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|  |
| --- |
| TS09.20 Western Metropolitan Regional Council (WMRC) Funding Request |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee** | 12 May 2020 |
| **Council** | 26 May 2020 |
| **Applicant** | City of Nedlands |
| **Employee Disclosure under *section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995*** | Nil |
| **Director** | Jim Duff – Director Technical Services |
| **Attachments** | 1. Letter from WMRC dated 28 November 2019 2. Comparative Schedule of Gate Fees |
| **Confidential Attachments** | Nil |

**Executive Summary**

In November 2019, the City received correspondence from the Western Metropolitan Regional Council (WMRC) seeking a contribution from the City of Nedlands towards services that the WMRC was providing to City residents and ratepayers (refer Attachment 1).

It is acknowledged that a number of Nedlands residents may use the WMRC facilities in addition to the extensive range of waste services provided by the City. Administration is of the view that WMRC’s services are supplementary to the City’s waste services, and as such, would not recommend in favor of providing any further funding contributions to WMRC. Furthermore, any suggestion of increase to fees or charges under the current economic environment is difficult to justify, given the flow-on effects of the Covid-19 global pandemic.

**Recommendation to Committee**

**Council accept the user pays principle proposed by Western Metropolitan Regional Council, in preference to applying a Waste Services Charge for City of Nedlands residents as shown in Attachment 2.**

**Discussion/Overview**

The City of Nedlands is not a member of the WMRC or any other Regional Council, and the City conducts its own waste management including collection, disposal and community education. In November 2019, the City received a request from the WMRC seeking a funding contribution based on services that the Regional Council provides for the City’s residents and ratepayers (refer Attachment 1). The services include receipt of Household Hazardous Waste (HHW), e-waste, mattresses and other recyclables and recycling promotion and education.

The WMRC at the JFR (Jim) McGeough Resource Recovery Facility (JMcGRRF), located on the corner of Brockway Road and Lemnos Street, is registered with the State Government as a receiver of HHW. The HHW Program funds the collection and recycling/disposal of hazardous materials from residential sources. Material from commercial and industrial premises are excluded. The HHW Program is funded by the Waste Authority through the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Levy.

Householders can go to any of the HHW permanent facilities including the JMcGRRF and drop off any of the following products:

* Acids (note: some permanent facilities do not accept hydrofluoric acid)
* Aerosols (CFC-based, paints, lacquers, pesticides etc.)
* Alkalis
* Batteries (household)
* Compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) and fluorescent tubes
* Cyanides
* Engine coolants and glycols
* Fire extinguishers (non-halon only)
* Flammable liquids (e.g. hydrocarbons and fuels)
* Flammable solids
* Flares
* Gas cylinders
* General household chemicals (e.g. cleaning products)
* Heavy metal compounds
* Inorganic oxidising agents (e.g. pool chlorine)
* Low level radioactive substances (smoke detectors)
* Mercury (e.g. thermometers)
* Organic peroxides
* Paint
* PCB materials
* Pesticides (including Schedule X pesticides)
* Solvents

The City of Nedlands operates its own e-waste, mattress collection and recycling programs. Since 2013, the City continues to sell and promote WMRC’s tip passes (hard and green waste) to its residents on behalf of WMRC. The cost of the tip passes is covered by direct charge to residents. Once this pass has been used at the transfer station, WMRC invoices the City. This process is a cost recovery arrangement which has no financial benefit to the City.

The City also utilises the JMcGRRF to dispose of operational green waste (tree loppings and parks waste), and the City is charged non-member commercial rates for this disposal. The rates are 37 percent higher than the equivalent SUEZ rate, but remain cost effective due to the proximity of the WMRC facility.

The Administration does not support the collection of WMRC mulch by City of Nedlands residents given WMRC’s mulch has not been certified to comply with Australian Standards and consequently, the risk to health and the environment is unknown.

The WMRC advises that City of Nedlands’ residents and ratepayers are utilising the JMcGRRF on a regular basis. If this is the case, then City Administration would suggest the individuals should be charged an appropriate gate fee for the service (excluding HHW) which is similar to the operations at other Local Government’s transfer stations and tip sites (refer Attachment 2).

