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1. Introduction

The City of Bayside is expected to grow by an additional 14,000 people by 2036\(^1\) across an additional 8,000 households\(^2\). As a result of this growth, increasing traffic pressures, including increased road use and demand for car parking is expected. Similarly, growth in the demand for public transport, safe cycling and accessible walking paths is expected as convenient and sustainable alternatives to private vehicles for short distance trips. Bayside has a number of strategies which provide frameworks for our future sustainable transport needs and the health benefits of active travel, the key strategies being:

- The overarching Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2013;
- The Bayside Bicycle Strategy 2013;
- The Bayside Walking Strategy 2015;
- The Public Transport Advocacy Statement;
- The Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012; and

However there is currently a gap in terms of a strategic approach to the provision and management of car parking.

State policy is already acknowledging that change is required in the way in which people travel in Melbourne, with a greater reliance on walking and cycling as transportation. Our roads are already congested and parking in high demand which will only increase, particularly if a ‘business as usual’ approach is accepted.

Oversupplying car parking has the potential to undermine the encouragement being given to reduce car based travel in favour of public transport, walking and cycling. One of the benefits of providing less car parking is a lower volume of vehicle movements and therefore a reduced increase in traffic movements on the road network.

A strategic approach to car parking provision and management is required to balance the transport needs of Bayside residents and ensure that a sustainable approach is prepared. This strategic approach will need to consider the costs and implications of providing additional car parking, estimates of future demand, constraints of each location and the return on investment.

Council’s long term financial commitment to deliver large car parking infrastructure which increases parking supply needs to be considered in relation to this resource constrained environment. A clear focus on public value needs to be demonstrated in order to justify the

---

\(^1\) http://forecast.id.com.au/bayside
significant investment required to increase parking supply. With the focus on sustainable travel, any increased supply needs to be thoroughly considered with a range of other measures to reduce demand and encourage sustainable travel behaviour.

Car Parking Background Reports for Bay Street, Hampton Street, Church Street and Sandringham Major Activity Centres (MACs) were presented to Council in July and August 2016. These reports brought together information contained in numerous studies undertaken by Council in relation to car parking and sustainable transport options in the activity centre areas to provide an understanding of car parking needs. The reports identified a range of potential mechanisms, options and operational actions for consideration which respond to future parking pressures in the MACs.

It was considered that a reasonable approach to manage car parking supply and demand in the short term could be achieved whilst more advanced, innovative and potentially courageous long term measures were further explored. This Discussion Paper explores a package of measures that can potentially improve the management of the car parking supply whilst supporting future economic growth and maintaining the amenity and attractiveness of these areas as a place to live, shop, visit and do business.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper is to provide an understanding of parking pressures in Bay Street, Hampton Street, Church St and Sandringham Major Activity Centres (MACs) and a link to policies and strategies of Council that may assist in facilitating a response to this pressures. Whilst this discussion paper focuses specifically on these four centres, the issues discussed are relevant for all of Bayside’s activity centres.

The discussion paper provides the basis to inform the preparation of the Parking Strategy (identified as an action in the Integrated Transport Strategy 2013) that will consider at a municipal-wide approach to respond to car parking pressures in Bayside and explores some actions that could be implemented in the short term to address car parking supply and demand in these areas.

It is not intended that this report will be subject to community engagement as this will occur as part of the future work identified through the development of the future Parking Strategy and Car Parking Plans.
3. Scope

This Paper identifies the key issues to be addressed in each of the centres and provides a series of actions and a framework to improve parking conditions in the future.

In order to achieve this, the discussion paper looks at mechanisms available to facilitate the implementation of proposed actions relating to planning policy changes.

This paper will not predetermine the outcomes of a future parking strategy but rather inform its scope and deliverables.

This paper identifies the demographic change and social expectations in relation to car parking supply and demand and management of the resource.

It considers in detail the policy context relating to car parking and sustainable travel at both the State and local level, as well as summarizing policy changes as a result of VCAT and Planning Panel decisions on the subject.

This report provides an approach to ensure a strategic approach to car parking can be considered and the existing policy context consolidated to be more sustainable.
4. Background

4.1 Preparation of Structure Plans for Bay St, Church St, Hampton St and Sandringham Major Activity Centres (MACs)

As part of the development of Structure Plans between 2004 and 2006, transport consultant AECOM was engaged to undertake background transport, traffic and parking analysis to inform Car Parking Precinct Plans for the four structure plan areas. At the time car parking plans were prepared for each of the MACs, however they only applied to land within the commercial zone. The purpose of the Parking Precinct Plans were to:

- Ensure the supply of car parking for retail and commercial development responds to demand and local conditions;
- Set out how car parking spaces can be provided;
- Specify car parking rates on a precinct based approach;
- Simplify the information required to support future individual planning permit applications; and
- Provide greater certainty and consistency in decision making relating to car parking requirements for retail and commercial developments.

Recommendations within the Car Parking Precinct Plans included:

- Identification of possible sites to create additional car parking;
- Establishing a financial contributions scheme in lieu of providing on site car parking; and
- A monitoring and review program.

It was intended that the Car Parking Precinct Plans would be incorporated into the Bayside Planning Scheme as incorporated documents at Clause 81. However through the policy implementation process of the Structure Plans, the Parking Precinct Plans were not implemented. The State Government at the time raised concerns indicating it did not believe aspects of the parking plans were adequately justified, particularly in relation to the cash in lieu contributions proposed and the eventual development of potential multi deck car parks.

Given the volume of work required to resolve the concerns raised was significantly more than the changes required to other aspects of the amendments, it was resolved to remove the Parking Precinct Plans and to undertake further work at a later stage.

4.2 MAC Structure Plan implementation

Planning Scheme Amendments C100, C101, C102 and C103 implemented policy changes into the Bayside Planning Scheme to give effect to the land use and built form recommendations of the Structure Plans.
A number of submitters raised concerns in relation to parking and traffic. In responding to submissions, Council as part of the Planning Panel process appointed Aurecon Australia to peer review the 2006 work undertaken by AECOM, which informed the Traffic/Access sections of the Structure Plans. The peer review concluded that the recommendations provided would ensure that traffic and parking issues will be adequately addressed and that there would be no impediments for each of the MACs to accommodate the level of growth anticipated.

The Panel agreed that the traffic and parking recommendations identified in the Structure Plans provided a sound basis on which to address the identified issues.

4.3 Structure Plan Reviews and New Car Parking Plans

In November 2012 Council resolved to undertake a review of the four MAC Structure Plans. The review sought to provide an understanding of development trends and implementation of the vision and policies for the MAC areas.

The Structure Plan reviews were undertaken internally, with input from external consultants for the economic analysis. This included the appointment of Aurecon to prepare car parking plans for each centre. The car parking element of the project was scoped so that the focus was the development of Parking Precinct Plans, including a comprehensive review of all previous material and technical advice already provided to Council on parking related matters.

Aurecon undertook traffic and car parking surveys and an initial stage of community consultation for each centre throughout 2013 and 2014 to inform these reviews however this work did not proceed to new car parking plans.

In late 2015 O’Brien Traffic was engaged to review all previous work undertaken in relation car parking plans for the MACs and to provide recommendations for each of the centres reviewed. The key findings and recommendations from O’Brien Traffic concluded that:

- The 2006 AECOM car parking plans provided a good basis for understanding the issues and possible solutions for each centre, however were too outdated to be useful in any future strategic work; and
- The findings from the community consultation undertaken in 2013/14 were considered sufficient to identify perceived community concerns.

Following the review, it was recommended that any future car parking studies should identify future parking challenges within each centre and recommended actions to address the specific challenges of each location rather than a ‘one size fits all’ approach for all
activity centres. This approach is favoured rather than specifically aiming to implement a particular measure (such as the Parking Overlay) as this provides for a range of mechanisms to be explored and potentially different approaches for some centres.

In response to this recommendation a methodology was prepared and informed the basis of the Car Parking Background Report presented to Council in July/August 2016.

4.4 **Car Parking Background Reports**

Car Parking Background Reports were presented to Council at its 26 July and 23 August 2016 Ordinary meetings, which outlined many short-term actions to consider which can be delivered without significant cost or impact to the community, as they are generally minor operational improvements that will improve parking conditions in the relevant centre. The Background Reports considered and provided recommendations in relation to demand management mechanisms such as:

**Planning Scheme mechanisms**
- Reduced car parking rates;

**Mechanisms outside the Planning Scheme**
- Reducing the supply of unrestricted parking in activity centres;
- Greater parking enforcement to ensure vehicle turnover;
- Installation of and improvements to parking guidance signage;
- Increased parking restrictions;
- The installation of paid parking facilities;
- Parking permit schemes;
- Behaviour change programs; and
- Incentives for sustainable travel.
4.5 **Bayside Community Plan 2025**

Car parking is identified as an important issue for Bayside residents in the *Community Plan 2025*, particularly with ongoing concerns relating to commuters parking in Bayside’s residential streets close to railway stations. In addition to the Aurecon consultation, the feedback obtained through the development of the Community Plan has informed this report. The *Community Plan 2025* recognises the tensions and challenges faced by the Bayside community.

While Bayside residents support less reliance on cars to reduce their impact on the environment and encourage greater social interaction, the integration of transport options and overall convenience are still a perceived barrier to greater utilisation. Suggestions from the community to better manage issues arising from commuter parking in residential streets includes removing parking restrictions in the activity centres to support on-street residential and commuter parking, but imposing greater parking restrictions in residential streets near train stations. There is a significant tension in this issue as removing restrictions would lead to less turnover which would impact the viability and vibrancy of the centres, and would likely result in it being more difficult to find a short term car park. These dilemmas do not necessarily translate into a need for more parking spaces, but the need to more efficiently manage the available parking while encouraging alternative ways to get around Bayside.

The community aspiration in relation to car parking is “finding a car park at the local shopping centre is easier. Bayside will be a better place when I can park my car easily around Bayside, and accessibility in shopping centres is improved.” The indicator for this is stated as being community satisfaction with the car parking across the municipality. The outputs from Council are:

- Regulation and management of public parking (e.g. Time restrictions, fines) to ensure shared and fair access to activity centres; and
- Monitor car parking availability at major activity centres to understand occupancy and turnover rates and develop strategies to manage parking demand.

Further expected outputs are to be stated within the Council Plan, estimated to be completed later in 2017.

