces are unlikely to change the current situation</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Reserve Association</b>  <b>Peter Altona</b>  <b>President</b>  <b>11 June 2013</b>  <b>(Also member of CP Friends Group)</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Survey confirmed lack of support &amp; socially divisive</p>	<p><b><u>SIRA Survey</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the information provided by SIRA from the survey(s) it carried out there is equal support as non-support for the deck. In addition there was over 60 expressing strong interest in an allocated space and of these over 50 currently use the Main carpark</li> <li>• To make the deck more affordable with a faster pay-back period one financial model is to allocate up to 60 allocated spaces at a much higher cost for that parking arrangement. This is still accommodating 60 additional cars out of the overall equation and this helps to subsidise and hence keep all other user pays fees down.</li> <li>• General users would not be subsidising the deck</li> <li>• Those taking up the opportunity of an allocated space would in turn take further pressure off the general spaces adding weight to provide the deck</li> </ul>
	<p>CPRA wants to mitigate costs, effect on environment &amp; a waterfront to be proud</p>	<p><b><u>Mitigate Costs &amp; effects on environment</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The carpark project needs to adhere to Sustainability principles and in particular Triple Bottom Line impacts. These have been taken into consideration in compiling the PoM</li> <li>• There is a significant push via Option 1 to landscape the road and walkway separation where none exists at present – and this is raised as to why Option 1 is more environmentally superior and a waterfront to be proud.</li> <li>• In reply, this landscape separation is not seen as an essential requirement</li> </ul> <p><b>From an environmental perspective:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The adopted PoM took the environmental issues into account in deriving the Masterplan precinct outcomes</li> <li>○ A Part V Assessment along with a Review of Environmental Effects (REF) will be carried out for the project which will specifically address environmental issues and amelioration measures as part of the design as well as both during and subsequent to construction.</li> <li>○ As is the case with most projects there will be a change from the current ‘environment’ to the future and suitable mitigation and enhancement works will be carried out</li> <li>○ For the McCarrs Creek Road project the current foreshore in part is badly eroded and as a minimum rectification works are required to address this as well as improve the overall walkway</li> <li>○ As a parallel example the provision of the foreshore scenic walkway also involved a significant change from the former to current environment – and a positive outcome achieved on many fronts</li> </ul> <p><b>From a social perspective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As identified in the adopted PoM and a primary focus is a pressing need to provide additional carparking to relieve the current pressures at Church Point.</li> <li>• A primary user cohort are Pittwater residents who live ‘off-shore’ who are seeking to park their car in order to get home each evening – this is not an unreasonable requirement</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Reserve Association Peter Altona President 11 June 2013 (Also member of CP Friends Group) (cont'd)</b></p>		<p><b>From an economic perspective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adopted PoM carpark layout that provides additional parking for up to 120 vehicles is affordable on the basis of user pays funding</li> <li>• For the decked carpark outcome the cost per car space created is approx. \$51,000 which is not dissimilar to the cost per car space that adjoining Church Point residents need to fund to provide off street car accommodation.</li> </ul>
	<p>Enhance public recreation amenity</p>	<p><b><u>Enhance public recreation amenity</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This again needs to be considered in the overall Church Point context and more broadly the link with the Bayview to Church Point walkway and the linear park that this has created</li> <li>• The Main Reserve will have the foreshore marginally widened and the seawall reconstructed to create a foreshore corridor along with definition of the southern point and with the removal the former dilapidated boat shed has opened up the beach area</li> <li>• This in conjunction with Precinct 1 and 2 foreshore works will definitely enhance recreation amenity</li> </ul>
		<p><b><u>Cost per space vs cost per parking permit</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Cost per car space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Option 1 with approx. 54 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$76,000. Note the carpark yield has been reduced to provide disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces will also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required for CPF option.</li> <li>• For Option 2 with 60 car spaces the cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces the cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst this may appear high it needs to be considered in its overall context, including lack of current spaces/demand, lack of suitable alternatives, costs defrayed over a large number of users, centralised facility and hence an effective use of space created and comparison with the equivalent cost per car space for mainland carparking (see below)</p> <p><b><u>Cost per parking permit holder</u></b> There is no disconnect – the cost per car space is one element and the cost per parking permit holder when defrayed over the total number of users is considered reasonable and affordable.</p> <p>The likely user pays fees are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$350 pa without deck</li> <li>• \$300 p.a. with deck &amp; 60 x higher charge spaces</li> <li>• \$560 p.a. with deck if no higher charge spaces</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Reserve Association Peter Altona President 11 June 2013 (Also member of CP Friends Group) (cont'd)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hyder Report</li> <li>• Working in deep water pushed up costs by 33%.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Construction in water is not problematic</u></b></li> <li>• All seawall options will require construction in the water, even if there is no carpark and we just provide a new seawall and walkway to address the current badly eroding foreshore, not just Option 2</li> <li>• Both the adopted PoM option and the Friends option will require a pier type sea wall. This type of seawall relies upon embedment into the underlying rock and a similar depth of embedment will be required for both options. The process is relatively fast and is far less dependent on the tides compared to a gravity seawall</li> <li>• The only variables then are the height of the pier above the bed and the constructability/impact on traffic.</li> <li>• The change in length of pier as a result of depth of water has only a minor impact as this is merely exposed length to the required height and the total length tends to even out over the run of each option.</li> <li>• The constructability has a greater influence - the Friends Option requires far more of the works to be carried out under direct traffic management adding to the time of construction and significant disruption to the travelling public and public transport service and hence greater impact on general amenity and relative cost</li> </ul>
	<p>No issue of environmental effects/no separation of pathway from roadway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue of separation between the proposed boardwalk/foreshore walk and the roadway is best considered from a broader precinct perspective and in relation to the current situation</li> <li>• When looking at the walkway from Bayview to Church Point, the key characteristics are the panoramic view from both the path and from the road, sandstone elements and a dash of landscaping. Landscape elements are generally a metre wide planter with Lomandras. There are considerable lengths without landscaping with the path close to the road edge. There is no section of path that is separated from the road by a large expanse of landscaping. Such a broad expanse of landscaping could ultimately block the view of the waterway and activities from the roadway.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Reserve Association Peter Altona President 11 June 2013 (Also member of CP Friends Group) (cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Still deficiencies – additional costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>As already indicated, the net cost for Option 2 is \$4.1M for 60 spaces</b> - see earlier comments</li> <li>• The carspaces quoted by CPRA are not accurate</li> <li>• Option 1 has already been through a number of design iterations and changes and as such the time has come to rule off on further amendments otherwise the process just goes on and on</li> </ul>
	<p>Hyder option shows misunderstanding in its resolution and connection to immediate surrounds/no solution for access to commuter wharf (impact on boat moorings)</p>	<p><b><u>There is minimal impact on existing tie-ups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commuter Wharf was moved further out to take advantage of berthing on both sides of the pontoon even when the road realignment is carried out. Like the 90 degree carpark, this maximises the use of this central access aisle for dinghy berthing on each side.</li> <li>• It had also already been recognised that the set down area would displace what are temporary spaces in that location and that these would be replaced as either short fingers on the opposite side of the pontoon as the adopted PoM indicates or an extension to the eastern end – this again would need to be factored into the Commuter Wharf project</li> </ul>