In consideration of the above, the Administration believes that the City should not contribute any additional funding to WMRC. Please note the City declined a similar request from WMRC in 2016, and Council declined a second similar request in December 2018.

**Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions:**

Ordinary Meeting of Council 18 December 2018, Item TS29.18

Council Resolution:

*“That Council does not support the Western Metropolitan Regional Council’s request for a contribution to Resource Recovery and Waste Education services.”*

**Consultation**

Nil

**Strategic Implications**

**How well does it fit with our strategic direction?**

Declining the request does not impact the City achieving its objectives outlined in the City of Nedlands Waste Minimisation Strategy 2017-2020.

**Who benefits?**

Declining the request does not introduce an inequitable distribution of benefits in the community.

**Does it involve a tolerable risk?**

Risk to the City in declining the request is low.

**Do we have the information we need?**

Yes.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

Nil

**Can we afford it?**

No.

**How does the option impact upon rates?**

If the WMRC funding request was supported, $65,712 funding, including any agreed annual price variance mechanism will be added to the City’s annual waste budget.

|  |
| --- |
| TS10.20 Bishop Road Reserve Enviro-scape Master Plan |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee** | 12 May 2020 |
| **Council** | 26 May 2020 |
| **Applicant** | City of Nedlands |
| **Employee Disclosure under *section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995*** | Nil. |
| **Director** | Jim Duff – Director Technical Services |
| **Attachments** | 1. Bishop Road Reserve Enviro-scape Master Plan |
| **Confidential Attachments** | Nil. |

**Executive Summary**

This report is being presented to Council to seek endorsement of the Bishop Road Reserve Enviro-scape Master Plan (BRREMP). A final concept plan for the reserve has been produced following briefing of elected members and conclusion of community engagement activities.

**Recommendation to Committee**

**Council endorse the Bishop Road Reserve Enviro-scape Master Plan concept plan.**

**Discussion/Overview**

**Background**

The City commenced the process of master planning for Bishop Road Reserve following endorsement of the five (5) year Capital Works Program (CWP) and adoption of the 2018/19 annual budget. The (5) year CWP identified funding in the 2018/19 financial year to upgrade the in-ground reticulation system.

One of the primary considerations of the BRREMP is the need to consider preservation of the City’s parks and reserve assets in an environment of changing rainfall patterns and reduced groundwater accessibility for irrigating public open space.

The BRREMP plans for a 30-year time horizon, linked to the useful life of the proposed new reticulation system, which is a key infrastructure component of the reserve.

**Objective**

The objective of the strategic master planning process was to identify constraints and opportunities to ensure future development within the reserve is coordinated, fit for purpose and meets the needs of current and future users at an affordable whole-of life cost. The BRREMP is intended to inform and improve decision making processes including asset management, forward works planning, budgeting and service delivery. The BRREMP is intended to provide solutions to preserve the character of the reserve while planning for the imminent reduction of the City’s groundwater licence allocation.

**Strategic Considerations**

The BRREMP has been developed with consideration of the statutory constraints associated with development and management of reserves abutting the river. Listed below is an overview of some of the key strategic issues considered:

* Groundwater abstraction for irrigation:

The City has approximately 100 hectares of public open space under irrigation and this is forecast to increase in future. A groundwater licence is issued to the City by the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER), pursuant to the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914.* The licence allows an allocated amount of groundwater to be abstracted for irrigation purposes. The City’s approved annual abstraction allocation is 709,300 kilolitres (kl). This figure was originally based on an allocation of 7,500 kl per annum/per hectare of irrigated area. The area the City irrigates has increased since its allocation was introduced. Groundwater abstraction in the subdistrict of Nedlands is fully allocated and no further groundwater abstraction will be approved by DWER under the City’s licence.

DWER has advised of imminent reductions to groundwater licence allocations in the order of ten percent (10%) by 2028 in areas including the City of Nedlands. DWER have advised further reductions are likely beyond this period. A ten percent (10%) reduction equates to an annual allocation of 638,370 kl equalling 6,750 kl per annum/per hectare of irrigated area. The City must find practical solutions to manage a reduced groundwater allocation if parks are to be presented to current levels into the future.

