



To the General Manager

Attach: Nil

---

**SUBJECT:** (4.10) Resident Parking Area 2 – Kirribilli – Parking Restrictions – 6 Month Review

**AUTHOR:** Report of Traffic & Transport Engineer, Nathan Wu

**DESCRIPTION/SUBJECT MATTER:**

At the North Sydney Traffic Committee meeting held on 18 October 2019, the Traffic Committee considered the survey results of a community consultation for Resident Parking Area 2 - Kirribilli. At the meeting, the following recommendations were made and subsequently adopted by Council:

1. **THAT** Council adopt the attached parking restriction recommendations for Parking Area 2.
2. **THAT** Council notify the residents before installing the parking restriction changes in Parking Area 2.
3. **THAT** the new parking restrictions be reviewed six (6) months after the date of installation in Parking Area 2.

The new signage installation in High Street, Hipwood Street and Bradly Avenue were completed on 27 March 2020 and the new meter installation in Bradly Avenue was completed on 17 June 2020. Therefore, the new signage is now due for the 6-month review.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **THAT** the parking restrictions installed in Resident Parking Area 2 - Kirribilli that were completed on 17 June 2020 remain.

## CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with Council's Community Engagement Protocol

**Relates to ECM No:** N/A

**Standard or Guideline Used:** AS2890.5; AS1742.11; NSC Resident Parking Permit Policy

**Signs & Lines Priority:** 2

**Precinct and Ward:** Anderson and Milsons Precinct, Victoria and Wollstonecraft Wards

**Impact on Bicycles:** Nil

**Impact on Pedestrians:** Nil

**Impact on Parking:** No further changes are proposed to the current parking restrictions

## DETAIL

At the North Sydney Traffic Committee meeting held on 18 October 2019, the Traffic Committee considered the survey results of a community consultation for Resident Parking Area 2 - Kirribilli. At the meeting, the following recommendations were made and subsequently adopted by Council:

- 1. THAT Council adopt the attached parking restriction recommendations for Parking Area 2.*
- 2. THAT Council notify the residents before installing the parking restriction changes in Parking Area 2.*
- 3. THAT the new parking restrictions be reviewed six (6) months after the date of installation in Parking Area 2.*

The new signage installation in High Street, Hipwood Street and Bradley Avenue were completed on 27 March 2020 and the new meter installation in Bradley Avenue was completed on 17 June 2020. Therefore, the new signage is now due for the 6-month review.

On 20 March 2020 Council sent a notice to all the affected residents and Milson Precinct regarding the changes to the parking arrangements in Resident Parking Area 2.

Subsequently, Council received one submission from a resident in Hipwood Street who requested the parking restriction be relocated further away from their property boundary; one submission from a resident in High Street opposing to the 2 Hour Parking restrictions in High Street; and four submissions from property owners opposing to the meter installation in Bradley Avenue.

After the implementation of the parking changes, Council received one compliment from a resident in McDougall Street with regard to the addition of angle parking spaces in McDougall Street between Clark Road and the cul-de-Sac and one submission from Kirribilli Marina (1 Bradley Avenue) opposing to the meter installation in Bradley Avenue.

A numerical summary of submissions received is produced in Table 1.

<b>Street name</b>	<b>Support Changes/Compliment</b>	<b>Objections/Concerns</b>
Hipwood Street	-	1
High Street	-	1
Bradly Avenue	-	4
McDougall Street	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>

Table.1 summary of submissions received

## Submissions received prior to the implementation of parking changes in area 2

### Hipwood Street

- The situation is that my daughter is a professional 'gigging' musician who also supports the community by playing with orchestras like North Sydney Orchestra, NSW Youth Orchestra, Shore School, James Milson and Kirribilli Neighbourhood Centre. She plays the harp which weighs about 40 kg and she needs to transport it from our building to the motor vehicle, and after the gig, back inside the building. I often help her with this exercise since it really is a two-person job to move the instrument, chair, music stand, etc.

Whenever we know there is an occasion to move the harp, which could be as many as three or four times a week, we keep an eye out the window for an opportunity to locate our harp-moving vehicle, registered with council permit (BNI74R), to what we call "the harp-moving spot", which is the stretch of the road closest to the driveway between Nos. 26 and 28. This spot is better than other positions on Hipwood St because it is the only level part of the road on an otherwise steep hill, and there is no possible obstruction from another parked car when heaving the harp into the rear of our car, ready for transport. The action requires a metre of space behind our SUV. The manoeuvre is repeated on unloading after returning home after the performance.

Council's proposal to allocate two 4-hour parking spots near the border of Nos 28 and 32 Hipwood Street will remove the likelihood that the "harp-moving spot" is vacant for loading and unloading of the instrument.

The potential for harm to my daughter is that the action of heaving and twisting to manhandle the instrument into the car is more fraught on an incline, which affects most of Hipwood Street, but not the two spots which Council appears to have dedicated for a new 4-hour restriction. The risk of injury is significantly greater because the physical exertion of balancing a harp, which is by nature unbalanced, is more difficult on an inclined surface.