	<p>Disconnect between cost per carspace/cost per parking permit holder</p>	<p><b><u>Cost per car space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Option 1 with approx. 54 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$76,000. Note the carpark yield has been reduced to provide disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces will also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required for CPF option.</li> <li>• For Option 2 with 60 car spaces the cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces the cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst this may appear high it needs to be considered in its overall context, including lack of current spaces/demand, lack of suitable alternatives, costs defrayed over a large number of users, centralised facility and hence an effective use of space created and comparison with the equivalent cost per car space for mainland carparking (see below)</p> <p><b><u>Cost per parking permit holder</u></b> There is no disconnect – the cost per car space is one element and the cost per parking permit holder when defrayed over the total number of users is considered reasonable and affordable.</p> <p>The likely user pays fees are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$350 pa without deck</li> <li>• \$300 p.a. with deck &amp; 60 x higher charge spaces</li> <li>• \$560 p.a. with deck if no higher charge spaces</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Reserve Association</b> <b>Peter Altona President</b> <b>11 June 2013</b> <b>(Also member of CP Friends Group)</b> <b>(cont'd)</b>	Need lower cost solution – better demand management	<u><b>Lower Cost Solutions</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As identified during the PoM process there may be lower cost alternatives however cost is not the only determinant.</li> <li>A lower base cost is to deck part of the main carpark however the PoM process identified that an above ground carpark was not acceptable in that location and hence it would need to be totally underground which significantly adds to the cost and as well there is a massive disruption to existing users for at least a year for the construction phase.</li> <li>This was rigorously tested by the design group and other specialist input and ruled out as a viable option</li> <li>An above ground deck is again being put forward on the main carpark on the pretext of being least cost and that times have changed – after many years of deliberation and the adopted PoM only 4 years old there is no merit in reconsidering this as an option</li> <li>The Hyder Option 4 was merely a benchmark comparison if all other issues were able to be removed which is not able to be achieved – this option also requires works to be done on McCarrs Creek Road to retain the foreshore and improve the pathway and the existing road alignment is not improved</li> <li>The Lands Department are unlikely to support a further commuter use of the Crown Reserve</li> </ul>
		<u><b>Demand Management</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demand management in part is being applied through the carpark user pays system</li> <li>It is clear however that with the number of offshore properties and other general parking needs there is a need for additional car spaces to be provided at Church Point</li> <li>This is the major issue identified in the adopted PoM and the new McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility is a significant part of that solution</li> </ul>
	If offshore residents to pay \$5.4 million for 35 - 40 spaces	<u><b>Project Cost</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The quoted figures need to be clarified</li> <li>\$5.4M is for the whole project which includes public domain works already required</li> <li>The net cost is \$4.1M and for the adopted PoM layout this provides 60 spaces with the further potential for an additional 60 spaces making 120 spaces in total for a net cost of \$6.1M.</li> <li>Offshore residents will contribute to the cost via Sticker parking scheme already in place</li> <li>The other contribution is from general users via Pay &amp; Display and this will in turn produce some additional P&amp;D revenue</li> </ul>
	Need to address recreational/visual amenity – hire landscape architect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recreational and visual amenity is being suitably addressed and relevant specialist input will be utilised</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Reserve Association Peter Altona President 11 June 2013 (Also member of CP Friends Group) (cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Precinct 1 plan needs to be sufficiently developed to give community confidence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The carpark is a major component of the adopted PoM</li> <li>• Precinct 1 and was/is in the process of being developed. Hence the importance of confirming the base layout so that the additional detail can be included. This was where the project was at before being required to re-test alternatives already considered and ruled out previously</li> <li>• Constant requirements to test ever changing alternatives actually erodes community confidence and as a heavy drain on scarce resources</li> </ul>
---	---	---

Name	Points Raised	Comments
<b>Church Point Friends (6 &amp; 7 June 2013)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of Option 2 on inside moorings of commuter wharf</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>There is minimal impact on existing tie-ups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commuter Wharf was moved further out to take advantage of berthing on both sides of the pontoon – which was an improvement on the PoM. Like the 90 degree carpark, this maximises the use of this central access aisle for dinghy berthing on each side.</li> <li>It had also been recognised that the set down area would displace what are temporary spaces in that location and that these would be replaced as either short fingers on the opposite side of the pontoon as the adopted PoM indicates or an extension to the eastern end – this again would need to be factored into the Commuter Wharf project</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPF option OK with restricted spaces as used as an everyday carpark by offshore residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Carpark dimensions / user friendly</u></b></li> <li>The new carpark is not solely dedicated to offshore use</li> <li>it is also available for visitors who are likely to be casual infrequent users and be higher turn over</li> <li>it is therefore better to have a configuration that has standard rather than mixed parking arrangements along the one aisle</li> <li>The wider aisle also has added benefits of throughput, less congestion, less chance of vehicle damage and less pedestrian conflict</li> <li>The issue of congestion is on the basis of vehicles that may seek to stand while awaiting a spot to become available and block the aisle for others – this in turn may require vehicles to circulate multiple times while seeking a spot to become available.</li> <li>The wider aisle although still one way provides some ability to wait for a spot and not clog it for everyone else</li> <li>For a 90 degree carpark, in particular one way access, the wider carpark aisle is acceptable as a share way for pedestrians and as such there is no specific need for a separate path– this is the case with most carparks in this configuration</li> <li>A separate pathway becomes necessary when you parallel park particularly next to landscaping otherwise you do not have a hard surface to alight on to. The proposed parallel carparking is also on the 'off-side' and as such not a common approach to negotiate the parallel park.</li> <li>Not sure what this means given that the narrower aisle does not allow vehicles to pass and as such potential for queuing is greater</li> </ul>
	<p>Concerned over justification of \$5.4 million spend on 60 spaces.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The net cost is \$4.1M for 60 additional spaces (\$68,000 for each space) or with deck \$6.1M for 120 spaces (\$51,000 per space)</li> <li>The Church Point Friends Option costs a similar amount however provides fewer spaces and hence a higher cost per car space achieved</li> </ul>

Name	Points Raised	Comments
Church Point Friends (6 June 2013)	Issue of misinterpretations/opinions used to be reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The options have been independently reviewed, costed and critiqued by Hyder, a specialist engineering firm with extensive experience in such matters and at added cost.</li> <li>This critique has been very comprehensive providing a significant amount of detail including quantity survey and costings</li> <li>The critique also looked at carpark performance and constructability as well as other pertinent considerations</li> <li>The alternative by the Friends Group was received in good faith as a stated viable alternative</li> <li>There is no misinterpretation other than the validity of what was presented to Council and the motives – the obvious task as agreed by Council was to have it compared with the PoM already being developed</li> </ul>
	Option One prepared prior to final geotech information	<p><b><u>Geotech information</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geotech information was not an impediment to Option 1 being developed as an alternative and does not explain the subsequent changes to Option 1</li> <li>The Geotech has provided additional information as to the constructability which was always going to be obtained and form part of the design and tender documentation</li> </ul>
	Two way central aisles questioned. Reference to AS/NZS 2890, 1:2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The carpark has a one way configuration</li> <li>the critique was in relation to ease of use of a wider aisle compared to the added disruption and reduced amenity of a narrower aisle.</li> </ul>
	Traffic congestion minimal given nature of offshore periodical use	<p><b><u>Traffic congestion</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The offshore residents are not the only proposed users given that it is also available for visitors who during the day are likely to be casual users and be higher turnover.</li> <li>The issue of congestion is on the basis of vehicles that may seek to stand while awaiting a spot to become available and block the aisle for others – this in turn may require vehicles to circulate multiple times while seeking a spot to become available.</li> <li>The wider aisle although still one way provides some ability to wait for a spot and not clog it for everyone else</li> </ul>
	Option One provides pathway with landscape area; Option 2 – not	<p><b><u>Pathways</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a 90 degree carpark, in particular one way access, the wider carpark aisle is acceptable as a share way for pedestrians and as such there is no specific need for a separate path– this is the case with most carparks in this configuration</li> <li>A separate pathway becomes necessary when you parallel park particularly next to landscaping otherwise you do not have a hard surface to alight on to. The proposed CPF Option 1 parallel carparking is also on the 'off-side' and as such not a common approach to negotiate the parallel park.</li> </ul>
	Option One able to accommodate better solution for queuing of vehicles	Not sure what this means given that the narrower aisle of CPF Option 1 does not allow vehicles to pass and as such potential for adverse impacts of queuing is greater

<b>Church Point Friends (6 June 2013) (cont'd)</b>	Mix 45°/90°/parallel not an issue with regular users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mix of parking with a narrower aisle is less amenable for all users</li> <li>• The offshore residents are not the only users as it is also available for visitors who are likely to be casual users and be higher turn over</li> <li>• 90/90 is therefore more amenable than 45 / parallel</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distance from cliff to wall Option One 25m (two L/S strips 4.5m wide). Option 2 29m 3m L/S strip</li> <li>• Option One ensures dinghy tie-ups on inside of commuter wharf</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Impact on Dinghy Tie-ups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commuter Wharf has been installed on a revised alignment (further out) that allows the dinghy tie-ups to occur and continue to occur along the majority of the inner face even when Option 2 has been constructed. The only area affected is where the vehicle pull in bay is to be installed – replacement dinghy spaces may be required as an offset and these can be accommodated as short pontoon addition fingers on the opposite side or as a further extension toward the central wharf area (with some minor dredging) noting the future desire to connect via an elevated gantry - this would be provided by the Commuter Wharf fund and not the carpark project.</li> <li>• It should be noted that the PoM did not have berthing on the inner face and the modification as constructed is a more cost effective and practical use of the berthing facility</li> </ul>