The City’s irrigation operating plan is aligned with industry best practice principles. The plan identifies numerous ‘hydrozones’ (refer Table 1 below). Hydrozones are areas within parks where watering requirements of turf or plants are similar for sustaining acceptable health as well as functional requirements and presentation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Hydrozone** | **Open Space Description** | **Requirement per Hectare per Annum** |
| Active Turf | Sports ovals and fields | 10,000 kl |
| Passive Turf | Oval surrounds & local parks | 6,000 kl |
| Low Turf | Park verges, median strips | 4,000 kl |
| Exotic Gardens | Ornamental garden beds | 9,000 kl |
| Native Gardens | Ornamental garden beds | 2,500 kl |
| Eco-zones | Self-sufficient endemic species | <1,000 kl |

Table 1 – Assigned groundwater to hydrozones within irrigation operating plan

The City’s strategy for responding to reduced groundwater accessibility, whilst preserving current presentation of parks and reserves, is to improve water use efficiencies whilst concurrently reducing the area of Low Passive turf. Water use savings will be achieved through improvements in irrigation design, technology and management in addition to introducing Eco-zones and Native Gardens in areas of Low Passive turf, generally done amongst trees where it has the added benefit of improving long term tree health.

* Climate change:

Climate forecasting for the south west of WA indicates future increased temperatures and reduced rainfall, but with increased intensity. Decisions associated with management and design of the reserve, including vegetation selection, has considered the consequences of the forecast climate scenario.

* Bushland and biodiversity conservation:

Urban development and population densities in districts close to the CBD are forecast to increase for the foreseeable future. With this in mind, there is a need to protect, expand (where appropriate) and better manage existing remnant bushland to retain the green space interconnections, including along the river foreshore.

* Groundwater quality:

The quality of groundwater within the local area is being negatively impacted by decreasing rainfall and a resultant reduction in recharge of the superficial aquifer. Saltwater intrusion from the Swan River into the localised aquifer will increasingly become an issue requiring management through modified irrigation practices.

* Statutory vegetation protection:

Protection and management of vegetation in the reserve is regulated pursuant to the *Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act 2006*. The Parks and Wildlife Service has overarching authority for the types of vegetation that can be planted in the reserve and how this is managed.

* User accessibility:

The City has statutory obligations to provide equal access to public facilities pursuant to the federal based *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* and the state-based *Disability Services Act 1993.* These obligations extend to path networks that support access to and through parks and reserves and that paths are designed to mandatory accessibility standards.

**Proposed Initiatives**

The BRREMP concept proposes implementing initiatives addressing the above strategic considerations. Below is a list of the new initiatives for this financial year and future years:

* Introduce or expand Eco-zones by marginally reducing grass throughout the reserve, mulching where grass is eradicated and planting indigenous natives, preferably from provenance seed.
* Redesign and renew inground reticulation system to:
  + resolve undersized mainline and lateral pipes;
  + resolve inefficient sprinkler spacing;
  + improve water dispersal uniformity; and
  + reconfigure watering practices to reduce water use in eco-zones.
* Replacement of parks furniture and facilities to improve accessibility and amenity. This includes replacement of the drinking fountain with added dog bowl, bin/dog waste station, bike racks, perimeter bollards and access gate.
* Construct approximately 50 metres of new accessible path providing improved access within, and to, the reserve and which also serves to separate Passive Turf hydrozone and Eco-zones to facilitate maintenance efficiencies.
* Redesign of the ramp access to the river foreshore to modify this into steps to improve pedestrian safety.
* Prepare a concept plan for the removal and replacement of the concrete viewing structure, adjacent to the river foreshore.

**Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions:**

Ordinary Meeting of Council 26 November 2019, Item 12.3, Report TS22.19 Bishop Road Reserve Enviro-scape Master Plan.