I respectfully request that Council maintains the existing parking restrictions or considers alternatives such as allocating the two 4-hour spaces elsewhere in Hipwood Street, or allocating a Loading Zone.

## High Street

- I am a North Sydney resident who lives on High St and recently received a notice of the Area 2 parking restriction changes.

I strongly object to the changes on the northern side of High St between Clark Rd and Hipwood St, as well as the southern side, outside 171 High St to be changed to a 2 hour zone. There is already an extreme lack of all-day parking options during the week and limiting these even more is unfair to residents who have two occupants living in an apartment with only one parking space. I've been told previously I cannot get a parking permit for North Sydney because we have a garage which I feel is particularly unfair to residents who have two cars (which I think is reasonable for a two-person household. The person living with me is a flatmate, not my partner).

I agree with increasing the parking limit from 2 hours to 4 hours in Hipwood St and don't have any issues with the other proposed changes.

I know I am only one resident but it would be greatly appreciated if you could consider my request seriously. I have been living at this residence for 9 years and parking is already so hard to come by for long term residents.

## Bradly Avenue

- I am writing to formally object to the proposed parking changes along Bradly Ave, Kirribilli.

We have received notification that Bradly Ave will become 1P metered parking along the whole length of the street. I strongly object to these changes as it is an unreasonable solution to the problem, it was based upon unreliable survey results and it will significantly reduce the value of the properties and rental value on the street.

My objections are based on the following reasons:

### **1. It is an unreasonable solution to the parking problem.**

The existing signage is insufficient and misleading information is likely the reason for the parking breaches. One overarching sign at the corner of Hipwood St and Bradly Ave, is not sufficient to control the 180m stretch of road. Not only is it located approximately 40m from the first parking spot on Bradly Ave, it is on a corner of a highly pedestrian trafficked intersection. If you were to miss this sign at the busy intersection you would not encounter another sign along the stretch of the road and understandably assume that the whole street is unrestricted. The parking issue could be easily and cheaply mitigated by increasing 1P signage down the entire length of Bradly Ave with anti-theft brackets to stop the signs being removed.

### **2. Unfairly penalising guests of Bradly St residents**

Guests who have previously legally parked within the 1 hour time limit will now be charged to do so.

### **3. It is a residential street and parking issues are seasonal**

It is a dead end residential street to service the 7 buildings along Bradly Ave and visitors to the park. It is not in the city or even on the main roads of Kirribilli that would warrant metered parking. Parking issues only really arise during the Jacaranda season when visitors come to enjoy the park. An increased ranger presence during this time would sufficiently mitigate the issue.

### **4. Increase ranger patrols**

Owners on Bradly Ave pay rates for services including ranger patrols which are not regularly done in this area. Cars regularly occupy spots for days without receiving a single ticket. Increased presence in this area would increase awareness of the parking restrictions. Quite frankly, the introductions of these meters seems purely like a revenue raising activity, whilst reducing the need to employ Council rangers to actually patrol the streets.

### **5. The 3 Bradly Street respondents were not owners**

After speaking with Council's representative and reviewing the survey data, it appears that only 3 people on Bradly Ave voted, all of which did not classify themselves as owners of the buildings. I later discussed this with other owners of the within my block who do not live in the properties, and they advised they were not aware of these changes. Firstly, there seems to be a breakdown in the distribution of information to owners who do not live in the subject properties. Secondly, it is extremely unfair that the opinions of renters who are likely transient and have only a minor financial interest in the changes govern the future sale and rental prices for the properties.

### **6. 5. 85% of the respondents did not vote for metered parking**

85% of the respondents did not vote for metered parking, and of the survey respondents who had an opinion on the metered parking, 70% of the respondents voted against metered parking. Despite them being Bradly Street residents or not, the nature of parking within Area 2 is shared between streets as parking is scarce and vehicular movements are regular. The 70% of respondents who have voted no have not been heard purely based on their address. It should also be noted that 5 "no votes" belonged to residents of Hipwood Street and the main frontage of 1 Hipwood Street fronts Bradly Ave.

As a resident and owner of 4 Bradly Ave, Kirribilli and a former Council Civil Engineer and Traffic Engineer, I strongly object to the installation of these meters for the aforementioned reasons and believe the parking issue can be easily and cheaply mitigated with a more reasonable and less drastic solution.

- As an owner of an apartment 4/4 Bradley Ave, I am totally opposed to the setup of those meters and moreover the process by which it seems the decision was made to instal them.

We were not consulted.

Please endure my objection is lodged and the appropriate decision makers review the installation of these meters!

I am reliably informed that there only three respondents from Bradley Ave and none were property owners.

Moreover, neither I nor my fellow owners of no 4 Bradley were approached on this subject.

This looks like another heavy handed edict from a council that seems to have little respect for the property owners of your domain.

I strongly object to the installation of those meters.

I trust that taking the issue to the press to present yet another controversial decision is not the only remedy to reason here.

- I am drawing to your attention a situation that has developed and action that appears to be proceeding with little or no justification, at significant cost and with no defined benefit.