	Pedestrian control through fences in landscape. Option 2 requires Armco railing	<p><b><u>Pedestrian control measures</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separation of the boardwalk from the roadway can be achieved through a number of edge treatment types including a larger kerb (as used in Newport Commercial area) incorporating decorative railings/bollards or even planters with an overall maritime theme.</li> <li>• An Armco rail would not be suggested. Council staff will develop a number of detail cross sections for discussion by the design group. Traffic calming facilities and speed reductions will also be utilised</li> </ul>
	Disabled catered for in Option One adjacent Ross Trevor	<p><b><u>Disabled spaces</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disabled spaces need to be accommodated within the centralised carpark and hence be centrally located to the main crossing point as this provides convenient ready access to the Commuter Wharf at the least travel distance particularly when the gantry is moved to its central location which will be further again away from Ross Trevor Reserve.</li> <li>• The crossing point will be suitably 'calmed' to facilitate cross overs</li> <li>• The CPF Option will therefore need to be modified noting that disabled spaces require larger dimensions and wider set down areas – this will affect the car park yield</li> </ul>
	Only one landscape strip separating carpark and seawall (Option 2)	<p><b><u>landscape strip separating carpark and seawall</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the adopted PoM layout (Option 2) the landscaping is only between the carpark and the road as the objective is screening/ softening of the carpark. There is purposely no landscape separation between the existing road and the foreshore boardwalk given that the current appeal is not having any visual obstruction. This location is one of the first break out points to view the Pittwater waterway when travelling from the west and a primary reason for not having cars on the waterside to impact on those current uninterrupted views.</li> <li>• In this regard there are a number of other locations along the scenic walkway where there is no landscape separation between the road and the pathway and where there is landscaping it is only 1 to 1.5 metres wide and low height.</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends (6 June 2013) (cont'd)</b>	Option One incorporates landscape strip between road and pedestrian walkway	<p><b><u>Landscape Strip between road and pedestrian</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It could be argued that a landscape strip between the road and the path is not an essential element in this location and the status quo without landscaping would better retain the current circumstances and appeal, particularly as a road user or cyclist.</li> <li>• This location is one of the first Pittwater breakout viewing points when travelling from the west</li> <li>• Landscaping can also be via other means such as planter areas rather than continuous runs along with at the ends, in particular in the vicinity of the Cargo Wharf which would help screen that facility as well.</li> </ul>
	Option 2 – how is suspended drop off point to be constructed – is it costed?	<p><b><u>Vehicle Drop off is accommodated and costed</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle drop off point for Option 2 has been costed into that option</li> <li>• It can either be constructed as a suspended deck structure or the piling be used to encapsulate it. More detailed cost estimates will be sought on a 'whole of life basis as there is less ongoing maintenance with the contiguous pier option compared to a timber structure. The timber boardwalk would still be around the waterfront</li> </ul>
	Option 2 parking aisle 5.8m, no alternate pedestrian path	<p><b><u>Aisle width/ pedestrian path</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With 90 degree parking, a one way circuit and a 5.8m aisle, the same aisle can be used as a pedestrian share way as is the case with most carparks including the Main Carpark at Church Point. A footpath becomes more important when you go to parallel parking and narrower aisle widths as you need to alight from the vehicle on to a hard surface rather than a garden or a dish drain as originally proposed with Option 1</li> <li>• A reduced aisle width is also more problematic as some cars may still attempt to pass in that reduced width</li> </ul>
	Option 2 – two entry/exits creates conflict points	<p><b><u>Two entry / exits not a concern</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The double entry/exit is associated with Option 3 (the decked option) – it will be clear which entry to use given that recommended use model is to have one level of dedicated spaces at a higher annual rate</li> </ul>
	Option 2 – 90° parking most parking for shorter run but creates additional infill at subsequent cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is agreed that option 2 provides the most effective carpark layout and carpark yield for available space</li> <li>• The cost of options 1 and 2 are very similar – as such added costs do not apply</li> <li>• For option 1 however there are added intangible costs in particular delays to motorists due to direct traffic control requirements and potential added length of time for the project as a result</li> <li>• The difference in infill once installed in its final context will generally not be noticeable.</li> </ul>
	Deck not supported	<p><b><u>Deck Option</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No support by Friends Group is noted. In reply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Council has prepared montages depicting the deck and possible landscape/facade treatment</li> <li>○ The deck is in fact a significantly more cost effective outcome in that it reduces the cost per car space by \$17,000 each.</li> <li>○ This is as a result of the far more effective use of the car park footprint already created 'at grade' and the doubling of the capacity of the carpark i.e. it amortises the costs over 120 spaces</li> <li>○ The deck is a single storey addition without a roof and the aesthetics can be suitably addressed with landscaping and façade treatments, in particular local endemic trees and a maritime theme using timbers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends (6 June 2013) (cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Option One has opportunity to include road in carpark</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would appear to suggest that Option 1 would consider a wider central aisle</li> <li>• This moves this design even closer to the adopted PoM but still without added flexibility and added capacity / residual issues</li> <li>• the problem still exists with the mix of parking and parallel reverse parking in particular on to the main crossing point and the need to accommodate larger dimension disabled spaces in a parallel parking configuration</li> </ul>
	<p>Option 2 – construction in deep water will be extremely problematic</p>	<p><b><u>Construction in water is not problematic</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All seawall options will require construction in the water, even if there is no carpark and we just provide a new seawall and walkway to address the current badly eroding foreshore, not just Option 2</li> <li>• Both the adopted PoM option and the Friends option will require a pier type sea wall. This type of seawall relies upon embedment into the underlying rock and a similar depth of embedment will be required for both options. The process is relatively fast and is far less dependent on the tides compared to a gravity wall</li> <li>• The only variables then are the height of the pier above the bed and the constructability.</li> <li>• The change in length of pier as a result of depth of water has only a minor impact as this is merely exposed length to the required height and the total length tends to even out over the run of each option.</li> <li>• The constructability has a greater influence and the Friends Option requires far more of the works to be carried out under direct traffic management adding to the time of construction and significant disruption to the travelling public and public transport service and hence greater impact on general amenity and relative cost</li> </ul>
	<p>Any solution that reduces construction closures should be seriously considered</p>	<p><b><u>Construction road closures are associated with CPF Option</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing the impact of construction road closures/traffic management is a major consideration that has been seriously considered.</li> <li>• Road closures/construction traffic lights and working under traffic add to the delays and motorist frustration, reduces resident and worker amenity &amp; safety and affects the constructability and project timeframes</li> <li>• The Friends Option 1 will require this part of McCarrs Creek Road to be under active traffic management for most of the works at what is also a sharp bend in the road and a bus route – this will be far more disruptive, less safe and add to the length of the project</li> <li>• PoM Option 2 being a wider footprint can avoid most of the construction under traffic and hence is far less disruptive and safer for the travelling public and should result in a faster construction and finish date – effectively the new road can be constructed separately and then swap over to construct the remainder of the carpark</li> <li>• With Option 3 (deck) if constructed at the same time it will also be far less disruptive and less costly compared to a later date as you will not have a future shut down and displacement of users and a separate contract with a possible need to affect/reinstate parts of the original construction e.g. footings and services</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends (6 June 2013) (cont'd)</b>	Re-use of stone for existing wall against piled concrete wall will not cover entire wall at low tide	<p><b><u>Sandstone Boulder 'facing'</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was never the intention to fully cover the piled seawall. The main reasons for the boulders are to provide marine habitat and reduce wave/turbulence associated with dinghies/swell. At the ends of the seawall run there is more scope for more coverage and there may be a transition back to a sandstone seawall</li> <li>• Most of the depth of piling will be below the tidal range and as such not visible</li> <li>• From the roadway and the suspended walkway you will not even see the type of seawall underneath given the 3 metre boardwalk deck overhang.</li> <li>• From the main waterway the dinghies on the Commuter Wharf and other moored vessels provide some screening already</li> <li>• From the dinghy pontoon you will see the piling however with the timber walkway elements extending for 3 metres out and over the top with its added shadowing it will present more as part of a wharf structure. Marine growth will also occur on the piling elements</li> </ul>