Council Resolution:

*“That this item be deferred for costings to be provided for future projects and the matter is returned to Council for further consideration.”*

**Consultation**

Community consultation commenced on 18 September 2019 and concluded on 14 October 2019. Letters were posted to 74 properties surrounding Bishop Road Reserve. Letters included an enclosed flyer (refer to Attachment 2) outlining the proposed BRREMP and invited feedback on the proposal. The project was also uploaded to the City’s Your Voice online engagement platform. Below is an overview of the key statistics and feedback from the consultation.

| **Engagement Type** | **Responses** | **Key Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Letter mail out  (74 properties) | Three (3) written responses | * “Satisfied with the attached proposal as it has been presented” * “The park is small and is in no need of more furniture or equipment — its enjoyment for many is the nature of its present state — low key” |
| Letter mail out  (74 properties) | Three (3) written responses | * “The proposed plan shows bicycle racks and a drinking fountain with water for dogs. Let it not be large and showy but visually acceptable” * “Before more money is spent on a series of "improvements", it should be noted how satisfactory the area is right now” * “Bishop Road Reserve is a small park, but very special with its elevated relationship to the Swan river” * “More thought is needed with plant choices, with lower planting preferred under the tree canopy so as to allow the visitors to continue to enjoy the river panorama” * “Hopefully the grassed areas will be largely maintained as they are well utilised” * “Upgrading of the drinking fountain, bicycle racks, repairs to the pathway leading to white beach and stairs with a handrail are necessary and will be greatly appreciated by all.” |
| Your Voice | * 26 total visits | N/A |
| * 10 documents downloaded | N/A |
| * 1 survey completed | * Very important to maintain vistas. * Very important to protect and maintain bushland and mature trees. * Quite important to respond to climate change. * Quite important to manage groundwater resources. * Most like the views at the reserve. |

**Budget/Financial Implications**

**Can we afford it?**

Operational budget – a negligible overall impact on current maintenance operations

budgeting is forecast over the life of the BRREMP.

Capital budget – funding was approved in the 2018/19 capital budget for upgrading of the irrigation system and associated works. These funds were not expended and have been brought forward and approved in the 2019/20 financial year through the midyear budget review process.

**How does the option impact upon rates?**

Proposed expenditure associated with the BRREMP is shown in the following table. The budget for each project aligns with the Long-Term Financial Plan through inclusion in the 5 Year Capital Works Program and should have negligible direct impact on rate setting.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Financial Year** | **Project Description** | **Cost (Inc. on-costs)** | **Grant** | **Municipal** |
| 2019/20 | Upgrade irrigation system and  include hydrozoning; Install 165 m of garden kerbing; Construct 50 m of accessible footpath; Introduce Eco-zones. | $66,096 | - | $66,096 |
| 2020/21 | Replace Bike Racks. | $5,300 | - | $5,300 |
| Replace 115 m of CCA pine bollards with recycled plastic bollards. | $13,800 | - | $13,800 |
| Remove concrete viewing structure, re-design and install new structure. | $90,800 | - | $90,800 |
| Redesign ramp leading to foreshore to modify into steps. | $46,000 | - | $46,000 |

**Strategic Implications**

**How well does it fit with our strategic direction?**

Section 05 of the Strategic Community Plan identifies “Renewal of community infrastructure such as roads, footpaths, community and sports facilities” and “Providing for sport and recreation” as priorities. The draft BRREMP concept is part of a scheduled master planning program intended to realise these strategic priorities.

**Who benefits?**

Endorsement of the BRREMP concept, and delivery of the associated projects, will benefit current and future users of the reserve and the broader community. The objective of the BRREMP is to deliver a recreational facility that is fit for purpose for the foreseeable future and caters to a broad range of passive recreational activities. The intent is to enhance current asset servicing levels whilst maintaining the essential character of the reserve.

**Does it involve a tolerable risk?**

The risks associated with the BRREMP concept are reasonably low and acceptable with adequate management. Main areas of risk that have been identified and require managing include reputational, project delivery, regulatory and financial risks.

