



Community & Environment Committee

Agenda: *Community & Environment Committee*

Date: *Monday 9 July 2012*

Time: *6.00pm*

Outline of Meeting Protocol & Procedure:

- The Chairperson will call the Meeting to order and ask the Committee/Staff to present apologies or late correspondence.
- The Chairperson will commence the Order of Business as shown in the Index to the Agenda.
- At the beginning of each item the Chairperson will ask whether a member(s) of the public wish to address the Committee.
- If person(s) wish to address the Committee, they are allowed four (4) minutes in which to do so. Please direct comments to the issues at hand.
- If there are persons representing both sides of a matter (eg applicant/objector), the person(s) against the recommendation speak first.
- At the conclusion of the allotted four (4) minutes, the speaker resumes his/her seat and takes no further part in the debate unless specifically called to do so by the Chairperson.
- If there is more than one (1) person wishing to address the Committee from the same side of the debate, the Chairperson will request that where possible a spokesperson be nominated to represent the parties.
- The Chairperson has the discretion whether to continue to accept speakers from the floor.
- After considering any submissions the Committee will debate the matter (if necessary), and arrive at a recommendation (R items which proceed to Full Council) or a resolution (D items for which the Committee has delegated authority).

Recommendation only to the Full Council (“R” Items)

- Such matters as are specified in Section 377 of the Local Government Act and within the ambit of the Committee considerations.
- Matters which involve broad strategic or policy initiatives within responsibilities of Committee.
- Matters requiring the expenditure of moneys and in respect of which no Council vote has been made.
- Matters delegated to the Council by the Traffic Authority of NSW.
- Matters not within the specified functions of the Committee,
- Matters reserved by individual Councillors in accordance with any Council policy on "safeguards" and substantive changes.
- Parks and Reserves Plans of Management (Strategies, Policies and Objectives).
- Residential Parking Schemes - Provision and Policies.

Delegated Authority (“D” Items)

- Community Services and Programs.
- Library Services
- Health.
- Licensing.
- Liquor Licences.
- Regulatory.
- Fire Protection Orders.
- Residential Parking Schemes (surveillance and administration).
- Traffic Management (Traffic Committee Recommendations).
- Waste Minimisation.
- To require such investigations, reports or actions as considered necessary in respect of matters contained within the Business Agendas (and as may be limited by specific Council resolution).
- Confirmation of the Minutes of its Meetings.
- Any other matter falling within the responsibility of the Community and Environment Committee and not restricted by the Local Government Act or required to be a Recommendation to Full Council as listed above.
- Statutory reviews of Council's Delivery Program and Operational Plan.

Committee Membership:

7 Councillors

Quorum:

The quorum for a Committee meeting is 4 Councillors.

WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Notice of Meeting

5 July 2012

To: Her Worship The Mayor, Councillor Susan Wynne ex-officio
Councillors Susan Jarnason (Chair)
Isabelle Shapiro
Anthony Boskovitz
Peter Cavanagh
Greg Medcraft
Andrew Petrie
Toni Zeltzer

Dear Councillors

Community & Environment Committee Meeting – 9 July 2012

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, I request your attendance at a Meeting of the Council's **Community and Environment Committee** to be held in the **Council Chambers, 536 New South Head Road, Double Bay, on Monday 9 July 2012 at 6.00pm.**

Gary James
General Manager

Additional Information Relating to Committee Matters

Site Inspection

Other Matters

Meeting Agenda

Item	Subject	Pages
1	Leave of Absence and Apologies	
2	Note Council resolution of 27 June 2011 to read late correspondence in conjunction with the relevant Agenda Item	
3	Declarations of Interest	

Items to be Decided by this Committee using its Delegated Authority

D1	Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 25 June 2012	1
D2	Woollahra Local Traffic Committee Minutes – 3 July 2012	2
D3	Minutes of the Animal Advisory Committee Meeting of 16 May 2012 – 271.G AACM	11
D4	Public Art Advisory Committee Minutes – 1160.G	16
D5	Mobility Parking Scheme Review	22
D6	Inner Sydney Regional Bike Network - 256.G	33

Item No: D1 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 25 June 2012**
Author: Les Windle, Manager - Governance
File No: See Council Minutes
Reason for Report: The Minutes of the Meeting of Monday 25 June 2012 were previously circulated. In accordance with the guidelines for Committees' operations it is now necessary that those Minutes be formally taken as read and confirmed.

Recommendation:

That the Minutes of the Community and Environment Committee Meeting of 25 June 2012 be taken as read and confirmed.

Les Windle
Manager – Governance

Item No: D2 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Woollahra Local Traffic Committee Minutes – 3 July 2012**
Author: Tom O’Hanlon – Director, Technical Services
File No: 595.G 2012
Reason for Report: For the Committee to consider the recommendations of the Woollahra Local Traffic Committee.

Recommendation:

- A. That the Recommendations Y1-Y5 contained in the minutes of the Woollahra Traffic Committee held on Tuesday 3 July 2012 be adopted.
 - B. That the Recommendation Z1 contained as an informal item in the minutes of the Woollahra Traffic Committee held on Tuesday 3 July 2012 be adopted.
-

Cathy Edwards-Davis
Manager – Engineering Services

Tom O’Hanlon
Director Technical Services

Woollahra Local Traffic Committee Minutes

The meeting of the Woollahra Local Traffic Committee was held in the Thornton Room, Council Chambers, Double Bay, on Tuesday 3 July 2012 at 10.00am.

1. Attendance

Committee Members:

Present:	Ms Cathy Edwards-Davis (Chairperson)	(Woollahra Municipal Council)
	Mr Michael Kayello	(Roads and Maritime Services)
	Ms Robyn Attuell	(Clover Moore MP Representative)
	Snr Const Kylie Kemp	(Rose Bay Police - Traffic)
Staff:	Mr Frank Rotta	(Woollahra Municipal Council)
	Ms Carla Hetherington	(Woollahra Municipal Council)
Observer:	Mr John McDonagh	(Harbour View Residents Group)
Apologies:	Mr Eric Graham	(Transport NSW – State Transit)
	Mr Tom O’Hanlon	(Woollahra Municipal Council)
	Ms Shirlene Yee Yet	(Woollahra Municipal Council)
	Mr John Giblin	(Gabrielle Upton MP Representative)

Also in Attendance:

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of Meeting No.05/12 held in Council Chambers, Double Bay, on Tuesday 5 June 2012 were confirmed by Snr Const Kylie Kemp & Mr Michael Kayello.

3. Matters Arising from Minutes of Previous Meetings

Nil

4. Local Traffic Committee recommendations not adopted or amended by Woollahra Council Community & Environment Committee

Nil

5. Extraordinary Meetings

Nil

6. Late Correspondence

Nil

7. Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for Consideration

Item No: Y1 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for Consideration

Subject: **Parking Restrictions Changes**

Author: Frank Rotta – Traffic Engineer,
File No: (Refer to Table 1)

Reason for Report: Various parking restriction changes throughout the Woollahra Council area.

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

That the recommendations of Item Y1-1 to Y1-5 contained in Annexure 1 be adopted.