	No allowances for commuter wharf connection. Need to include cost of commuter shed/suspended loading dock	<p><b><u>Commuter Wharf connection</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gantry was always intended to be moved to the central location to align with the main crossing point and this relocation has always been a Commuter Wharf project matter to be separately funded via that project and has been included as a works item for that project</li> <li>• The suspended car stand/drop off is funded in the Option 2 and rather than a suspended deck it could be part of the piled reclaimed area with the suspended walkway in front dependent on whole of life cost differences</li> <li>• The provision of a shelter shed is a matter for the collective users of the Commuter Wharf to fund as a further enhancement to that facility and can be factored into that arrangement – it is not a carpark item to fund and the equity lies with the Commuter Wharf users as not all carpark users use the Commuter Wharf</li> </ul>
	Stone wall calculations on both options needs review.	<p><b><u>Stone Wall calculations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intention is to reuse the existing stone boulder wall for the marine habitat in front of the pier wall and other seawall at ends and to supplement this with additional boulders as required – this is not a high cost item</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Summary</b> Difference of 4.0 metres between both options from edge of cliff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difference in overall width is to a large extent a direct correlation with the carpark layout.</li> <li>• The CP Friends initial option was parallel parking on both sides of a narrow aisle which had less lateral extent but also far less compliant parking. The latest CPF version has parallel and 45 degree which moves it out further. There are a multitude of other configurations that were set out in a ready reckoner provided by Council and we do not intend to iterate through all of these combinations.</li> <li>• Although the adopted PoM (Option 2) is further out in the central portion it provides far more scope as a carpark facility which is the primary objective for taking on this project. The adopted PoM has already taken this extra width and triple bottom line implications into consideration when comparing alternatives</li> </ul>
	<p>Option One/28ml Option 2/36m. Option 2 – 8m further will take out dinghies on inside of commuter wharf</p>	<p><b><u>Impact on Dinghy Tie-ups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commuter Wharf has been installed on a revised alignment (further out) that allows the dinghy tie-ups to occur and continue to occur along the majority of the inner face even when Option 2 has been constructed. The only area affected is where the vehicle pull in bay is to be installed – replacement dinghy spaces may be required as an offset and these can be accommodated as short pontoon addition fingers on the opposite side or as a further extension toward the central wharf area (with some minor dredging) noting the future desire to connect via an elevated gantry - this would be provided by the Commuter Wharf fund and not the carpark project.</li> <li>• It should be noted that the PoM did not have berthing on the inner face and the modification as constructed is a more cost effective and practical use of the berthing facility</li> </ul>
	<p>Rocks against piled wall will also impact on dinghies</p>	<p><b><u>There will be no impact on navigation by the boulders</u></b> The boulders will be located under the run of the suspended walkway extending up from the sea bed interface of the contiguous piled sea wall on a stable batter – they provide added marine habitat – they will be placed so as not to impede navigation</p>
	<p>Option 1a has less infill – 7986 vs 8780</p>	<p><b><u>Difference in fill volumes:</u></b> The infill comparison provided by CPF indicates an approx 10% difference in fill– it is noted that bulk infill is one of the lesser cost and easier to install construction items. As already commented the PoM being on an arc has a fill projection in the central portion. The main cost is in the seawall and both options are almost identical as are the overall total costs for each option. However the major difference is that Option 2 provides a number of added benefits, in particular the flexibility and capacity to double the number of spaces</p>

	Request for further comprehensive analysis of both options	<p><b><u>Further Analysis is not required – already analysed</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From our understanding and as initially stated by the Friends Group, Option 1 was presented to Council as a detailed, viable and tested alternative</li> <li>• In good faith, Council has provided progressive detailed analysis including independent specialist advice at considerable extra cost that adds to the overheads for the project. This independent analysis showed up a number of deficiencies with Option 1 as submitted and the Friends Group then deemed it to be a concept to be further developed. This is one of the fundamental problems in that Option 1 keeps changing and has subsequently been through a number of iterations that have substantially changed this option from the original submission that was claimed to be a robust and tested alternative.</li> <li>• These changes to Option 1 bring it much closer to the adopted PoM layout as well as being very similar to option(s) already considered by the PoM process and ruled out as not providing the same benefit as the eventual adopted PoM design (Option 2)</li> <li>• Although Option 1 is in part narrower over the central portion and provides scope for more width for landscaping it falls short of Option 2 in a number of other significant areas</li> <li>• Council’s resolution was to test the alternate design against the adopted PoM layout and by extension not to embark on an extended range of alternatives noting the robust process already followed to adopt the PoM and the many different options presented at that time, including a number similar to what is now being presented that have been previously ruled out in comparison to the adopted PoM</li> <li>• Council does not agree that there needs to be further comprehensive analysis of both options given the amount of comprehensive and detailed independent analysis already carried out.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b>  <b>30 June 2013</b>  <b>Stephen Crosby</b></p>	<p>How much of the natural environment should be sacrificed for how many additional parking spaces at what cost to whom?"</p>	<p><b><u>The adopted PoM and associated Masterplan with its specialist and community input provides an agreed way forward for precinct upgrades at Church Point</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This process was highly consultative and considered the environment, social aspects as well as economic considerations and distilled these to the associated Masterplans and actions to achieve the required outcomes</li> <li>• There was also an in depth independent peer review and response</li> <li>• The adopted PoM carpark layout is therefore not an adhoc inclusion – it was well researched and compared this against a number of other alternatives and in the end was adopted because it best met all of the requirements across environmental, social and economic considerations.</li> <li>• The natural environment affected is mainly associated with the foreshore infill. Compared to the existing eroding foreshore and diminishing footpath that is not sustainable a new seawall on a new alignment is already required. The added extent of infill and necessary infill with the amelioration measures such as rock habitat will not significantly diminish that natural environment and rather can improve habitat as a result of the seawall and pier/ boardwalk elements</li> <li>• The other impact is visual and relates to the single storey deck in front of the lower part of the cliff face</li> <li>• The additional spaces in the Option 3 carpark is 120 and this would provide substantial carpark demand relief. This carpark configuration at its core will require approx. 1,800 sqm at approx. 15 sqm per car</li> <li>• Compare this to the much less land efficient mainland vehicle access/driveways and carparking and the similar cost involved per carspace and the collective facility is a far more effective use of public land</li> <li>• With the costs defrayed over a much larger number of users and user pays arrangements making it affordable</li> </ul>
	<p>Irreversible effect on the environment</p>	<p><b><u>Environmental considerations in overall context</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In formulating the adopted PoM and associated precinct Masterplans the principles in that same document were considered when formulating the required outcomes. It again should be noted that the Plan of Management is for the whole locality and considers all of the stated objectives across that spectrum noting that the various precincts have differing attributes and roles to play. This is why the term 'within the study area' is applied. In this context every project will provides its own unique benefits across that continuum with some being offsets for others and vice versa. E.g. not every location can be landscaped and as such the foreshore of the main carpark is better suited to that outcome</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Enhance public recreation amenity for all users</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreshore boardwalk is an extension to the already highly popular Church Point to Bayview scenic walkway</li> <li>• The same concerns were raised when Council widened the road and provided the path and very soon after it was deemed to be a major success and one of Pittwater's most popular 'linear parks'</li> <li>• At McCarrs Creek Road the logical reserve space is Rostrevor Reserve</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b>  <b>30 June 2013</b>  <b>Stephen Crosby</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>		<p><b><u>Recognise the unique historical and social values</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subject foreshore is not pristine in that it currently presents as an eroded foreshore with pathway and road at risk of collapse. This narrow and eroding face with poor pedestrian amenity was exactly the previous case for the many kilometres of Pittwater Road that has been provided with a new seawall on a new alignment and highly popular scenic walkway where no walkway existed previously. Yes this was a change to the former environment however that situation was not sustainable. From a social perspective this project linked what were previously isolated suburbs and has provided a massive social boost. In addition there is an economic and health benefit boost as well</li> <li>• The unique historical and social values include the vital role of Church Point as a commuter hub and the vibrancy of movement of people and goods, part of which includes provision for cars</li> <li>• Offshore subdivisions are some of the oldest in Pittwater (older than many on the mainland) and we cannot turn back the clock</li> <li>• Social interaction in the carpark; at Thomas Stevens Reserve; at the commercial premises; the wharves; etc are part of the social fabric</li> <li>• The new carpark and boardwalk will add to that social interaction</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Enhance the visual amenity and distinctive character of the study area</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The visual amenity is a primary consideration and this is why the McCarrs carpark location has been adopted and is not on the waterside but has been purposely placed on the cliff side so as not to place cars on what is currently an unobstructed foreshore. This location also is best placed for a deck addition for the same reasons i.e. located against the cliff and not overviewed and can be landscaped without taking away any of the current views of the water.