**Do we have the information we need?**

The City completed a condition audit of all park assets in 2012. Through this process an asset replacement program was developed over a period of 20 years. The upgrading of several key assets at Bishop Road Reserve, including the irrigation system, have been identified as requiring replacement as they have come to the end of their useful life.

|  |
| --- |
| TS11.20 Hollywood Subdivision Parking Embayments |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee** | 12 May 2020 |
| **Council** | 26 May 2020 |
| **Applicant** | City of Nedlands |
| **Employee Disclosure under *section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995*** | Nil. |
| **Director** | Jim Duff – Director Technical Services |
| **Attachments** | 1. Hollywood Subdivision Parking R19-55-01-00 |
| **Confidential Attachments** | Nil. |

**Executive Summary**

In February 2020, the City conducted community consultation in response to a complaint received from a local resident regarding vehicle usage in the parallel parking embayment’s throughout the Hollywood subdivision.

Community engagement was undertaken between 21 February 2020 to 13 March 2020. The consultation presented affected residents with proposed formalised parking via use of painted holding lines to resolve the purported issue. The City invited local residents within the Hollywood subdivision to participate by responding to the engagement letter sent on 21 February 2020. The outcome of the consultation resulted in a low number of responses. Of the five responses received from a possible 91 residents, three residents indicated that they were not in support the proposal.

The Administration recommends the parallel parking embayment’s be line marked to Australian Standards through use of painted holding lines to maximise legal parking availability.

**Recommendation to Committee**

**Council approves the installation of painted holding lines in the parallel parking embayment’s within the Hollywood subdivision.**

**Discussion/Overview**

In February 2020 the City received a complaint in relation to parking usage in the parallel parking embayment’s within the Hollywood subdivision.

The City proposes to formalise the existing parallel parking embayment’s through use of holding lines in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards for ‘On Street Parking’ to define each bay.

Under the City’s Parking Local Law, vehicles will be required to park within the holding lines. This eliminates the potential for single vehicles to occupy more than one bay when currently zoned as informal parking. It should be noted that the existing parking embayment’s were originally designed to accommodate a maximum of two cars only under the Australian Standards for On Street Parking.

With respect to the feedback received in the resident comments, it may be worth adding the option of civil works to extend the length of the embayment’s to accommodate three (3) vehicles in future. However, this has not been designed nor budgeted for in the City’s Five Year Forward Works Program.

**Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions:**

Nil.

**Consultation**

Community engagement occurred between 21 February 2020 to 13 March 2020 to seek community feedback on the proposed changes to the parallel parking arrangements within the Hollywood subdivision.

Opportunities for the ninety-one (91) residents to engage with the City and to seek information were provided as follows:

* A letter to all affected residents and property owners to provide information on and seek one of the preferred options on the proposal; and
* Invitation to contact the City by email or telephone to discuss the proposal further.

During the engagement period, the City received a total of five (5) submissions. A summary of the responses from the affected properties is summarised in Figure 1. Table 1 summarises the comments received. The community consultation results indicate neither support nor opposition for the proposal to line mark the parallel parking bays.

Figure 1: Summary of Responses

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Resident Comments** | **Administration Comments** |
| The parking bays could accommodate three vehicles. | The City does not support line marking the existing parallel parking embayment’s to accommodate three vehicles as this does not comply with the relevant Australian Standards for On Street Parking. |
| Damage to verge plantings and sprinklers by vehicles trying to squeeze two cars in the single embayment’s on Verdun Street. | The City is aware that more than one vehicle may occasionally occupy the single parallel parking embayment’s. The City may investigate the option of installing “single car only” text on the parking signs within those embayment’s. |

Table 1: Feedback Received from Community Engagement

**Strategic Implications**

**How well does it fit with our strategic direction?**

Managing parking forms part of the City’s overall strategic priorities. The City undertakes operational reviews of parking, traffic management, traffic and transport planning City-wide, placing particular focus on areas identified as a priority across all four wards.

Parking will be monitored with strategies implemented for properly planned improvements to ensure parking amenity is maximised. Traffic will be monitored and managed to allow for an efficient transport network that contributes to a more environmentally friendly, safer City for both business and community activities.