Item Y1-1: Anderson Street Carpark, Double Bay – Parking restrictions

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

1. That the 2 timed disabled parking spaces in the Anderson Street carpark at the rear of the Double Bay shopping strip be changed to untimed disabled parking and the signage updated to current standards.
2. That the through lane on the eastern side of this carpark currently signposted as ‘No Standing’ be changed to ‘No Parking’.

Item Y1-2: Loftus Road, Darling Point – Installation of new signage to enforce the exiting Loftus Road one way restrictions

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

1. That the existing NO ENTRY sign in New Beach Road, south of the Loftus Road intersection, be relocated to lamp pole SY11470 fronting 25-26 New Beach Road and aligned facing west.
2. That a new ONE WAY (left arrow) sign be installed on the existing post located on the northern corner of the Loftus Road and New Beach Road intersection.

Item Y1-3: Old South Head Road, Watsons Bay – Concealed Driveways Sign as per the Condition of Development Consent for No. 331 Old South Head Road

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

That no action be taken with regard to the installation of a ‘Concealed Driveway’ sign on the north-eastern side of Old South Head Road adjacent to No 331A Old South Head Road facing south-easterly bound vehicles.

Item Y1-4: Stephen Street, Paddington – No Stopping restrictions to allow access for pedestrians along the Lawson Street footpath.

Committee Vote: Majority Support (RMS Representative did not support this recommendation)

Recommendation:

1. That ‘No Stopping’ restrictions be installed on the eastern side of Stephen Street, Paddington from the southern kerblines in Lawson Street for a distance of 7 metres in a southerly direction.
2. That ‘No Stopping’ restrictions be installed on the western side of Stephen Street, Paddington from the southern kerblines in Lawson Street for a distance of 6.5 metres in a southerly direction.

Item Y1-5: Yarranabbe Road, Darling Point – Parking restrictions

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

That the existing ‘No Stopping’ on the northern side of Yarranabbe Road east of Beverley Lane be extended by 6.6 metres to give an overall ‘No Stopping’ zone of 10 metres at this location.

Item No: Y2 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for Consideration

Subject: **Albermarle Lane, Rose Bay – Proposal to Change Direction of One Way Movement**

Author: Frank Rotta – Traffic Engineer

File No: 544

Reason for Report: To report on results of Community Consultation.

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

- A. That the alterations of parking restrictions in Albermarle Lane be limited to signposting the statutory ‘No Stopping’ restrictions on the southern side of Albermarle Lane at its intersections with Albermarle Avenue and Wilberforce Avenue.
- B. That the plans to change the direction of traffic flow in Albermarle Lane from southbound to northbound be abandoned.
- C. That Council note that Rose Bay Primary School is unable to provide land to facilitate a trafficable footpath on the school side of Albermarle Lane.

Item No: Y3 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for consideration.

Subject: **Sun Herald City to Surf 2012**

Author: Frank Rotta – Traffic Engineer

File No: 16.G

Reason for Report: To approve conditions for the running of the 2012 Sun Herald City to Surf.

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

That in principle approval be granted for The Sun Herald City to Surf 2012 foot race, to be held on Sunday 12 August 2012, through the streets of the Woollahra Municipality, subject to the following conditions:

- i. Approval of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) by the Roads and Maritime Services and NSW Police.
- ii. Road Closures – Details of the road closures, including the method and authorised persons to control and regulate these closures be submitted to Council by 20 July 2012 for consideration.
- iii. Signage – full details of all signage proposed to be erected as part of the event, including height, clearance and fixing details, etc, prior to or during the event, being submitted to Council by 20 July 2012 for consideration.
- iv. Television Camera Stands – Full details of all structures proposed to be erected on the public roadway as part of this event being submitted to Council for approval under the Roads Act by 20 July 2012.

- v. Event Clean-Up – Assurance that the roadway is not opened to through traffic, until such time as cleaning has been satisfactorily completed is to be provided by the Sun Herald and the Police.
- vi. Advertising Road Closures and Event Details – Local residents being advised of the road closures, opening times etc by the Sun Herald. These advertisements are to be placed in the local paper prior to the event.
- vii. Waste Management Clean Up Costs - Sun Herald to pay for all clean up costs.
- viii. Insurance - Evidence of current Public Liability Insurance to the value of \$20 million for the event is to be submitted to Council by 20 July 2012.
- ix. On-Site Contact – The Police and Sun Herald to remain in contact with Council’s nominated on-site contact person.
- x. Road / Street Cleaning – the Drink Supervisors being instructed, as part of their duties, to arrange for any empty drink cups to be swept or raked from the roadway towards the gutter during breaks, in between peak periods of the race event. The empty drink cup boxes are to be emptied into the Clean-Up Bins. Once the boxes are emptied, they are to be unfolded, flattened and then stacked for collection and recycling.
- xi. Drink Stations/ Clean Up Bins – the number and location of drink stations and clean up bins are to be provided to Council. All drink stations on New South Head Road are to be supplied with two bins on each side of the road. The last drink station on Old South Head should be supplied with two bins at the drink station site.
- xii. All bins to be placed on the footpath two (2) metres after the drink station. Council’s co-ordinator being contacted prior to the race in relation to Council’s requirements for bin locations and collection procedures.

Item No: Y4 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for consideration.

Subject: No. 77-79 Underwood Street, Paddington – Works Zone

Author: Frank Rotta - Traffic Engineer

File No: 407.G Pt16

Reason for Report: Request for a Works Zone

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

- A. That approval be granted for a Works Zone to be temporarily installed for No. 77-79 Underwood St, Paddington. The proposed Works Zone is to be located on the northern side of Underwood Street, Paddington from 27 m east of the eastern kerbline in Union Street for a distance of 6 metres in an easterly direction and is subject to the following conditions:
 - i. Any directive provided by the NSW Police Department is to be complied with.
 - ii. The Works Zone is to operate between the hours of 7.00am-4.00pm Mon-Fri and 7.00am-1.00pm Sat for a period of 4 weeks from July, 2012 (to be calculated from sign installation date).
 - iii. Suitable traffic control measures are to be put in place to manage truck movements to and from the construction site, and if necessary to and from the adjacent street system, in accordance with the RTA’s Traffic Control at Works Sites manual.
 - iv. A Permit to Stand Plant will be required for all concrete pours, deliveries and/or truck presences in relation to the construction works.

- v. Residents Permit parking shall be maintained outside of the Works Zone hours of operation.
 - vi. The applicant must ensure that the traffic lanes, footpaths and driveways, adjacent to the Works Zone, remain free of obstruction at all times during the construction.
 - vii. The applicant must inform Council's Traffic Engineer when the project is completed and the Works Zone can be removed.
 - viii. This Works Zone is in an area zoned as Residential 2(a). The fee payable shall be in accordance with Council's adopted fees and charges applying to the period for which the approval is given, and must be paid prior to the Works Zone being installed. Should the Works Zone be required for a shorter period, application may be made for a pro-rata refund.
 - ix. Failure to comply with any of these conditions may result in the cancellation of the Works Zone at Council's discretion.
 - x. Should the Works Zone be required for a period longer than the approved period, permission from the Director of Technical Services is required to extend the Works Zone.
 - xi. Any alteration to the hours of operation of the Work Zone will require the approval of the Woollahra Local Traffic Committee.
- B. That the applicant notifies all residents and businesses whose property frontage is within 50 metres of the Works Zone.

Item No: Y5 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for consideration.