</li> <li>• Looking back at the deck it can have landscaping and timber façade elements in keeping with the locality and could in fact be part of the maritime theme and public art expression including use of recycled wharf timber from wharf reconstruction works that Council has ready access noting its 28 public wharves to maintain</li> <li>• The main carpark is also intended to have a foreshore make-over to provide some widening with a rebuilt sloping sandstone revetment seawall that will improve the foreshore recreation value and habitat</li> <li>• The central hub will have improvements in keeping with its central commuter and commercial role</li> <li>• The new carpark area on McCarrs Creek has been chosen for the very reason that it can be recessed against the cliff so as to have least impact on overviewing with addition of new boardwalk</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Provide adequate and appropriate parking facilities without destroying amenity</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new carpark provides appropriate parking and at the same time greatly improves safety and amenity</li> <li>• The amenity needs to be considered in the overall context with the addition of boardwalks and other connected foreshore experiences as an extension to the Bayview To Church Point walkway</li> </ul>
---	--	--

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b>  <b>30 June 2013</b>  <b>Stephen Crosby</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>		<p><b><u>Enhance flora and fauna within the study area, including vegetation communities, aquatic and terrestrial environments</u></b>          Again the Plan of Management is for the whole precinct and considers all of the stated objectives across that spectrum noting that the various precincts have differing attributes and roles to play. This is why the term 'within the study area' is applied.</p>
	<p>Demand Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand management in part is being applied through the carpark Sticker user pays system along with removal of the general Pittwater sticker and hence requiring resident and visitors to use P&amp;D</li> <li>• It is clear however that with the number of offshore properties and other general parking needs there is a need for additional car spaces to be provided at Church Point</li> <li>• This is the major issue identified in the adopted PoM and the new McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility is a significant part providing additional car parking for the overall precinct</li> <li>• Commercial developments will need to address parking demand as part of the Development Consent process</li> </ul>
	<p>Acceptable Cost-benefit &amp; risk?</p>	<p><b><u>Acceptable Cost-benefit &amp; risk?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The benefit/cost is a fundamental consideration. A Business Case/ Risk Profile Model was provided as part of the supplementary PoM information</li> <li>• The benefits are:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased carparking with potential for up to 120 cars which will alleviate the pressing demand for carparking relief</li> <li>• It will provide a new carpark facility in a very convenient location to the Commuter Wharf</li> <li>• Improvements to the road alignment</li> <li>• The costs are within acceptable bounds noting the lack of suitable carpark alternatives, the type of works involved and compared to the do nothing base position. These costs also compare reasonably with what mainland property owners are required to meet for 2 x offstreet carparking spaces</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The risks are manageable and Council has a track record of providing quality and substantial projects, in particular expertise in the road./marine/foreshore environments as demonstrated by the Bayview to Church Point project, as well as the recent Rowland reserve and Griffin Park seawall projects along with numerous wharf projects as references</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Financial risk of cost blow outs</i></li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Financial Risk</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will be subject to detail design and a further detail QS and include suitable contingencies</li> <li>• Construction prices will be obtained via a competitive construction tender process.</li> <li>• Council will project manage the project and valid variations are part of any project and will need to be part of the project costings and would be amortised over the 20 year term of the payback period</li> <li>• It is again noted that the funding is from Sticker and P&amp;D arrangements and as such would be pro-rata around that as well</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends</b> <b>30 June 2013</b> <b>Stephen Crosby</b> <b>(cont'd)</b>	What will offshore residents pay? For how long? What charge is reasonable?	<p><b><u>User Pay arrangements</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is being undertaken as an opportunity to provide parking relief for offshore residents and visitors to the area</li> <li>• Offshore residents are already paying a fee for carparking and Council has agreed that this income along with part of the P&amp;D income can be used toward the cost of providing additional carparking</li> <li>• The annual fee will be based on repayment of an external 20 year loan to repay the residual cost of the project and this fee will need to be agreed upon. Part of the P&amp;D income is also being used for this outcome</li> <li>• The deck option is proposed to have another form of user pay commensurate with the allocated spaces provided</li> <li>• The i</li> </ul>
	Latest Hyder 33% increase on PoM	<p><b><u>Project Costs</u></b> <b><u>Cost estimates</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost estimates were provided as part of the PoM in 2009 – these were developed with the information available at that time.</li> <li>• Latest cost estimates reflect price increases due to CPI and a more detailed analysis including geotechnical and structural advice and quantity survey – this is a logical progression.</li> <li>• It should be noted that both the adopted PoM layout and the CP Friends alternative Option cost a similar amount. As such there is no cost advantage with the CPF option which also results in fewer car spaces and hence higher cost per space created. The CPF option also rules out any further consideration of additional carparking on a deck</li> <li>• The adopted PoM with the capability of another level of carparking for 60 more cars makes it substantially more cost effective</li> <li>• For what is a relatively minor difference in seawall alignment and infill between option 1 and option 2 it makes far more sense to keep flexibility in the design noting that the major objective is to provide additional carparking.</li> </ul>
	Extra costs not included	<p><b><u>Cost of Commuter Wharf, shelter shed, ramp connection</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relocation of the main gangway has always been a Commuter Wharf project matter to be separately funded via that project and has been included as a future works item</li> <li>• The suspended carstand/drop off is funded in the Option 2 and could instead be part of the piled reclaimed area with the suspended walkway in front dependent on whole of life cost differences</li> <li>• The provision of a shelter shed is a matter for the collective users of the Commuter Wharf to fund as a further enhancement to that facility – it is not a carpark project funded item</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b>  <b>30 June 2013</b>  <b>Stephen Crosby</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Overall carspaces compared to existing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comparative logic is flawed – you cannot benchmark a new carpark against non-compliant / informal spaces associated with separate existing facilities</li> <li>• The main carpark if it was linemarked to standard dimensions could result in the 20 space reduction – this deficiency already exists and is not a benchmark for the new carpark – this can however be ameliorated by designating areas to smaller vehicle use</li> <li>• Reduction in main carpark numbers to increase reserve space is not geared to the McCarrs Creek project and needs to have regard to the adjustment to the main foreshore and in the broader context of the linear park established via the scenic walkway. There will also be extra curtilage around the central precinct and next to the Cargo Wharf</li> <li>• Pittwater Road spaces – same applies</li> <li>• McCarrs (Cargo) – the PoM closes down the non-compliant stacked parking on the east side of Cargo and replaces this with parking on the west side – this is still part of the PoM and as such is not lost parking but needs to be compliant</li> <li>• The new facility is still geared to 60 spaces 'at grade' which is in addition to the existing spaces and the need to make the existing spaces legal and compliant</li> <li>• Making the existing spaces legal and compliant is even more reason to establish the new facility to replace potentially lost spaces</li> <li>• It also takes pressure of adjoining streets where there is likely to be other non-compliance and safety and amenity issues</li> <li>• In addition from an overall triple bottom line assessment it lends more weight to construction of the deck facility as part of the combined precinct outcomes</li> </ul>
	<p>Impact of options on commuter mooring and ramp access</p>	<p><b><u>There is minimal impact on existing tie-ups</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commuter Wharf was already moved further out to take advantage of berthing on both sides of the pontoon – which was an improvement on the PoM. Like the 90 degree carpark configuration, this maximises the use of this central pontoon access aisle</li> <li>• The gantry was always intended to be moved to the central location to align with the main crossing point for the carpark</li> <li>• It has already been recognised that the vehicle set down area would displace what are temporary spaces in that location and that these would be replaced as short fingers on the opposite side of the pontoon as the adopted PoM indicates but not needing to be to that extent or as an extension toward the Main wharf area with some minor dredging which then brings it closer to the desired gantry connection – this has been factored into the Commuter Wharf project</li> <li>• Some parallel berthing/dinghy set down may still be possible in the reduced width area</li> </ul>