One of the significant tensions which is highlighted is the varying needs of car parking users in the activity centres, and the impact that car parking overflow has on residential areas. As change occurs slowly over time, perceptions and attitudes towards parking may change, however the supply of publicly available parking is unlikely to increase significantly and with the growth expected, it may not be possible to meet community expectations in relation to parking in activity centres. Other strategies and approaches will need to be considered to
shift expectations towards more sustainable travel methods with less reliance on car parking.

5. Policy Context

5.1 State Government Policies

The following documents inform the State Government directions relevant to car parking matters in Bayside’s MACs:

- **Plan Melbourne 2017-2050**
  Plan Melbourne will guide the growth of our city for the next 35 years. It sets the strategy for supporting jobs, housing and transport, while building on Melbourne’s legacy of distinctiveness, liveability and sustainability. The vision for Melbourne is that ‘Melbourne will continue to be a global city of opportunity and choice.’

  The key policy directions within Plan Melbourne relating to car parking in activity centres are as follows:
  - Policy 1.2.1 Support the development of a network of activity centres linked by transport;
  - Policy 3.3.1 Create pedestrian-friendly neighbourhoods;
  - Policy 5.1.2 Support a network of vibrant neighbourhood activity centres; and
  - Policy 5.2.1 Improve neighbourhoods to enable walking and cycling as a part of daily life.

Within Bayside, Plan Melbourne designates the Bay Street, Church Street, Hampton Street, Sandringham Village, Moorabbin (Hampton East), Elsternwick, Cheltenham and Cheltenham-Southland activity centres as Major Activity Centres. It is recognised that within the list of MACs, each centre has different development potential and is subject to local strategic planning. MACs are at the top of the hierarchy of centres that seek to provide a network of centres to facilitate the 20 minute neighbourhood concept. These centres contain a mix of uses that are easily accessible and linked by public transport to improve access to jobs, services and facilities.

Plan Melbourne includes policies to support new housing in activity centres and other places that offer good access to jobs, services and public transport. This is consistent with Bayside’s strategic planning framework which designates MACs as areas for accommodating mixed use developments and increased dwelling densities.

The direction to ‘transform Melbourne’s transport system to support a productive city’ includes a policy to create a metro-style rail system with ‘turn up and go’ frequency and reliability. This will improve the availability of rail services on the Sandringham line and
together with increasing the smart-bus network, can significantly improve public transport connections to, within and from the City of Bayside.

• **Activity Centre Design Guidelines**

The Activity Centre Design Guidelines support councils and developers to create well designed activity centres throughout Victoria. The guidelines provide advice to developers, planners and place managers on what constitutes best-practice when developing vibrant, high quality activity centres. Element 8 provides specific objectives for car parking in activity centres. The Guidelines state that:

‘Car parks are often poorly designed and located, and create unpleasant and potentially unsafe environments, and pedestrian barriers between different developments and the surrounding neighbourhood. Car parks must be available for an activity centre to remain viable, though the efficacy of their use, and their location and design can be improved to ensure pedestrian and cycling environments are not degraded. In many instances, they offer a substantial opportunity for the activity centre to be better integrated into the surrounding neighbourhood.’

The objectives within Element 8 include:
- To maximise on-street parking opportunities;
- To use on-street parking efficiently;
- To minimise off-street car parks visually dominating public space; and
- To improve pedestrian and cycling safety and amenity in and around off-street parking.

The Design Suggestions within Element 8 are:
- Encourage on-street car parking throughout the activity centre, to calm vehicle speeds, enhance the perception of safety for pedestrians and minimise the number of off-street car parks required;
- Take steps to limit the impact on non-local traffic and parking on surrounding residential streets;
- Ensure local area traffic management is cycle and pedestrian friendly;
- Consider instigating time limits that discourage traders/workers from using the spaces closest to the shops to ensure the greatest turnover of the most convenient spaces;
- Share bicycle and car parking facilities for residential development and other activity centre uses;
- Place off-street car parking under residential and other developments;
- Ensure ground-level street frontages are not used for car parking but rather have activity and interest for pedestrians;
- Use landscaping to screen half-basement car parking from the street and public spaces;
- Minimise the total number of car parks required by sharing bicycle and car parking facilities between different uses within mixed use developments;
- Directly link the car park to the shops it serves by pedestrian routes lined by active frontages;
- Encourage natural surveillance of off-street car parks;
- Avoid car parks edged by blank walls;
- Ensure ground-level car parks have continuous built edges without recesses, where possible;
- Provide footpaths around the built edges of ground-level car parks;
- Ensure the car park is well lit with a high quality 'white light' and clearly signed;
- Plant trees to provide shelter and offer an attractive appearance to ground-level car parking; and
- Place bicycle parking under cover and, where possible, within 20 metres of building entrances.

The Activity Centre Design Guidelines are listed as a policy guideline in the Planning Scheme at Clause 11.03-2. Council planners use these guidelines when considering planning permit applications for development in activity centres.

- **Transport Integration Act 2010**
  The Transport Integration Act 2010 establishes a framework for the provision of an integrated and sustainable transport system in Victoria. The vision for the Act is as follows:

  “Victoria aspires to have an integrated and sustainable transport system that contributes to an inclusive, prosperous and environmentally responsible state.”

The Transport Integration Act 2010 also outlines principles for integrated decision making to achieve Government policy, through coordination between all levels of Government and Government Agencies and with the private sector. These principles include:
- A principle of integrated decision making, across all levels of government and the private sector;
- A principle of triple bottom-line assessment, being an assessment of all the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits taking into account externalities and value for money;
- A principle of equity, between persons and between generations;
- A principle of the transport system user perspective, including understanding requirements, information needs, enhancing useability and the quality of the experience;
- A precautionary principle;
- A stakeholder engagement and community participation principle; and
- A principle of transparency.

A key outcome of a successful integrated transport system will include a community less reliant on private vehicles for transport. The requirement of this Act to prepare an Integrated Transport Strategy informed Council’s *Integrated Transport Strategy 2013*, discussed further in this report.

- **Victoria’s 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy 2016**

  Infrastructure Victoria has developed the first ever 30-year infrastructure strategy for Victoria. This Strategy acknowledges that activity centres are the focus of major urban change over the next 30 years.

  Recommendation 1.1, to ‘increase the proportion of housing in areas that are well serviced with infrastructure’ provides for development in established areas to be further intensified. Focusing on Melbourne’s inner and middle ring suburbs is prioritized, particularly along the Sandringham railway line. As Bayside’s four largest MACs are located along the Sandringham railway line, this further supports the strategic objectives of the *Bayside Housing Strategy 2012* to encourage growth into these areas and create vibrant and activated activity centres.

  The recommendations at Section 4 of the Strategy focus on delivering walking and cycling networks and facilities for both recreational and transport purposes. The opportunity to increase investment in walking and cycling infrastructure to better reflect its share as a transport mode is acknowledged. In addition to expected health benefits, including mental health benefits, such investment would help reduce congestion and the negative environmental impacts of transport.

  Recommendation 4.1 seeks to ‘increase walking and cycling for transport’. This section of the Strategy acknowledges that without enabling adequate infrastructure, low rates of physical activity and participation can become intractable, though societal factors play a significant role also.

  Recommendation 4.2 seeks to ‘promote more incidental and recreational physical activity in local communities’. A method of achieving this is the encouragement of cycling and walking in established areas. Three pilot projects are to be run in Melbourne to retrofit walking and cycling facilities in established suburbs with high levels of car dependency. An extensive program could support the delivery of the 20 minute neighbourhoods concept championed through *Plan Melbourne*. 
Recommendation 6.2 of the Strategy is to ‘increase transport choice to reduce barriers to mobility.’ This includes the introduction of regulatory changes to enable the testing and deployment of driverless vehicles over 0-30 years to improve traffic flow, increase the operational efficiency of public transport, expand the range of available transport options and potentially improve the carrying capacity of roadways by allowing vehicles to safely travel together in close proximity at the same speed.

Recommendation 10.1 further reinforces the development of established areas by promoting ‘urban consolidation to enable people to live closer to jobs, public transport and the central city’.

Recommendation 10.2 will ‘introduce a transport network pricing regime to manage congestion and obtain the most efficient use of the transport network.’ This recommends that within 5-15 years, a transport network pricing regime should be introduced to reduce congestion and crowding, with a focus on addressing equity concerns. This reform will fundamentally change the way the transport network is used and will play an important role in preparing for the arrival of driverless vehicles and improving freight productivity.

Recommendation 10.3 ‘encourage(s) people living along congested corridors and in higher density areas to shift to active travel to reduce the demand on other transport modes.’

The availability and accessibility of other transport options is a key factor when preparing a strategic approach to car parking. Encouraging alternative transport options such as walking, cycling and public transport are the primary focus, and the provision for car parking should be a secondary focus. With the changing technology influencing travel behavior, such as services such as Uber and driverless vehicles, greater options exist which need to be considered as part of future travel behavior.

- **Other relevant documents**

In addition to the strategy and policy documents above, the following Advisory Note and Practice Notes are of relevance to this Paper:

- Advisory Note 25, June 2012: New car parking provisions;
- Practice Note 22, April 2013: Using the car parking provisions; and

These documents provide guidance on the operation of the planning scheme mechanisms to manage car parking supply and demand.
5.2 Local Planning Policy Context

The following adopted Council strategies and policies are relevant to car parking in Bayside:

- **Bayside Housing Strategy 2012**
  Building on State policy, the *Bayside Housing Strategy 2012* encourages housing growth in locations with access to employment, community infrastructure and public transport. Bayside’s MACs are key focus areas to encourage diverse housing typologies to ensure that Bayside’s growing population is accommodated in its vibrant activity centres. The four MACs which are the subject of this report include Key Focus and Moderate Residential Growth areas.

  Key Focus Residential Growth areas are areas where the majority of high and medium density residential development is to be located. These areas have a high level of access to public transport along with commercial and community services.

  Moderate Residential Growth areas are areas where medium density development will occur. These areas provide a transition between the Key Focus and Minimal Residential Growth areas. The design of new medium density housing in these areas will demonstrate sensitivity to the existing residential context and amenity standards in these areas, particularly at interfaces with the Housing Growth Area boundaries.

  Objective 14 of the *Bayside Housing Strategy* is to ‘manage the impacts of car parking and loading/unloading associated with new developments, particularly within Housing Growth Areas.’ The Strategies to achieve this are:
  - Identify the parking requirements of each ‘Housing Growth Area’ taking into consideration both resident and commuter parking needs;
  - Prepare car parking precinct plans for each ‘Housing Growth Area’;
  - Ensure development within ‘Housing Growth Areas’ contributes to the cost of new or upgraded car parking;
  - Ensure medium and high density developments within ‘Housing Growth Areas’ that provide apartments without parking include appropriate covenants on the relevant title or Section 173 Agreements making it clear that no parking is provided to these apartments and that Council may not issue a residential parking permit; and
  - Discourage car parking dispensations for new residential developments within ‘Minimum Residential Growth Areas.’