Subject: **No. 72 Bellevue Road, Bellevue Hill – Works Zone**

Author: Frank Rotta - Traffic Engineer

File No: 407.G Pt16

Reason for Report: Request for a Works Zone

Committee Vote: Unanimous Support

Recommendation:

- A. That approval be granted for a Works Zone to be temporarily installed for No. 72 Bellevue Road, Bellevue Hill. The proposed Works Zone is to be located on the southern side of Bellevue Road, for a distance of 12.5 metres from the western side of the driveway to No.70 Bellevue Road to the eastern side of the driveway to No. 72 Bellevue Road and is subject to the following conditions:
- i. Any directive provided by the NSW Police Department is to be complied with.
 - ii. The Works Zone is to operate between the hours of 7.00am-4.00pm Mon-Fri and 7.00am-1.00pm Sat for a period of 20 weeks from July, 2012 (to be calculated from sign installation date).
 - iii. Suitable traffic control measures are to be put in place to manage truck movements to and from the construction site, and if necessary to and from the adjacent street system, in accordance with the RTA's Traffic Control at Works Sites manual.
 - iv. A Permit to Stand Plant will be required for all concrete pours, deliveries and/or truck presences in relation to the construction works.
 - v. Unrestricted parking shall be maintained outside of the Works Zone hours of operation.

- vi. The applicant must ensure that the traffic lanes, footpaths and driveways, adjacent to the Works Zone, remain free of obstruction at all times during the construction.
 - vii. The applicant must inform Council's Traffic Engineer when the project is completed and the Works Zone can be removed.
 - viii. This Works Zone is in an area zoned as Residential 2(b). The fee payable shall be in accordance with Council's adopted fees and charges applying to the period for which the approval is given, and must be paid prior to the Works Zone being installed. Should the Works Zone be required for a shorter period, application may be made for a pro-rata refund.
 - ix. Failure to comply with any of these conditions may result in the cancellation of the Works Zone at Council's discretion.
 - x. Should the Works Zone be required for a period longer than the approved period, permission from the Director of Technical Services is required to extend the Works Zone.
 - xi. Any alteration to the hours of operation of the Work Zone will require the approval of the Woollahra Local Traffic Committee.
- B. That the applicant notifies all residents and businesses whose property frontage is within 50 metres of the Works Zone.

8. Informal Matters – For discussion by committee members and recommended to Community and Environment Committee by Council Officers

Item No: Z1 Traffic Matters on Local Roads – Recommendation to C&E for consideration.

Subject: **New South Head Road – Modifications to Lane Alignments & Traffic Signals**

Author: Cathy Edwards-Davis, Manager Engineering Services

File No: 467.G/Q10

Reason for Report: Response to Council Question without Notice

Informal Item: Recommendation by Council Officers

Recommendation:

- A. That Council request RMS investigate the provision of three westbound lanes in New South Head Road, Rose Bay, at O'Sullivan Road; incorporating two through travel lanes and one left turn only lane.
- B. That Council request RMS investigate appropriate traffic signal phasing to accommodate this new left turn only lane.

9. Late Items

Nil

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 10.33am.

Cathy Edwards-Davis
Chair

Item No: D3 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Minutes of the Animal Advisory Committee Meeting of 16 May 2012**
Author: Suzy Rich, Chair – Animal Advisory Committee
File No: 271.G AACM
Reason for Report: To submit the minutes of the Animal Advisory Committee meeting of 16 May 2012

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Animal Advisory Committee meeting of Wednesday 16 May 2012 be received and noted.

Report:

The Animal Advisory Committee (AAC) was set-up in 1997 to coincide with the introduction of the *Companion Animals Act* 1998, which commenced operations on 1 September 1998.

On 27 September 2004, Council adopted the current ‘Terms of Reference’ for the AAC. The ‘Terms of Reference’ state that the purpose of the AAC is;

- “1. To serve as an advisory body to Council to assist with the development of policies, programmes, services and plans for companion animals. The AAC shall not operate in a regulatory or authoritative capacity.
2. To organise community events and educational programmes to raise awareness about companion animals and the *Companion Animals Act*.”

The ‘Terms of Reference’ further state that;

“The AAC is an advisory committee only and has no delegated authority. The AAC will report to the Community and Environment Committee as required.”

The current members of the AAC were appointed by the Community & Environment Committee on 13 October 2008 and their term runs concurrently with the term of the Council.

As specified by the ‘Terms of Reference’, AAC meetings are held on the third Wednesday of February, May, August and November of each year. The minutes of the AAC meeting held on **Wednesday 16 May 2012** are attached for the information of the Committee.

While the attached minutes will not be adopted by the AAC until their next meeting, the minutes have been circulated to the members and corrections made where requested and appropriate.

Suzy Rich
Chair - Animal Advisory Committee

Craig Jenner
Acting Manager - Compliance

Annexure:

1. Minutes of the Animal Advisory Committee meeting of 16 May 2012.

Animal Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

Meeting held - Wednesday 16 May 2012

Present: **Councillors:** Nicola Grieve
Community: Petra O’Neill, Ann Ahern, Ericka Van Aalst, Barrie Towers,
Vicki Etherington, Pamela Tinslay, Margaret Titterton, Lyn Sanchez,
Julianne Mills

Staff: Suzy Rich (Team Leader Parking Enforcement - Chair), Melanie Isaacs
(Companion Animals Officer), Alexis Hannagan (Secretary), Michael Weston
(Team Leader Parking Enforcement), Paul Fraser (Team Leader Open Space
& Rec Planning)

Apologies: Jose Brown

Meeting opened: 12.35pm

Item No.	Subject	Discussion	Action
1.	Confirmation of the previous minutes		
	Confirmation of minutes from previous meeting held on Wednesday 15 February 2012	Moved – Lyn Sanchez Seconded – Julianne Mills	Adopted
2.	Business arising from previous Minutes		
2.1	Presentation of AAC Meeting minutes to the Community and Environment Committee	The minutes of the AAC meeting of 15 February 2012 were presented to the C&E Committee meeting.	Noted
2.2	Dog Safety – on leash	Photo will be taken with Lyn & her Staffy “Lolita”, a quote will also be obtained. The advertisement will hopefully be in the Courier within the next 2-3 weeks. The fine is currently \$220 (footpath) and \$330 (prohibited area.) Council will no longer be giving cautions. A letter is to be placed in the Courier by the Mayor. Barry mentioned there should be more signage informing residents. Suzy advised that there are varying thoughts within the community about signage. Rangers will be focusing on footpaths as opposed to park areas as their main area of enforcement.	Noted Noted Noted
2.3	Faded painting on the footpath along Christison Park.	Suzy advised the path along Christison Park had been re painted and Ericka Van Aalst confirmed this.	Noted

