

Items raised by SIRA and WPCA at Council Meeting 29 October 2016

The numbers and overview

There are a number of positive components to the Demand Management Proposal, but there are several shortcomings which is why we speak against it. I want to focus on broad numbers, to set the scene and leave it to others to speak on specifics.

In 1979 there was a full adequate solution, based on a 30-year projection on parking needs that Warringah Council developed, but which it chose not to implement.

Their numbers were right on: 550 building blocks in the offshore communities; 1.3 vehicles per household; they projected forward a need for 750 spaces and they proposed a plan that catered for that plus spaces for visitors and other users.

So what do we have. Looking at the whole of the Church Point including the local streets the number **of spaces where an Offshore Resident can arrive home on Friday night and park and leave their cars over the weekend** in 1980 was 570, now it is about 460 (and thereby hangs another sad tale of failure).

So going forward and bravely assuming that all 120 spaces in the new carpark are used by offshore residents (which is a stretch as it assumes that we take up all the leased spaces) and then also assuming that all the proposals as they are now stated in current DM Proposal are implemented, then optimistically the number of spaces where those with a CPPP could park and leave their cars over the weekend is actually reduced from 460 to approx. 420 (i.e. a net loss of 40 spaces at a cost of about \$10M), which is why we are a little concerned.

While we know that over the years some good people in Council and in the onshore communities have struggled to understand our point of view, I believe we have largely failed to be able to really communicate the difficulties and frustrations of not being able to find a parking space at Church Point after a busy day to access your home.

What is needed is for the leadership in Council to grasp the moral vision to see the priority of the need of people to be able to access your home. Only once that is taken care of then by all means cater for visitors, local business, etc.

Sure people need to eat at cafes, have guests, visit friends and go on Ferry rides, but if all the Proposals in front of us now are implemented on Friday night we will have to walk a minimum of 1.2 Km from Bakers Road, or further just to get to Church Point. These and other places is where we will have to go as our vehicles do not just disappear in a puff of smoke if we can't park at Church Point.

Resident Parking Scheme

- I believe that this current Demand Management Proposal is deficient in that it does not include a proposal to investigate a **Resident Parking Scheme (RPS)**. No RPSs existed anywhere in the previous Pittwater Council, but they do within the bounds of the new Northern Beaches Council such as is the case for those Manly for residents who have no off-street parking.
- At the Pittwater Council meeting on 16 December 2013, Council resolved that “a report be presented on transport options, including a **resident parking scheme**, availability of parking stickers and other mechanisms to manage parking demand at Church Point.” It was this Pittwater Council resolution that originally raised the prospect and the hopes of the offshore communities regarding a RPS.
- On page 97 of the **Pittwater Council Demand Management Report** that was then presented to Council in December 2015, it states in regard to an RPS that “offshore residents satisfy these requirements as they have no off-street parking.”
- Page 12 of the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) Guideline for Parking Permits (Version 3.3), Section 9.4 Resident Parking Permits, clearly outlines the eligibility criteria that must be met. The offshore communities meet all 5 of these criteria.
- The benefit of the formal adoption of such a scheme by Council is that would more clearly legitimates the usage for parking purposes that Offshore residents make of this area as they have no alternative off-street parking available and this area is the closest area they can park to access their homes.
- The approval of such a scheme would better support future planning and provide an understanding for all current and future stakeholders of the status of Offshore residents in relation to parking in this area.

Main Carparking Area

The Proposal for 52 non-CPPP exempt Spaces in the main carpark

- The offshore communities are very opposed and indeed shocked by the new proposal for 52 Spaces (Row 4 – the roadside Row in the Main Carpark) to become Pay and Display with no CPPP exemption between 9.30am Friday to 7pm Sunday and on Public Holidays.
- The weekend is our peak demand. Most working people come home on Friday night and don't work on the weekend or expect to go back onshore until Monday morning. This proposal would alienate 25% of the main carpark from such usage.
- In one stroke this undoes years of discussion and agreement. It almost makes the building of the new carpark pointless with its 56 new spaces (not counting the leased spaces).
- This removes a right we have had for over 50 years (since the main carparking area was created) to be able to park here to access our homes and a right which has existed for as long as the offshore communities themselves have been in existence.
- The foundations of the implicit agreement that the Offshore communities entered into with Council in forming the Church Point Plan of Management to help jointly fund this project are being thrown out the window.
- It may have been mistakenly thought that the proposal for 6pm to 6am exclusivity for CPPP would compensate for this. But that presumption is not based on fact. By midnight there are only a few non-CPPP vehicles parked in the main carpark. The fact is we need the whole carpark and often the back streets (particularly in summer time) to be able park to access our homes. The construction of the new carpark may help alleviate the stress on the back streets, but with the proposal loss of these 52 spaces that advantage would be completely knocked out.

