

Church Point Working Group Report

Notes from the Church Point Working Group Meeting (7:30 to 9:30pm) on the 16th of July.

The meeting was attended by Judy Readman, Bill Gye, Jenny Cullen, Sharon Kinnison, David 'Hegarty', Hubert van Mierlo (for the first 30 minutes) and Iza Foster (via Skype). Broadly we discussed Demand Management; the Privately Leased Spaces; our Response to the letters recently received from BYCPRA and CPF; the content in the Application Form for a Church Point Parking Permit; and Fees

Some actions arising consist of several letters and meeting with some Councillors to seek their support and for them to put some motions (see below) at Council meetings.

Proposed letters to Council to request that:

- If the proposal for some privately leased spaces proceeds, that top priority is given to applicants who currently have a Church Point Parking Permit and park at Church Point rather than attracting additional parking demand from people who currently park elsewhere.
 - The option for online applications for CPPP is created and also that this option include the possibility of simply renewing your annual application without having to fill in all fields again.
 - Fees for the CPPP for non-residents be increase from their current level to \$1,000 (to be discussed at the SIRA Committee meeting).
 - Council includes in the current application request for information that will provide necessary information for the better future management of parking at Church Point.
- Suggested alterations to CP Permit Application Form

Please complete the following information to assist Council understand the needs of people purchasing Church Point Permits.

1. Are you:
 - i) a full-time offshore resident purchasing Permit for own use?
 - ii) a part-time offshore resident purchasing Permit for own use?
 - iii) an offshore resident purchasing Permit for use by another person?
 - iv) business?
 - v) other? please specify reason for purchasing CP Permit

2. What is the registration number of the car where this permit will be affixed?

At what address is this car registered?

3. Indicate the number of CP Permits bought by members of your household.

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th or subsequent |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|

If your household requires more than 2 permits, please explain the reason.

Response to letters from BVCPRA and CPF

- Agreed that we write an thank BVCPRA and CPF for their letters and that the matters they raise and that draft copies of these letters be sent to CPWG members before distribution

Demand Management (DM):

Background: The offshore communities were not given access to the initial DM consultant's brief, nor have we yet seen a draft of this DM report. Early unconfirmed indications are that this report may be making recommendations that will not assist but which may even further negatively affect offshore community users. It seems that the brief for this project has been interpreted as "how can you decrease overall demand for parking at Church Point for all users". Thus in the consultants initial (unpublished) report we once again have proposals for ferries & dispersion options (back to the 1990s).

If this is so we need to ensure that unacceptable recommendations are blocked and that the process for developing a helpful DM strategy are realigned with a more explicit guiding principle such as **"to maximise access for parking at Church Point for Offshore Community members to be able to access their homes in the evening..."** An optional addition to make this principle more palatable and equitable could be *"... while providing equity of access to Church Point parking for all users during daytime hours"*

To do this we need to find some supportive Councillor(s) who are prepared to submit one or more of the following motions at the appropriate time.

Motion: That the current demand management plan be reviewed and modified with the guiding principle for planning for demand management of parking at Church Point being to **maximise access for parking at Church Point for Offshore Community members to be able to access their homes in the evening, while providing equity of access to Church Point parking for all users during daytime hours.**

Argument for the motion: *"The additional parking infrastructure at Church Point is and has been controversial. A major reason for additional infrastructure is to support the offshore communities to be better able to access their homes. The offshore communities, together with support from Council and the NSW State are the major final contributors to this project. Following the construction of any additional infrastructure the outcome we must avoid is that after some period of time the offshore communities are no better off when they are needing to park their cars in the evenings, because additional evening and overnight demand for parking by non-local user is created by the additional capacity. "*

Fees:

Background: Given what the Pittwater GM said at our recent SIRA General Meeting (and as indicated before in a meeting with him and senior staff) it is highly likely that the fees that Council staff will be recommending to Council will be \$500. He also said that should the cost of the additional parking infrastructure "blow out" that Council would bear that risk. In effect he is saying that \$500 would be the maximum amount of the fees and that by implication that the fees are being set at this maximum \$500 as a pre-emptive way of Council managing its risk (i.e. not knowing what the final cost of construction is).