	<p>Considering alternatives</p>	<p>The suggested alternative approach, basically working in reverse, is at best a further check however has the following logic problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The land/sea edge construction – a rip rap wall still needs to be structural and requires substantially more mass for stability. It also involves far more preparation of the base and placement of wall elements in or below the tidal zone and the batters required results in much more lateral extent and potential construction delay</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b>  <b>30 June 2013</b>  <b>Stephen Crosby</b>  <b>(cont'd)</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Again the major cost is in the seawall and the cost difference would not be significant once you also factor in working under traffic and the slower rate of construction and ultimately the reduced carparking outcome which will likely increase the cost per carspace achieved with no opportunity for a future deck to substantially increase spaces</li> <li>• There is no doubt that the proposed boardwalk will provide a great foreshore experience, in particular in conjunction with the proposed future connection to the Precinct 2 via the waters-edge (eliminating the need for the sharp bend access). Again the major appeal is the lack of clutter, informality and uninterrupted views. You don't need to landscape everything. It is also intended to connect the Commuter Wharf at the eastern end with the main wharf area which provides an even closer take on the water and life as an 'off-shorey'.</li> <li>• Many of the issues now being raised were raised when Council took on the foreshore walkway – no infill/ too much infill; visual blight; unacceptable impact on the environment; not enough landscaping; etc, and despite these objections what we now have is a massive improvement that has helped to connect and define this area despite the small but highly vocal nay-sayers at that time who would have preferred the road to crumble into the water and pedestrians to only have access at low tide along the mudflat which was how it was only 20 years ago.</li> <li>• That project involved a new seawall, it collectively involved a significant amount of infill over its considerable length, it encapsulated a number of visually intrusive sewer manholes, provided for some road widening and cycle access and a dash of interspersed landscaping/clear areas at appropriate locations</li> <li>• The current berthing on the inside is a bonus due to the main pontoon being moved further out and made longer – it was always a requirement that some of these spaces were temporary until the road/carpark was built and would be lost or would need to be replaced as a Stage 2 addition as always envisaged by the PoM</li> </ul>
	<p>Actions  Consider all 3 precincts simultaneously</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• – Agreed - however also need to recognise that each precinct has unique roles and attributes and although there can be common themes, one size does not fit all and some precinct have more dominant themes. E.g. enhance flora &amp; fauna does not mean that it is necessary or appropriate to landscape every part</li> </ul>
	<p>Demand management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand management</li> <li>• – this works effectively when there are suitable alternatives. What we have at Church Point however is part of our Pittwater community just wanting to park in a reasonable location so they can get home each evening. We do not impose demand management on mainland properties and in fact go the other way requiring 2 x off street parking spaces to be provided as part of the consent at whatever cost that may involve.</li> </ul>
	<p>Complete detailed design of connections to Commuter Wharf, The Store &amp; Cargo Wharf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relocated gantry will form part of the proposed works and is to be funded from the Commuter Fund  The other connections are a future stage</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends 30 June 2013 Stephen Crosby (cont'd)</b>	Update Hyder cost estimates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hyder cost estimates have been produced to a level of detail that is adequate and commensurate for the next phase</li> </ul>
	Submit recommendations to an independent design review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is not considered to be necessary – the already established Working Party will be utilised for those elements beyond the core engineering requirement</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends</b> <b>15 July</b>	<p>Have additional costs not included in the Hyder Plan such as shelter shed, ramp connections to commuter wharf been costed into the project?</p>	<p><b><u>Commuter Wharf, shelter shed, ramp connection</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relocation of the main gangway has always been a Commuter Wharf project matter to be separately funded via that project and has been included as a future works item</li> <li>• The suspended carstand/drop off is funded in the Option 2 and could instead be part of the piled reclaimed area with the suspended walkway in front dependent on whole of life cost differences</li> <li>• The provision of a shelter shed is a matter for the collective users of the Commuter Wharf to fund as a further enhancement to that facility – it is not a carpark project funded item</li> </ul>
	<p>How are charges for the new works to be levied to the offshore community and how is it to be financed?</p>	<p><b><u>Cost Breakdown</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreshore in this part of McCarrs Creek Road is already badly eroded and the footpath needs to be upgraded and as such a new seawall and footpath is required in any event.</li> <li>• On this basis, for the carpark project, Council will be funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 50% of the sea wall cost = \$800,000 (this includes \$500k from the former EI Levy plus \$300k from the RMS handover funding)</li> <li>▪ total cost of the boardwalk = \$500,000.</li> <li>▪ Hence a total of \$1.3M from Council which comes off the total estimates for each of the options</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For Options 1 (Friends) and Option 2 (adopted PoM) the net cost is similar = \$4.1M</li> <li>• For Option 3 (adopted PoM with deck) the net cost = \$6.1M</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Cost per car space</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Option 1 with approx. 52 (TBC) car spaces, the cost per car space = \$79,000. Note the carpark yield has been reduced to provide 4 x disabled parking spaces on a like for like comparison – the disabled spaces would also need to be configured to larger dimensions and as such there would need to be a further design modification required.</li> <li>• For Option 2 with 60 car spaces - cost per car space = \$68,000.</li> <li>• For Option 3 with 120 car spaces - cost per car space = \$51,000.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Cost per parking permit holder</u></b> There is no disconnect – the cost per car space is one element and the cost per parking permit holder when defrayed over the total number of users is considered reasonable and affordable.</p> <p>The likely user pays fees are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$350 pa without deck</li> <li>• \$300 p.a. with deck &amp; 60 x higher charge spaces</li> <li>• \$560 p.a. with deck if no higher charge spaces</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Value for money/cost-benefit</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides a consolidated footprint to accommodate up to 120 additional car spaces to relieve carparking pressure at Church Point</li> <li>▪ With the deck option the construction cost per space is approx \$51,000</li> <li>▪ The area of land required for the core of the carpark is approx. 1,800sqm and for 120 cars = 15 sqm per car</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b> 15 July (cont'd)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In comparison in this same locality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the multiple vehicle access immediately above McCarrs Creek Road uses approx 1,000 sqm of public reserve land for approx. 8 properties or 16 cars (on basis of DA requirement for 2 spaces) = 62 sqm of public reserve land used per car. This is an alternative to direct driveway access to each property which would be impractical and cost prohibitive.</li> <li>▪ add to this the private driveway and garaging components and the land required adds about another 2,000 sqm. Hence about 3,000 sqm of land is required to provide access and accommodate 16 cars or 190 sqm per car. Over and above the land involved the construction cost has/would be substantial.</li> <li>▪ Even for the 11 properties directly opposite Church Point Reserve the driveways over the road reserve require 650 sqm for 22 cars = 30 sqm per vehicle of steep driveway construction. Add to this approx. 1200 sqm for private driveway and garaging and the total land required is approx. 1,800 sqm for 22 cars = approx. 80 sqm per car which again would be expensive to construct per car space.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The collective facility for up to 120 cars is therefore a much more efficient use of public land for the number of spaces accommodated and the cost per car space would not be dissimilar to what adjoining properties have already constructed and maintain.</li> </ul>
	<p>What is the net gain in carparking spaces across the entire PoM area + which of the 20 spaces are to be removed to create recreation space?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across the entire PoM area there are car spaces in different locations in various configurations, some more formal than others. For example the main carpark probably fits more cars in its informal arrangement than if it were linemarked. These differences in these other locations should not be used as a net adjustment against the proposed McCarrs carpark and in fact if the other changes were made to formalise then there would be an even greater need for the new carpark.</li> <li>• The additional car spaces associated with CPF Option 1 is estimated to be 54</li> <li>• The additional carspaces associated with the adopted PoM layout is 60</li> <li>• The additional car spaces associated with Option 3 is 120</li> <li>• As per the PoM spaces lost on the eastern side of the Cargo Wharf can be replaced on the western side</li> <li>• The adopted PoM states that up to 30 spaces located in the main carpark are to be returned to recreation <b>if a carpark facility is provided at Holmeport</b>. The current McCarrs Creek Road project is not subject to that net reduction.</li> <li>• Any reduction would come from the eastern end of the main carpark and would need to be considered on a triple bottom line basis as to impacts from an environmental, social and economic perspective</li> <li>• It should be noted that the Bayview to Church Point Scenic Walkway created what is in effect a linear park over a number of kilometres where no foreshore access previously existed. This provides substantial recreational experience and links appropriately with the main reserve foreshore improvements and the further freeing up of Bennett's Beach following the boat shed removal.</li> </ul>

<b>Church Point Friends</b> <b>15 July (cont'd)</b>	Are the 14 car spaces above Holmeport to be built?	The existing spaces on McCarrs Creek Road above Holmeport were recently adjusted to improve safety and amenity for motorists and pedestrians – there is no current plan to build further spaces in this location and the terrain and geotech issues would suggest that this is not practical.