2.4	Update from the Open Space & Recreation Planning Section – dog bags	<p>Update provided from the Open Space & Recreation Planning Section - Paul Fraser.</p> <p>Council are currently investigating solutions to the problems of dog bags and vandalism of machines that have occurred as the trial cannot be extended to other parks until these problems are resolved.</p> <p>Paul has been in contact with various suppliers who will be distributing samples soon. Servicing is currently taking place to re fill the dog bags on Monday mornings and Friday afternoons. Signal Hill Reserve: Bags are being used extremely fast. Paul has advised he has investigated other Councils where there are also issues with dog bags.</p> <p>Paul commenced the trial using 400 dog bags per roll, however Paul he has found that 250 per roll is better because the larger amount was too big for the dispensers.</p> <p>Councillor Grieve put forth a recommendation to the C&E Committee that mixed use parks should be given preference for trialling. The AAC urgently requests there is at least one container placed in a mixed use area for the trial. Example Lyne Park or Christison Park. This recommendation was seconded by Barrie Towers.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
2.5	Update from the Open Space & Recreation Planning Section – Rosebay Beach	<p>In regards to off leash areas the committee was advised that due to the playground within this vicinity the Companion Animals Act requires a distance of approximately 10 metres to be maintained at all times. Paul Fraser is currently looking at Dumaresq Reserve and Rose Bay foreshore as potential off leash areas. Paul is currently in discussion with Maritime.</p> <p>Paul suggested the AAC present the issue to RMS (Roads & Maritime Service), presenting as a committee would hold more stead as opposed to an individual.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
3	New Business		
3.1	Companion Animal Work Activity Statistics	Document handed out at meeting containing statistics and graphs.	Noted
3.2	Puppies in the park	<p>Document handed out at meeting containing information about the event held on Sunday the 22nd of April 2012 at Rushcutters Bay Park from 9am-12pm. The event attracted the biggest attendance yet with approximately 900 people.</p> <p>It was suggested that no helium balloons be used at the next event.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

3.3	Other Business Arising from Previous Minutes – Comments from Ericka Van Aalst	Referring to 2.1(a) re point 2 I said: Bikes are prohibited at Signal Station Reserve at all times and there is an increase in bikes especially in the evenings, an accident waiting to happen. Ericka Van Aalst advised she is seeking considerations that Signal Station Reserve be off leash from 4.30pm-8.30am.	Noted
4.	General Discussion		
4.1	Lyn Sanchez – alleged dangerous dog & owner	Lyn Sanchez advised (as a representative of the Vaucluse community) of email received RE dangerous dog and dubious behaviour of owner. Owner and dog are approaching people in the vicinity of Vaucluse Beach areas. Lyn Sanchez has forwarded emails to Melanie Isaacs who will investigate further and will present an update at the next AAC meeting.	Melanie Isaacs
4.2	Department of Local Government Website	White paper available on Department of Local Government Website regarding current taskforce to propose options to reduce the euthanizing of animals in pounds and shelters. Vicky commented they were looking to push through legislation for the licensing of breeders, therefore crossbreeding will gradually reduce over time. Melanie Isaacs to email committee members the link to view website.	Melanie Isaacs
4.3	Nominating for awards	Councillor Grieve advised all committee members that they are able to nominate suitable people for community awards via Councils website.	Noted

There being no further business, the meeting closed at approximately 1:50pm.

NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday 15 August 2012 at 12.30pm

Item No: D4 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Public Art Advisory Committee Minutes**
Author: Maria Lacey, Public Art and Cultural Development Officer
File No: 1160.G
Reason for Report: To table the minutes of the Public Art Advisory Committee meeting held on 13 June 2012.

Recommendation:

THAT the minutes of the Public Art Advisory Committee meeting held on Wednesday 13 June 2012.

Background:

This report outlines the meeting held by the Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC) on 13 June 2012 (Annexure 1).

Public Art Projects update:

A summary of PAAC generated public art priority projects and their respective directions are as follows:

1. Royal Hospital for Women Park: The Artist Agreement has been signed by artist Mikala Dwyer and the work on *Egg Swing* has commenced.
2. Temporary Art Installation Program: The sculpture *The Wall* by Guy Buseyne has been installed at Trumper Park, Paddington. The sculptures *Sun Disks* by Diego Latella is in the process of being included in the program.
3. Public Art Trust: Council adopted the Public Art Trust Deed at its meeting on 12 June. An application to the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) will be submitted by Lowensteins Arts Management to obtain a tax deductible status for the Trust.
4. Women in Woollahra: Council adopted on 12 June the recommendation of commissioning Sam Harrison's sculpture *Seated Woman II*. The Committee discussed how best to commemorate a number of significant women in relation to the display of artwork.
5. Major Projects 2012/13: The Chair gave a brief overview of all public art projects currently undertaken, or at various stages of development, according to the Public Art Program document (Annexure 2), including a short presentation of the Artist in Residence program currently in development.
6. Signal Box Project 2012: A list of location of traffic signal boxes was provided to the Committee. The selection of boxes for next year's project to be made at the PAAC meeting in August 2012.

Conclusion:

PAAC is satisfied with the public art projects currently being undertaken and has concluded that a number of projects will continue to develop and expand over the next financial year.

Maria Lacey
Public Art and Cultural Development Officer

Kylie Walshe
Director – Community Services

Annexures:

1. Minutes of the Public Art Advisory Committee Meeting, Wednesday 13 June 2012
2. Public Art Programs overview 2012/13

Item No: D5 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Mobility Parking Scheme Review**
Author: Cathy Edwards-Davis, Manager Engineering Services
File No:
Reason for Report: To seek Council approval of a submission to State Government

Recommendation:

That Council send the attached submission to the Independent Advisory Committee established to review the NSW mobility parking permit scheme.

Background

In 2011, Mr Duncan Gay, Minister for Roads & Ports announced a review of the current NSW Mobility Parking Scheme (MPS). The review is being conducted by an Independent Advisory Committee. Transport for NSW have prepared a report, "Discussion Paper: Review of the NSW Mobility Parking Scheme" dated May 2012.

The review is primarily focused on identifying improvement to the disability parking scheme. The Review also focuses on the parking concessions offered and the eligibility criteria and assessment process prior to NSW further implementing the Australian Disability Parking Scheme. Other issues raised in the discussion paper include how permits are used and enforcement of the scheme.

The Advisory Committee has invited stakeholders to make a submission in response to the Discussion Paper by Friday 20 July 2012.

Current MPS

The key objective of the MPS is to improve access for people with mobility issues.

Currently, to be eligible for a MPS permit, a person must be unable to walk because of permanent or temporary loss of the use of one or both legs or other permanent medical or physical condition, or whose physical condition is detrimentally affected as a result of walking 100 metres, or who requires the use of crutches, a walking frame, callipers, scooter, wheelchair, or other similar mobility aid. Permits are also available to people who are permanently blind.

The current application process requires the person to fill in an application form. They must have a medical certificate signed by a medical doctor, confirming they meet the eligibility criteria above. The MPS is administered by the RMS. Permanent mobility permits are issued for a five year period. Temporary permits may be issued for up to six months.

The current MPS provides the card holder with the following entitlements:

- When parking in metered, coupon or ticket parking areas, no charge is applied.
- Where parking is limited by a sign to more than 30 minutes, the vehicle can park for an unlimited time.
- Where parking is limited by a sign to less than 30 minutes, the vehicle can park for a maximum of 30 minutes.
- Where parking is limited by a sign to 30 minutes, the vehicle can park for 2 hours.

- Where parking is limited by a “No Parking” sign, the vehicle can park for up to 5 minutes (compared with 2 minutes for able-bodied drivers), and the driver must remain within the vehicle or within 3 metres of the vehicle to drop off or pick up passengers or goods.
- A permit holder may park in a designated disability parking space.

