

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
2 (cont)	<p>Council could resolve the longstanding land use conflicts at Warwick Farm with an alternative vehicle access to Scrivener Street from Governor Macquarie Drive.</p>	<p>allowing 7 day per week use of the industrial area is consistent with the NSW Industrial Noise Policy.</p> <p>Council investigated an alternative road access for industrial properties around the horse training precinct. The results of the investigation were reported to the Council meeting of 26 March 2012. The investigation found that the cost of the alternative road access was too expensive for Council to fund.</p> <p>Council is investigating a Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) plan which will recommend improvements to the local area and has been referred to a grant program by the Minister for Roads and Ports.</p>
	<p>Council still has the opportunity to consider the specifics of individual development applications for the Warwick Farm East precinct and impose appropriate conditions suited to the nature and potential impacts of the proposed development to ensure amenity for surrounding land uses is maintained.</p>	<p>Agreed, the draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries.</p> <p>It is acknowledged within the report that the controls cannot be applied retrospectively to valid development consents. It is also noted that these are DCP controls and can be varied with justification. Given the sensitivity of this area it is advised that the proposed controls remain and only to be varied if justified as part of a development application. Council would consider on a case by case basis specific mitigation measures as part of a development assessment process.</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
3	<p>We support the two following points within the draft controls.</p> <p>General Control 5(iv) Measures to prevent, contain and divert water run-off from the site from entering Council's stormwater system – details required to be submitted include, wash bay areas (horse, float and truck), location of bunding, gross pollutant traps, disposal of waste, liquid trade waste agreements etc;</p> <p>Residential Equine Controls (2) Cleaning of trucks and horse floats must be undertaken on private property. Mud, manure, wood shavings or other material are not permitted to flow into the stormwater. Details of water treatment facilities are to be provided as part of the development application.</p>	<p>These controls form part of the proposed controls being suggested.</p>
	<p>Objective (c) To ensure that negative impacts of neighbouring industrial developments are appropriately managed and that land use conflicts that arise due to the passage of industrial traffic through a residential and equine related area are minimised.</p> <p>This cannot be achieved as the volume of traffic is now intolerable.</p>	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential and equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries.</p>
	<p>Assessment of noise must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All on site operations, including manoeuvring of vehicles and machinery on site. <p>This can only be achieved by erecting sound reducing barriers to stop</p>	<p>This control requires that all new developments must provide details of their proposed operation in relation to noise. This will enable council officers to assess the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding areas.</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
3 (cont)	the noise travelling offsite across Rosedale Park to the residential area.	Mitigation measures would be proposed by the developer and may include noise walls, acoustic treatments etc.
	<p>Assessment of noise must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. any noise generated as a result of vehicular movements to or from the site on residential neighbours, and <p>This cannot be achieved as the volume of traffic now is intolerable.</p>	This control requires that all new developments must provide details of their proposed operation in relation to noise generated in relation to vehicle movements. This will enable council officers to assess the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding areas.
	<p>Details of potential deliveries, vehicles movements, hours of operation.</p> <p>There can be no more vehicle movements. the amount of traffic is unbearable now.</p>	This control requires that all new developments must provide details of their proposed operation. This will enable council officers to assess the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding areas.
	<p>EMP 5 (ii) Measures to control odours and dust emissions from the site;</p> <p>Trucks moving through the equine area emit fumes, pollution and stir up dust causing health problems for residents, the workers and horses.</p> <p>This cannot be achieved</p>	All proposed developments must submit an Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The EMP identifies all potential environmental issues on the site and provides a comprehensive and complete action implementation plan to ensure that nearby residents and the environment are not unacceptably impacted. This plan would assess the full range of potential environmental impacts.
	<p>EMP Discussion of traffic routes to be utilised through the Warwick Farm training area to minimise residential impacts.</p> <p>This cannot be achieved as the volume of traffic now is intolerable.</p>	This requires the applicant to provide details of how their proposed movements will minimise the impact on residents and equine related uses. This will enable council to assess the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding area. DCP controls cannot require a reduction in existing traffic volumes.

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
3 (cont)	<p>Development of business land north of Munday Street and the Industrial development in Scrivener and Priddle Street Warwick Farm</p> <p>1. The maximum permitted hours of operation (including deliveries) are between the hours of 7am and 6pm Monday to Saturday and 8am to 6pm Sundays.</p> <p>We strongly object to this at the moment we only get peace on Sunday. We can safely walk our horses, drive out or our driveway and cross the road without B-doubles and cars continually speeding past.</p>	<p>The restriction of hours of operation aim to limit the impact of future developments on the residential and equine industry. The DCP proposes operation between 8:00am to 6:00pm allowing reasonable access to the industrial uses and is consistent with the provisions of the NSW Industrial Noise Policy.</p>
	<p>For certain development Council may require Driver behaviour guidelines / training to educate drivers of the sensitive nature of the Warwick Farm Training Precinct.</p> <p>Most of the drivers at the moment have no regard for the workers who are trying to lead horses across the road. The brakes of the trucks are so loud, they speed, they don't stop. Horses are very unpredictable and are quite capable of killing their handler. The idea is good but these drivers are on a tight schedule and we don't think they are going to abide by this and who is going to enforce their behaviour.</p>	<p>This proposed control allows Council to condition future development consents to ensure truck drivers and users of Manning Street understand the sensitivity of the area as they travel through to their destination.</p> <p>Through the Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) Plan there may be opportunities to work further with existing land owners to educate drivers on the sensitive nature of the Warwick Farm Training Precinct, and provide for improvements to the current conditions.</p>
	<p>The construction of a bridge from Bridges Road Moorebank linking Scrivener Street Warwick Farm.</p>	<p>Council investigated an alternative road access for industrial properties around the horse training precinct. A bridge linking Bridges Road Moorebank to Scrivener Street was not considered as part of that investigation due to cost and feasibility implications.</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
3 (cont)	The by-pass road could be built behind Rosedale Park to link the Industrial area with Governor Macquarie Drive.	Council investigated an alternative road access for industrial properties around the horse training precinct. The results of the investigation were reported to the 26 March 2012 Council meeting. It was found that the cost of the alternative road access was too expensive for Council to fund. Further Council resolved to prepare a LATM plan which will look into improvements to the local traffic conditions.

