

## Church Point Sub-Committee Report

June 2014



### Church Point Sub-Committee (CPSC) Meeting June 23

**Present:** Bill Gye, Judy Readman, Jenny Frazer, Adrian Matthews, Hubert van Mierlo, Jenny Cullen

**Apologies:** Shar Jones, Sharon Kinnison and David Hegarty

- The CPSC again discussed running a survey of all SIRA members to seek Demand Management ideas and suggestions and to gauge the level of support for some of the currently proposed options. Decision deferred pending further discussion.
- Questions were framed for upcoming meeting with Council General Manager.

**Meeting with Council, June 25, 7.30am:** General Manager Mark Ferguson and Chris Hunt met with Bill Gye, Judy Readman and Michael Weiner (WPCA) President. Answers to questions raised at that meeting were:

- a. There is no decision on the LURS funding low interest rate loan) expected in July or August. Mark and Chris still unsure of the probability of success.
- b. The LUR loan will be at an interest rate of approx. 2.5% per annum (in contrast to normal rate of about 7%), but is only for 10 years. This will mean that fees will probably be considerably higher than the indicative fees of \$300 communicated by Council during the recent consultation process, as those figures were all based upon a 20 year loan scenario.
- c. The tender when it comes out will be a "fixed price" contract. Chris Hunt was of the view that there was a relatively low probability of cost blowout, but that you "can never give a 100% guarantee".
- d. The Review of Environmental Factors is almost complete. The environmental division of Hyder Consulting have been engaged in this process as they know the job and the area well.
- e. The preparation for the Traffic and Demand Management Report has begun. It is being outsourced to an independent company (name unknown). It was agreed that the community will have input. There is no thought yet regarding the format for consultation, a workshop was suggested. In the meantime Council will always appreciate community suggestions now. Council said we would get a copy of the brief when it is complete.
- f. Council has the power to determine the car park conditions and signage at Church Point.
- g. Discussed the need for greater compliance checking in the car park at night and at the commuter wharf and said that this was needed. This was noted.
- h. We can have input in the form that people complete when applying for a Church Point Parking Permit, so that it is possible to collect more accurate demographic data about who is buying CP Parking Permits.

- i. The discussion we had about fees will be discussed at the full SIRA Committee meeting on Sunday the 29<sup>th</sup>.

**Church Point Friends:** A document was received on Thursday from CPF (see attached). On first quick review, my view is that it has some merit and will be discussed at our next CPSC meeting. My initial comments are:

- a. It supports the notion of there being CP Permit Only Parking in several areas at CP between the hours of 6pm and 6am. We have previously discussed this and it would be good to receive a clear community mandate.
- b. Some of the analysis is based upon ABS figures. My concern is that the ABS always qualify the accuracy of their own census figures at the level of small local community (i.e. they are usually understated). While some averages may be reliable (e.g. average number of cars per household) exact population figures are not reliable.
- c. The count of the number of vehicles in the main carpark with CP Permits of 264, was spookily identical to the figure found by those SIRA Committee members who did the count at 4am last year (i.e. 264)! Beyond that there are some differences, which need further investigation.

Main Car Park Area	SIRA 4am count in May 2013	CDF evening counts 2014
Total parked cars	283	295
With CP Permits	264	264
With Pay and Display	-	14
With Neither	10	17
In 4 hour or Disabled Parking space (with no CP Sticker)	9	-

- d. The total number of spaces in the main carpark when it is fully parked out does need to be re-checked as the figures of 283 has been verified twice by SIRA Committee members. Given that there is no parking bay marking it is possible that there may be up to 295, as that is only a 4% variability.
- e. We also have discussed the possibility of “Differential pricing for first and subsequent CP Permits” (Recommendation 4). We would clearly need to seek a community mandate for this as there are some equity issues for families, if it is done as cars per household (e.g. the kids still living and going to work from home).
- f. There are other suggestions worth considering, albeit the underlying suggestion that implementing the suggested measures as an alternative to implementing the full Council decision (i.e. deck option) is the central controversial claim. At this time, given the community mandate we have at present, our view has been that these demand management measures are clearly required in addition to the additional infrastructure.

**Bill Gye**