My initial telephone conversation on this matter with a council officer, Nathan Wu, indicated the installation of meters would be proceeding no matter what. This prompted me to send the following email of 19th May to Mr Wu's superior as:

Traffic Department: Attention M. Kemp

It has been brought to my attention that at the Traffic Committee meeting in October 2019 the decision was made to install parking meters in Bradly Avenue. this was based on interpretation of a survey conducted earlier in the year citing the only three respondents from Bradly Avenue. It is unclear whether these "resident" responders were owners, hence ratepayers, or tenants. The survey did not support installation of meters in any other part of Area 2.

1. I do not recall receiving a copy of the survey form on which the decision has been based and I certainly was not notified of the decision itself.
2. The response to the survey should be based on the views of the owner ratepayers and not potentially determined by tenants who are transient.
3. I see no advantage to meters over the current arrangement except in terms of income for the council at a charge of \$3.30/hr. it do not see how it will alleviate the parking situation in the street in any significant way.
4. Council should give favourable consideration to applications for renovations to create off street parking on Bradly Avenue.

In discussion with Nathan Wu it amazed me that he believed the installation of the meters, currently postponed due to Covid 19 issues, would go ahead regardless of any objections and that a survey would be conducted 3 months after installation to assess the benefit of the meters. This would appear to be a rather cavalier approach to expenditure of ratepayers money.

I believe you will shortly be receiving other objections from owners of 4 Bradly Avenue which would negate the 3 survey votes on which the decision was made.

## **Submissions received after the implementation of parking changes in Area 2**

### **McDougall Street**

- Thanks very much for the below. The parking changes were made and all the residents seem very happy with the new set up and the access to additional spots.

Thanks for listening to the community - and while it has taken about 5 years to affect this change, it's finally happened.

## **Bradly Avenue**

- Parking meters were recently installed in Bradly Avenue Kirribilli with a 1 hour limit. We are the owners of 1 Bradly Avenue Kirribilli, known as Kirribilli Marina. This is a commercial enterprise with a complex of 23 tenancies plus 15 berths.

We have 15 car spaces within the complex so it is always a juggling exercise as to what tenants the car spaces can be allocated to.

The tenants who are without car spaces prior to the changes had an opportunity of parking in Bradly Avenue for periods of time. Now with this 1 hour restriction it does not give them any flexibility.

Since the parking meters were installed that most of the day and everyday there are very few people parking in Bradly Avenue.

Please see photos attached taken on Friday the 17th July 2020, which clearly shows the deserted street.

I was also down at the Marina on Sunday the 19th July 2020, attending to the public gardens and although Milson Park was well used by picnickers and the like, there again there was no one parking in Bradly Avenue. I meant to take a photo before I left at 3pm but I forgot to.

I also observed a lot of people being dropped off at the park by possibly a member of the family.

I believe North Sydney Council are endeavouring to encourage community to live, shop, and support the local facilities. This is indeed a disincentive and inconvenience to your local community who are also your ratepayers.

In regard to our Marina, we have been a small family company operating this Marina for the past 40 years. We do pay commercial rates with little or no impact to North Sydney Council. We were wondering whether or not it would be possible to supply us with at least 1 visitor's pass for tenants who may have clients visiting their premises.

The previous system seemed to work for all concerned and we were wondering if the North Sydney Council can revert back to how it was and admit they were wrong.

I have heard so many people comment that they do not visit North Sydney Council because of the parking situation.

The parking fines should never be considered a revenue getter for the Council which obviously it has become at the cost of your constituents.

## **Discussion**

The objection regarding the location of the 4 Hour Parking sign in Hipwood Street has been resolved by installing the signs further north from the property boundary of 28 and 32 Hipwood Street while maintaining the same number of parking spaces. No further submission has been received since the installation of the signage.

The submission regarding High Street was concerning the conversion of the three (3) unrestricted parking spaces on the northern side of High Street between Clark Road and Hipwood Street and outside 171 High Street to '2 Hour Parking 8.30am-6pm Mon-Fri Permit Holders'. The section of High Street between Clark Road and Hipwood Street had an occupancy rate of 100% and the section outside 171 High Street had an occupancy rate 89% prior to the installation of 2 Hour Parking. The conversion of unrestricted parking to restricted parking is expected to increase parking turnover and reduce the occupancy rate. Council generally aims an occupancy rate of 85%. Therefore, it is recommended that the new parking restriction remains.

A parking occupancy of 62 % was recorded in Bradly Avenue on 5 November 2020 compared to the occupancy rate of 46% on 10 September 2018. This reveals that the occupancy rate has increased by 16% which shows more usage of parking in Bradly Avenue. Majority of the submissions concerning the meter installation in Bradly Avenue were from non-resident owners from 4 Bradly Avenue. No further submission was received to date from any other residents in the area except Kirribilli Marina.

It should also be noted that the initial survey was sent to both owners and occupiers for all properties within parking Area 2.

The parking restrictions in Area 2 generally reflect the feedback from the resident parking survey, and occupancy rates are below Council's maximum target of 85%. Therefore, it is recommended that the new parking restrictions remain.