	Make all submissions available on Council's website	Subject to permission by all parties who have made submissions this request can be accommodated along with these comments in reply
	Demand Management and how does Council intend to address this?	<p><b><u>Demand Management Options</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand management in part is being applied through the carpark user pays system which includes Sticker Parking as well as P&amp;D parking arrangements. The general Pittwater parking sticker also does not apply at Church Point.</li> <li>• It is clear however that with the number of offshore properties and other general parking needs there is a need for additional car spaces to be provided at Church Point</li> <li>• This is the major issue identified in the adopted PoM and the new McCarrs Creek Road carpark facility is a significant part of that car parking relief.</li> </ul>
	Lower cost alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As identified during the PoM process there may be lower cost alternatives however cost is not the only determinant.</li> <li>• A lower base cost is to deck part of the main carpark however the PoM process identified that an above ground carpark was not acceptable and hence it would need to be totally underground which significantly adds to the cost and as well there is a massive disruption to existing users for at least a year for the construction phase.</li> <li>• This was rigorously tested by the design group and ruled out as a viable option</li> <li>• An above ground deck is again being put forward on the pretext of being least cost and that times have changed – after many years of deliberation and the adopted PoM only 4 years old there is no merit in reconsidering this as an option</li> <li>• The Hyder Option 4 was merely a benchmark comparison if all other issues were able to be removed which is not able to be achieved</li> </ul>

<p><b>Church Point Friends</b> <b>15 July (cont'd)</b></p>	<p>CPF submitted its plan to Council originally to open the door to investigating other design outcomes – it was never CPF's intention that this document be used for comparative costing – not aware until plan turned up in Hyder Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In good faith, Council agreed to take on board the CPF alternative on the initial stated basis by CPF that it was a tried and tested valid alternative. The subsequent report to Council provided an open recipe as to how it would be compared with the adopted PoM layout despite reservations as to its technical compliance and ability to meet carpark and other objectives.</li> <li>• Progressive detailed analysis has been applied, including independent specialist assessment and advice at considerable extra cost that adds to the overheads for the project. This independent analysis confirmed a number of deficiencies with Option 1 as submitted and its derivatives to the extent that it would not be practical, amenable nor safe to build in that configuration.</li> <li>• The CP Friends Group then deemed it to be a concept to be further developed. This is one of the fundamental problems in that Option 1 keeps changing and has subsequently been through a number of iterations that have substantially changed this option from the original submission that was claimed to be a robust and tested alternative. The 15 July statement further highlights the lack of certainty associated with the Friends approach as it is a moving feast that is highly resource hungry.</li> <li>• Council's resolution was to test the alternate design (as submitted by CPF) against the adopted PoM and by extension not to embark on an extended range of alternatives noting the robust process already followed to adopt the PoM layout and already tested against the many different options presented at that time, including a number similar to what is now being presented that have been previously ruled out in comparison to the adopted PoM</li> <li>• Council is concerned about this latest statement by CPF that CPF submitted a plan to Council originally merely to open the door to investigating other design outcomes. And we are at a loss as to the concern now being raised that this was analysed in more detail and used for costing comparison</li> </ul>
--	--	--

<b>Scotland Island Residents Association</b> <b>17 June 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2/no clear mandate for the deck as yet (previous survey – 50% support)</li> </ul>	Support for Option 2/no clear mandate for deck as yet noted
	Support for Option 2 based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longstanding support of PoM option through a long process of community consultation and it is their expectation</li> <li>• Option 2 superior outcome for several reasons outlined in Hyder Report</li> <li>• Option 2 still allows investigation of Option 3</li> </ul>	Support for adopted PoM (Option 2) noted
	Also based on provisos: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fee structure yet to be agreed upon</li> <li>• Agreement about any new parking infrastructure</li> <li>• Need to go back to community re final support</li> </ul>	Fee structure provisos noted

<b>Scotland Island Residents Association (PoM)</b>	Issues raised against Option One:	<b><u>Dis-benefits raised about Option One (Friends) noted – in reply to issues about Option One:</u></b>
	Closure of McCarrs Creek Road during construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1 being a narrower design will require McCarrs Creek Road to be under more extensive ongoing traffic management and road closures during its construction whereas the bulk of Option 2 construction can be accommodated away from the road until such time as the end tie-ins are required – Option 2 is therefore far less disruptive to the travelling public in particular residents to the west and the bus service. It also makes for a more efficient and timely construction when not under direct traffic management</li> </ul>
	No right turn option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tighter arrangement can affect turning into and out of the carpark and as such significantly affect circulation and reduce user amenity</li> </ul>
	Narrow aisle/cause of congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrower aisle along the carpark does not allow throughput if a car is attempting to park or waiting for a spot – this could lead to congestion and if this occurs near the carpark entry could result in cars extending back on to the road just around from the sharp blind bend</li> </ul>
	No disabled spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requisite number of disabled spaces need to be provided within this facility - disabled spaces require added width and as such the overall number of spaces will reduce</li> </ul>
	Whether design could deliver 56 spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design needs to be further analysed as to technical compliance – there also needs to be provision for the larger disabled spaces</li> </ul>
	Requires reverse parking to access spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reverse parallel parking is a more complex arrangement for a carpark situation and is normally associated with roadside parking</li> </ul>
	Sight lines better with curved option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The curved alignment improves sight lines at the sharp bend at the Mini-mart which in turn provides improved sight distance for those wanting to cross the road at the Bus stops at Thomas Stevens Reserve</li> </ul>
	Less efficient parking arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1 has a mix of parking arrangements which can add to the complexity of use. It is also a less efficient carparking arrangement – the optimum carpark arrangement is one that takes full advantage of both sides of the access aisle and as such Option Two with its 90 / 90 will provide the most spaces per equivalent run</li> </ul>
Prevents even option of deck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1 also precludes the ability to construct a deck and hence has no flexibility to cope with future demand. Having created an ‘at grade’ footprint for the carpark for a similar cost it is then questionable as to why you would not build in that future flexibility</li> <li>Option 2 provides that future flexibility to double the capacity of the carpark for what is only half the cost again and hence provides 120 spaces – this is a far more cost effective use of the space created for what is only a marginal increase in width over the central portion.</li> </ul>	

<b>West Pittwater Community Association</b> <b>2 July 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unanimous support for Option 2</li> <li>• Large majority no support for Option 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unanimous support for adopted PoM carpark layout is noted</li> <li>• Large majority no support for Option 3 is noted</li> <li>• <b>xxx</b></li> </ul>
	Support for Option 2 on the following basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design set out in the Church Point PoM that involved a long process of community consultation &amp; is expectation of community</li> <li>• It is the better option for the several reasons outlined in the Hyder Report</li> </ul>	<u><b>Basis of Support for adopted PoM carpark is noted</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>xxx</b></li> </ul>