  The achievement of these strategies has yet to make significant progress as it has been subject to the development of the Car Parking Plans, outlined at Section 4 of this report. There is currently limited guidance within the Bayside Planning Scheme relating to localised car parking matters, which has resulted in several instances of VCAT setting
aside Council’s decisions to refuse applications for car parking waivers or reductions. A summary of these VCAT decisions and the identified need for a localised approach are outlined at Section 6.3.2 of this report.

- **Integrated Transport Strategy 2013**

  The Integrated Transport Strategy 2013 (‘the ITS’) sets Council’s ten year direction for transport planning and the provision of transport services. The ITS provides actions for Council to undertake in isolation, including capital works for cycle paths and footpaths, as well as supportive programs which can influence personal travel behaviour, such as helping schools to run events like Walk to School Day.

  The vision for transport as outlined within the ITS is:

  ‘Sustainable Transport is the mode of choice facilitated through the creation of a well connected, safe, accessible and convenient transport system that positively contributes to a strong economy, the health and wellbeing of the community and a low carbon future within Bayside.’

  The ITS identifies five guiding principles to achieve this vision:

  1. **Improved local accessibility**: Council will prioritise walking and cycling as the preferred mode of transport for short trips in Bayside;
  2. **Create better public transport connections**: Council will work with key partners to improve public transport access to, within and from Bayside. It will also work to maximise the use of community transport services in Bayside;
  3. **User friendly streets**: Council will treat streets as places where people live, work and play and provide access for a range of users in order to deliver a safe, integrated and efficient transport system;
  4. **Integrated transport and land use**: Council will work to ensure that land use and development supports sustainable transport use;
  5. **Improve perceptions and enable choice**: Council will work with the community and key stakeholders to raise awareness of the benefits of sustainable travel and actively promote and support its increased use within the community. Council will support initiatives designed to increase transport choice and contribute to the reduction of emissions from transport.

  As noted within the ITS, private vehicles are likely to continue to play a prominent role in Bayside’s transport environment well into the future. However, Council also has a responsibility to raise awareness of all transport choices and support suitable initiatives aimed at reducing transport related emissions.

  In order to achieve this, the ITS recommends three main strategies to be implemented:

  o raise awareness of and promote sustainable transport options;
- support travel behaviour change programs; and
- adopt efficient technologies.

The ITS acknowledges that individual perceptions matter when making decisions about transport choices. People who use public transport on a regular basis, such as commuting for work, are likely to have more positive perceptions of it as a form of transport, even if only for that trip, than others who rarely use a train or a bus. Council will seek to increase awareness within the community about the benefits of sustainable travel through a number of different communication methods, including the development and implementation of a series of promotions campaigns exploring options to utilise social media, developing the website, providing regular information in council newsletters, promoting sustainable transport to events in Bayside and by leading by example within the organisation. While promotion is important it is however, only a first step.

Emphasising benefits of sustainable transport in a way which outweighs their perceived limitations, such as encouraging school children to walk to promote their health in contrast with concerns about their safety, is necessary to create a more sustainable transport system.

The ITS acknowledges that providing car parking to satisfy the demands of all road users is one of the biggest challenges. Council is committed to providing residents and their visitors with a reasonable likelihood of parking in close proximity to their home, while preserving access for other legitimate road users such as shoppers, traders, disabled persons, workers and commuters in areas of high on-street parking demand. The greatest demand for car parking is around train stations and shopping areas, particularly for commercial car parking.

The ITS acknowledges that while it is important to ensure that access and connections to public transport are not limited by poor availability of commuter car parking, there is a need to balance this demand by providing high quality public transport, walking and cycling links to train stations.

The ITS confirms that these issues will be examined in more detail in the development of a Parking Strategy, which includes parking precinct plans for shopping areas, a key recommendation of the Strategy which currently remains outstanding.

- **Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016**
  The Bayside Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy (‘the RCE Strategy’) provides a framework to guide commercial uses in Bayside’s employment precincts. The RCE Strategy identifies that Bayside’s activity centres are best practice examples of local...
activity centres, performing well and providing high quality offerings without the anchor tenants often present in large activity centres of similar sizes. Rather than changing the planning policy directions for the MACs given their success, the RCE Strategy provides recommendations to address location specific issues and themes.

An important shaping factor in Bayside’s retail precincts has been the rail network. These railway stations not only provide important access to employment opportunities elsewhere but also help to concentrate foot traffic and retail expenditure within activity centre boundaries.

Ensuring that residential development does not take over commercial land is a key focus of the RCE Strategy, as is providing increased access to health and related services in activity centres. An action includes considering reducing the car parking requirements for health services given the increased need for these uses in Bayside. Car parking provision can be a significant barrier for health uses to operate and by alleviating some of the pressure to provide the required car parking, this will assist in ensuring Bayside’s aging population has greater access to medical and support services.

- **MAC Structure Plans 2006**
  The Structure Plans provide some recommendations and objectives in relation to car parking, similar across all centres, including:
  - Increased publicly accessible car parking opportunities (specific locations were nominated for Bay Street and Church Street MACs);
  - Improve pedestrian safety when moving between off-street car parks and main Streets;
  - Ensuring new development provides adequate off-street car parking;
  - Improved management of both on and off-street parking restrictions;
  - Improved general signage relating to car parks; and
  - Safer and more convenient access to disabled parking.

- **MAC Structure Plan Reviews 2016**
  The Structure Plan Reviews make recommendations on the future actions to implement the objectives of the Structure Plans. A key recommendation is the preparation of Car Parking Plans for each centre given the time passed since the AECOM plans were completed. Due to the considerable change in the centres over time, new Car Parking Plans are required.

- **Walking Strategy 2015**
  The Walking Strategy 2015 acknowledges that ‘Walking is an important mode of transport and has a significant part to play in the quality of life in Bayside. It provides an accessible, clean, healthy and enjoyable way to travel short distances and is a great way
to enjoy urban and open spaces. Regardless of how people choose to travel, everyone is a pedestrian at some point in their journey. For many people, walking provides access to public transport or is their only transport option. Even the availability of a car does not mean that all members of a household have access to it, especially children and the elderly. Walking offers transport, health, environmental sustainability, economic and social benefits across the whole community.’

The Walking Strategy prioritises the needs of the older community, people with disabilities and people with young children by aiming to create safe, comfortable and inviting places to experience walking. The aims of the strategy include increasing the number of people who choose to walk, which can potentially reduce the future car parking demand.

The vision for walking in Bayside is ‘to encourage more people to walk more often through the provision of inclusive, safe, comfortable and convenient facilities and the promotion of walking as a healthy and sustainable mode of transport.’

Strategy 2 of the Walking Strategy is to ‘prioritise walking in areas of high people activity.’ An action to achieve this is to investigate the opportunities for shared spaces in activity centres. The four MACs are likely to be the areas most suitable to accommodate this style of change, as they have larger catchments and have a range of locations to accommodate any potential loss of parking and slower moving traffic.

Strategy 3 relates to creating streetscapes that invite people to walk. An action within this is to identify walking routes around local landmarks and points of interest that will attract people to explore their community by walking. The MACs can play a large part in this given that they are some of the primary destinations within Bayside for social interaction and can be promoted on walking maps and other materials available through Council.

Strategy 7 seeks to normalise walking in Bayside and includes an action to create social proof of walking in Bayside. A social norming campaign is to be developed to create social proof that all types of people in the community already walk for a range of trips, particularly to school, to public transport, for shopping and recreation. The strategy can be delivered by having regard to the principle of people achieving big change by making many small changes. For example, swapping some local trips they would normally do by car with walking.

These strategic actions if implemented effectively will have significant implications on the demand for parking in activity centres.
• **Public Transport Advocacy Statement 2016**

The role of the Public Transport Advocacy Statement is to ensure Council has a clear, justified position around what improvements are required to the public transport system in Bayside to achieve its transport vision. This is vital to the advocacy role Council plays in advocating to other agencies for deliverable improvements for the transport needs of Bayside residents and visitors.

Council’s current Public Transport Advocacy Statement was adopted in June 2016 and includes advocacy in relation to:

- Council will advocate to the State Government for a program to expand commuter parking at train stations in Bayside;
- A 10 minute train frequency on the Sandringham line;
- Parking enforcement at train station car parks to ensure that only public transport users are utilizing car parking provision;
- Increased minimum bus service frequencies for all bus routes in Bayside;
- Bike racks on all bus routes to integrate bicycle trips with bus trips;

If delivered, these actions will all contribute to improved public transport experiences which can result in some potential behaviour change toward sustainable travel.

• **Bayside Bicycle Strategy 2013**

The Bicycle Strategy 2013 sets Council’s direction for the development of the bicycle network within the municipality and identifies Council’s position in encouraging and supporting more cycling within the Bayside community. The strategy seeks to improve bicycle infrastructure across Bayside, particularly where short trips (1-2 kms) can be encouraged via cycling rather than private motor vehicle travel. It presents strategies towards an integrated approach to cycling with land use and development and ways to develop a cycling culture in Bayside.

• **Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2013-2017**

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2013-17 (‘the WAAA’) integrates planning for wellbeing across the life stages of all Bayside residents. The WAAA informs the Ageing Well, Early Years, Disability, Healthy Community and Youth Action Plans and provides the framework for Council (and other organisations) to plan and advocate for infrastructure, services, programs and support to allow Bayside residents the greatest level of health and wellbeing that can be achieved. Of relevance to this paper is Goal 2: A healthy and active community.

Objective 2 within this goal is to increase Bayside residents utilization of active transport. The WAAA acknowledges that being active constitutes one of the major components of a healthy lifestyle and that improving the built environment can have a
major impact on people's physical activity. The WAAA also outlines a range of the barriers for people to use walking and cycling as the preferred method of travel and encourages active transport methods.

- **Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012**
The Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 is a 20 year planning document to provide policy and strategy to enable decision making about how open space is used, developed, managed and maintained across Bayside. With the expected growth across Bayside, the Bayside Open Space Strategy identifies areas where additional public open space is required. Of note is the shortfall of open space around the Bay, Church and Hampton Street MACs. The open space provision is a lesser issue for the Sandringham MAC as the majority of the MAC boundary is within 400m of open space. The open space shortages in the three larger MACs is an issue when considering the potential purchase/acquisition of additional land in these centres and whether future land should be set aside for open space or car parking provision. This tension should be explored throughout the investigation stages of any future car parking plan for these centres.