**Who benefits?**

When implementing new parking strategies, the City aims to maintain general amenity level to a standard expected by our residents. The City will continue to monitor parking turnover and plan for improvements to ensure an efficiently operating transport network.

**Does it involve a tolerable risk?**

Should the City choose not to line-mark the embayment’s to Australian Standards and accommodate three vehicles per embayment, the City may potentially be liable for any associated property damage claims against the City involving non-compliant parking arrangements. This also carries a reputational risk to the City and reduces the integrity of the City’s standard line marking practices. It is essential the City adopts and maintains a uniform approach to on street parking.

**Do we have the information we need?**

Decisions are be based on Australian Standards AS2890.5 – 1993 Parking Facilities – On Street Parking. Vehicles are modelled using standard Austroads vehicle templates.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

**Can we afford it?**

Decisions are based on sound asset management principles and look to promote a “whole of life” approach to the management of assets across the City**.** The cost for implementing new line marking is summarised in Table 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Cost per Item** | **Number of Items** | **Total** |
| Install new line marking | $ 3.26LM | 36m | $ 117.36 |
| Total Cost |  |  | $ 117.36 |

Table 2. Cost estimate of proposed signage

**How does the option impact upon rates?**

The works will be funded from the City’s operational budget.

|  |
| --- |
| TS12.20 North Street – Removal of Verge Parking |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee** | 12 May 2020 |
| **Council** | 26 May 2020 |
| **Applicant** | City of Nedlands |
| **Employee Disclosure under *section 5.70 Local Government Act 1995*** | Nil. |
| **Director** | Jim Duff – Director Technical Services |
| **Attachments** | 1. North Street Parking Plan 2. North Street Sight Visibility Splay |

**Executive Summary**

In March 2020, the City conducted community consultation in response to a complaint received from a local resident regarding insufficient sight visibility when exiting driveways along North Street in Swanbourne.

Community engagement was undertaken from 12 March 2020 to 31 March 2020. The consultation presented affected residents with proposed parking prohibitions to resolve the purported issue and invited residents in North Street to provide feedback to the City.

North Street is currently zoned as ‘No Stopping’ in the road carriageway. Administration has reviewed the traffic situation on North Street and identified a potential road safety risk associated with exiting driveways.

The community consultation information presented by Administration did not favour either option which were as follows:

1. remove the verge parking on North Street; or
2. retain the verge parking on North Street.

Based on the potential for verge parking outside properties 3 and 3a North Street, Swanbourne to compromise the visibility for drivers exiting from the driveway of number 3a North Street, it is recommended the City prohibit parking on the verge in front of property 3 North Street in accordance with Attachment 1.

**Recommendation to Committee**

**Council:**

1. **implement verge parking prohibitions outside the frontage of property 3 North Street Swanbourne in accordance with Attachment 1;**
2. **supports no change to the existing ‘No Stopping’ prohibition in the road carriageway.**

**Discussion/Overview**

**Background**

In February 2020, the City received a request in relation to insufficient sight distances from a resident exiting their property due to verge parked vehicles. The City investigated the complaint and found that the sight distance for vehicles exiting from property 3a North Street, Swanbourne is potentially compromised by localised verge parking directly in front of property 3 North Street, Swanbourne.

North Street, between West Coast Highway and Walpole Street, is a local distributer road which carries approximately 8,500 vehicles per day in both directions with an 85th percentile speed of 54km/h and a posted speed limit of 50km/h. This section of road consists of a left turn only pocket with ‘No Stopping’ in the eastbound carriageway from Walpole Street to the intersection with West Coast Highway.

Main Roads WA crash statistics demonstrate no recorded accidents within the five-year period involving vehicles entering and exiting driveways. Although there is the potential for accidents of this nature to occur, the likelihood is low based on the recorded crash history.

Officers carried out a sight visibility review for North Street in accordance with Austroads and Main Roads WA guidelines (refer Attachment 2). It should be noted there is potential for verge parked vehicles to fall within the “sight triangle” formed by the driver’s eye to objects on the road carriageway. The guidelines note the sight distance length should be kept clear from obstructions greater than 0.2m in height which includes street furniture, landscape elements and parking.