	Need assurances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tie-ups can still occur on the inner face of Commuter Wharf</li> <li>• These groups not responsible for any cost overruns</li> </ul>	<u><b>Assurances</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PoM did not envisage tie-ups on the inner face however the alignment for the as built facility was changed so that the majority of the inner face could be utilised which is a far more efficient and practical use of the pontoon aisle</li> <li>• It was always envisaged that the central berths at the vehicle pull in bay would be temporary due to the added width removing some tie ups. These can be converted to parallel tie ups – if practical &amp; safe to do so or there can be an extension or finger(s) installed to replace again noting that these were always only temporary and the whole of the inner face is a bonus</li> <li>• The cost of ‘replacement’ is not a carpark project cost and will need to be met by the Commuter Wharf project given that not all carpark users use the commuter wharf.</li> <li>• This cost can be amortised over the 20 year pay-back period</li> <li>• When the adopted PoM layout is constructed the central berths will need to be removed</li> </ul>
	Continuing Design Group involvement in the detailed designs	<u><b>Yes –</b></u> on the basis that there is an agreed process and not open ended
	Fee structure in consultation with offshore groups	<u><b>Yes –</b></u> this was always the case and needs to be resolved and a commitment provided before embarking on construction- this will provide certainty for all involved

<p><b>West Pittwater Community Association</b>  <b>2 July 2013 (cont'd)</b></p>	<p>Clear agreement about future use and management</p>	<p><b><u>A project of this magnitude will include reasonable contingencies and valid variations will need to be accommodated</u></b> – any added costs will be reasonably apportioned noting that funding is from various user pays sources</p> <p><b><u>Future use and management will be confirmed up front in particular parking arrangements and user pays</u></b></p>
---	--	--

<p><b>Frank Makin</b> <b>31 May &amp; 1 July</b></p>	<p>The alternate concept is to deck the main carpark at Church Point Reserve with the following logic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incremental cost of first floor deck providing 60 car spaces is \$1.85M or \$31,000 per car space</li> <li>• Present car spaces on Church Point Reserve approx. 300</li> <li>• Proposed McCarrs ground + deck = 120 spaces</li> <li>• Hence total of 420 spaces</li> <li>• If deck the main carpark instead to provide 210 + 210 then would be able to remove approx. 90 spaces and return to reserve use for same carpark yield</li> <li>• Embellishment of expanded reserve to be funded by land sales</li> <li>• Upgrade of McCarrs + path via Council funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placing a deck over the main carpark in theory is a more cost effective way of providing additional carparking given that the land already exists rather than needing to be reclaimed and the logic presented is noted along with the enlargement of the reserve by removal of car spaces.</li> <li>• the PoM process has already tested this as an option and the following added constraints arise:</li> <li>• This option was considered as part of the PoM process and at that time (only 4 years ago) there was significant objection to an above ground deck or even a partially above ground deck on the Reserve given the view loss from the road and overlooking from properties opposite noting that this carpark is on the waterside of the road as distinct from the adopted McCarrs carpark layout which is purposely on the non-waterfront side and tucked against the existing cliff.</li> <li>• The Lands Department was already reluctant to have carparking on the reserve in any event and as such likely to be averse to an intensification of carparking for commuters on the reserve</li> <li>• These issues basically drive a 'basement' carpark outcome. Placing the carpark underground significantly adds to the cost and practicality, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Excavation, transport &amp; disposal costs which have also significantly increased with waste levy charges</li> <li>○ Basement slab &amp; extensive retaining works compared to an above ground carpark deck facility – possibly need a contiguous pile perimeter in any event given the groundwater influences</li> <li>○ Waterproofing, dewatering and pumps</li> <li>○ Ventilation and lighting and ongoing energy and mechanical costs</li> <li>○ Access ramps and more susceptible to climate change inundation</li> <li>○ Disruption to probably 150 spaces during the construction phase likely to take 1 year – where do you accommodate all of the displaced current users given the major impact on other carpark facilities that this would create and the added cost to shuttle from there if you do happen to find or need to build a facility.</li> <li>○ Additional whole of life costs</li> <li>○ Still need to carry out seawall and path works on McCarrs Creek Road and still left with a poor alignment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Frank Makin</b> <b>31 May &amp; 1 July (cont'd)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• With these major impediments/concerns the adopted PoM included the McCarrs Creek Road carpark given its advantages as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Least intrusive as it is positioned against the cliff with the option of above ground deck both of which do not impact on views of the water or create an overlooking problem for properties above</li><li>○ does not require displacement of up to 150 vehicles for up to a year for the construction phase and the added cost and inconvenience this creates</li><li>○ in conjunction with the roadworks provides a better road and pedestrian outcome</li><li>○ convenient location directly opposite the upgraded Commuter Wharf</li></ul></li></ul>
---	--	--

<p><b>David Naylor</b> <b>11 June 2013</b></p>	<p>This recommended alternative is a revised parallel parking scheme similar to the initially lodged CPF alternative.</p> <p>Submission lists the matters addressed in relation to the original alternative and presents this as a least infill least cost alternative</p>	<p>In reply, it is acknowledged that this parallel parking scheme will be less costly and involve the least infill however this alternative is not supported given that it has substantially less carpark yield, is more disruptive to build, has reduced flexibility and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Narrower aisle still restricts through access</li> <li>○ Parallel parking is a more difficult manoeuvre in particular for off side parking</li> <li>○ Parallel parking will require a pathway on both sides as it is unacceptable to alight from a vehicle into a dish drain on the cliff side – hence will need to add 1.2m for path</li> <li>○ Parallel parking is right up to the main pedestrian access point and concern about reversing vehicles on to that narrow gap</li> <li>○ Disabled spaces need to be within the carpark facility and these need larger dimensions - in a parallel configuration need longer length and width to access the rear and/or side of vehicle – hence need to remove say 2 spaces and make spaces much wider</li> <li>○ Any vehicle conflict at the Cargo Wharf is unacceptable – hence remove 3 to 4 spaces</li> <li>○ Proposed 12 spaces along the cliff side outside of the carpark cell are unacceptable – the whole concept of the separate and protected carpark cell is to provide added safety – hence remove 12 spaces</li> <li>○ The transition of the road at the Cargo Wharf and 16m turning eats into the useable cargo space and the realigned path through the middle is not practical – up to 6 end spaces will need to be removed to move turn further east</li> <li>○ The improvement at the sharp bend is minimal compared to Option 2. This results in less sight distance to turn into the carpark and less sight distance for pedestrians at Precinct 2 to cross at bus stops</li> <li>○ Entry to the carpark is closer to the bend</li> <li>○ Additional spaces along the Rostrevor Reserve is common for all options and are shown in the adopted PoM</li> <li>○ Cost advantage of a boulder seawall is not as significant given the added mass and dimensions involved and working with the tides</li> <li>○ This option will involve all work to be under direct traffic management and as such affect the construction activity - the \$3.2M suggested cost is probably low.</li> <li>○ This higher order traffic management also has a much greater impact on road user amenity with increased delays and over a longer period</li> <li>○ Suggested carpark yield of 51 is therefore unattainable and would likely reduce to 42 or less spaces with the above adjustments – this is at least a 30 % reduction on Option 2 and there is no scope for a deck for a further 60 cars – hence an overall reduction of 78 cars.</li> <li>○ A new seawall and infill is required for all options and this is the most costly and critical item - the greater carpark yield is a primary consideration along with additional flexibility</li> </ul>
--	--	--