### 5.3 Adopted Council Policies

Council has two adopted policies relating to car parking:

1. The Managing on-Street Car Parking Demand Policy; and
2. The Residential Parking Permit Scheme.

- **Managing On-Street Car Parking Demand Policy 2016**
The intent of this policy is to provide consistent and transparent guidance for the introduction of new parking restrictions in areas where on-street car parking may be causing a road safety hazard or where on-street car parking spaces are in high demand and has resulted in parking congestion. The policy considers allocation of existing on-street parking spaces relevant to demand, and does not have regard to the number of parking spaces available.

The purpose and objectives of this Policy are to:
- demonstrate a commitment to managing on-street car parking demand to best satisfy the needs of all users of the road space;
- guide effective community engagement in relation to establishing car parking restrictions and support good decision making;
- ensure that expectations are managed in an appropriate way in response to community needs; and
- establish a framework to ensure that restrictions are implemented in a structured, consistent, inclusive and cost effective manner.
The policy applies to all streets within Bayside, however those most directly affected are all residents, schools, businesses and other organisations in an area where parking restrictions are required or requested. Other users of the roads are indirectly affected. The policy acknowledges that competition for on-street parking is increasing throughout the municipality. Council faces the challenge of balancing the competing demands of all users of roads and is committed to providing shoppers, residents, traders, people with a disability, workers and commuters with a reasonable likelihood of finding parking in close proximity to their destination.

The policy outlines that car parking restrictions are implemented for a range of reasons including:

- Promotion of road safety;
- Protection of residential amenity;
- Promotion of economic viability of activity centres and commercial areas;
- Provision of accessible parking for people with disabilities; and
- To encourage a high turnover of parking spaces at other locations where there is a high on-street parking demand, for example schools and community facilities.

The needs of all users are to be considered and a hierarchy of road users based on street type (residential / commercial) will guide the type and extent of restrictions required.

Where the installation of parking restrictions is not as a result of an immediate safety issue, the installation of parking restrictions is able to be voted down by residents of the street. This can have unintended consequences in a number of ways, particularly in activity centre locations where growth is to be encouraged and the same level of amenity cannot be expected as other residential areas. The consequence of this is the issues are then pushed further into residential areas and increase parking pressure and congestion around these key destinations.

The policy does not include any provision for residential areas within activity centres as these are considered residential areas despite forming important growth opportunities within the activity centres. As a result, this requires a different approach to be developed for these future growth areas.

• Residential Parking Permit Scheme 2016

The Residential Parking Permit Scheme Policy acknowledges that demand for on-street car parking is already high in areas close to activity centres, commercial precincts and transport nodes. The policy notes that residents of these areas have to compete with all road users for the availability of on-street spaces (regardless of the provision of off-street parking).
The Policy states that without intervention, residents and their visitors can find it hard to locate a parking space close to their homes. Residential parking permits allow the driver to occupy on-street parking where time limits exceed 1 hour, in any time restriction in their registered street.

The objective of this Policy is to provide a mechanism by which residents and their visitors are exempt from some parking restrictions and therefore have a reasonable likelihood of finding car parking in close proximity to their homes, while still preserving opportunities for parking for other road users such as shoppers, traders, people with disabilities, workers and commuters. The Policy specifies the criteria by which Residential Parking Permits will be allocated to households for use and will define the process by which permits will be considered.

The policy provides eligibility criteria where three types of properties are ineligible:
- Multi-dwelling developments with three or more dwellings, which were constructed after 1 July 2007;
- Shop-top dwellings; and
- Commercial properties.

Prior to August 2016, the multi-dwelling clause related to any development of two or more dwellings, however this was increased to three or more when the policy was reviewed in August 2016. It is noted that this change does not align with the ITS aim of reducing reliance on private vehicle trips as it essentially enables more residents to obtain more residential parking permits regardless of their location.

Residents are able to apply for up to four free residential parking permits per eligible property issued for specific vehicles. In this case, no visitor permit is available. The second option is three free residential parking permits, with one visitor car parking permit per eligible household.

Additional parking permits can be purchased for specific vehicles registered at an address. There is no cap on the number of permits provided the vehicles are registered to the eligible address.

In relation to Beach Road paid parking areas, the first option affords our eligible residents three free parking permits issued for specific properties plus four visitor parking permits. Option two affords two free residential parking permits plus four free visitor permits, and one additional paid visitor parking permit for $68 (unrestricted time limit).
The permits do not apply to areas outside or adjacent to single/mixed use businesses and off-street car parks.

Similar to the Managing on-street Parking Demand Policy, this policy does not differentiate between residential areas within activity centres and other residential areas. As such, a different approach is required to be developed in given the forecast growth in these areas.

5.4 Guidance within the Bayside Planning Scheme

The Planning Scheme provides the following clauses in relation to car parking:

- **State Planning Policy Framework**
  - **Clause 11.03-2 Activity centre planning**
    The objective of this Clause is to encourage the concentration of major retail, residential, commercial, administrative, entertainment and cultural developments into activity centres which provide a variety of land uses and are highly accessible to the community. In particular relevance to car parking is a key strategy to reduce the number of private motorised trips by concentrating activities that generate high numbers of (non-freight) trips in highly accessible activity centres.

- **Clause 18.01 Transport**
  The objective of this Clause is to create a safe and sustainable transport system by integrating land-use and transport. Encouraging the use of public transport and walking and cycling as modes of transport is central to achieving this objective. The Bay Street Activity Centre lends itself to promote the vision of this objective by encouraging the use of public transport, cycling and walking and not encouraging an abundance of car parking within the area, and in turn an overuse of motor vehicles.

- **Local Planning Policy Framework**
  - **Clause 21.02 Bayside Key Issues and Strategic Vision**
    This Clause provides an overview of the municipality’s strategic vision, recognising the majority of economic activity in Bayside is associated with the commercial activities in the MACs in Brighton, Hampton and Sandringham and the important role these centres play for serving the needs of the Bayside community.

  - **Clause 21.03 Settlement and housing**
    This Clause provides local content to support Clause 11 (Settlement) and Clause 16 (Housing) of the State Planning Policy Framework. Bayside’s four Major Activity Centres are identified as key areas for growth. Objective 1 is “To direct new medium density housing to Major Activity Centres, (...) particularly those with good access to public transport routes as identified in the Residential Strategic Framework Plan.”
Clause 21.09 (Transport and Access)
This Clause provides strategic direction about how integrated transport is to be addressed at the local level. It sets out key objectives for cycling, roads, access and car parking in Bayside. The aim of these objectives is to assist in reducing the car dependency of the municipality by providing easier access and better transport alternatives to the motor vehicle in convenient locations. Of particular relevance is the objective to improve access, movement and car parking within, around and through activity centres and to maintain existing numbers of public parking spaces and ensure appropriate numbers of additional parking spaces are provided in accordance with Clause 52.06 'Car Parking' to support added intensity of uses within each centre.

Clause 21.11 Local Areas
This Clause focuses on the local area implementation of the objectives and strategies set out earlier in the Bayside Planning Scheme. In regard to parking for the centres, the clause sets out the following general strategies:
- Encourage redevelopment of larger sites and grade level car parks for residential with basement car parking
- Encourage redevelopment of larger sites for mixed use developments with basement car parking, commercial uses at ground level and residential above.
- Provide adequate off-street parking for all new dwellings.

The Clause also recommends particular strategies in regard to specific centres such as:

*Bay Street*
- Encourage access to off-street car parking via Bay Street to limit traffic impacts on local residential streets.
- Support the development of a new car parking facility over the existing Council owned parking lot located between Marion Street and Willansby Avenue, to provide between 80-120 additional car spaces.

*Church Street*
- Encourage redevelopment of larger sites and grade level car parks for mixed use developments with basement car parking, office uses (residential in Well Street) at ground level and residential above.
- Support the provision of an additional car parking facility over the existing parking lot located off the north side of Well Street, between Carpenter Street and the railway line, to provide, along with the redeveloped car park on the corner of Carpenter and Black Street, between 120-160 additional car spaces.
- Support the provision of an additional car parking facility over the existing parking lot located on the corner of Carpenter and Black streets to provide, along with the redeveloped Well Street car park, between 120-160 additional car spaces.
Hampton Street
- Facilitate redevelopment of the Willis Street Precinct and railway car park to a mixed use development with basement car parking, integrated community facilities, improved links to the station and between transport modes, improved station facilities and a public space incorporating the existing large eucalypts.
- Support the redevelopment of the station car park in Railway Crescent to provide housing that fronts the street and also looks onto the station.
- Ensure that the redevelopment of the Willis Street Precinct includes additional car parking spaces to replace those lost due to the redevelopment of the Railway Crescent car park.
- Redevelop existing shopping areas between Ludstone and Villeroy streets, and between Grenville and Holyrood streets, to provide shops built to the footpath edge and car parking behind the development.

Sandringham
- Redevelop properties in Melrose Street with 90 degree angle car parking to provide shops built to the footpath edge and parking provided behind the development.

- Clause 52.06 Car Parking
Clause 52.06 of the Bayside Planning Scheme sets out the State standard requirements about the number and design of car parking spaces. The car parking provisions in Clause 52.06 and the Parking Overlay provide five functions:
1. To outline when car parking spaces must be provided and how those spaces can be provided;
2. To determine the number of car parking spaces to be provided;
3. To explain the requirements for reducing the provision of car parking spaces;
4. To require that new car parking spaces are designed and constructed to certain standards; and
5. To provide for precinct based provisions that:
   - establish local rates in identified areas;
   - provide a mechanism for financial contributions in lieu of providing car spaces; and
   - set local requirements, such as the design and layout of car parking spaces.

The car parking provisions apply to a new use, an extension to an existing use and buildings and works associated with some application types.

State standard parking rates (‘Column A rates’) are applied for default areas where no localised plan has been enacted. A second set of parking rates (‘Column B rates’) have been designed specifically for activity centre areas and are able to be activated through the introduction of a Parking Overlay Schedule. These are generally lesser rates to the
standard rates. As there is no Parking Overlay in place in Bayside’s MACs, the Column A car parking rates apply.

A planning permit can be granted to reduce the car parking requirements, including to zero, where the parking cannot be accommodated on the land. A range of application requirements and decision guidelines are included for Council consideration when deciding whether to grant a waiver or reduction of the car parking requirements.