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
3 (cont)	<p>The Traffic Problem is a Work, Health and Safety issue for the equine industry. Council cannot make decisions that concern horses without Workcover and representatives from the Racing Industry. We therefore ask that Council call a meeting between representatives of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warwick Farm Community Horse Trainers and residents 2. Industry from Scrivener Street area 3. Workcover 4. ATC 5. Liverpool City Council Mayor and his representatives 6. Landowner (name withheld) and advisers 	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impacts of future development on the horse training precinct. A LATM plan is being drafted, with one of the objectives of the plan is to improve safety and reduce the current conflicts.</p> <p>Straight Talk Pty Ltd on behalf of Council held stakeholder meetings as part of the Strategic Review. This DCP amendment was produced as an outcome of the Strategic Review. The draft DCP was also publicly exhibited between 12 September to 12 October 2012. As such community feedback has informed the development of the proposed controls.</p> <p>The DCP was publicly exhibited where all land owners were given the opportunity to comment. From the submissions received the majority of issues are traffic related.</p> <p>It would be appropriate for these groups to provide input into the LATM recommendations to best match the needs of the local community.</p>
4	<p>Land owner (name withheld) and numerous others have experienced significant hazards associated with the land use conflicts associated with the industrial land uses to the south and the horse training precinct.</p>	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries. It is expected that the draft DCP controls will lessen the impact of new development and not exacerbate existing land use conflicts.</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
4 (cont)		
	Planning Consultant (name withheld) have already prepared a planning submission in response to the Council's community engagement of Straight Talk Consultants.	The planning submission was addressed as part of the Warwick Farm Strategic Review process.
	The land use conflicts include large trucks which utilise the narrow streets as heavy vehicle routes which are also used by stable hands walking high strung thoroughbreds to and from Warwick Farm Racecourse. These movements often occur in the early morning prior to sunrise which exacerbates the conflicts. The conflicts not only involve the potential for collision but also from the noise associated with the trucks including air brakes.	The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries and driver behaviour guidelines. As part of the Local Area Traffic Management plan the interactions of existing truck movements and trainers with thoroughbred horses will be investigated.
	The granting of approvals of the permanent stables (DA899/2009) has resulted in the significant vacancies within the individually owned stable blocks within the area being redundant and being used as single dwellings on sites generally over 2000sqm.	This Council report addresses the DCP controls included in the draft amendment No. 8 Competition between stables is not a matter addressed by this DCP.
	<p>It is considered that the (draft) amendments in the DCP are short term and inadequate planning solutions which will not adversely address the major amenity and planning issues in this locality.</p> <p>The recommendations in the DCP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Compliance with noise criteria b) Operational details including hours of operation, manoeuvring or vehicles and operation of machinery and traffic routes c) Requirement of Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) d) Maximum hours of operation including deliveries 	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls giving particular consideration to the residential amenity and safety of horses and trainers.</p> <p>The draft controls require assessment of all these factors as part of future development applications. The existing conditions may be improved through actions identified in</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
4 (cont)	These are not considered adequate to overcome the planning conflicts as the amendments cannot apply retrospectively to existing developments which have no such limitations.	<p>the LATM plan.</p> <p>Through the Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) Plan there may be opportunities to work further with existing land owners and users of the industrial precinct to educate drivers on the sensitive nature of the Warwick Farm Training Precinct.</p>
	<p>It is considered that LEP amendments are the more appropriate course of action to address these land use conflicts rather than the draft DCP amendments. The LEP amendments should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LEP amendment for an alternative vehicle east of Rosedale Oval. - LEP amendment to rezoned land from R2 to R4 	<p>The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the issues that arose as part of the public exhibition period of the draft amendments to the DCP.</p> <p>The introduction of high density R4 development with additional vehicles and residents will not improve the existing horse related or truck related conflicts.</p>
	<p>Council should investigate the recommendations of the report submitted by planning consultant (name withheld) seek to provide an alternative heavy vehicle route in association with rezoning Low Density Residential Land to R4 High Density Residential.</p>	<p>The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the issues that arose as part of the public exhibition period of the draft amendments to the DCP.</p> <p>The introduction of high density R4 development with additional vehicles and residents will not improve the existing horse related or truck related conflicts.</p>
	<p>It is considered that the DCP amendments which seek to ameliorate land use conflicts between the industrial land and horse training precinct is a positive initiative, however, it is considered that the recommendations are inadequate to achieve any meaningful outcome.</p>	<p>The draft controls seek to minimise conflicts arising from future developments. Existing conflicts may be addressed through the LATM plan.</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
5	<p>The proposed controls have the potential to unacceptably and unreasonably restrict the important ongoing industrial and employment activity in this area.</p>	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries.</p> <p>The controls cannot be applied retrospectively to valid development consents. These DCP controls can be varied with justification. Giving the sensitivity of this area it is advised that the proposed controls remain and only to be varied if justified as part of a development application. Council would consider on a case by case basis specific mitigation measures as part of a development assessment process.</p>
	<p>The proposed restriction to hours of operation, if applied to the existing approved sites would have an unacceptable impact on the viability of the continued manufacturing.</p>	<p>The draft DCP controls cannot be applied retrospectively to existing development consents.</p>
	<p>The Draft South-West Subregional Strategy identifies the Priddle/Scrivener Street precinct as Category 1 employment land to be retained for industrial purposes, specifically heavy manufacturing. This acknowledges the strategic importance of this industrial precinct as an employment generating land use within the region. It is unreasonable to restrict the viability of ongoing industrial development in this location through the imposition of hours of operation that do not take into account the operational requirements of existing and potential future businesses operating in the area.</p>	<p>The Southwest Subregion Draft Subregional Strategy states (2007):</p> <p><i>"Priddle/Scrivener Street Warwick Farm is an industrial area of 25ha separated from Liverpool CBD by a rail line. It contains a number of large manufacturing units, including Kimberly-Clark mill, which currently employs 174 people, but is due to close in 2007. The precinct has potential for redevelopment and, while there is poor vehicle access, it could accommodate activities that will generate a high level of employment and be</i></p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
5 (cont)		<p><i>supportive of Liverpool CBD functions. The industrial land adjoins land owned by Liverpool Hospital, connected to the main hospital site by pedestrian access. Its potential for medically based industry should be investigated."</i></p> <p>The Draft Subregional Strategy states that the site does have poor vehicle access. The subregional strategy fails to state that the vehicles travelling to the industrial precinct must do so through a residential and equine area. Due to the existing land use conflicts and safety issues Council has drafted controls that attempt to limit the impacts from future development.</p> <p>The draft DCP controls ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the residential and equine industry when a development application is lodged in the future.</p>
	<p>We submit that rather than a blanket control as proposed in the draft DCP, hours of operation would be more appropriately assessed on a case by case development application basis. This would enable full and proper assessment of the character and impacts proposed activities in the area with imposition of appropriate conditions of consent to mitigate any genuine negative impacts. The preferred approach is in the Strategic Review of the Warwick Farm Horse Training Precinct prepared by Liverpool Council which states:</p> <p><i>Specifically limiting the precinct to operating hours is unfeasible, especially considering that a business already has approval</i></p>	<p>The draft development controls for the precinct are aimed at limiting the impact of future developments on the residential / equine industry by proposing a number of controls including the restriction on hours of operation and deliveries.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the controls cannot be applied retrospectively to valid development consents. It is also noted that these are DCP controls can be varied with justification. Given the sensitivity of this area it is advised that the proposed controls remain and only to be varied if</p>