Local Resident Priority Overnight Parking in the Main Carpark:

- The combined onshore and offshore associations have for several years jointly supported the creation of spaces in the main carpark which are “No Parking 6:00pm to 6:00am – CPPP Exempt”. Our previously expressed preference was for this to cover 100% of the main carpark, but if it is the case that in order to remove the dreadful proposal for the 52 spaces in Row 4 where those with a CPPP cannot park over the weekend then somewhat reluctantly we will support 50% in the main carpark
- On the other hand in new carparking area the current Council Proposal is for 50% of all the remaining non-disabled and non-leased spaces (i.e. 28 spaces in the Council Proposal) in the new carpark to be “No Parking 6:00pm to 6:00am – CPPP Exempt”. We are happy to share this spaces during the day with other Pay and Display users of Church Point, but as the major financier of the project we need to have 100% of the non-disabled, non-leased spaces to be “No Parking 6:00pm to 6:00am – CPPP Exempt”.

Two sub-points about the main carpark

1. Special access for local Onshore residents

- The current Demand Management Proposal does not include a proposal for a **Special Permit** for all residents in postcode 2105 that allows holding this Permit to park for free during the day (6:00am to 6:00pm – Mon to Fri) in the main carpark.
- This proposal was first put to Council in 2014 in a joint onshore and offshore association letter. Its rationale is that local onshore residents had lost their traditional ability to park in the main carpark unless they purchase a CPPP or Pay and Display.

2. The proposed 11 additional 4P 9:30 am to 7pm (with no CPPP exemption)

- We **do not support the proposal** in the main carpark to **expand the current number** of parking spaces which are **4P 9:30 am to 7pm (with no CPPP exemption)** from the current 9 spaces to a proposed 20 spaces. This expansion is proposed for Stage 2 of this project.
- It is our observation over the past few years that these spaces provide very little benefit for anyone and are more unnecessary signage.
- The irritating thing about these current 9 spaces is that if you have a CPPP and park there overnight you have to make sure you move your vehicle by 9:30 the next morning, or else you will get a fine. But when a vehicle with a CPPP moves out of one of these spaces in the morning at 9:30 am it provides very little benefit to vehicles without a CPPP because there are always plenty of spaces available for Pay and Display in the main carpark in the morning and during the daytime except on weekends.
- On the other hand at end of the day during weekdays before 7pm these spaces are often empty as there is no demand for Pay and Display at that time, but as no one with a CPPP can park there they remain vacant until 7pm. For those with CPPP every space is precious so we certainly do not support an increase in these spaces whose positive value is questionable but whose irritating value is high.

Local Streets

After much internal debate which is the Offshore Communities will support Council's proposals with one major caveat and one minor caveat.

Major Caveat: The proposed 4P spaces become **4P 6:00am to 6:00pm Mon-Fri**. This will still remove all warehousing. The added benefit for local residents is that it will allow parking for guests staying over the weekend. The benefit for Offshore residents is that it will allow weekend parking from Friday night and not require a special trip to the mainland on Saturday morning to move a vehicle.

Minor Caveat: While we understand that efforts have been made to reduce to a minimum the number of spaces that need to be removed for safety reasons, we (and I am sure some local residents in these streets) would like an opportunity to discuss the details of some of the proposals with appropriate Council staff as in a few cases we do not understand the reasons or necessity for their proposed removal.

Who can purchase Church Point Permits

The current Demand Management Proposal is lacking in that it does not include any discussion of who can purchase a Church Point Parking Permits. This is and should be a key aspect of Demand Management:

In this regard, we a set of have our preferences

1. **Our 1st Preference:** If the CPPP is in fact a type of Resident Parking Scheme then **only offshore residents who have no off-street parking options should be able to purchase one.**
2. **If that is not possible then our second preference is to** expand the above to include residents from postcode 2105 being able to purchase CPPPs.
3. **If the second preference is not possible then our third preference is to ensure that if CPPP are** offered for purchase to non-local residents or businesses then they should be at least 2.5 x more expensive (e.g. if the fee is \$500 should be \$1,250). This is because once the new carpark is build and if further developments happen at Church Point it will be all to easy for a local business to choose to buy a number of these in bulk at what to them is quite a cheap rate.

Lease Spaces

There is a very important Demand Management strategy that is missing in the current proposal regarding the Leased Spaces in the new carpark. After Expressions of Interest for such spaces are sought, priority should go to those who currently park at Church Point with a CPPP. Without this consideration the serious risk is that we will simply attract a migration of vehicles from other Marinas, or bulk purchasing of these leased spaces by new entrants to Church Point, etc...

Secondly we must do everything we can to reduce the number of these leased spaces:

While they may be a financial necessity in the short term they are an inequity and privatisation that we should minimise as much as and as soon as possible.

Indeed, we can imagine that there will be times when these leased spaces will be empty. For those driving around looking for a space with such leased spaces are empty will be more than a bit painful and even a bit divisive.

The current proposal speaks of 60 leased number of leased spaces. In Council's own financial plan for this project the number is 50. The financial plan for this project made several conservative assumptions (e.g. that there would be a decrease in the number of CPPPs sold in 2017 for 550 to 450). If 50 is in the Plan which already assumed a significant contingency overrun, then the number should be 50, making more available for general usage.

The final R&E (Revenue and Expenditure) for this project should be transparent and public. If indeed and cost saving are made (e.g. through a lower than anticipated Interest Rate on the loan) then these saving should be passed on in the form of fewer leased spaces.

This is a broader and more complex topic and we would like an opportunity to discuss it further with appropriate Council staff as we have spent much time thinking about and surveying our community about this matter.