A MPS permit becomes invalid if it expires, is revoked by RMS or the permit holder is deceased. The permit may only be used to gain parking concessions where the permit holder has been part of the journey. Display of a mobility permit that the person is not authorised to utilise may result in a fine of \$530. The Parking Enforcement Officer may also confiscate an MPS permit that is being utilised unlawfully.

Proposed MPS

The full Discussion Paper is available to download from the RMS website.

The Discussion Paper notes that the generous nature of the current entitlements listed above gives rise to fraudulent use of mobility parking permits. Abuse of the MPS is generally undertaken in the following ways:

- People fraudulently obtain a mobility permit, when they do not have a genuine disability. That is, they do not meet the eligibility criteria.
- People “borrow” a relative or a friend’s permit and use it for their own benefit.
- People utilise permits which have been reported as lost, stolen or issued to a person that is deceased

The Discussion paper notes that under the existing MPS there are no guidelines for medical practitioners on how to determine if the applicant does genuinely meet the eligibility criteria. The Discussion Paper recommends that NSW adopt the national eligibility criteria guidelines and that people seeking the renewal of their permit will be required to complete a functional assessment of their ability to walk to prove their eligibility. The national eligibility criteria is as follows:

A permit may be issued to an applicant:

- a) who is unable to walk and always requires the use of a wheelchair; or
- b) whose ability to walk is severely restricted by a permanent disability or medical condition; or
- c) whose ability to walk is severely restricted by a temporary disability or medical condition.

Temporary permits only issued for conditions that severely restrict walking for more than six months and up to 12 months.

The Discussion Paper proposes that NSW adopt the nationally agreed minimum parking concessions. These entitlements are less generous than the current NSW concessions. The Discussion Paper outlines the following reasoning for this proposal:

- The generosity of the MPS concessions minimises turnover of parking spaces affecting all road users
- Free all day parking concessions are considered an incentive for fraudulent use of permits
- Failure to adopt the national concessions will perpetuate the problem of multiple schemes operating across Australia with different rules.

The proposed entitlements are as follows:

- Where parking is limited by a sign to less than 30 minutes, the vehicle can park for 30 minutes
- Where parking is limited by a signs to more than 30 minutes but 1 Hour or less, the vehicle can park for 2 Hours
- Where parking is limited by a sign to more than 1 Hour, the vehicle can park for twice the period indicated on the sign
- A permit holder may park in a designated disability parking space.

They key difference in the above proposed concessions is that people with a mobility permit will be required to pay for parking in metered areas. Further, where parking is 1 Hour or more, people with a mobility permit will no longer be able to park indefinitely. The change to these entitlements will significantly reduce the current abuse of the mobility scheme.

The Australian Road Rules allow time limits on designated disability parking spaces (eg. 2 Hour Disabled Parking). However, there is some confusion between Councils and RMS as to whether timed disabled parking is currently permitted in NSW. The Discussion Paper proposes to allow timed disabled parking spaces. The Discussion Paper notes that there is high demand for timed disabled parking in certain areas such as near post offices, medical centres and CBD areas. Timed disabled parking spaces will force turnover of these spaces resulting in designated parking spaces becoming more widely available for people with disabilities.

Currently, permits are revoked or cancelled when there have been three or more proven incidents of misuse of the permit. Revoking the permit does not prevent the permit holder from obtaining further permits.

Council receives phone calls and correspondence from residents and the community who report alleged abuse of the existing MPS. It is noted that not all disabilities are easily visually identifiable by a lay person. However, the number of these complaints suggests that some of these allegations of abuse are founded. It is difficult for Council's parking enforcement officers to catch people misusing mobility permits. For security purposes, the permit which includes a photograph, sex and age of the permit holder is displayed face-down in the vehicle.

City of Sydney and North Sydney Council have organised special enforcement operations in the past. Generally, the parking enforcement officer must be in plain clothes and wait next to the suspected vehicle, often for a number of hours, until the person returns to their vehicle. The officer must then ask to see the permit. This is a very labour intensive process, but it has resulted in a high capture rate of fraudulent permits. Given the difficulty in finding fraudulent permits, it seems inappropriate that people are permitted three opportunities to misuse the permit before it is confiscated.

The Discussion Paper notes that it is often not the permit holder that is misusing the permit. It is generally a family member, carer or friend. The Discussion Papers suggests the following sanctions where there are three proven misuse incidents within a 12 month period:

- Serve a three month suspension period before applying for a new permit
- Be given a temporary permit of limited duration and dependent upon continued good behaviour, will only be able to re-apply for a five year permit after the expiration of the good behaviour period.

Currently the only way a fine for permit misuse can be issued is if the enforcement officer interviews the driver to determine if they are aware the permit displayed on the vehicle is not valid, even where the officer knows that the permit has been cancelled or revoked. The Discussion Paper proposes that the enforcement officer be able to issue a notice of demand to the registered operator of the vehicle requesting explanation as to why a cancelled or revoked permit was displayed. Included in the notice would be a requirement to surrender the cancelled or revoked permit.

Conclusion

A MPS is an essential service for those people who have a genuine mobility impairment. Unfortunately, the existing generous scheme in NSW has led to fraudulent use of mobility permits in recent years. The proposed recommendations outlined in Transport for NSW's Discussion Paper are generally supported as a means to reduce abuse of the scheme.

It is recommended that Council send the attached submission to the Independent Advisory Committee established to review the NSW mobility parking permit scheme.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

Nil

Cathy Edwards-Davis
Manager Engineering Services

Tom O'Hanlon
Director Technical Services

Annexures

1. Recommended Submission to the Independent Advisory Committee established to review the NSW mobility parking permit scheme.

Council Ref: 404.G (SW, CED)
Your Ref:

25 June 2012



MPS Review
Level 4, Transport for NSW
PO Box K659
HAYMARKET NSW 1240

Dear Sir / Madam

Woollahra Council Submission to MPS Review

Thank you for providing Woollahra Council with the opportunity to comment on the “Discussion Paper: Review of the NSW Mobility Parking Scheme” prepared by Transport for NSW and dated May 2012.

This matter was considered by Council at the Community & Environment Committee on the 9 July 2012 where it was resolved:

That Council send the attached submission to the Independent Advisory Committee established to review the NSW mobility parking permit scheme.

Woollahra Council supports a mobility parking scheme (MPS) as an essential service for those people who have a genuine mobility impairment. The MPS allows people with disabilities to more easily access employment, studies, attend appointments or participate in social activities. However, Council is concerned that the MPS has been abused by individuals in recent years.

Council supports and commends the State Government on initiating the MPS review and establishing the Independent Advisory Committee.

In response to the questions raised in the Discussion Paper:

Question 1. Do you think the functional assessment criteria will improve the assessment process to ensure only people that genuinely meet the eligibility criteria will receive a permit? If no, why not?	No comment.
Question 2. Do you think all existing permit holders should undertake an assessment against the new national eligibility criteria when they first renew their permit under the Australian Disability Parking Scheme? If no, why not?	Yes, existing permit holders should have to be reassessed under the new national eligibility criteria. There is significant anecdotal evidence of abuse of the current NSW eligibility criteria.