The clause also includes provision for design standards relating to parking spaces and accessways, as well as ramp gradients and other design related aspects.
6. Issues and Challenges

Bayside faces a number of challenges in relation to the supply and management of car parking in and around its activity centres.

These can generally be categorised into three key areas:
1. Demographics and travel behaviour;
2. Community expectations; and

6.1 Demographics and Travel Behaviour

Bayside faces challenges as a result of the increasing population and dwelling densities in and around the MACs. Between 2011 and 2036, the population for the City of Bayside is forecast to increase by 22,531 persons (23.44% growth), at an average annual change of 0.85%.

Estimated State Government projections (VIF 2016) indicate that Bayside is expected to accommodate an additional 7,836 occupied private dwellings by 2031. Much of this housing will be accommodated within the MACs and other designated growth areas, where the demand for on-street parking will continue to increase.

An overview of the population characteristics for each of the MACs is outlined below:
- 54% of houses (496 households) in the Bay Street MAC were separate houses, 32.2% (292 households) were medium density and 11.9% (108 households) high density;
- 58.4% of houses (546 households) in the Church Street MAC were separate households, 37.5% (350 households) were medium density and 3.9% (36 households) high density;
- 44% of houses (371 households) in the Hampton Street MAC were separate households; 43.3% (365 households) were medium density and 12.3% (104 households) high density;
- 38.3% of houses (361 households) in the Sandringham Village MAC were separate houses, 25.9% (338 households) were medium density and 25.4% (239 households) were high density;
- The four MACs all have a higher percentage of young workforce (25yrs-34yrs), and persons over 60 years compared with Bayside, with Hampton Street MAC also having more persons between 50-59;
- 8.1% of Sandringham MAC residents reported needing help in their day-to-day activities due to disability, compared with 5.8% in Bay Street, 3.1% in Hampton Street and 2.2% in Church Street;
- 56.9 of Sandringham MAC residents travelled to work in a car, compared to 56.6% in Hampton Street, 55.6% of Bay Street MAC residents and 54.6% in Church Street;
- 38.5% of households in the Sandringham MAC were lone person households, compared with 29.7% in Bay Street, 27.7% in Hampton Street and 24.4% in Church Street;
• In the Church Street MAC, 49.3 % of households have two or more cars, compared with 45.4% in Hampton Street, 43.5% in Bay Street and 42.5% in Sandringham Village.

Additional demographic profiles for the MACs are outlined at Attachment 1.

Medium density includes all semi-detached, row, terrace, townhouses and villa units as well as flats and apartments of 1 or 2 storeys. Given the height controls in place and some of the typologies encouraged in policy, it is likely that much of Bayside’s growth will occur in the medium density segment.

Council strategic objectives recognise\(^3\) the importance of shifting to a more integrated and sustainable transport system. Bayside, like all of Melbourne, is facing a future of change and our transport system must be flexible and resilient enough to adapt. One of the main challenges identified in the ITS is an increasing number of vehicle trips. The ITS projected suggest an additional 7,881 peak hour car trips each day across the Bayside road network by 2026 (based on projected population growth and current travel patterns remaining the same).

One of the biggest challenges faced by Council as identified in the ITS is the provision of car parking to satisfy the demands of all road users. The ITS acknowledges that the increasing number of dwellings across the municipality, changing travel habits and changes to the rail fee structure in recent years have led to a reduction in the availability of on-street parking in close proximity to the train stations due to increases in commuter parking demand. As the dedicated commuter parking fills up, due to time restrictions in activity centres, commuters are pushed further into the residential areas surrounding activity centres. This results in amenity impacts in residential streets as frustrated residents cannot find convenient on-street parking in close proximity to their homes.

These frustrations have been raised through various consultation processes and continue to create tensions between residents of activity centres and commuters who drive to the station.

A recent analysis undertaken in 2016 found that 18 of our 30 Local Government Areas have below average public transport service per resident. Although Bayside is included within the ‘low’ service per resident group, there has been a small increase of 0.08% in service between 2005 and 2016. Clearly this needs to improve if we are to encourage residents in Bayside to choose alternative modes of transportation to the motor vehicle. Public transport needs to be more reliant and frequent so people can feel confident about their travel choices. Council has a firm commitment articulated in our Public Transport Advocacy Statement to ‘...advocate to State government for improvements to public transport within the municipality.’

\(^3\) Bayside City Council Integrated Transport Strategy  April 2013
6.2 Community Expectations

The following is a summary of some of the issues raised by the community in recent years through the following processes:

- The Aurecon Australia car parking community consultation and engagement process;
- The development of the Community Plan; and
- VCAT decisions and Planning Panel reports considered through the research stages of the 2016 Structure Plan reviews.

Issues raised have been summarised for each MAC to provide a snapshot for each area.

Bay Street Major Activity Centre

- There is an imbalance of short to long-term parking (with both identified as priority);
- Insufficient signage for locations of car parking;
- Inappropriate time restrictions or lack of capacity within the main activity area leading to over spill into the residential areas;
- Commuter car parking over spilling into residential areas;
- Need to expand disabled parking;
- Bus services to the centre need improving, such as community bus;
- Inadequate parking enforcement (with underactive and overactive enforcement being raised as a key priority);
- Rail passengers and traders parking in residential areas, impacting residents ability to take advantage of on-street parking close to their homes; and
- Council should develop a multi-deck carpark in the centre.

Church Street Major Activity Centre

- There is an imbalance of short to long-term parking (with both identified as priority);
- Different commercial uses had different expectations for short term spaces, with high turnover uses (bakeries, newsagencies and similar) seeking more 15 minute restrictions near their premises, with other longer term uses (hairdresser, offices) seeking 1-2 hour restrictions;
- Perceptions of inadequate time restrictions in the main area are leading to spill over into residential areas, including weekends;
- Rail passengers and traders parking in residential areas, impacting residents ability to take advantage of on-street parking close to their homes;
- Inappropriate time restrictions i.e. more 5-15 minute parking is needed on Church Street;
- Insufficient parking in new apartments including the ability for visitors to park on site;
- More commuter car parking should be provided close to the railway station;
- Council should develop a multi deck car park in the centre; and
- Inadequate parking enforcement (with underactive and overactive being raised as a key priority).

Hampton Street Major Activity Centre
- Rail passengers and users of the activity centre are parking in residential areas;
- Perceived inappropriate time restrictions in the main area are leading to spill over into residential areas;
- Insufficient parking enforcement means vehicles are overstaying the time restrictions;
- There is an imbalance of short to long-term parking (with both identified as priority);
- There is insufficient bicycle parking available on-street;
- There should be a multi-deck car park constructed at Council’s Willis Lane car park;
- There is an opportunity for a multi-story parking complex at the train station;
- Since the change in fare structure for the train, there may be more commuters choosing to travel from Hampton Station instead of driving further up the line;
- Whilst the Frankston railway line has its level crossing removals, this may influence the numbers of people choosing to journey from stations towards the end of the Sandringham line (as residents travel to Sandringham/Hampton instead of alternative transport provided on the Frankston line); and
- Given the significant building works occurring throughout the activity centre, tradesmen are occupying and outstaying significant numbers of time restricted bays. Given the length of construction periods, this is a considerable issue for traders and visitors in particular.

Sandringham Village Major Activity Centre
- Rail passengers and traders are parking in residential areas, impacting residents ability to take advantage of on-street parking close to their homes;
- Perceptions in inadequate time restrictions in the main area are leading to spill over into residential areas, including weekends;
- Different commercial uses had different expectations for short term spaces, with high turnover uses (bakeries, newsagent and similar) seeking more 15 minute restrictions near their premises, with other longer term uses (hairdresser, offices) seeking 1-2 hour restrictions;
- Insufficient parking enforcement means vehicles are overstaying the time restrictions regularly and risking the chance of being fined;
- There is an imbalance of short to long-term parking (with both identified as priority);
- There is a lack of disabled parking;
- There is insufficient drop-off parking available at the train station;
- There are opportunities for additional parking spaces alongside the railway line;
Whilst the Frankston railway line has its level crossing removals, this may influence the numbers of people choosing to journey from stations towards the end of the Sandringham line (as residents travel to Sandringham/Hampton instead of alternative transport provided on the Frankston line); and

- Council should develop a multi deck car park in the centre; and
- More commuter car parking should be provided close to the railway station.

The Car Parking Background Reports provide actions which would go some way to addressing several of the key challenges raised above. A range of the actions outlined can be implemented without delay as part of Council’s standard operations as they respond directly to current issues. Greater explanation of some of these operational actions are outlined at Section 7.

Defining a parking hierarchy for activity centres which prioritises visitors to each MAC and working with residents of activity centres to shift expectations about on-street parking availability are necessary actions before any progress can be made to improve parking conditions in any centre. Whilst this is currently provided in Council’s Managing on-street parking demand policy, this needs to be addressed by way of a strategic position in a broader strategy document. It is acknowledged, however, that some residents may not agree with some of the actions aimed at addressing the challenges facing Council.

6.3 Planning Panel Reports and VCAT Decisions

This section provides a summary of the interpretation of car parking related policy from a number of Planning Panel hearings and VCAT decisions. A list of some of the relevant VCAT decisions is included at Attachment 7.

6.3.1 Planning Panel Reports

A number of municipalities have been through the planning scheme amendment process to introduce car parking overlays since the introduction of the tool in June 2012.

Planning Panels have further supported the direction within Practice Note 57: The Parking Overlay which indicates that the Column B rates are typically appropriate in activity centres. Other rates have been considered and in many cases implemented, although all examples sourced introduced further reduced rates compared with increases to the car parking rates.

Some of the issues canvassed in these Panel reports include:
- Criticism from submitters about the rationale for reducing car parking provision rates;
- Concern about the impact of reducing car parking provision rates on surrounding streets; and
- Stakeholder submissions indicating a need for greater car parking in the area to which the overlay is to be applied.

- **Reduction to Car Parking Rates**
  
  At the Whitehorse City Council Amendment C158 hearing, submitters questioned the logic of that Council’s approach to reducing car parking rates to encourage people to use other forms of transport. Submitters believed that this was unrealistic and likely only to result in undesirable impacts on businesses and surrounding residential areas. Submitters further stated that decreased car parking rates would only benefit developers and that the rates should be retained or increased.

  When balanced with sustainable travel options, behaviour change over time and journey to work data, the Panel found that the reduction in rates are appropriate in activity centres for both commercial and residential uses.

  It is likely that future residents of Bayside’s MACs will be more likely to own one or no cars than the present ownership rates, given the number of apartment and similar developments occurring within each MAC. The location of this growth is likely to result in reduced reliance on private vehicles for MAC residents going about daily needs, as well as easy access to the CBD and other employment precincts via public transport.

  For residents of activity centres, owning a car does not necessarily equate to its use during peak travel periods. Whilst Bayside has fewer households with no motor vehicle or access to 1 motor vehicle than Greater Melbourne\(^4\), it is expected that with most housing growth being concentrated into activity centres and with the increasing number of lone person households, the convenience of other transport modes may result in a change to car ownership patterns.

  At the C158 hearing, the Panel commented its’ experience that it is inefficient and unnecessary to provide more than a total of five visitor spaces for larger developments. The Panel considered that the ‘*provision of an excessive number of spaces can lead to some spaces not being used at all or being used for other purposes such as storage or rubbish collection. Generally, a limit of five visitor spaces would seem to be a sufficient provision.*’ This supports the use of the on-street car parking for visitor parking as this many visits will occur outside of usual business hours where there is a lesser demand for on-street parking. The Column B rates provide for this as the visitor parking requirement is reduced to zero.

The Column B rates are based on an area-wide parking provision and allow for commonality of rates between various uses which facilitates changes of use without the requirement for a parking assessment.

The issues regarding the impacts on nearby residential streets if reduced rates are introduced have also been considered by Panels. In the Whitehorse C158 Amendment, the Panel agreed with Council’s submission that the proposed reduced car parking rates are unlikely to result in a worsening of parking overflow problems. The reduced commercial parking rates proposed were typically rates used successfully in other locations. The Panel agreed with the Council’s submission that developers will tend to ‘follow the market’ when it comes to residential properties and are likely to provide greater than the minimum number of spaces if the market requires that. Once dwellings are built new buyers and renters will select or not select properties to buy or rent based on their own parking needs. Whitehorse Council’s policy of not providing on-street parking permits to new residents was considered by the Panel to discourage people to buy or rent properties that don’t provide the right number of car parking spaces to meet their needs.

There are similarities between Bayside’s MACs and the approach taken in the City of Whitehorse. In the Bayside context, much of these parking pressures already exists for properties on the fringes of activity centres and this would be unlikely to worsen if Council were to introduce different rates. There are management strategies which can be implemented to reduce the impacts and ensure that other travel options are explored. All of Bayside’s MACs are well serviced by public transport and provide shopping and recreational uses within each centre. In some of Bayside’s MACs, providing surplus resident car parking than required is common as it is a market expectation that households with two motor vehicles will have access to two off-street spaces, noting Council’s policy that multi dwelling developments are ineligible for on-street parking permits.

Developing Council’s Parking Strategy along with a robust consultation and engagement program will assist to identify problem areas and develop strategies to minimise the impacts at MAC interfaces.

- **Increases to car parking supply**
  Submissions to Panels regarding the need for an increased parking supply were often misaligned with transport policy. Without much direct commentary on this issue, there are some Panel reports which refer strongly to Council prioritising the reduction on the reliance of private vehicles. Whilst the community feedback obtained indicates that Bayside residents wish to see greater parking, it may not be feasible to continue to provide increases in publicly available off-street parking in
Bayside. Focusing on behaviour change and sustainable travel, as supported by Panels, is the more sustainable approach to car parking provision.

Where car parking rates were proposed to be introduced without activation of other parts of the Parking Overlay (for example, without cash in lieu provisions), the Whitehorse C158 Panel agreed that a more detailed overall plan for how Council will undertake works to address parking issues should apply. This did not prevent a Parking Overlay from being applied informed by the broader approach to parking.

A similar approach could be undertaken in Bayside if Council were to resolve to move forward with the Column B rates based on the existing car parking material prepared to date.

- **Cash in Lieu**
  Panels have also commented on some of the challenges in relation to the cash in lieu provisions afforded by the Parking Overlay.

In the Wyndham City Council Amendment C151 Panel report, the Panel commented that submitters concerns highlight one of the drawbacks of cash in lieu schemes in that it takes considerable time to collect sufficient funds to construct car parking. This often results in car parking shortfalls for a significant period, until Council can fund and build facilities.

Deferring development until a suitable car park has been built, however, would likely place additional financial burden on the Council as it would be required to borrow money to bring the project forward. The C151 Panel considered that such an approach may be counter-productive as the flow of income from cash in lieu payments would be interrupted, and the economic benefits of new development lost or deferred. The Panel concluded it would be very difficult to structure a planning control and cash in lieu scheme to effectively defer development until car parking is provided.

The only effective way to do that would avoid implementing a cash in lieu scheme at all and require developers to provide all car parking as part of each development. The Panel concluded that such a requirement would make many developments unviable, and would be particularly harsh on smaller scale development sites, where car park spaces may take up a large proportion of the site footprint. Such dispersed on-site parking on all sites also does not always result in the best urban design outcome, as each site would require individual driveway access to the street.
The Bayside context is similar where many of the land parcels in activity centres are small with fragmented ownership, lacking the larger consolidated development sites for larger proposal which can generally accommodate its parking on-site more easily. In many cases, it will be difficult for new development in MACs to provide all required car parking on site, particularly where parcels of land are relatively constrained or fragmented. Requiring new developments to provide all required parking on site is not reasonable, and granting a waiver or reduction for some types of development is a reasonable approach to encourage development of the centre (where the proposal is considered reasonable).

- **Cash in lieu for sustainable travel initiatives**
  The Moonee Valley City Council Amendment C132 sought to introduce a Parking Overlay which provided for the collection of financial contributions in lieu of residential car parking waivers to contribute to the construction of sustainable transport improvements within the overlay boundary. The improvements were to be identified through a consolidated sustainable projects plan which suggested a hierarchy of schemes for implementation.

  Whilst the C132 Panel agreed that there is scope within the Parking Overlay to provide for the funding of sustainable transport initiatives, this was not sufficiently justified in the Moonee Valley amendment. In that case, the Council had not adequately demonstrated a clear link between the specific non-car parking based initiatives that will support a reduction in car parking need. Whilst the list of projects specified (including streetscape improvements, laneway improvements) was potentially worthwhile, there was no clear link provided as to how the improvements would directly decrease the demand for car parking.

  It is likely that if Bayside was to pursue a similar approach, a greater strategic framework would be required to justify the proposal. A clear approach to how transport projects will reduce car parking demand needs to be clearly articulated. This may be undertaken as part of the future Municipal Parking Strategy and Car Parking Plans to be developed.

  Council already has an action within the *Integrated Transport Strategy 2013* to investigate the feasibility of preparing a municipal wide Development Contributions Plan to support active travel. Through Amendment C124, this action was included in the Planning Scheme at Clause 21.09-4 as further strategic work. This action has yet to commence. If feasible, a municipal wide approach to active travel is preferred as residents of activity centres are more likely to walk to local destinations and would be less likely to travel by car for short trips. Residents from outside activity centres are more likely to receive the benefit of investment in sustainable travel.
infrastructure (for example, bicycle hoops) and a municipal wide approach is a more equitable approach to the delivery of this infrastructure.

- **Beaumaris Concourse Car Parking Precinct Plan 2005**
  Through the development of a Structure Plan for the Beaumaris Concourse, Council also developed a Car Parking Precinct Plan for the centre.

As part of the implementation of the *Beaumaris Structure Plan 2005* into the Planning Scheme, Council was proposing a mandatory minimum requirement of 2 car spaces per dwelling constructed within the centre (regardless of the size of the dwelling). The provision of two spaces per dwelling was considered by the Panel to be ‘*excessive and contradictory to the broader provisions of the Planning Scheme*’ and it was recommended that the State standard parking rates continue to apply.

Council was also seeking the payment of $38,000 for each car parking space waived, to be invested into creating new parking in the centre. The issues about an oversupply of car parking, the impacts on new uses within the centre and the amenity impacts were all raised in the discussion about cash contributions in lieu of parking.

Whilst the Panel accepted that the cost of providing parking in the centre may be up to $40,000, the Panel was concerned about the impacts of the payment on the development potential and viability of the centre. The Panel considered that the provision of additional parking in the centre was a long-term aspirational goal of Council rather than an immediate need that can justify a significant cost impost on new development.

Without a site identified for new parking to be constructed, the Panel found it difficult to establish the legitimacy and transparency of where and how any cash in lieu money would be utilized.

Ultimately, the Panel considered that the cash in lieu scheme could not be justified because:
  - It was likely to affect the viability of establishing new development in the centre;
  - The designation of when, where and how the money would be used was not sufficiently transparent; and
  - The consideration of any new parking in and around the centre should have regard to the broader parking supply and demand, taking into account surrounding land uses which are outside but adjacent to the centre.
These findings relating to the cash in lieu components remain relevant to the MACs as it highlights the need for a broader approach to car parking to be defined prior to determining centre specific approaches.

Once a broader approach to parking is resolved, this will allow for localized plans to be prepared which include a more detailed consideration of opportunities for cash contributions in lieu of parking provision. How cash contributions will be invested into new car parking facilities needs to be clearly articulated within the Parking Plan to ensure the contribution has any chance of success.

6.3.2 VCAT Decisions relating to Bayside’s Major Activity Centres

VCAT has considered a number of planning permit applications in the MACs where contentious car parking matters have been considered. The Tribunal has commented that waiving car parking requirements should not be the determinant factor of whether an application is granted, and that it must be a factor balanced with Council’s strategic planning objectives for the MACs.

VCAT has been critical of Bayside’s approach to parking matters and has highlighted the need for Council to prepare a centre based approach, rather than decision making on an individual case by case basis.

Given Council’s encouragement for vibrant and diverse activity centres, it is expected that customer travel behaviour will include multi-destination trips to the MACs which sees on-street parking shared by multiple businesses. VCAT has also acknowledged the impracticality of providing all car parking spaces required by Clause 52.06 on site and noted that the excellent access to public transport for Bayside’s MACs ensures other modes of travel are available.

In some centres, additional residential parking is commonly provided (generally two car spaces per dwelling) than what is required at Clause 52.06. This is particularly evident in the Hampton Street and Church Street MACs however this typically results in limited or no visitor car parking provided on site.

Visitor parking in apartment developments has often been reduced, as it has been acknowledged that peak visitor hours are typically outside standard business hours where there is usually a lesser demand for on-street parking. In most instances, VCAT has determined that there is sufficient capacity available in the on-street parking to absorb visitor parking demand.

Requests for car parking waivers have generally been granted for commercial uses which have been unable to provide customer parking on site.
This has been the case for a number of medical centres, restaurants and other uses where it is considered that sufficient short term parking exists within the available on-street network.

In some instances, this has included the provision of bicycle parking for staff to facilitate sustainable travel behaviour for staff and reduce demand for long term parking in activity centres.
7. Proposed Approach to Car Parking

There are a number of steps for Council to consider in order to sustainably address car parking issues. Whilst certain actions may result in competing pressures, and others are easily implementable, it is important to ensure that any approach balances the needs of different users and works towards Council’s sustainability objectives.

A three stage plan to addressing car parking in Bayside is outlined throughout this section.

- **Stage 1 | Quick Wins and immediate actions**
- **Stage 2A | Parking Strategy and Parking Precinct Plans**
- **Stage 2B (optional) Basic Parking Overlays**
- **Stage 3 | Planning Scheme Amendment for statutory actions**
- **Stage 3 | Implementation of non-statutory actions**
7.1 Stage 1 | Short term actions and ‘Quick Wins’

7.1.1 Part A | Short term actions

The Car Parking Background Reports presented to Council in July and August 2016 outlined a range of short term improvements for consideration which may result in some immediate outcomes for the activity centres. These include:

- Initiating a behavior change campaign targeted towards sustainable travel;
- Reducing the unrestricted car parking spaces for on-street parking in activity centres (including residential streets);
- Reviewing the time restrictions within each MAC to ensure needs are being met;
- Encouraging greater enforcement of restrictions to ensure parking turnover;
- Improvements to parking signage;
- Identification of improvements to the existing parking supply;
- Identification of opportunities to extend the parking supply; and

As mentioned throughout this report, focusing on a behavior change campaign which includes measurable targets will assist in managing the demand for car parking in the activity centres.

Removing unrestricted on-street parking in the activity centres (including residential streets within the activity centres) will assist in ensuring that turnover of car parking is achieved. It is noted that this is a departure from Council’s current approach, which aims to strike a balance between unrestricted residential parking and time restricted parking serving the activity centres. Whilst this approach may cause concern for residents of activity centres and traders, the primary purpose of the car parking is to facilitate short term visits to activity centres. Other arrangements can be investigated to address trader and staff parking options, however should be subject to further consultation.

It is important to ensure that time restrictions within activity centres are meeting community needs. Regular review of the utilization to determine needs is required to make sure restrictions are serving their intended purpose. With this, comes the need to ensure parking restrictions are being adequately enforced. Monitoring key areas where infringements are regularly issued will assist Council to determine whether other action may need to be taken to encourage turnover.

There are a number of different sign types which provide information on the location of off-street car parking. The integration of technology with car parking signage will assist motorists to easily identify where there are available spaces, which can avoid congested streets as motorists search for a vacant space. Investigating options for dynamic signage will
assist people to find spaces to suit their visitation needs and should be pursued for centres with significant publicly available off-street parking. This is an action supported by the *Economic Development Strategy 2014* and investigations into electronic signage opportunities has commenced.

Identifying areas where the car parking supply can be expanded will provide an opportunity to increase supply. For example, an opportunity to introduce new car parking bays exists along the western side of the railway line, north of Abbott Street, Sandringham.

Opportunities such as this should be explored with public land managers and nearby owners to facilitate an incremental increase to the car parking supply. Reviewing configuration of parking in other areas could be an opportunity to identify potential increases, however this should be designed so as to ensure poor streetscape outcomes are not created.

Undertaking a mid-term review of the ITS is a key recommendation of the Traffic Management and Transport Planning Service Review. This action will provide the basis for measuring the community benefit indicators and will provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the community benefits of the ITS. The review will also underpin some of the future strategic work in the transport area and ensure provide timelines for delivery.

### 7.1.2 Part B | Data Collection

In order to inform a parking strategic framework, greater information is required to be collated from Council’s internal systems in relation to a range of matters. This includes:

- The effectiveness of current policies and strategies in relation to sustainable travel. This is supported by the Service Review recommendation to undertake a mid-term review of the ITS;
- Mapping of existing restrictions and utilization surveys to understand areas of demand;
- Greater comparison of the number of cars registered within each MAC, the number of off-street parking spaces, the number of unrestricted on-street parking spaces and the number of resident parking permits;
- Reconciling the above information with the expected housing typology and car ownership data to forecast expected travel levels;
- Investigating further the number of and requirements for disabled or special needs car parking spaces in activity centres;
- The effectiveness of trader parking permit schemes operated in other municipalities; and
- Significant other data as relevant.

Obtaining this and other data will:

- Build a picture of parking supply and user demands as they change over time;
- Make monitoring and planning for parking assets easier and more efficient;
- Accurately estimate future car parking (and other related transport mode) requirements and appropriate management techniques;
- Improve understanding of important influences at a local level across the municipality;
- Lower costs for future parking studies and parking plans;
- Improve day to day information to the public about existing parking arrangements and availability;
- Improve business processes when responding to requests for changes to parking conditions; and
- Ensure that any future parking strategy is based on data and community feedback to ensure a consistent approach is undertaken across all departments of Council.

Having this information will also assist Council’s understanding of travel behavior and parking within Bayside and create a base data set to inform the future car parking work. If the project is to be developed by an external consultant, it will also reduce the costs associated with obtaining this data if Council has it already at hand. This is particularly relevant given the opportunities presented through the installation of parking sensor and signage technologies.

A number of recommendations regarding data collection and use have been identified in the Traffic Management and Transport Planning Service Review and the collection and maintenance of key data will be incorporated into standard business operations as the service review recommendations are implemented. These inputs are important, however it is firstly important to establish a greater data set to identify trends.
7.2 Stage 2 | Development of a Municipal Parking Strategy

Council’s Integrated Transport Strategy 2013 identifies the need to prepare a municipal Parking Strategy as a short term action. This is further supported by the findings of the Traffic Management and Transport Planning Service Review which outlines the need for Council to have a strategic position in relation to car parking. It is expected that this will also be a key recommendation of the future review of the Integrated Transport Strategy scheduled to occur in 2017/18.

The role of a Parking Strategy can be to:

- To inform council planning and operational activities;
- To guide council decision making, including through the Bayside Planning Scheme, and support community transport initiatives;
- To drive a range of policies and actions that will deliver Council’s chosen vision; and
- To engage the community and key stakeholders to build and strengthen partnerships that will be required in order to bear sufficient resources to make a difference.

Action 3.5 of the ITS states that the Parking Strategy will also include:

- On-street parking management;
- Off-street parking routes;
- Access to car parks across footpaths to address potential conflicts with pedestrian and cyclists;
- Car parking design requirements including requirements for pedestrian priority plans to ensure safe, easy and sheltered access for pedestrians;
- Adequacy of disabled, senior, taxi and community transport parking and access provision at key destinations; and
- Development of parking precinct plans for all MACs and Large Neighbourhood Activity Centres to be undertaken in conjunction with strategic structure plans.

It is noted that the above items relating to footpath crossing conflict points and the, design requirements for pedestrian priority are primarily design related matters which may be more appropriately referenced in a future review of the Integrated Transport Strategy compared to the Parking Strategy.

The municipal Parking Strategy will also identify where the areas of highest demand/need for parking are. It is anticipated that this will primarily be around activity centres, the Bayside Business District and along the foreshore, however there may be other areas identified that may warrant a more specific or nuanced approach to parking. These sub precincts can be included in localized Parking Precinct Plans however it needs to be clearly recognized that what may be suitable in residential areas differs substantially from what is suitable in activity centres and other key destinations. As such, it may be appropriate to
defer preparation of the car parking plans for the MACs until the Parking Strategy has been completed.

A key focus of any parking strategy in relation to managing conditions in activity centres will be the need to ensure that Council prioritises pedestrians and sustainable travel, as well as ensuring that the supply of on-street parking in activity centres is not occupied by long term parking users (residents/commuters).

Car parking is a finite but highly valued commodity. As such, the fundamental objective underpinning any car parking strategy will be the need to ensure the overall objectives relate to behavior change toward sustainable travel. Using this as the starting point, other objectives relating to the ongoing management can be secondary to the primary objective.

The Heart Foundation’s *Good for Business Discussion Paper* 2011 found that car drivers tended to be ‘drive through’ shoppers stopping only for one item rather than visiting an activity centre specifically to spend time shopping. Installing cycle parking can produce higher levels of retail spend than an equivalent space for car parking and this should be a key consideration in any Parking Plan or Strategy prepared.

It is recommended that a cross-organisational project control group be developed to ensure an integrated approach to car parking demand and management, comprising representatives from Sustainability and Transport, Urban Strategy, Amenity Protection and Communications.

A key element of the Parking Strategy will be to ensure that the community are informed and engaged throughout the process. This will be necessary through both the development of the Strategy and also throughout the implementation. This will be imperative in assisting to shape the community’s attitudes and expectations towards transport in their daily lives as it is not sustainable or feasible to continue to provide more and more car parking.

A new approach to preparing Car Parking Plans for specific centres (including MACs) is required which will build upon the data obtained by the Traffic Management and Transport Planning areas through their regular monitoring of conditions in and around activity centres. It is recommended that these parking plans be developed in conjunction with a broader Car Parking Strategy, given the extension of activity centre parking issues into nearby residential areas (but outside MAC boundaries). A considered and comprehensive approach will allow Council some efficiencies in terms of community consultation and traffic survey data and will allow overlapping issues to be considered holistically.
Following the review of the ITS, the development of a municipal Parking Strategy and area based Parking Plans will allow Council to outline its broader commitment in relation to parking and help shape community expectations about what is a realistic position for Council to take. This will need to be informed by a comprehensive data gathering exercise, and the overall strategy underpinned by a focus on behavior change toward sustainable travel. A Communications Plan will be a key element of the project to ensure that the community are informed throughout the project.

It is likely that this stage will see the consolidation of the existing parking related policies to align with the strategic direction of the Parking Strategy.
7.3 Stage 3 | Implementation of the Parking Framework

Once the Parking Strategy and Parking Plans have been prepared, there are two methods for implementation – the statutory actions and non-statutory actions. Non-statutory actions will be able to be implemented by various Council departments as part of normal operations. If changes to the Bayside Planning Scheme are recommended, a planning scheme amendment will be necessary to give effect to the changes. Whilst other options have existed in the past, the current available tool to manage localized car parking issues within the Planning Scheme is the Parking Overlay.

*Practice Note 57: The Parking Overlay provides guidance on the preparation and application of the Parking Overlay.*

**Figure 1 | Relationship between Car Parking Plan, the Parking Overlay and other actions**

The Parking Overlay can be used for any precinct where local parking issues can be identified, and a common strategy can be adopted to respond to them. This might include a new car parking rate or design requirement that applies to the entire municipality, but is more likely to apply to a smaller area, such as an activity or employment area within the municipality.

The Parking Overlay and schedules can be used to:
- Specify local objectives;
- Specify the car parking rates to be provided for any use (through either specified requirements or by applying the ‘Column B’ rates);
- Introduce financial requirements (such as a cash-in-lieu scheme) to be made as a way of meeting car parking requirements where appropriate;
- Introduce application requirements;
- Specify design requirements; and
- Introduce decision guidelines.

**Car Parking Objectives and Decision Guidelines**

In most cases, car parking objectives to be included in the Parking Overlay will be translated from the Car Parking Strategy or Car Parking Plans. These will have been tested through a community consultation and engagement process during the development of the Car Parking Plan. Any requirements in a schedule to the Parking Overlay will flow from the car parking objectives.

In terms of the Bayside context, objectives may be obtained from the MAC Structure Plans, though it is noted these were prepared in 2006. Much has changed since these plans were developed, and whilst the overall Structure Plan objectives remain relevant, the 2016 Review of the Structure Plans identified that further work was required in relation to car parking in order to address community concerns. As such, it is considered that in order to specify parking objectives and decision guidelines for the MACs, further strategic work is required.

**Car Parking Rates**

A schedule to the Parking Overlay can be used to vary the standard car parking requirements at Clause 52.06 of the Scheme. A schedule to the Parking Overlay may either apply the Column B rates (designed to be suitable in activity centres), or specify other parking rates to be applied. It is noted that Practice Note 57 states that ‘The schedule should only be used to decrease the standard number of car parking spaces specified in Table 1 in Clause 52.06, unless there is an overwhelming strategic reason to increase these rates.’ Initial discussions with DELWP have indicated that no municipality in Victoria has yet sought to increase the Clause 52.06 parking requirements. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, this was attempted unsuccessfully through the implementation of the *Beaumaris Concourse Car Parking Plan 2005*.

The 2011 Advisory Committee did not see a need for a Council to provide substantial strategic justification to apply Column B rates to activity centres and it was expected that most Councils would support the application of the Column B rates to principal, major, special and most neighbourhood activity centres. Where a Council proposes locally specific rates (whether increased or decreased from the Column B rates) or other specific considerations such as maximum rates, the Advisory Committee thought that further strategic justification should be provided in the form of empirical evidence, parking surveys and other appropriate strategic work.
Having regard to this, there may be scope for Council to commence a planning scheme amendment to introduce the Column B rates without waiting until the completion of a Car Parking Plan. The Practice Note provides that lesser justification is required if a Council is seeking only to introduce the Column B rates.

The challenge with this approach is more a community perception issue, rather than the suitability of the change. In most cases, the Column B rates offer reduced car parking requirements compared with the Column A (standard) rates which may cause concern for residents who consider that new development is already not providing sufficient car parking.

As already identified in the Community Plan, car parking is as an important issue for the Bayside community, especially in relation to commuters parking in residential streets. The issues identified are often conflicting and the perception is that there is insufficient parking being provided in new developments. The perception that Council is ‘making it easier’ for developers by reducing the parking rates will require careful consideration as to how this message is conveyed through the planning scheme amendment process.

The benefits of implementing the Column B rates are that there will be a lesser number of applications which are seeking waivers in activity for parking rates which are not reasonable or even possible to be provided on site in almost all cases. This will ensure that applications to waiver or reduce parking requirements are based on activity centre specific rates and not blanket parking provisions which may lead to greater success defending Council’s position on car parking at VCAT.

Some of the key land uses most likely to be found in Bayside’s MACs which have different rates between the Column A and Column B rates are outlined in Table 6.

**Table 6 | Comparison of Column A and Column B Parking Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Column A rate (applies the standard rate to all zones)</th>
<th>Column B rate (applies only where specified in a Parking Overlay)</th>
<th>Car Parking Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To each patron permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of net floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises Type</td>
<td>Rate 1</td>
<td>Rate 2</td>
<td>Rate 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Shop if leasable floor area exceeds 80 sq m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and drink premises, other than listed in this table</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, other than listed in this table</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal agency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted retail premises</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop, other than listed in this table</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If Council considers it necessary to apply the Column B rates prior to a Parking Strategy or Parking Plans being prepared, applying this change in isolation is likely to have a greater level of success through a Planning Panel if the proposed amendment does not include other actions which may rely on the future Parking Strategy for justification (e.g. cash in lieu).

The challenge with activating the Column B rates in isolation is that it may be perceived by the community as an action which makes it easier for developers to seek waivers. Whilst the rates are recognized as being the rates for activity centres, undertaking this action in isolation of other actions to manage car parking demand issues is unlikely to receive broad community support.

Draft Parking Overlays for each MAC is included at Attachment 8. These draft overlays activate the Column B rates only, and demonstrate the content of the Parking Overlay in the absence of justification for activating the other benefits the Parking Overlay affords.

It is noted that activating the Column B rates may be an action recommended through the implementation of the Parking Strategy and if undertaken once the Strategy and Car Parking Plans are prepared, the activation of Column B rates would be one of several possible planning scheme inclusions.

Financial Requirements

Financial contributions can be collected through various means such as special rate charges and development contribution schemes. Practice Note 57 confirms that in some cases it may be appropriate to establish a financial contribution scheme under the Parking Overlay. Any requirement for a financial contribution needs to be justified and should address the core principles of need, nexus, accountability and equity in the strategic assessment of the proposal before it is introduced.

- **Need** – is the ‘cash-in-lieu’ scheme needed?
- **Nexus** – is there a direct link between the types of proposals affected by the scheme and the infrastructure provision?
- **Accountability** – what are the financial arrangements? How will the scheme be monitored and reviewed?
- **Equity** – is the scheme fair in terms of who is and isn’t required to pay? Would another method of collecting funds be more appropriate?

A requirement for financial contributions must:
- Relate to a use (or change in use) of land or development of land;
- Designate the area to which it applies;
- Be financially proportionate to the statutory right for which they are exchanged. Councils can only require a payment for car parking that actually reflects the cost of providing a car parking space;
- Identify a proper planning purpose to be funded by the contribution. A project that provides car parking facilities, or other measures which reduce the demand for parking would generally be regarded as a proper planning purpose.

Each payment should be made into a separate ‘car parking and access fund’ established by the municipality. The fund should only be used for the purposes identified in the schedule.

In the 2006 AECOM Report, it was recommended to collect cash-in-lieu funds in both Bay Street and Church Street MACs at the rates of $50,000 and $76,000 per parking space respectively. The funds collected were recommended to be set aside for the construction of additional off-street car parking spaces in those centres, on sites identified in the 2006 Parking Precinct Plans.

However, the AECOM analysis did not reveal the need to construct additional car parking spaces in either the Hampton or Sandringham MACs. It was recommended that a nominal cash-in-lieu rate of $20,000 per parking space be set in each centre (a generous discount on the estimated cost of a parking space) in order to fund a range of sustainable transport initiatives. They recommended that these should be aimed specifically at pedestrian, cyclist and public transport initiatives – drawing from the list of actions developed in the respective Structure Plans for those Activity Centres.

It is uncertain at this time whether a cash in lieu for sustainable travel would be supported at an independent Planning Panel, given the recent Panel recommendation for Moonee Valley Amendment C132.

Amendment C132 proposed to introduce a cash in lieu payment which was to be allocated toward Council installing improvements to sustainable travel infrastructure. This was ultimately not supported by the Panel for a range of reasons, notably the complexity in measuring the direct link associated with the sustainable travel improvements proposed and the tangible impact these would have on reduced car parking demand.

A considerable challenge for Bayside to implement cash in lieu will be the high cost of land, as well as construction costs for development of any new car parking facility. It is unlikely that a cash in lieu scheme would actually fund a significant proportion of the construction costs for a multi-level car park (noting that no feasibility for a multi deck has been prepared). It is anticipated that Council would be required to contribute the vast majority of funds for such a development as the cash in lieu rates would most likely be prohibitive to developers. Council would likely need to offer a subsidized amount in order to promote development in the centres, which would further reduce the amount of funds collected to
fund a new car parking facility. If this does not occur, it is more likely to stifle development and detract from the vibrancy of the activity centres rather than encouraging developers to pay the full amount nominated.

Council has no current plans to develop additional car parking facilities in its activity centres. If Council wishes to pursue cash in lieu further, justification in relation to need, nexus, equity and accountability is required as well as nominating potential sites for development or acquisition. These matters can be considered through the development of the Parking Strategy and Parking Precinct Plans however any attempt at obtaining a cash in lieu scheme prior is unlikely to be successful.

Application requirements and design requirements

The need for application requirements or design requirements would likely feed out of the data collected in the development of the Parking Strategy or Car Parking Plans.
8. Implementation

This report provides a range of actions for Council to consider in preparing and implementing its approach to car parking demand management. A longer term, staged approach is most likely to result in some tangible outcomes for the community which can be delivered through a robust strategic framework.

Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) has advised that there has not yet been any amendments approved which sought to only introduce the Column B rates. Pursuing the Column B rates will assist to manage the number of applications where parking waivers are sought for changes of use applications where there is simply no provision for additional on-site car parking. It will apply parking rates which have been considered suitable for activity centres rather than the broader rates for all of Victoria.

Undertaking a comprehensive behavior change campaign will assist in managing the expectations of users and educating people toward more sustainable travel methods.

It is important to build a long term strategic approach to car parking in Bayside with localized plans to ensure that all departments of Council have a common goal and framework within which to operate. It will be important to ensure that significant budget exists to undertake this work thoroughly, with heavy involvement from the community given the sentiments on parking expressed through the Community Plan. It is noted that no budget is currently allocated for the preparation of the Parking Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Undertake a comprehensive Behaviour Change Campaign</td>
<td>Transport Planning, Communications, Sustainability</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Establish data needs and strategic framework (including electronic signage)</td>
<td>Transport Planning, Traffic Management, Amenity Protection, Statutory Planning</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (optional) Commence a planning scheme amendment to apply the Column B rates</td>
<td>Urban Strategy</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prepare Parking Strategy and Parking Plans</td>
<td>Transport Planning</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Implement Parking Overlay and other key actions</td>
<td>Transport Planning, Traffic Management, Urban Strategy, Amenity Protection, Commercial Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>