It is unlikely that it will be proposed that this fee increase begin in September 2015 due to the unpopularity of increasing fees before any new infrastructure is put in place. Thus the date for the first increase would be for the September 2016 fees. By the time the next fee payment (September 2017) the project will be complete.

In all previous documentation the **major factors** affecting the level of the CPPPs fees are:

1. The **cost of the construction** of the new infrastructure
2. The amount of the **contribution from Council** for works in this so-called Precinct 1 at Church Point
3. The amount of **accumulated funds** in the Church Point Reserve Cost Centre
4. The amount of ongoing **contribution from the Pay and Display and Parking fines**
5. The number of the higher priced **privately lease parking spaces**
6. The ongoing **contribution of the Church Point Commuter Boat fees**
7. The **length of the loan** needed to fund the residual amount
8. The **rate of the loan** needed to fund the residual amount

The major factors which are known to have changed since 2013 are the length of the loan and the rate of the loan given the receipt of the Local Infrastructure Renewal Scheme (LIRS) for this project.

Of course CPPP fee levels could be higher if Council chooses to do so for reasons additional to funding the cost of construction. Some of these possible reasons are:

- A. To **decrease** (i.e. offset financially) **the number** of required **privately leased spaces**
- B. As a means to **discourage and manage demand**
- C. To fund **other infrastructure improvements to Church Point**
- D. To compensate for a **particular community group receiving** a private benefit from a public asset
- E. As an additional **general income** source for Council
- F. To cover depreciation and thus accrue income for **future replacement**
- G. To fund (or contribute to) the **maintenance and management of facilities** at Church Point

With the possible exception of (i) and (vii) all of the above are unacceptable and an unfair impost upon those who live in the offshore communities

Strategic Steps:

We work with a select Councillor or group of Councillors to achieve the following:

1. We get explicit written agreement that the principle of transparency applies that in relation to the factors and information upon which of the setting of the amount of the fees for the CPPP. This could be couched in terms of maintaining a partnership with the offshore communities as a major financial contributor to this project.
2. We also seek agreement that:
 - a. **The purpose** of the Church Point Parking Permit fees **was and IS to contribute to the funding of the additional parking infrastructure at Church Point.**
 - b. Thus the purpose of the CPPP fees **IS NOT** to be used as a means discourage and manage demand; to fund other infrastructure improvements to Church Point; as an additional general income source for Council; to cover depreciation and thus accrue income for future replacement; nor as a payment to Council to compensate for a particular community group (i.e. the offshore communities) receiving a private benefit from a public asset

3. We then mount an argument and work with some chosen Councillors to argue against this fee increase for any of reason other than that necessary to fund the construction.
4. If we win good; or if end up with a compromise (e.g. \$400), then this may be better than nothing. If we don't win or only get a compromise outcome then we ensure that a motion has gone through that the fees be reviewed in early 2017 once the project is complete and all income and cost variables are then known.
5. If Council still insists upon higher fees then we could, following extensive consultation with our communities, being willing to accept this for one or both of the following reasons.
 - a. If the reason is primarily as a consequence of not including the contribution of Pay and Display funds for servicing the loan for the new infrastructure (\$140K per annum). The value for us being that this greatly strengthens our argument for exclusivity for those with CPPP (and the privately leased spaces) in the new infrastructure
 - b. To decrease the need for the number of privately leased spaces. The value for us being that while the general fees would be higher there would be more spaces generally available.

Recommendations in relation to Fees:

That SIRA seek the support of WPCA so that the Offshore Community Associations with the further support of the majority of Pittwater Councillors seek to ensure that:

1. The purpose of the Church Point Parking Permit fees is solely to contribute to the funding of the additional parking infrastructure at Church Point (with the possible exception of making a contribution to the ongoing maintenance of the new infrastructure).
2. If it is insisted that the reason for higher than previously advertised fees is to decrease the need for the number of privately leased spaces, then the offshore communities survey their communities to determine the degree of support for this proposal.
3. Council confirms the principle of transparency and partnership with the offshore communities in relation to present and future negotiations regarding the setting of the amount of the CPPP fees