	<p>For example, a parking occupancy survey was undertaken in the metered parking areas in Double Bay in December 2011. Of the 391 metered parking spaces, on average 76 of these were taken up by vehicles with a mobility parking permit. This represents 19.4% of the parking resource. It appears highly unlikely that 19.4% of the driving population parking in Double Bay has a genuine mobility issue. There is no doubt some of these permits were being utilised legitimately. However, it would appear that there is some abuse of the scheme, to take advantage of the generous permit entitlements including free parking at parking meters.</p> <p>Woollahra Council receives numerous phone calls and correspondence from residents and the community who report alleged abuse of the existing mobility parking scheme. It is acknowledged that not all disabilities are easily visually identifiable by a lay person. However, the number of these complaints suggests that some of these allegations of abuse are founded.</p>
<p>Question 3. Do you agree that in addition to medical practitioners, physiotherapists and occupational therapists should be able to conduct the functional assessment to determine eligibility? If no, why not?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 4. Do you think there needs to be an additional independent review of an applicant's eligibility before a permit is issued? Why do you think this?</p>	<p>Yes, it is essential that there is an independent review of an applicant's eligibility for a permit. There is anecdotal understanding that people are currently fraudulently obtaining mobility permits when they do not meet the eligibility criteria. This may be because GPs have less training and understanding of the eligibility criteria for the issuing of mobility permits. An independent review would largely remove this issue.</p> <p>Council supports Option 2 as outlined in the Discussion Paper. That is, the medical practitioner, OT or physio makes a recommendation which is reviewed together with the applicant's information by an independent qualified assessor for final determination on eligibility. Option 2 allows for the highest level of external scrutiny. It is noted that this Option would need to be combined with an efficient administration process to minimise any delay in approving and providing the mobility permit to the person.</p>

	<p>An alternative option which Council recommends is that people seeking approval for a mobility permit visit a doctor who specialises in the functional assessment for mobility permits (rather than their GP). These doctors could be located in the various Sydney metro suburban centres and regional centres. These doctors would have a clear understanding about which people do and do not meet the eligibility criteria for a mobility permit.</p>
<p>Question 5. Is a minimum six months and maximum 12 months for temporary permits appropriate for a disability parking scheme focused on an applicant's functional ability to walk? If it is not appropriate what would be a better timeframe for temporary permits?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 6. Do you believe Clinically Recognisable Disabilities are not compatible with the eligibility criteria under the Australian Disability Parking Scheme? Why do you believe this?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 7. It is proposed that only applicants who permanently require the use of a wheelchair be exempt from further eligibility medicals when renewing their permits. All other applicants will be required to undertake an assessment of their functional ability to walk. Is this appropriate?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 8. Is it acceptable to only provide temporary permits to lower limb amputees that are learning to use prosthesis until their functional ability to walk can be properly assessed?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 9. Will moving to the national minimum standards still allow the majority of disability parking permit holders to complete their business and social activities? If no, why not?</p>	<p>Yes, Council strongly supports the adoption of the nationally agreed minimum parking concessions. As outlined in the Discussion Paper, the existing generous parking concessions create an incentive for fraudulent use of permits.</p> <p>The proposed new parking entitlements still provide those with genuine mobility issues greater access to the parking resource, allowing more easy access to employment, studies, attend appointments or participate in social activities.</p>

<p>Question 10. Do you think the introduction of timed disability parking spaces in combination with the national minimum parking concessions will be sufficient to ensure that the majority of disability permit holders can complete their business and social activities? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Yes, Council supports the introduction of timed disability parking spaces. As noted in the Discussion Paper, there are certain areas where there is high demand for timed disabled parking such as near post offices, medical centres and CBD areas. If these spaces are taken up all day, every day by a commuter with a mobility permit, then other people with mobility permits may not be able to easily access the nearby services. Timed disabled parking allows the one space to serve numerous people with mobility permits during the day.</p>
<p>Question 11. Do you think a policy ensuring that timed spaces can only be introduced in areas where there are more than one disability parking space will improve turnover and access to wide bay parking spaces? Why do you think this?</p>	<p>No, Council does not support the introduction of timed spaces only where there are multiple disabled parking spaces.</p> <p>Generally in CBD and retail areas, all disabled parking spaces should be timed. The purpose of disabled parking is to provide improved access for those with mobility difficulties. From experience, Council has found that if non-timed disabled parking is installed, then it is often taken up all day every day by one person. This clearly only provides assistance to one person with a mobility permit. This is acceptable in residential areas where disabled parking is often installed to assist one resident. However, this is not the intention when installing disabled parking in retail areas. Timed disabled parking allows the one space to serve numerous people with mobility permits during the day.</p> <p>Requests for un-timed or timed disabled parking should be considered on their merits, taking into account the local circumstances.</p>
<p>Question 12. Is it necessary for wheelchair accessible taxis to have access to disability parking spaces for up to 15 minutes while waiting for passengers with a disability to enter or exit the vehicle? Or are there other alternatives you can suggest that would assist passengers with a disability using wheelchair accessible taxis?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 13. Should permits only be used if the permit holder is immediately entering or exiting the vehicle? Is this reasonable use?</p>	<p>Yes, permits should only be used if the permit holder is immediately entering or exiting the vehicle.</p> <p>If a person with a mobility permit has been dropped off at the destination, their mobility access needs have been addressed. The able bodied driver of the vehicle who heads off to park the vehicle is capable of walking from a</p>

	<p>regular parking space and does not need to utilise disabled parking.</p> <p>If the permit holder has to be in the vehicle, this will improve enforcement and reduce fraudulent abuse of the MPS where people “borrow” a permit from a family member or friend.</p>
<p>Question 14. Is it appropriate to have organisations maintain registers and log books to record the locations and use of all permits issued to them? Why do you feel this way?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 15. What should happen to permit holders whose permit has been misused on more than one occasion?</p>	<p>Council supports the introduction of sanctions where there is proven misuse of a mobility permit.</p> <p>The person misusing the permit should be subject to a significant monetary penalty.</p> <p>Where there are two proven misuse incidents within a 12 month period, the permit holder should be subject to a monetary penalty and/ or temporary suspension of the permit and/ or a temporary permit of limited duration dependent on continued good behaviour.</p>
<p>Question 16. Should penalties be applied to the permit holder or to the person using the permit without the permit holder being present? If yes, what type of penalty should be applied?</p>	<p>See response to Question 15.</p>
<p>Question 17. Should organisations that do not maintain proper records of permit location and use be prevented from obtaining new or replacement permits or fined for breaching the conditions of use? Why do you think this?</p>	<p>See response to Question 15.</p>
<p>Question 18. Is it reasonable to make all permit holders liable for misuse of the permit issued to them? If no, what alternative process do you suggest for managing repeated misuse of permits issued to children or incapable adults?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 19. Should a person with a disability be banned from holding a disability parking permit if it can be proven that they knowingly allowed their permit to be misused? Would this be fair?</p>	<p>See response to Question 15.</p>
<p>Question 20. Do you think good behaviour periods could be introduced for disability parking permit holders? If a further offence was detected while on a good behaviour period is it reasonable to revoke the permit and prevent the person from re-applying?</p>	<p>See response to Question 15.</p>