Administration notes that verge parking is utilised by residents on this section of North Street, during and outside of normal business hours. The City will apply the ‘No Stopping Road or Verge’ prohibition based on Austroads guidelines recognising the City’s Parking Local Law generally permits verge parking, unless stated otherwise by a parking control sign.

**Proposal**

The City is proposing to implement verge parking prohibitions outside the frontage of property 3 North Street Swanbourne in accordance with Attachment 1.

**Key Relevant Previous Council Decisions:**

The 2011/12 approved Capital Works Program included the extension of the left turn pocket on North Street at the intersection of West Coast Highway. These works resulted in reduced queuing of vehicles and improved traffic movements at the intersection. Improved traffic flow meant a greater capacity to exit residential driveways onto North Street.

**Consultation**

Community engagement occurred between from 12 March 2020 to 31 March 2020 to seek community feedback on the proposed changes to the parking arrangements on North Street.

Opportunities for the eighteen North Street residents to engage with the City and to seek information were provided as follows:

* A letter to all affected residents and property owners to provide information on and seek one of the preferred options on the proposal;
* Invitation to contact the City by email or telephone to discuss the proposal further.

During the engagement period, the City received a total of 6 submissions. A summary of the responses from the affected properties is summarized in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Results of Community Consultation

The community consultation results indicate neither support or opposition for the ‘No Stopping Road or Verge’ restriction. Table 1 overleaf summarises the comments received from the residents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Resident Comments** | **Administration Comments** |
| The proposal will disadvantage residents who utilise the verge for residential parking. Removing the verge parking may result in vehicles relocating to surrounding residential streets. | The City acknowledges that removal of the verge parking will result in the potential loss of amenity for those residents in this locality however, prohibiting parking in this location helps address an identify road safety concern. |
| Our sightlines have been impacted by vehicles parking on residential verges. We cannot see when exiting our driveway. | The City will apply the ‘No Stopping Road or Verge prohibition based on Austroads guidelines recognising the City’s Parking Local Law generally permits verge parking unless stated otherwise by a parking control sign. |

Table 1: Comments Received during Community Consultation

The alternative approach is to prohibit all verge parking on North Street between West Coast Highway to Walpole Street. Based on the consultation feedback which indicates a desire to maintain verge parking between West Coast Highway to Walpole Street, it is recommended to permit residents verge parking outside the proposed parking prohibition area, noting that any further parking complaints will be assessed on their individual road safety merits.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

**Can we afford it?**

Decisions are based on sound asset management principles and look to promote a “whole of life” approach to the management of assets across the City.The cost for implementing the parking signs is summarised in Table 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Cost per Item** | **Number of Items** | **Total** |
| Replace sign only | $30.00 | Nil. | $0 |
| Remove sign only | $30.00 | Nil. | $0 |
| Install new sign pole | $130.00 | 2 | $260 |
| Total Cost |  |  | $260.00 |

Table 2. Cost estimate of proposed signage

**How does the option impact upon rates?**

This has no impact on rates and can be funded from the current operational budget.

**Strategic Implications**

**How well does it fit with our strategic direction?**

Managing parking forms part of the City’s overall strategic priorities. The City undertakes operational reviews of parking, traffic management, traffic and transport planning City-wide, placing particular focus on areas identified as a priority across all four wards.

Parking will be monitored with strategies implemented for properly planned improvements to ensure parking amenity is maximised. Traffic will be monitored and managed to allow for an efficient transport network that contributes to a more environmentally friendly, safer City for both business and community activities.

**Who benefits?**

When implementing new parking strategies, the City aims to maintain general amenity level to a standard expected by our residents. The City will continue to monitor traffic flows and plan for improvements to ensure an efficiently operating transport network.

**Does it involve a tolerable risk?**

The removal of verge parking on North Street may set precedence for the removal of verge parking on North Street, between Walpole Street and Walba Way. Furthermore, this precedence may carry a flow on effect to other streets within the City.

**Do we have the information we need?**

Warrants for removing the verge parking must be based on robust evidence that demonstrates an unacceptable risk of an accident occurring.