



Community & Environment Committee

Agenda: *Community & Environment Committee*

Date: *Monday 27 June 2005*

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).

Delegated Authority (“D” Items):

- Community Services and Programmes.
- Health.
- Liquor Licences.
- Fire Protection Orders.
- Residential Parking Schemes (surveillance and administration).
- Traffic Management (Traffic Committee Recommendations).
- Waverley/Woollahra Process Plant.
- 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 Meeting.
- 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 below.
- Library Services
- Licensing.
- Regulatory.
- Waste Minimisation

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 the 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, or which are not the subject of a Business Agenda (current or past).
- Matters reserved by individual Councillors, in accordance with any Council policy on "safeguards".
- Parks and Reserve Plans of Management (Strategies, Policies and Objectives)
- Residential Parking Schemes - Provision and Policies

Committee Membership:

7 Councillors

Quorum:

The quorum for a Committee meeting is 4 Councillors.

WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Notice of Meeting

22 June 2005

To: The Mayor, Councillor Rundle, ex-officio
Councillors Marcus Ehrlich (Chair)
 Anthony Boskovitz
 Claudia Cullen
 Tanya Excell
 Wilhelmina Gardner
 Andrew Petrie
 John Walker

Dear Councillors

Community & Environment Committee Meeting – 27 June 2005

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 27 June 2005 at 6.00pm.**

Gary James
General Manager

Meeting Agenda

Item	Subject	Pages
1	Leave of Absence and Apologies	
2	Late Correspondence	
3	Declarations of Interest	

Items to be Decided by this Committee using its Delegated Authority

D1	Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 14 June 2005	1
D2	Petition to Council from residents affected by noise on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive – 884.G 05.1 Petitions 2005	2
D3	School – Drop off and pick up traffic issues – 900.G, 255.G / Schools	7
D4	Faraday Avenue, Rose Bay – Boat and trailer parking – 195.G Part 15	13
D5	Minutes of the Environmental Levy Community Reference Group meeting Thursday 24 February 2005 – 1142.G	16

Item No: D1 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held on 14 June 2005**
Author: Les Windle, Manager - Governance
File No: See Council Minutes
Reason for Report: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday 14 June 2005 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 14 June 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

Les Windle
Manager - Governance

Item No: D2 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Petition to Council from residents affected by noise on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive**
Author: Jacqui Hansen, Engineer - Policy and Projects
File No: 884.G 05.1 Petitions 2005
Reason for Report: Council is in receipt of a petition from residents on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive seeking Council's assistance to have the RTA install a noise barrier on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive

Recommendation:

- A. That Council write to the Minister for Roads and the RTA on behalf of the petitioners seeking consideration of their request to have a sound barrier placed on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive to reduce the noise impact on their residences.
- B. That the signatories of the petition be advised of the RTA's *Noise Abatement Program* and that they should register individually following the opening of the Cross City Tunnel.

Background:

A petition signed by 50 residents of Woollahra living on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive was tabled at the Council meeting held on Tuesday 26 April 2005. The terms of the petition were as follows:

We the residents on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive petition Woollahra Council to make representations to the Minister and the Roads and Traffic Authority on our behalf to have a sound barrier placed on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive the same as the one that is located on the immediately opposite on the southern side for the following reasons;

1. *The properties that we occupy are in fact closer to the roadway than the majority of those affected on Grafton Street.*
2. *It is our opinion that more residents are affected on the northern side than the southern side.*
3. *The installation of the barrier on the other side about 5 years ago increased the noise levels to the properties we occupy by on average 12%.*
4. *We are being discriminated against by not being treated in the same manner as the residents on the other side.*

We also seek Woollahra Council's assistance in obtaining from the Minister's Office files that relate to the decision by the RTA to soundproof one side and not the other.

The covering letter attached to the petition stated;

Individual efforts have previously failed due to the RTA maintaining that other areas have a greater priority, but this fails to answer the question as to why the sound barrier was placed immediately opposite on the other side of the roadway.

We fear with the opening of the Cross-City Tunnel the volume of traffic will become much greater and the noise levels even higher.

Following discussion of the matter, Council adopted the following resolution;

That the petition lie on the table for fourteen (14) days and be referred to the appropriate Council Officer for submission of a report on the issues raised in the petition.

RTA Noise Abatement Program:

The NSW Government has recognised that increasing levels of traffic have the potential to cause concern to the community. To address this concern, the RTA has developed the NSW *Noise Abatement Program*, to mitigate noise impacts associated with **existing** State and Federal Roads that are not subject to upgrades and where traffic noise is high.

There are many sites in the *Noise Abatement Program* and a finite level of funding, so the RTA prioritises sites based on the following criteria;

- The RTA monitors noise sensitive buildings located along existing State and Federal roads not subject to upgrading works to monitor noise levels and collect control data. A noise sensitive building is defined as a school, residence, health care institution or place of worship.
- To be considered for the program, average noise levels must exceed 65 decibels during the day (7am – 10pm) or 60 decibels at night (10pm – 7am).
- Only residences, schools, places of worship and health care institutions are considered for the *Noise Abatement Program*.
- Priority is given to long-term affected residents (7 years or more) rather than those who have bought into a noisy area.
- There must be at least one noise complaint received by the RTA.

If residents believe that they are adversely affected by road traffic noise, the RTA recommends that they contact the RTA and ask to be registered with the *Noise Abatement Program*. The RTA then sends a registration form and an explanation of the program to the resident. The RTA next conducts a preliminary investigation of noise to determine if a detailed investigation, including long-term monitoring, is warranted.

If the *Noise Abatement Program* criteria are met, the residence is entered into the RTA priority evaluation database. The database contains a list of noise affected properties from around NSW. In April of each year, the RTA determines which properties, from the priority evaluation database will be treated. It is RTA policy that *where treatment is found to be both feasible and cost-effective, the loudest sites will be treated to the extent that the funding allows.*

RTA NOISE ABATEMENT TREATMENT

The types of treatments available under the RTA *Noise Abatement Program* are limited to the acoustic treatment of buildings and the construction of noise barriers and noise mounds.

Noise walls are constructed where the number of houses likely to benefit exceeds three.

Noise walls, such as currently located on the southern side of Syd Einfeld Drive are the preferred treatment but often they cannot be constructed due to site limitations. Limitations include; bridge structure limitations, hydrology flooding issues, line of site safety limitations or orientation of the affected building to a road or driveway. Often architectural acoustic treatment of buildings is the only option.

Architectural acoustic treatment provides an improved internal noise environment than what could be offered by a noise wall but no external benefit.

The cost of a noise wall compared to architectural acoustic treatment of buildings depends on the specifics of the site. Generally the construction of a noise wall is more costly than architectural acoustic treatment. The RTA, in the case of Syd Einfeld Drive, considers that architectural acoustic treatment of individual buildings is more cost effective than the construction of a noise wall.

To determine which treatment or combination of treatments is most appropriate for a noisy site the RTA follows a defined process.

RTA INVESTIGATION OF ROAD TRAFFIC NOISE AT SYD EINFELD DRIVE, WOOLLAHRA

Approximately five years ago the RTA investigated noise levels on both the northern and southern side of Syd Einfeld Drive. It was found that noise levels on the southern side were much higher than on the northern side. The RTA subsequently constructed a noise wall on the southern side of Syd Einfeld Drive.

Certain homes on the northern side were found to be significantly affected by road traffic noise. The RTA recently undertook architectural acoustic treatment on a property in Nelson Street Woollahra affected by road traffic noise. This followed the resident's written complaint and a noise study by the RTA.

Several residents living in Woollahra have recently written to the RTA concerned about road traffic noise at their properties. The RTA have advised Council that they have scheduled to undertake noise studies at homes in; Junction Street, Wallis Street and Nelson Street between now and September 2005. The results of these studies along with other criteria will be entered into the RTA priority evaluation database. Affected residents are encouraged to contact the RTA *Noise Abatement Program* after 1 September 2005 to find out the results of these studies.

It is the policy of the RTA to deal with individual residents on a case by case basis. If a resident considers that their property is adversely affected by road traffic noise they are advised to write to the RTA as an individual.

Councils customer request database does not have any records of complaints regarding road traffic noise from residents on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive from 2002 to date. One verbal complaint was made to an Environmental Health Officer when he recently visited the complainant's home in Woollahra to discuss a separate issue.

The petition to Council was signed by 50 residents. The RTA has informed Council that in the past 10 years, fewer than 50 complaints have been received by the RTA about road traffic noise from Syd Einfeld Drive. The RTA considers the number of complaints to be irrelevant and the *Noise Abatement Program* is a priority program that follows strict criteria. The loudest sites in Sydney receive priority. Whilst a minimum of one complaint must be received for a site to be considered under the Noise Abatement Program, the number of complaints has no bearing on priority.

Council has not undertaken any testing of road traffic noise from Syd Einfeld Drive for several reasons. Firstly, Council does not have the appropriate equipment. The testing of road traffic noise requires a specialised data logger that registers numerous frequencies of sound over a given time period (usually a week). Secondly, Council does not have access to the guidelines used by the RTA when testing road traffic noise. For example it is not clear from the information that the RTA has provided to Council how close to a residential dwelling a reading should be taken. Finally, the testing of road traffic noise from RTA controlled roads is the responsibility the RTA and Council should not be seen to be taking over the responsibilities of the RTA.

Consideration

Council acknowledges that some properties in Woollahra in the vicinity of Syd Einfeld Drive could be adversely affected by road traffic noise. The abatement of road traffic noise from Syd Einfeld Drive is however the responsibility of the RTA. Council can however inform the RTA of the residents' concerns and seek appropriate action.

Council cannot influence the RTA *Noise Abatement Program* priority evaluation database, which determines which properties are treated for the abatement of road traffic noise. Council can however indicate its support of the residents' concerns.

The petition requests that Council obtains from the Minister's office files that relate to the decision by the RTA to construct a noise wall on the southern side of Syd Einfeld Drive but not the northern side. In relation this matter, it is recommended that affected residents be advised to individually contact the RTA *Noise Abatement Program* to discuss their particular circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that in accordance with the terms of the petition, Council write to the Minister for Roads and the RTA on behalf of the petitioners seeking consideration of their request to have a sound barrier placed on the northern side of Syd Einfeld Drive to reduce the noise impact on their residences.

It is also recommended that residents who are affected by road traffic noise from Syd Einfeld Drive be encouraged to write individually to the RTA *Noise Abatement Program*. They can then be registered for the program and a noise study performed by the RTA at their property. The possibility exists that should enough residents register with the program, that construction of a noise wall will become a more cost-effective option than the architectural acoustic treatment of numerous individual homes.

If the signatories are concerned about increased road traffic noise once the Cross City Tunnel opens, it is recommended that they wait until after the opening of the Cross City Tunnel to register with the RTA.

Jacqui Hansen, Engineer – Policy and Projects Warwick Hatton – Director Technical Services

Annexure 1

1. Map showing the addresses of the signatories of the petition.

Item No: D3 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **School - Drop off and pick up traffic issues**
Author: Lorna Oliver, Traffic and Transport Planner
File No: 900.G, 255.G / Schools
Reason for Report: Council Notice of Motion requesting a report

Recommendation:

- A. That Council write to the Principals of all schools in the Municipality outlining the issues raised in this report and asking them to outline the policies or strategies they have in place to minimise the traffic and parking problems created during the morning drop off and afternoon pick up times.
- B. That the Principals be advised that although Council has limited resources available, Council is prepared, on a priority basis, to provide advice to schools on the development of appropriate strategies to minimise traffic and parking problems.
- C. That priority be given to schools:
 - i. That have a demonstrated traffic and parking problem, and
 - ii. Can demonstrate that they have attempted to introduce strategies to minimise traffic and parking problems, and
 - iii. Have a commitment to develop, implement and allocate resources, and
 - iv. Have the support of the school community.
- D. That Council's Development Control Plan for School and College Development (1995) be reviewed in response to the increased traffic problems around schools.

Background:

Council, at its meeting of 9 February 2004, adopted the following Notice of Motion:

“As a matter of urgency a report be brought to Community & Environment Committee to address the traffic problems in the Municipality created by schools at the morning drop off time and the afternoon pickup time.

The report to canvas ways of obtaining cooperation of individual schools:

1. by adopting car line strategies used at ASCHAM & SCEGGS;
2. by imposing conditions for traffic control if a DA is lodged by the school for future building works;
3. by encouraging a ‘schools are good neighbours’ policy;
4. by encouraging staggering departure times; and
5. by encouraging car pooling by parents.

That such report canvas ways of seeking cooperation from Sydney Buses, the RTA and Police.”

There are sixteen schools consisting of nineteen campuses in the Municipality. These schools are as follows:

- Ascham School
- Bellevue Hill Public School
- Cranbrook School
- Double Bay Public School
- Glenmore Road Public School
- Holy Cross Primary School

- Kambala
- Kincoppal-Rose Bay School
- McAuley Primary School
- Reddam House High School (Edgecliff Rd campus only)
- Rose Bay Public
- Rose Bay Secondary College - Vaucluse campus
- Sydney Grammar School Edgecliff Preparatory
- The Scots College
- Vaucluse Public
- Woollahra Public School

Observations have been carried out at six of the schools in the Municipality during morning drop off times and afternoon pick up times. The schools observed are as follows:

- Ascham School
- Cranbrook School
- Double Bay Public School
- Glenmore Road Public School
- Holy Cross Primary School
- Reddam House High School (Edgecliff Rd campus only)

At the observed schools, the most common arrival mode was by car with one family arriving in each car. Often there was only one child in the car. Car pooling was not evident at any of the observed schools.

School traffic is not confined to parent vehicles but is also generated by staff and senior students driving cars to the school. These vehicles not only generate additional traffic but generally park in nearby streets when vehicles cannot be parked on site, which adds to the parking and traffic congestion in the vicinity of the school. This impacts on residents and businesses in the area as well as the school community.

From these observations it could be seen that a large amount of school traffic consists of parent vehicles as most of the children arrived by car. It is common to see parent vehicles illegally parked and executing potentially dangerous manoeuvres directly outside schools. Where schools have traffic management policies in place, these behaviours are often specifically disallowed in the policies. Many vehicles, particularly at primary schools, park outside the school for relatively short periods of time. Often these vehicles are illegally parked as there is generally limited short term parking directly outside the school. It seems parents are often not prepared to walk short distances (in an extreme case, less than ten metres) to ensure their vehicle is parked legally and safely.

Congestion around the schools can be quite severe and while the congestion may partially explain these behaviours, it must be acknowledged that these behaviours exacerbate the situation. Most schools commence between 8 and 9am and conclude around 3pm which means the morning drop off time coincides with the commuting AM peak period and the afternoon pick up time precedes the commuting PM peak period. Before and after school care is often available at schools, which extends the period of traffic congestion.

Some of the observed schools have strategies in place to manage or mitigate traffic issues and traffic impacts. These systems are in a varied degree of development and effectiveness. The most effective strategy that has been implemented at the observed schools was teacher supervised car-line queuing. Successful systems were those in which the school placed resources, often in the form of teachers regulating and controlling the area, ensuring they continue to work. Limitations include the availability of on-street parking and the resources of the school.

Paddington had a higher observed rate of pedestrian access to schools with Glenmore Road Public School having the largest observed proportion of pedestrian arrivals at the observed schools.

The following information addresses the individual points raised in Council's Notice of Motion:

1. Adopting car line strategies used at Ascham and SCEGGS

Car line strategies involve a dedicated area with signage denoting parking restrictions during the peak drop off and pick up times for use by parents when dropping off or picking up their children. When the parent's vehicle reaches the front of the queue the child enters or exits the vehicle and the parent leaves the queue. Of the observed schools, Ascham, Holy Cross Primary, Cranbrook (Victoria Road campus) and SCEGGS are currently operating teacher supervised car line strategies. The traffic around these schools was noticeably better managed than schools with no strategies in place.

Ascham has a very good system that was operating well on the date of observation. Parents entered the school to drop off and collect their children, removing this traffic from the street. The system worked well as the school has sufficient land to allow for a well-planned layout. Most of the schools within the Municipality do not have sufficient space for such an expansive system. However, some schools may have scope for an on site drop off and collection area

Holy Cross Primary does not have available land, however it does have two street frontages. One of these streets is quieter in terms of traffic volumes, parking, and is reasonably wide. The school relies on parking restrictions during the morning drop off and has adopted a teacher supervised car line strategy along this frontage during the afternoon pick up time. During this time, parents queue in their vehicles with a sign stating the name of the children they are to collect. This system is supervised by 2-3 teachers with megaphones. The principal was on duty with another teacher on the day of observation. She stated that the system was developed by one of the parents at the school and that it worked very well for them and they were very happy with it. She said the traffic flow has improved since implementing the system and that it is well worth the resources they put into it.

Cranbrook School utilises signage denoting parking restrictions in the morning. It has a similar strategy to the one used at Holy Cross in place at its Rose Bay Avenue frontage during the afternoon pick up time. This is supervised by a teacher. On the day of observation it was disrupted due to a car parked in the 'No Parking' zone. The teacher on duty reported that there is frequently at least one car parked in the 'No Parking' zone and that the system worked smoothly otherwise.

SCEGGS has two street frontages, Bourke Street and Forbes Street. Bourke Street is used for supervised afternoon pick-ups of junior students and Forbes Street for unsupervised collection of senior students. On the day of observation this was working quite well due to the small number of students being collected from each location.

Kambala School has introduced a dedicated pick up and drop off zone in Tivoli Avenue adjacent to the school. Parents however have been reluctant to use this area to pick up and drop off their children due to difficulties in negotiating safely, the intersection of Tivoli Avenue and New South Head Road. Kambala School and Council have been exploring with the Roads and Traffic Authority the possible installation of traffic lights at this intersection to overcome this problem and a report on this issue will be presented to Council shortly.

It is clear that properly organised and supervised car line strategies can be very effective when well planned and adequately resourced. This may not be possible for all schools within the Municipality as they require:

- A street frontage where there is available on-street parking and demand for on-street parking is low, enabling the installation of a 'No Parking' zone during the drop off and pick up times without disrupting parking and traffic in the surrounding area
- School commitment and the availability of personnel to regulate and control traffic
- Cooperation of parents

2. Imposing conditions for traffic control if a Development Application is lodged by the school for future building works

According to Council's Development and Control Plan for School and College Development (1995), schools are required to provide: "A layby area adjacent to the principal entry gates or an internal driveway should be provided, to the satisfaction of Council, for the picking up and dropping off of students before and after school, where necessary and/or possible". Note: as this document is ten years old and it is apparent that more and more children are being dropped off and picked up in motor vehicles it would be appropriate to review the document to consider other issues that have changed in the period since its adoption.

3. Encouraging a 'schools are good neighbours' policy

As part of the neighbourhood, schools impact on their surrounding community. Many schools are aware of this impact and endeavour to be proactive in their relations with the surrounding community, however there are times when competing interests make this difficult. Schools need to recognise that residents are part of their local community.

There are various types of projects, relating to funding for traffic-related improvement projects and to neighbourhood issues such as student behaviour and community access to school facilities. Either or both of these can be promoted in dealings with the schools when appropriate.

4. Encouraging staggered departure times

Some schools have already developed programs including staggered departure times to reduce the numbers of students entering and leaving the school at the same time which reduces the number of vehicles accessing the schools at these times. This can be promoted with schools that do not have staggered departure times during interactions with the schools.

Staggered arrival and departure times has been raised with some schools and some commitment to explore this has been stated by the schools. This has been carried out both with schools which do not currently have staggered departures as well as with those which do and may have the potential to expand their departures.

5. Encouraging car pooling by parents

Discussions with one school indicated that their impression of car pooling was that it would be unlikely to be a viable option for that school.

Car pooling can be encouraged when meeting with schools and parents. This may have limited effectiveness as car pooling will not be successful unless parents are located within easy mutual access and there is adequate resourcing to assist parents to establish and maintain suitable car pooling arrangements.

Addressing Traffic and Parking Issues Through Enforcement

Safety in and around schools is a high priority for Council's Parking Enforcement and Ranger Services Section, with parking patrols being undertaken around one or more schools per day, during school terms. School headmasters and Parent & Citizen representatives also request patrols by Council enforcement officers and Councils Senior Ranger – Parking has attended a number of meetings with school staff and parent groups.

At the beginning of the school year, Council's enforcement officers provide an educational role, patrolling school zones to speak with new parents and to distribute Council's highly successful '*School Road Safety*' brochure. Council's Parking Enforcement and Ranger Services Section, in consultation with Council's Communications Manager, developed this brochure.

Patrols continue throughout the school year and penalty infringements are issued where breaches of the Australian Road Rules (ARR) are observed. If continued problems or concerns are reported in relation to a particular school, Council's enforcement officers may undertake less visible patrols in an endeavour to change the attitude of parents when they drop-off or collect their children.

Council's enforcement officers have found that people are more likely to obey the ARR when they see a Council enforcement officer. However, considering the number of schools in the area and the available number of enforcement staff, it is not possible to have enforcement officers at every school on a daily basis. Therefore, it is important to have people do the right thing, even if it appears as if there are no enforcement officers in the area. Council's less visible patrols aim to achieve this objective.

Comments

At the request of Double Bay Public School and Cranbrook School, meetings were held to discuss traffic matters at the two schools.

A number of phone calls were received from members of Double Bay Public School's P&C in relation to traffic at the school and two informal meetings have been held at the school. The principal attended the first and was informed of the second. At these meetings the school presented as being very interested in working to resolve these issues. Issues discussed included safety in and around school property, relocation of the staff car park as well as signage and parking in the school vicinity. The school's traffic committee is currently considering its options. It is likely that further meetings will be held with the school to address these issues.

An initial meeting was called by Cranbrook School recently to look into traffic issues in the vicinity of the school. Cranbrook Staff, a resident, Police and Council staff attended. Concerns about safety, access, parking and enforcement were raised. A variety of options and ideas were discussed focusing on reducing the number of vehicles travelling to and from the school each day. These included restrictions on students driving to school, similar to those which the school reported Ascham and Scots utilising, door-to-door buses for students, reducing staff cars through incentives as part of salary package and preferential parking treatment for vehicles participating in car-pooling schemes. The school is currently investigating options discussed at the meeting. There is expected to be further meetings with the school to address these issues.

Conclusion:

Each school within the Municipality has different operating, traffic and parking problems and different site constraints. Accordingly, individual traffic and parking strategies need to be developed for each school having regard to these different problems and site constraints.

For a traffic and parking strategy to be effective, it needs to be functional, user friendly and easy to enforce. It must also have regard to the needs and the amenity of the adjoining residents. For it to be successful, the school needs to formally adopt the strategy, be committed to its implementation and be prepared to allocate the resources necessary to implement and manage the strategy. The strategy must also have the support and cooperation of the school's parents.

If a school and its parents are committed to develop and implement a parking and traffic management for the school, Council can assist by:

- Working with the schools to assist in the development of strategies to deal with traffic management issues
- Implementation of restrictions (signage)
- Enforcement of restrictions
- Control through Development Applications

Council has limited staff resources to provide assistance to all the schools within the Municipality concurrently. Therefore any assistance given would have to be provided on a priority basis with priority being given to schools:

- i. That have a demonstrated traffic and parking problem, and
- ii. Can demonstrate that they have attempted to introduce strategies to minimise traffic and parking problems, and
- iii. Have a commitment to develop, implement and allocate resources, and
- iv. Have the support of the school community.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

As discussed above, Council has limited resources and any resources allocated to this project would have to be provided on a priority basis.

Lorna Oliver
Traffic and Transport Planner

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

ANNEXURES:

Nil

Item No: D4 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Faraday Avenue, Rose Bay – Boat and Trailer Parking**
Author: Greg Stewart - Manager Public Infrastructure
File No: 195.G Part 15
Reason for Report: Community and Environment Committee resolution

Recommendation:

- A. That the residents of Faraday Avenue and Albemarle Avenue, Rose Bay be invited to a meeting to discuss options available to deter non-resident boat and trailer parking in these streets.

Background:

The Woollahra Traffic Committee, at its meeting of 1 March 2005, reviewed the implementation of parking restrictions in O'Sullivan Road and Newcastle Street, Rose Bay that were designed to deter long term boat and trailer parking in these streets.

The review of the effectiveness of these changes identified an increase in the number of boat and trailers being parked in Faraday Avenue, Rose Bay. One resident of Faraday Avenue requested the Council to take action to remove the boats and trailers that had moved into Faraday Avenue.

The Woollahra Traffic Committee at that time considered two options in relation to the increase of parking in Faraday Avenue, these being to introduce time-limited parking in Faraday Avenue near the intersection of Newcastle Street or to wait and monitor the situation. At its meeting held on 1 March, 2005, the Woollahra Traffic Committee recommended:

- A. *That the parking restrictions in O'Sullivan Road and Newcastle Street, Rose Bay continue to be enforced.*
- B. *That Council continues monitoring the boat and trailer parking in O'Sullivan Road, Newcastle Street and surrounding streets.*
- C. *That Council's Regulatory staff pursue the removal of all unregistered boat and trailers in O'Sullivan Road and Newcastle Street.*
- D. *That the residents of Faraday Avenue, near the intersection of Newcastle Street, Rose Bay, be canvassed to determine their views on the possible extension of the One Hour Resident Parking Scheme in Newcastle Street to the Newcastle Street end of Faraday Avenue.*
- E. *That a further report be submitted to the next meeting of the Woollahra Traffic Committee detailing the results of the above.*

At its meeting of 14 March 2005, Council's Community & Environment Committee resolved:

- A. *That the parking restrictions in O'Sullivan Road and Newcastle Street, Rose Bay continue to be enforced.*

- B. That Council continues monitoring the boat and trailer parking in O'Sullivan Road, Newcastle Street and surrounding streets.*
- C. That Council's Regulatory staff pursue the removal of all unregistered boat and trailers in O'Sullivan Road and Newcastle Street.*
- D. That the residents of Faraday Avenue, near the intersection of Newcastle Street, Rose Bay, be canvassed to determine their views on the possible extension of the One Hour Resident Parking Scheme in Newcastle Street to the Newcastle Street end of Faraday Avenue.*
- E. That a further report be submitted to the next meeting of the Woollahra Traffic Committee detailing the results of the above.*

Issues:

As a consequence of Part D of the Community & Environment Committees resolution, a total of twenty-five letters were distributed to the residents of Faraday Avenue and the properties on the corner of Faraday Avenue in both Newcastle Street and Old South Head Road on the 4 May 2005. Written submission in relation to the proposed Scheme were invited with a closing date of 20 May 2005.

Fifteen responses were received by Council, of which eleven respondents were against the proposal and four respondents were in support as shown in the attached Annexure. An overwhelming majority of respondents were against the implementation of these parking restrictions and the participation in a Resident Parking Scheme for which they would have to apply and pay an annual fee.

The responses received seemed to indicate that there is a greater concern by the respondents to the Residential Parking Scheme than deterring non-resident boat and trailer parking in this street. Additionally, most respondents expressed their concern that the implementation of the scheme in Newcastle Street had not provided effective results and had not been adequately policed by Council's regulatory staff. It appears from the responses received that the residents of the street do not fully understand what Council is trying to achieve and the options available to Council in trying to move the long-term non-resident boat and trailer parking from this street. Additionally, Council has received several telephone calls from residents in Albemarle Avenue in relation to this issue and asking if options can be explored in this street to deter the long-term non-resident boat and trailer parking that is now occurring in this street.

Conclusion:

It is considered that a meeting should be held with interested residents of Faraday Avenue and Albemarle Avenue to discuss the options available to Council to deter non-resident boat and trailer parking in these streets. Such action will enable the residents to make an informed decision as to their preferred option in relation to this issue.

Identification of Income & Expenditure:

Nil

Greg Stewart
Manager Public Infrastructure

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

Annexures:

1. Locality Map – Responses Received

Item No: D5 Delegated to Committee
Subject: **Minutes of the Environmental Levy Community Reference Group Meeting Thursday 24 February 2005**
Author: Jamie Howieson
File No: 1142.G
Reason for Report: To report on the outcomes of the Environmental Levy Community Reference Group meeting held on Wednesday 8 June 2005

Recommendation:

- A. That the minutes of the Environmental Levy Community Reference Group meeting, held on Wednesday 8 June 2005, be received and noted.
- B. That there be a report to the Corporate & Works Committee on the Atlantis proposal outlining how it could be used to treat the stormwater as part of the upgrade works considered for The Crescent, Vacluse.
- C. That staff respond to comments raised by the Harbourview Residents' Group on the Harbourview Park Stormwater Management Option Report.
- D. That staff investigate the option of a MOU with NSW Maritime detailing harbour foreshore cleaning arrangements on Maritime land under the project titled Harbour Foreshore Cleaning in next years Environmental Works Program.

BACKGROUND:

The Minister for Local Government gave approval for Council to implement an Environmental Levy in 2002 for a three-year period. This allows Council to implement a range of environmental improvements, which aim to preserve and protect the natural beauty of Woollahra.

The role of the ELCRG is to:

- receive and review progress reports on the implementation of the EWP;
- annually review the EWP;
- promote the EWP and its environmental objectives to the community;
- liaise with the community and provide feedback on the implementation of the EWP; and
- assist Council in seeking supplementary funding opportunities.

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to provide the Community and Environment Committee with a copy of the minutes of the Environmental Levy Community Reference Group meeting held Wednesday 8 June 2005. The minutes will provide the Committee with an update on a variety of issues related to the implementation of the Environmental Works Program (EWP), with the main issue being extension of the Environmental Levy.

CONCLUSION:

Reporting on the minutes of the ELCRG will keep Council informed on the progress and main developments of the various projects and initiatives associated with implementing the EWP. The minutes include the actions recommended by the Group for the Committee's consideration for adoption.

Jamie Howieson
Project Manager - Environmental Works

Warwick Hatton
Director Technical Services

ANNEXURES:

1. Minutes of the ELCRG meeting of Wednesday 8 June 2005.