<p>Question 21. Do you think enforcement officers should be allowed to write to the registered operators of vehicles displaying cancelled, expired or revoked disability parking permits seeking return of the permit and for the name of the driver at the time to be nominated?</p>	<p>Yes, Council supports the proposal to allow enforcement officers to write to the registered operators of vehicles displaying cancelled, expired or revoked disability parking permits seeking return of the permit and for the name of the driver at the time to be nominated.</p> <p>This will improve enforcement of the MPS.</p>
<p>Question 22. Do you think there should be a fine for failing to nominate the driver in this circumstance just as there is for other situations where a registered operator fails to nominate the driver? Why?</p>	<p>Yes, Council supports the proposal to issue a fine for failing to nominate the driver.</p> <p>This will improve enforcement of the MPS.</p>
<p>Question 23. If multiple permits were issued to carers, do you think this would create more opportunities for permit misuse? Why do you think this?</p>	<p>Council does not support multiple permits being issued to carers, this increases the risk of abuse of the MPS.</p> <p>As noted in the Discussion Paper, if a person has multiple carers, they should be able to exchange custody of the mobility permit.</p>
<p>Question 24. Would you use an online application process? If not, why not?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 25. Is the introduction of a limit on the vehicle size that permits can be used on appropriate? If no, why not?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>Question 26. Would you support the introduction of two tier scheme knowing that this is not compatible with the Australian Disability Parking Scheme and may prevent you using your permit in other jurisdictions? If yes, what do you think the tiers should involve?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>

Thank you for taking Woollahra Council's comments into consideration. Council looks forward to some practical modifications to the MPS to help ensure fair access for those people with a genuine mobility impairment.

Should you have any further enquiries, please contact xxxxxx.

Yours sincerely

Item No: D6 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Inner Sydney Regional Bike Network**
Author: Cathy Edwards-Davis, Manager Engineering Services
File No: 256.G
Reason for Report: Recommended response to Correspondence from City of Sydney

Recommendation:

That Woollahra Council write to the City of Sydney indicating support for their funding submission to Infrastructure Australia for the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network, subject to the removal of Manning Road from the regional network and subject to Council's further approval of future detailed designs of the regional network.

Background

The City of Sydney prepared an Inner Sydney Regional Bike Plan in 2010. The Plan encompasses the City of Sydney LGA and the surrounding 14 inner Sydney Councils, including Woollahra. The Plan identified enhancements that would provide high quality radial and cross regional cycling links within the inner parts of Sydney. The network is designed to provide greater connectivity and segregation for cyclists between key destinations and along key arterial routes within inner Sydney. The network includes the construction of 160 kilometres of cycleways which are separated from general traffic and 70 kilometres of upgraded shared paths.

Woollahra Council has received correspondence from the City of Sydney dated 13 June 2012 regarding the Inner Sydney Regional Bike Network. The City is preparing a funding submission to Infrastructure Australia to provide funding to the fourteen Councils to design and construct the network. The City will contribute funding for the works within their LGA and a contribution will be made by Transport for NSW. City of Sydney are asking Infrastructure Australia for full funding for Woollahra and other Councils. Woollahra's contribution to the project will be limited to staff time.

The City of Sydney is requesting a letter from Woollahra Council providing support for the funding submission to Infrastructure Australia for the building of the Inner Sydney Regional Bike Network.

Regional Bike Network within Woollahra Council

The Inner Sydney Regional Bike Network within Woollahra Council includes 14.5 kilometres of bicycle pathways at a cost of approximately \$5.34 million (2010 figures). Should funding become available, it is envisaged that the works would be phased over eight years.

The works proposed for the Woollahra area include:

Location	Treatment	Year	Length (m)	Cost (\$ in 2010)
Bathurst St (Edward St to Edgecliff Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	5	300	90,000
Birriga Rd (entire length)	Separated one way pair	8	1,150	460,000
Burton St bridge (Cutler Footway) Shared with CoS	Mixed zone	6	80	8,000
Edgecliff Rd (Bathurst St to Grosvenor St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	5	90	27,000
Edward St (Manning Rd to Bathurst St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	5	160	48,000
Glenmore Rd (Brown St to Gurner St)	Mixed zone	7	440	44,000
Grosvenor St (Edgecliff Rd to Oxford St & then into Waverley)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	5	130	39,000
Gurner St (Glenmore Rd to Cascade St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	6	280	84,000
Hargrave St (Cascade St to Jersey Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	6	630	189,000
Jamberoo Ln (New South Head Rd to William St)	Separated contraflow cycle lane	5	260	52,000
Kiaora Rd (New South Head Rd to Carlotta Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	5	200	60,000
Kiaora Rd (Carlotta Rd to Epping Rd)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	5	580	1,160,000
Macdonald St (entire length) & Brown Street (Macdonald St to Glenmore Road)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	6	220	66,000
Manning Rd (Epping Rd to Suttie Rd)	Shared path through park	5	340	51,000
Moncur St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	6	530	159,000
Newcastle St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	7	850	255,000
New South Head Rd (Norwich Rd to Wunulla Rd)	Shared path on verge upgrade	6	1,520	228,000
New South Head Rd (Wunulla Rd to William St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	2	880	264,000
New South Head Rd (Ocean Ave to Nield Ave)	Shared path on verge	1	860	129,000
Norwich Ln (entire length)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	7	210	420,000
Norwich Rd (entire length)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	7	120	240,000
Old South Head Rd (Bondi Rd to Victoria St) Shared with Waverley	Shared path on verge - one way pair	1	460	69,000
Old South Head Rd (Curlewis St to Newcastle St) Shared with Waverley	Shared path on verge	7	920	138,000
O'Sullivan Rd (entire length)	Separated one way cycle lane north bound / Sharepath on verge south bound	3	1,680	588,000
Ocean Ave (New South Head Rd to William St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	1	600	180,000
Victoria Rd (Birriga Rd to Old South Head Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	1	370	111,000
William St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	1	600	180,000
Total			14,460	5,339,000

The proposed treatment in Kiaora Road, Carlotta Road to Epping Road, is a Shared Zone at a significant cost of \$1.16 million. An alternative and cheaper treatment option would be to make this area a mixed zone.

Review of the Woollahra Bicycle Strategy 2009

The Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network Strategy was compared with the Woollahra Bicycle Strategy to ensure consistency:

Location	Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network 2010	Woollahra Bicycle Strategy 2009	Consistency Between Plans
Bathurst St (Edward St to Edgecliff Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A8 – bicycle shoulder lanes	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Birriga Rd (entire length)	Separated one way pair	Route A4 – on-road mixed traffic eastbound (downhill), bicycle shoulder lane westbound (uphill)	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Brown Street (Macdonald St to Glenmore Road)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A1 – mixed traffic northbound and shoulder lane southbound	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Burton St bridge (Cutler Footway) Shared with CoS	Mixed zone	Route A1 – mixed traffic westbound and shoulder lane eastbound	Location: Yes Treatment: Yes
Edgecliff Rd (Bathurst St to Grosvenor St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A4 – bicycle shoulder lanes	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Edward St (Manning Rd to Bathurst St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A8 – bicycle shoulder lanes	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Glenmore Rd (Brown St to Gurner St)	Mixed zone	Route A1 – on-road mixed traffic Route B5 – on-road mixed traffic	Location: Yes Treatment: Yes
Grosvenor St (Edgecliff Rd to Oxford St & then into Waverley)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A3 – bicycle shoulder lanes southbound, on-road mixed traffic northbound	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Gurner St (Glenmore Rd to Cascade St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Nil	Location: No Treatment: N/A
Hargrave St (Cascade St to Jersey Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Nil	Location: No Treatment: N/A
Jamberoo Ln (New South Head Rd to William St)	Separated contraflow cycle lane	Nil	Location: No Treatment: N/A
Kiaora Rd (New South Head Rd to Carlotta Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A8 – on-road mixed traffic	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Kiaora Rd (Carlotta Rd to Epping Rd)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	Route A8 – on-road mixed traffic	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Macdonald St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A1 – mixed traffic westbound and shoulder lane eastbound	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Manning Rd (Epping Rd to Edward Street)	Shared path through park	Route A8 – on-road mixed traffic. Note: Council has recently resolved not to proceed with the Manning Rd bike path.	Location: No (park c.f. on-road) Treatment: Upgrade
Moncur St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Nil	Location: No Treatment: N/A
Newcastle St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A6 – Standard bicycle shoulder lane treatment would fit with adjustments to existing linemarking	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
New South Head Rd (Norwich Rd to Wunulla Rd)	Shared path on verge upgrade	Route A2 – Norwich Road to Kent Road – off-road path on south side. Kent Road to Wunulla Rd – off-road path on north side	Location: Yes Treatment: Yes

New South Head Rd (Wunulla Rd to William St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A2 – off-road path on north side	Location: Yes Treatment: No
New South Head Rd (Ocean Ave to Nield Ave)	Shared path on verge	Route A2 – Ocean Ave to Darling Point Road – network gap Darling Point Road to Nield Avenue – off-road path on both sides	Location: Yes Treatment: Partially
Norwich Ln (entire length)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	Nil	Location: No Treatment: N/A
Norwich Rd (entire length)	Shared zone - street calming works as illustrated	Route A2 – Richmond Road to New South Head Road (only) – on-road mixed traffic	Location: Partially Treatment: Upgrade
Old South Head Rd (Bondi Rd to Victoria St) Shared with Waverley	Shared path on verge - one way pair	Route A4 – off-road shared path on north side of carriageway	Location: Yes Treatment: Partially
Old South Head Rd (O’Sullivan Road to Newcastle St) Shared with Waverley	Shared path on verge	Route A6 – two-way off-road shared path adjacent to golf course	Location: Yes Treatment: Yes
O’Sullivan Rd (entire length)	Separated one way cycle lane north bound / Sharepath on verge south bound	Route A5 – bicycle shoulder lanes	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade
Ocean Ave (New South Head Rd to William St)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route B13 – New South Head Road to Cooper Street (only) – on-road mixed traffic	Location: Partially Treatment: Upgrade
Victoria Rd (Birriga Rd to Old South Head Rd)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A4 – off-road shared path on west/ north side	Location: Yes Treatment: No
William St (entire length)	Separated bidirectional cycleway on road	Route A2 – on-road mixed traffic with mixed traffic intersection treatments	Location: Yes Treatment: Upgrade

The comparison analysis above demonstrates that the majority of the proposed Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network utilises the same routes as the Woollahra Bicycle Strategy. However, much of the proposed regional network envisages an upgrade in the type of bicycle path treatment.

The Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network does propose a small number of new routes, including Gurner Street, Hargrave Street, Jamberoo Lane, Manning Road, Moncur Street, Norwich Lane, Norwich Road and Ocean Avenue.

It is noted that Council has recently resolved not to proceed with the Manning Rd bike route.

Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network: Demand Assessment and Economic Appraisal

AECOM was commissioned by the City of Sydney to determine the economic desirability of developing the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network for the purposes of informing submissions to Federal and State bodies for project funding. As part of this study, usage forecasts were prepared to estimate the additional levels of cycling that will be generated from an expanded and improved cycle network. This study investigated benefits arising from increased levels of cycling including:

- Decongestion
- Vehicle operating costs savings
- Parking cost savings
- Travel time savings
- Journey ambiance
- Health benefits in the form of reduced mortality and absenteeism savings
- Accident costs

- Reduced air pollution
- Reduced noise pollution
- Greenhouse gas reduction
- Reduced water pollution
- Reduced urban separation
- Reduced pressure on government infrastructure and services

In addition to the abovementioned benefits, which were monetised for this study, the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network will generate additional benefits including:

- Improved journey time reliability
- Improved integration with public transport
- Public transport decrowding
- Improved equity and accessibility outcomes
- Potential for wider economic benefits beyond the transport sector
- Improved localised economic activity
- Reduced energy dependence

Within the Inner Sydney Regional area, cycling accounts for 0.92% of commuting trips and 0.71% of other trips. This compares with the average across the Sydney Statistical Division of 0.57% of commuting trips and 0.77% of other trips.

Growth in commuter cycling demand has grown by 27 percent between 2001 and 2006 and by 50 percent for non-commute trips over the same period. The highest levels of cycling demand can be found closer to the Sydney CBD.

AECOM forecasts that cycling levels will increase by 66 percent by 2016 within the study area and 71 percent by 2026 due to the implementation of the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network.

The State Government's NSW 2021 strategic plan includes a target to more than double the mode share of bicycle trips made in the Greater Sydney region, at a local and district level, by 2016. Whilst the full implementation of the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network will provide a contribution towards achieving these targets, additional interventions will be required to achieve the NSW Government targets.

The full implementation of the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network is predicted to have the potential to generate significant economic benefits in excess of the economic costs and deliver high returns on investment. Relative to doing nothing, the development of the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network is estimated to generate net economic benefits of \$507 million in 2010 prices at a benefit cost ratio of 3.88.

Funding

The City of Sydney has recognised that other Councils generally do not have the means to fund million dollar cycling facilities. City of Sydney therefore propose to make a grant submission to Infrastructure Australia on behalf of all 15 Councils involved in the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network.

Should City of Sydney be successful in attracting funding for these works, it is understood they intend to distribute the money to the other participating Councils. Each Council will then be responsible for delivering the works within their area. Woollahra Council's contribution to the project will be limited to staff time.

Conclusion

It is noted that Council has recently resolved not to proceed with the Manning Road bike path. Subject to the removal of Manning Road from the regional network, it is recommended that Woollahra Council support the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network for the following reasons:

- The regional network largely complements the Woollahra Bicycle Strategy 2009
- If the regional network goes ahead, it will be at no cost to Woollahra Council
- The regional network will contribute to the goals and objectives outlined in the Woollahra Traffic & Transport Study and the State Government's NSW 2021 and NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan
- If additional people choose to utilise cycling as an alternative means to the private vehicle, then this will have benefits for other road users in that there will be less congestion on the roadways
- City of Sydney have demonstrated that the works have a high benefit to cost ratio.

It is therefore recommended that Council write to the City of Sydney indicating support for their funding submission to Infrastructure Australia for the Inner Sydney Regional Bicycle Network.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

Nil – City of Sydney are seeking Infrastructure Australia funding for works within the Woollahra area

Cathy Edwards-Davis
Manager Engineering Services

Tom O'Hanlon
Director Technical Services

Annexure:

Extract from the Inner Sydney Regional Bike Plan Implementation Strategy 2010

POLITICAL DONATIONS DECISION MAKING FLOWCHART FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCILLORS