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
5 (cont)	<p><i>outside of Council's control to operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week) [sic]. It is more reasonable to limit the impacts more clearly articulating noise restrictions and operational restrictions and encouraging respectful driver behaviour.</i></p> <p>We submit therefore that the blanket restriction on operating hours be deleted.</p>	<p>justified as part of a development application. Council would consider on a case by case basis specific mitigation measures as part of a development assessment process.</p> <p>The current approach will allow this site by site analysis.</p>
6	Warwick Farm East consists of zonings and land use conflicts that are in extreme conflict	The draft controls will not resolve the existing land use conflicts within the precinct; they will however provide controls that will lessen the impacts of new development on the amenity of residential area and equine industry.
	DCP (Draft Amendment) No 8 should clearly establish controls for the horse precinct so that residential controls can be invoked over land use, activities and actions that needs to be carried out for Racing or other horse related uses	The LEP and DCP does allow a range of uses within this precinct. The draft controls relating to the equine industry are considered adequate to manage development in this area.
	Sydney Water (sewerage treatment) should be included in the controls	The draft DCP does not relate to the Sydney Water site. Council can write to Sydney Water requesting they consider the use of excessive braking in the area.
	Sydney water uses tip trucks to transport dried products out of the plant and this generates high level of traffic in concentrated periods of the month	
	The tip trucks contracted by Sydney Water use excessive exhaust braking and residents attempts to modify behaviour has failed	
7	Within this zone is a road network which is used frequently by many South Western Sydney Local Health District (SWSLHD) staff, deliveries and invited guests travelling by vehicle via the Scrivener entry to and from the Health Administration Cooperation owned by Liverpool Hospital. The use is expected to continue into the future and with continued development to Liverpool Hospital the volume of Health related traffic can be expected to increase.	The draft controls do not impact on the operations of the Liverpool Hospital site.

Submission No.	Issues Raised	Comment
(7 cont)	With expected increases in the volume of traffic, it is strongly recommended that Liverpool City Council act to ensure that an appropriate road network and traffic control infrastructure is in place to assist in the safe movement of vehicles, horses and people. This should extend to consideration of the impact on parking availability along these roads.	The local road network is being considered through the LATM plan. Council has initiated the first stages of the Local Area Traffic Management plan. The first stages are to be considered by the Local Traffic Committee (LTC) and will be reported to Council early next year. Features of the LATM were discussed at the LTC meeting on 7 November 2012.
	Of particular concern is the higher than average risk of vehicle collision when heading east and turning right from Munday Street into Governor Macquarie Drive.	The development application for the Munday Street Governor Macquarie Drive intersection upgrade was approved at the Council meeting of 5 November 2012. The new intersection will provide improved and safer access to the Warwick Farm east precinct.

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

CITY SERVICES REPORT

ORDINARY MEETING

28/11/2012

ITEM NO:	CITS 01	FILE NO:	2012/19092012/1909
SUBJECT:	CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION (CCTV) IN LIVERPOOL CBD		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE:	NEIGHBOURHOODS AND VILLAGES ARE WELL DESIGNED, SAFE AND CLEAN		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the Council meeting held on 8 October 2012, it was resolved to undertake public consultation with regards to the installation of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) within the Liverpool Central Business District (CBD).

Council held a public meeting on Monday 22 October 2012, chaired by Council's General Manager, Farooq Portelli. Simon Walker of Connley Walker Pty Ltd, CCTV Consultant, was also in attendance to answer any technical questions associated with the proposed CCTV system.

This report is to provide feedback on the questions raised at that meeting and proposed actions to take CCTV implementation forward.

DETAILED REPORT:

Council at its meeting held on 8 October 2012, resolved in part:

"That Council conducts a public community meeting to discuss with business and the general public what options may be available for them to participate in the CCTV implementation process."

On 22 October 2012 at 6:00pm, a public meeting was held at the Francis Greenway Centre to discuss the implementation of CCTV and to provide members of the public with an opportunity to ask questions and provide input as to the level of involvement that the local businesses and public would be prepared to participate in.

Council's General Manager provided an overview of Council's current approach to addressing safety issues within the CBD. A more comprehensive list of programs delivered by Council through the following safety initiatives, as part of the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Plan 2009-2012, are detailed below:

- A comprehensive series of safety audits, during the day and night
- Safety audits at Bathurst Street and Northumberland Street car parks and on street parking areas
- Lighting audits at identified hotspots
- Repair of lighting and installation of new lighting, at identified hotspots
- Safety signage at relevant car parks and streets
- Distribution of car immobilisers and car licence plate screws to residents
- Development of responses to common assault in partnership with licensed premises
- Support to the Police to deliver a Bizsafe Forum with local businesses
- Daily graffiti removal across the City Centre
- Ongoing maintenance (eg. rubbish pickups, tree trimming) to promote natural surveillance and guardianship
- A series of community events to activate public space and increase ownership
- Ongoing road safety initiatives around school zones
- Establishment and enforcement of Alcohol Free Zones
- Several Liverpool Safety Expo community education events
- Community consultations, information sessions and education programs related to a range of crime and safety matters
- Youth programs including the Responsible Use of Alcohol Digital Art Project
- Development and distribution of responsible drinking educational materials via licensed premises
- Engagement with relevant stakeholders by convening the Liverpool Community Safety and Crime Prevention Working Group and supporting the Liverpool City Liquor Accord, Liverpool Domestic Violence Liaison Committee and Community Drug Action Team.

Council has also sought and received funding from the State Government during the period of 2009-2012, as follows:

- \$50,000 funding from the Department of Attorney General and Justice to deliver the Non Domestic Violence Assault Risk Minimisation project, \$129,000 to deliver the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Graffiti Hotspot Program and \$47,000 to deliver the Car Security project.
- \$24,000 from ClubsNSW to deliver the Responsible Use of Alcohol Digital Art Project.
- \$30,000, 500 car immobiliser vouchers valued at \$80,000 and educational resources valued at \$15,000 from the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council to deliver the Operation Bounce Back Program.

Further funding of \$150,000 was also sought and received from the Federal Government, for the Proceeds of Crime Act Graffiti Prevention and Reduction and/or Removal Program to deliver the CPTED Graffiti Prevention and Reduction Project.

The General Manager explained that CCTV would be another initiative of Council to support the current safety initiatives as listed above. A number of questions were raised by those in attendance and generally CCTV was supported by the majority of people in attendance. A comprehensive list of questions and answers given at the briefing is provided in an attachment to this report.

The public meeting received support from the majority of business owners in attendance including the Liverpool's Business Social Association, a newly formed association of local business owners, within the Liverpool CBD area. Liverpool Police also provided support for the program along with positive comments being received from long term community members.

Council also resolved at its 8 October 2012 meeting to:

"Invite expressions of interest to:

- *Install and maintain CCTV in the Liverpool CBD based on an approximate budget of \$400,000*
- *Monitor CCTV in the CBD*
- *Potentially conduct trials of CCTV in the CBD"*

Council's Mayor and General Manager have met with a number of CCTV providers and a number of site inspections are proposed to be conducted of councils and other organisations that have installed CCTV. It is proposed that additional information needs to be gathered to better position Council to consider all of the options available to it before seeking expressions of interest.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications as a result of this report

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive and note this report

SIGNED BY:

David Tuxford
Director
City Services

Attachments: CCTV Public Meeting 22 October 2012 – Questions and Answers

**CCTV Public Meeting
22 October 2012**

Questions and Answers

- Q. What locations were being proposed for the installation of the cameras?
- A. Council's CCTV Consultant, Mr Simon Walker, had identified sites for the installation of the cameras in consultation with Liverpool Police, to address 'hot spots' with the CBD.
- Q. What type of cameras and systems are being proposed?
- A. No one brand of camera or system has been identified. However, an IP solution with a mesh wireless network is included in the recommendations by the CCTV consultant.
- Q. Can motion sensitive cameras be used?
- A. No. Motion sensitive cameras would not be sufficient under the usage circumstances that are proposed, as the installation sites would be in high usage areas.
- Q. Is Council proposing to introduce signage to advise businesses and residents that they are being monitored by CCTV.
- A. Council has a legal obligation to install signage to advise people of the operation of CCTV cameras. The signage will be visible and in high use areas.
- Q. Will consultation occur with the business owners where the proposed cameras will be placed?
- A. Consultation will occur with business owners who will be required to be in agreement with the installation of cameras on their buildings, as the cameras will require access to the business owner's power supply. Each camera only uses the equivalent power to that of a light bulb.
- Q. What monitoring of the cameras will occur?
- A. Monitoring times are yet to be determined and will be based upon input received through the Expression of Interest (EOI) process. Monitoring may be limited to busy times.
- Q. Will the cameras be able to be used in low light, as some areas of the CBD require better lighting?
- A. The type of cameras that have been recommended have the capability to be used in low light. These cameras switch to night mode in low light conditions, wherein they retrieve information in black and white with high resolution. The EOI will also allow for different technology to be explored.

- Q. What liability will Council have in relation to the operation of the CCTV cameras?
- A. Council carries public liability insurance for all of its operations and CCTV will be included in this process. However, information will be obtained through Council's insurers for further clarification as CCTV's are already operational within a number of Council areas.
- Q. Can local business owners purchase additional cameras that can be linked to the Council CCTV system?
- A. Yes. The proposed system has the capability for growth, where installation can start with a few cameras and grow to accommodate a large number.
- Q. Why doesn't Council spend the money set aside for CCTV on improving lighting in the CBD to make the area safer?
- A. Council is addressing the lighting issues through other safety initiatives such as those previously mentioned, with the assistance of external funding.
- Q. How is CCTV in the CBD going to be beneficial for the people who live in the rural areas? Is Council going to install CCTV in the rural areas?
- A. Council is not intending on installing CCTV in the rural areas as the perception of community safety and the occurrence of anti-social behaviour and crime is primarily a problem within the CBD, at this time.
- Q. CCTV is a State Government responsibility and should be undertaken by them. What are we doing to lobby them?
- A. Council has written to a number of State and Federal Ministers advising them of Council's current holistic approach to safety and has requested their financial support for the installation of CCTV in the Liverpool CBD.
- Q. The cameras may attract birds and there may also be problems with vandalism. This will be an additional cost to Council. How is Council intending on addressing this problem?
- A. CCTV cameras have improved over the years to address attacks by vandals and issues associated with bird droppings, by implementing improved design changes. The cameras that have been recommended are designed to be resistant to vandalism and bird droppings. Continued maintenance of the cameras will also reduce these problems.

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL**CITY ASSETS REPORT****ORDINARY MEETING****28/11/2012**

ITEM NO:	ASST 01	FILE NO:	2011/5071
SUBJECT:	DRAFT PERMIT PARKING POLICY		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN	DECISION MAKING PROCESSES ARE TRANSPARENT AND THE COMMUNITY HAS OPPORTUNITY TO BE INVOLVED		
REFERENCE:			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council, at its meeting held on 20 August 2012, resolved to place on public exhibition and obtain community comment on the Draft Permit Parking Policy for a period of 28 days and be provided with a further report in November 2012 following the public exhibition period.

This report outlines the public exhibition process, the number of submissions and comments received, amendments to the draft permit parking policy, pricing and parking permit allocation.

DETAILED REPORT:

Council, at its meeting held on 20 August 2012, resolved to:

- Approve to place on public exhibition and obtain community comment on the Draft Permit Parking Policy including the fees and charges for a period of 28 days in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993, Sect 160.
- Approves to promote the public exhibition of the draft Permit Parking Policy in the local media and Council's website.
- Be provided with a further report in November 2012 following the public exhibition period of 28 days that include community comments and any amendments to the Draft Parking Permit Policy.

In line with the above Council resolution, the Draft Permit Parking Policy was placed on public exhibition from Wednesday, 19 September 2012 to Wednesday, 17 October 2012 and promoted through local newspapers and Council's website, with hard copies being available at Council's Administrative Building and Central Library.

In addition, properties that will be affected by the introduction of the Liverpool City Centre Stage 2 ticket parking machine installation, and that may receive benefit from the introduction of the Draft Permit Parking Policy, were individually notified in writing of the public exhibition period and invited to provide comment on the Policy.

Following the public exhibition period, three responses were received and are as follows:

Address	Comment	Response to resident
Nuwarra Road, Moorebank	Remove all parking meters	Resident has been advised of Council's parking strategy to secure the long term viability of Liverpool City Centre and other Council initiatives.
Castlereagh Street, Liverpool	Request for parking permits	Resident advised that ticketed parking does not apply in this street and therefore the Draft Policy does not apply at this time.
Bigge Street, Liverpool	Request for parking permits	Resident advised that ticketed parking does not apply in this part of Bigge Street and therefore the Draft Policy does not apply at this time.

Recommend Approach for the Allocation of Permits

As some residents find it more convenient to park on-street instead of utilising their own off-street parking space and most residents would like to park within close proximity of their residence, a review of the number of properties that may be eligible for parking permits and available on-street parking spaces was undertaken for entire length of Bathurst Street.

The investigation revealed that, based on the available on-street parking spaces in Bathurst Street, Council would not be able to provide each resident with a parking permit and also accommodate short term (on-street) parking for businesses.

The number of residential/commercial units along Bathurst Street compared to the available on-street parking spaces is shown below.

Bathurst Street, Liverpool			
Type of units	Residential	Commercial	Total
Number	559	86	645
Parking spaces	Unrestricted	Restricted (timed/ticketed)	Total
Monday - Friday	77	60	137
Saturday	76	61	137
Ratio	Units -v- On-Street parking spaces		4.7 : 1

Based on the available on-street parking spaces, only one parking space is available for every five units and this would impact upon the churn of vehicles. This in turn could impact upon the businesses in Bathurst Street as their customers would have difficulty in finding on-street parking in close proximity to the business.

Bathurst Street contains 13 ticket parking machines. Allocating parking permits for all available on-street parking spaces could potentially provide minimal or no return on investment as the ticketed parking spaces could be permanently occupied by vehicles displaying parking permits.

The issuing of permits to all eligible residents could lead to the expectation that on-street parking is a right and place demands upon Council to satisfy this demand, irrespective of the costs, even though residents may have access to off-street parking.

In view of this, it is recommended that only residents with no off-street parking are provided with one Resident Parking Permit. Eligible residents who are provided with a Resident Visitor Parking Permits would be restricted to the time limits that apply to the street. This will ensure equitable on-street parking spaces for road users.

In this regard, the Draft Policy has been amended to indicate that the resident parking scheme will be used where residents have no off-street parking.

Amendments to Liverpool City Council Draft Permit Parking Policy

As indicated above, at the end of the exhibition period, Council only received three responses. None of the responses suggested changes to the Draft Policy. The very low community response has not provided Council with any opportunity to amend the Draft Policy with community input.

The amended Draft Policy is in line with the Roads and Maritime Services' mandatory Permit Parking procedures.

The Policy deals with the implementation of the following classes of parking permits:

Park in a ticketed parking space

- Business parking permit
- Resident parking permit
- Resident Visitor parking permit
- Non-Profit organisation permit.

Park in a No Parking zone, permit holders excepted

- Parking permit for non-community organisations including businesses
- Parking permits for community organisations.

The only change to the Draft Policy relates to the Resident Parking Scheme as outlined above, with eligible residents being those with no off-street parking.

Parking Permit Pricing

Resident and Resident Visitor Parking Scheme

The cost to issue a Parking Permit is estimated at \$35 per permit. To assist eligible residents who are directly effected by ticketed parking, it is recommended that permits are provided free of charge in the first year and full cost recovery applies in subsequent years.

Business Parking Scheme

Currently, Council provides business parking permits which allow parking in "No Parking" and "Council Permit Holders Excepted" zones for \$1,000 per annum. In addition, the Draft Policy proposes a business parking permit which would allow the permit holder to park in ticketed parking spaces in the City Centre.

In the report considered by Council on 20 August 2012, the value of a ticketed parking space was estimated at \$4,850 per annum based on potential full-time occupancy of a space. However, based on the current average occupancy in George, Macquarie and Northumberland Streets, the actual return per ticketed parking space is estimated at \$2,700 per annum. It is recommended that the annual fee for a Business Parking Permit is set \$2,700 which can be paid in two instalments per year.

Non-Profit Organisation Permit

Council currently provides parking permits for non-profit organisations at a cost of \$20 per annum. In line with the other permits, the cost of this permit is to be set at \$35 per annum.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Based on the recommended implementation of the Draft Permit Parking Policy the financial implication to Council would be minimal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Receives and notes the report.
2. Adopts the amended Draft Permit Parking Policy and associated fees.
3. Install appropriate signage in consultation with RMS for the implementation of the resident parking scheme.
4. In the first year provides parking permits to eligible residents free of charge and thereafter applies full cost recovery.
5. Includes the introduction of the Permit Parking Policy in its communication strategy

SIGNED BY:

Gino Belsito
Acting Director
City Assets

Attachments: Draft Permit Parking Policy



PERMIT PARKING POLICY

DRAFT
Adopted:

TRIM:185830.2012

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Legislative Requirements	3
3. Purpose / Objective	3
4. Definitions	4
5. Permit Parking Schemes	5
6. Features	5, 6
7. Eligibility Criteria	6, 7, 8, 9
8. Interstate Registered Vehicles	9
9. Company Registered Vehicles	9
10. Life of Permit	10
11. Display of Permit	10
12. Permit Fee	10
13. Use of Permit	10
14. Responsibility	11
15. Special Policy Considerations	11
16. Procedure	11, 12
17. Replacement Permits	12
18. General	13
19. How to Apply for a Parking Permit	13

1. INTRODUCTION

Liverpool City Council's Permit Parking Policy will exempt resident, visitor and business vehicles from some kerbside time restrictions and parking fees. This will ensure that the parking controls needed to manage traffic movement and parking within the City Centre do not unreasonably affect residents.

This Policy will permit Council to introduce a number of Parking Permit Schemes, including Resident Parking Scheme, Resident Visitor Parking Scheme, Business Parking Scheme and Non-Profit Organisation Parking Scheme.

2. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Australian Road Rules 1999

Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009

Interpretation Act 1987

Local Government Act 1993 (NSW)

Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999

Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) (Road Rules) regulations 1999

3. PURPOSE/OBJECTIVE

- Improve amenity for particular classes of road users who do not have sufficient off-street parking spaces or unrestricted on-street parking facilities available
- Provide equitable on-street parking spaces for road users
- Provide parking scheme to cope with extreme demands for parking that would otherwise be placed on the road system
- Provide an appropriate mix of on-street parking spaces in residential streets and in streets close to commercial centres
- Support regional transport objectives and strategies that have been framed with commuters in mind
- Increase public transport usage by converting those unrestricted kerbside parking spaces in residential area into restricted parking spaces such as permissive parking spaces or pay parking spaces where appropriate

1. DEFINITIONS

In this policy the following definitions apply:

- **Area of operations** - defined In the *Dictionary*. Part 1, of the *Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) (Road Rules) Regulation 1999*
- **ARR** – Australian Road Rules. October 1999.
- **Authorised officer** - a police officer or a person employed by a parking authority as an enforcement officer. See *Road Transport (General) (Short Descriptions and Penalty Notice Offences) Regulation 1999*
- **BPS** - Business Parking Scheme.
- **City Centre** – bounded by the Hume Highway (Copeland Street and Sydney Road), Mill Road and Railway Line.
- **Classified road** - any of the following: a main road, a State highway, a freeway, a controlled access road, a secondary road, a tourist road, a tollway, a State work. See *Road Act 1993*. Part 5 for further details.
- **Council**- the Liverpool City Council.
- **Declared organisation** - an organisation listed in STMR Schedule 3.
- **Motor vehicle** -a vehicle that is built to be propelled by a motor that forms part of the vehicle.
- **Park, parking or parked** - the driver stops a vehicle and allow the vehicle to stay (whether or not the driver leaves the vehicle).
- **Parking area** - a pay parking area, permissive parking area or a special event parking area. Refer also to STMR 124 (6).
- **Parking authority** - a council or a declared organisation as defined in the *Dictionary*, Part 1 of the STMR.
- **Parking permit** - a permit Issued by a council or a declared organisation under STMR clause 124. For brevity a parking permit is often simply referred to as a permit in this policy.
- **Pay parking space** - part of a road or road related area where a meter, ticket or coupon parking space has been installed by the parking authority and where parking may be paid for by means approved by RMS. See RMS's *Pay Parking manual*
- **Permissive parking area** - part of a road or road related area to which a permissive parking sign applies.
- **Permissive parking sign** - a traffic sign of the kind referred to In ARR rule 204.
- **PPS** - Permit Parking Scheme
- **Road and road related area** - has the same meaning as it has in ARR Rules 12 and 13. Each reference to a road includes reference to a road relates area unless otherwise expressly stated.
- **Roads authority**- the person or body that is responsible for a particular public road. See *Roads Act 1993*, for further details.
- **RPS**- Resident Parking Scheme.
- **RMS** - Roads and Maritime Services NSW.
- **STMR** - *Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) (Road Rules) Regulation1999*.
- **RVPS** - Residents Visitors Parking Scheme.
- **STM Act** - *Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999*.
- **Truck**- a motor vehicle with a GVM (gross vehicle mass) over 4.5 tonnes, except a bus, tram or tractor.

5. PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES (PPS)

Types of permit parking schemes

A parking permit issued by Council under any of the following schemes exempts the permit holder from kerbside time restrictions and parking fees while parked in a PPS:

- **Business Parking Scheme (BPS):**
 - Used where business people have no off-street parking and on-street parking is restricted
- **Resident Parking Scheme (RPS):**
 - Used where the residents have limited or no off-street parking and have difficulty parking near their residence
- **Residents Visitors Parking Scheme (RVPS):**
 - Similar to RPS, but used to allow a visitor / carers to attend the residence
- **Non-Profit Organisation Permit (NPOP)**
 - Non-Profit Organisations can apply direct to Council for a permit but are restricted to parking in "No Parking" Zones, "Council Permit Holders Excepted"

Classes of Parking Permits:

- Business Parking Permit (BPP)
- Resident Parking Permit (RPP)
- Residents' Visitors Parking Permit (RVP)
- Non-Profit Organisation Permit (NPOP)

6. FEATURES

The following are common features of all PPS;

- There are no areas set aside exclusively for the holders of permits
- The permit does not give exemption from other parking restrictions and laws in the PPS; these include Bus Zone, No Parking zone, No Stopping zone, etc.
- PPSs can only be introduced in conjunction with permissive parking schemes or pay parking schemes
- Only Council can issue a permit
- Every PPS requires display of a permit on or inside the vehicle to obtain exemption from parking restrictions/charges
- A permit holder can only get exemption from the times or charges when the holder's vehicle is parked in a permit parking space

- located within a parking area or road specified in the permit
- designated by the parking authority for us by holder of such a permit
- PPSs will use one or more area identifiers unique to Council. The identifiers will be displayed on both the permit and the parking sign
- The holder of a permit can park in any part of the area(s) for which the permit is applicable
- The holder of a permit is not guaranteed a parking space within the PPS
- PPSs can be introduced on a street-by-street basis or on a network or streets (area-wide) basis.
- Parking signs must be as prescribed in STMR Part 8 clause 131 and ARR rule 204 and have the words PERMIT HOLDERS EXCEPTED and area identifier to allow permit holders exemption from the period restrictions or charges for parking.

7. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Business Parking Permit

Principals of a business are eligible to apply for a permit in ticketed parking zones but must meet the following criteria the:

- Business premises has no on-site parking facility and no unrestricted on-street parking space in front of or close to the business
- Supply of off-street parking facilities within the area of the BPS are inadequate to meet the parking demand
- Business premises could not reasonably be modified to provide on-site parking space(s)
- Vehicle registration number is recorded on the permit
- Vehicle is not a truck, bus, tram or tractor
- Vehicle is registered in NSW in the name of the business

Business Parking Permit

Principles of the business are eligible to apply of a permit in a "No Parking" "Council Permit Holders Excepted" zones but must meet the following criteria:

- business premises has no on-site parking facility and no unrestricted on-street parking space in front of or close to the business
- supply of off-street parking facilities within the area of the BPS are inadequate to meet the parking demand

- business premises could not reasonably be modified to provide on-site parking space(s)
- vehicle registration number is recorded on the permit
- vehicle is not a truck, bus, tram or tractor
- vehicle is registered in NSW in the name of the business

Resident Parking Permit

The following eligibility must be met:

- Resident has no on-site parking ~~or limited on-site parking and also has no unrestricted on-street parking available near their residence~~
- Place of residence could not be reasonably modified to provide on-site parking space(s)
- Vehicle is not a truck, bus, tram or tractor
- Applicant establishes residential status within the RPS to the satisfaction of Council, e.g. current rate notice, current electricity / gas bill, entry on the electoral roll
- Vehicle is registered in NSW
- The vehicle need not be registered in the name of the applicant but proof is required from the registered owner that the vehicle is normally used by the applicant
- The number of permits to be issued for an area should not exceed the number of available on-street parking spaces in the area
- A maximum of one permit ~~per per bedroom in a boarding house or two permits per household~~. However, in exceptional circumstances, the number of permits may be increased to a maximum of two~~three~~
- When issuing permits to eligible residents who have on-site parking space(s), the number of permits which may be issued to the household is the difference between the maximum number of permits that can be issued to each household within the RPS and the number of on-site parking spaces available to the household.

Where the number of potential requests for permits exceeds the number of available on-street parking spaces, the following criteria must be used:

1. The applicant must have no unrestricted on-street parking space(s) in front of their residence or along their kerbside;
2. Secondly, the following priority order is to be used to issue permits:
 - a) No off-street parking space
 - b) One off-street parking space
 - c) Two or more off-street parking spaces

Number of off-street parking spaces	Number of visitor parking spaces available	Number of vehicles at the residence	Maximum number of Resident Parking Permits that could be issued	Maximum number of Visitor Parking Permit that could be issued
0		1	1	
0		2	1	
0		3 or more	1	
1		1	0	
1		2	0	
1		3 or more	0	
	0			1 ##
	1 #			0
KEY:		# includes visitor parking spaces shared with other residents ## permit holder required to comply with time restrictions		

Resident Visitors Parking Permit

Residents can obtain a permit from Council unless the resident has:

- On-site parking for the visitor
- Unrestricted on-street parking spaces in front of their residence or along their kerbside

The resident can then issue the permit to and retrieve it from their visitor who must park their vehicle in the immediate vicinity of the resident's premises.

To obtain a RVPP, an eligible resident must apply to Council with:

- Establishes residential status within the RPS to the satisfaction of Council, e.g. current rate notice, current electricity / gas bill, entry on the electoral roll

NOTE: When a carer requires a resident visitor's permit and the resident is unable to apply, than the carer may apply directly to Council and be issued with a permit when they provide the following information:

- The written consent of the resident or their representative;
- The address of the residence; and
- The expected duration and frequency of use of the permit.

Non-Profit Organisation Permit

Non-Profit Organisations can apply direct to Council for a permit but are restricted to parking in "No Parking" zones, "Council Permit Holders Excepted".

The application must be accompanied by a current copy of one of the following Notices issued by the Australia Taxation Office:

- endorsement as a tax concession charity (TCC)
- income tax exempt fund (ITEF)
- endorsement as a deductible gift recipient (DGR)

8. INTERSTATE REGISTERED VEHICLES

Vehicles operating in NSW must comply with the *Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999*, *Road Transport (Vehicles Registration) Regulation 1998* and must be registered under the NSW Legislation.

However, under section 9 of the *Road Transport (Vehicle Registration) Regulation 1998*, vehicles can be classified as "Vehicles temporarily in NSW" and so Council may issue a parking permit in accordance with this Policy to an applicant with an interstate registered vehicle.

9. COMPANY REGISTERED VEHICLES

For a permit to be issued by Council, the employer of an applicant is required to submit a letter on company letterhead that shows the company's ABN (Australian Business Number) stating that the resident is using the registered vehicle and that the vehicle is housed overnight at the residential property. The applicant must be a resident within the City Centre.

10. LIFE OF PERMIT

1. Permits are valid for one year from the date of issue and must be renewed prior to the expiry date on the permit.
2. Council does not send out renewal letters – it is the responsibility of permit holders to renew permits annually.
3. Permits must be renewed for any change in vehicle or to residential/business property that affects off-street parking.

11. DISPLAY OF PERMIT

1. Permits must be displayed similar to car registration label and be visible to rangers/police officers.
2. Permits must reflect the registration number of the vehicle in which it is displayed and designed zone in which it is parked.

12. PERMIT FEE

Fee for Permits shall apply as listed in Council's Revenue Pricing Fees and Charges.

13. USE OF PERMIT

The Permit is only valid:

1. For the period shown on the Permit
2. If displayed in the vehicle displaying the same vehicle registration number
3. In the designated area
4. If all the Permit details are clearly visible from outside the vehicle
5. If the vehicle is parked in accordance with the NSW Road Rules

This permit:

1. Is not transferable
2. Does not guarantee the availability of a parking space
3. Can be cancelled and withdrawn at the sole discretion of Council
4. Is no longer valid if circumstances change and the permit holder is no longer meets the eligibility criteria
5. Will not be honoured if misused

14. RESPONSIBILITY

1. Council's Customer Service Centre is responsible for the processing of applications for Permits under this Policy.
2. Council's Enforcement and Parking Unit is responsible for the enforcement of parking controls under this Policy.
3. The Liverpool Traffic Committee is responsible for reviewing regulatory changes for new or existing schemes.

15. SPECIAL POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Zone Identifier

Parking permits can only be used in their corresponding "Designated Parking Zone". Accordingly parking permits should be in different colours with zone identifier numbers representing the designated parking zone.

16. PROCEDURE

To obtain a parking permit, an applicant must complete the relevant forms and submit to Council with the applicable fees.

16.1 Applicants must provide the following details:

- a. Current driver's licence as proof of residency or in the absence of a licence, or having a licence with a previous address, one of the following:
 - I. Electoral Card.
 - II. Current Rate Notice.
 - III. Current Rental Agreement or Rental bond receipt.
- b. Proof of registration (not required for RVPS).
 - I. For a private vehicle a copy of the current car registration in the applicant's name.
 - II. For a company car, a letter on company letterhead stating the
 - a) Applicant is a company employee and sole use of a company vehicle;
 - b) Registration number of the vehicle;
 - c) Vehicle is normally parked at the applicant's address;
 - d) Expiry date of car registration;
 - e) Company address.

III. For companies owned by individuals a copy of registration of the business name or a letter with the company seal is required.

- 16.2 Visitor permits: Application for visitor permit can be made to Council using Parking Permit Application Forms. The Resident (not the visitor) must make the application and be accompanied with proof of residency. Registration paper is not required. A maximum of one visitor permit per property will be issued.
- 16.3 Business Permits: Application for a business permit, the property/business owner/manager/delegate, must lodge the application. The application form must be accompanied by documentation verifying business status i.e. copy of licence or rate notice and vehicle registration number.

NOTE: The issue of a permit does not guarantee a parking space to the permit holder.

17. REPLACEMENT OF PERMITS

To apply for a replacement permit, a Replacement Form is to be lodged and an administration fee must be paid. This applies when:

- a) Current Permit is lost or destroyed, or,
- b) A vehicle is sold. Documentation that the car has been sold will also be required.

Exemption from Parking Restrictions

The permit issued will exempt applicant from parking restriction, only if:

- a) The street sign states "Permit Holder Excepted", and in the right zone.
- b) The permit is clearly displayed on the vehicle.

NOTE: All other RMS conditions (Australian Road Rules & Road Transport Safety & Traffic Management Regulation) in relation to on-street parking still apply.

18. GENERAL

In accordance with the provisions of the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009, it is advised that:

- a) Collection of the relevant information is to facilitate the issuing of a parking permit.
- b) Collection of relevant information is to ensure that only those persons entitled to a parking permit receive such permit.
- c) The Liverpool City Council is the agency collecting the information relates, Council will provide to that person, access to the information collected in order to ascertain that the information is accurate and current.

19. HOW TO APPLY FOR A PARKING PERMIT

Ask	Council's Customer Service Centre Level 2, 33 Moore Street, Liverpool, Monday - Friday, 8.30am - 5pm
Post	Locked Bag 7064, Liverpool BC, NSW 1871
Telephone	1300 36 2170 (<u>Customer Contact Centre for NSW residents</u>) (02) 9821 9222 (<u>if calling from interstate.</u>) 133 677 National Relay Service (NRS) for hearing and speech impaired customers
Fax:	(02) 9821 9333
Email:	lcc@liverpool.nsw.gov.au

Authorised by:

Adopted:

Effective from:

Department Responsible: City Assets – Traffic & Transport

Review Date: Two years from adoption

Reference: Liverpool City Council
Enforcement Policy

This Policy has been developed with: Corporate Service Governance &
Legal Services.

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

CITY ASSETS REPORT

ORDINARY MEETING

28/11/2012

ITEM NO:	ASST 02	FILE NO:	2012/0949
SUBJECT:	PENSIONER PARKING SCHEME		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN	THE COMMUNITY IS SUPPORTED BY A WELL MANAGED AND RESPONSIVE COUNCIL		
REFERENCE:			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council, at its meeting held on 23 July 2012, resolved to investigate a Pensioner Parking Scheme to enable a free/concession system where pensioners can park for free in the Liverpool City Centre.

This report provides details of free parking currently available within the Liverpool City Centre, legislation governing Councils regarding permissible permit parking schemes, other Council experiences with a pensioner parking scheme, discussions with the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and financial implications associated with the introduction of a Pensioner Parking Scheme.

This report recommends that Council notes the information in the report, seeks formal legal advice, consults with relevant stakeholders such as the Liverpool Seniors Network, Heckenberg - Busby Over-50 Group and Sydney Alliance and following the consultation provides a further report to Council in March 2013.

DETAILED REPORT:

Current Situation

Free car parking is currently available within or close to the City Centre at the following locations:

- Northumberland Street Car Park - three hours on levels three and four.
- Liverpool Plaza - two hours.
- Westfield Shopping Centre - three hours.
- Club Liverpool (John Edmondson VC Memorial) for members whilst using the club facilities.
- Warren Serviceway Car Park - 15 minutes (drop-off and pick-up).

- Collimore Park - All day free parking plus a free shuttle bus service to the City Centre (provided by Council and the State Government).

With increased communication and awareness, most Mobility Parking Scheme permit holders are now aware that they do not need to pay for parking either on-street or in the Bathurst Street and Northumberland Street car parks. This has greatly increased the availability of free parking for a number of local residents, including aged pensioners.

A search of Council's customer databases revealed that since changes to the City Centre paid parking scheme came into effect on 28 August 2012, and now includes three hours free parking at the Northumberland Street car park (levels three and four), the number of requests for free parking and concerns about the scheme have reduced.

Target Pensioner Group

According to the Australian Government's Department of Human Services website, a Pensioner Concession Card is issued if you receive any of the following income-support payments:

- Age Pension.
- Bereavement Allowance.
- Carer Payment.
- Disability Support Pension.
- Newstart Allowance or Youth Allowance (job seeker) if you are single, caring for a dependent child, and looking for work.
- Parenting Payment (single).
- You may also get a Pensioner Concession Card if you are aged over 60 and have been receiving other certain income-support payments for nine months or more.

When Council's resolution of 23 July 2012 was discussed, it was made in the context of free car parking provision for aged pensioners. Hence for this report, the target pensioners group is aged pensioners.

Based on recent information provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), (2010 National Regional Profile for Liverpool Local Government Area), the number of people on aged pensions through Centrelink is 13,207. Liverpool City Council's records show that there are in excess of 6,500 eligible pensioners who receive pensioner concessions on their annual rates and charges. However, in this report, the discussions regarding the provision of free parking in the City Centre deals with the 13,207 aged pensioners from the Centrelink database.

The need for Community Consultation

As indicated above, requests for free parking in the CBD have reduced since changes to the City Centre paid parking scheme came into effect on 28 August 2012.

It is considered appropriate to carry out consultation with organised Aged Pensioner Groups in the Liverpool LGA, such as the Liverpool Seniors Network, Heckenberg - Busby Over-50 Group and Sydney Alliance to assess the demand and associated options of providing free parking for pensioners in the City Centre, and report back to Council in 2013.

Legislative Requirements Governing the Implementation of Permit Parking Scheme

The introduction of any permit parking scheme is governed by New South Wales State Legislation, namely the Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999 and associated Regulations.

Regulation 124 - Parking Permits - states that:

- (1) *A parking authority (Council) may issue a permit authorising the parking of a vehicle without charge or time restrictions in a parking space:*
 - a. *located within a parking area or road specified in the permit, and*
 - b. *designated by the parking authority for use by holders of such a permit.*
- (2) *The parking authority is to classify the permit in one of the following classes:*
 - *business parking permits;*
 - *commuter parking permits;*
 - *resident parking permits;*
 - *residents' visitor parking permits;*
 - *special event parking permits; and*
 - *declared organisation parking permits.*
- (3) *A permit must specify the parking area or road to which it applies, the conditions to which it is subject and:*
 - a. *in the case of a resident's visitor parking permit, the address of the resident who holds the permit, or*
 - b. *in the case of any other permit, the registration number of the vehicle to which it relates.*
- (4) *A parking authority must not issue a permit except in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Authority.*

In addition to the above permits, under Regulation 126, the Roads and Maritime Services (in conjunction with the other states and Territories Transport Authorities) operate the Mobility Parking Permit Scheme (for the mobility impaired).

As the Regulations do not provide a Pensioner Parking Scheme classification, discussions were held with Roads and Maritime Services and Leichhardt Council (the only NSW Council who operate such a scheme) on the operation of such a scheme.

Discussions with a Roads and Maritime Services traffic management representative has revealed that the relevant road transport regulations do not provide for the introduction of a "Pensioner Parking Scheme" and a parking authority, such as a Council, has therefore no legislative basis to issue permits to allow the parking of a vehicle without charge or time restrictions in a parking space. The introduction of this type of scheme would not comply with Roads and Maritime Services mandatory procedures for Permit Parking, have no legal support and would therefore not provide protection to Council and pensioners from penalty notice issuance/enforcement.

Although Leichhardt Council operates a Pensioner Parking Scheme, discussions with the Roads and Maritime Services indicate that a parking authority (Council) does not have the legislative framework to introduce/manage such a scheme as it is outside the legislation and the scheme would have no legal backing providing no protection for Council /pensioners.

In view of the above advice, it is recommended that Council seek formal legal advice on a Pensioner Permit Scheme, before introduction of such a scheme.

Impacts on the Liverpool CBD Parking Strategy

A Pensioner Parking Scheme, whilst popular with some members of the community, could significantly detract from current and future available parking as outlined in Council's adopted Liverpool CBD Parking Strategy.

Enforcement of the Scheme

Discussions with the Roads and Maritime Services revealed that the Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999 and associated Regulations do not provide for a Pensioner Parking Scheme. As legislation does not prescribe a Pensioner Permit Scheme, Council officers would have no power to deal with the fraudulent use of permits, irrespective of the conditions placed upon the permit by Council or provide pensioners with protection from penalty notice issuance.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The scheme would have operational budget implications which could result in the need to source alternative funding or identify savings. The scheme would require additional funding to replace all regulatory signage and impose an additional work load on regulatory staff as the community would expect a level of enforcement.

In addition, a database would be required to manage the scheme and as indicated above, the target group in this report is 13,207 aged pensioners as defined as being Centrelink recipients.

Using the above criteria, of Leichhardt's total population of 55,596*, 3,262* or 5.87% of residents would be eligible. Leichhardt Council has advised that as at 2011, 635 pensioner parking permits had been issued and in 2009 they estimated that the cost of providing each permit was \$72.00. *Source Australian Bureau of Statistics - Leichhardt 2010.

Using the same criteria as Leichhardt Council, the following estimates are provided for the investigated Liverpool City Council scheme.

	LEICHARDT	LIVERPOOL
Total population	55,596 *	185,481 *
Eligible residents	3,264 #	13,207 #
Eligible residents	5.87%	7.12%
Eligible residents who have applied for a Pensioner Parking Permit	635 ##	2,569 (estimate)
Percentage of eligible residents who applied for a Pensioner Parking Permit	19.45%	19.45% (estimate based on Leichhardt Council data)
Cost per Pensioner Parking Permit	\$78.00 ###	\$35.00 (estimate)
Estimated cost of administrating Pensioner Parking Permit Scheme	\$49,530	\$89,915
Potential loss of ticketed parking revenue	N/A #####	\$30,307
Signage	N/A	\$30,000 (first year only)
Year 1 cost		\$150,222
Year 2 cost		\$120,222

KEY

- * Australian Bureau of Statistics
- # Eligibility based on Department of Human Services criteria
- ## Eligible Liverpool pensioners who receive rates concession
- ### \$72 @ 2009 plus CPI 3% for 2010 and 2011
- ##### Based on 10% of eligible residents applying for a Pensioner Parking Permit visiting the City Centre fortnightly for 3 hours @ \$1.50 per hour

In addition to the cost of managing a Pensioner Parking Scheme and a loss of ticket parking revenue, signage associated with all ticketed parking would have to reflect "Permit Holders Excepted" or "Authorised Residents Vehicles Excepted" plus additional advisory signage at all entry and exit points to the City Centre. The cost to replace and install signage is estimated at \$30,000.

Based on the data provided by Leichhardt Council, a Pensioner Parking Scheme potentially benefits approximately 20% of the total population with the costs of the scheme being borne by the remaining residents.

Summary

The discussion with the Roads and Maritime Services and a review of the Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Act 1999 and associated Regulations does not provide an appropriate legal framework for the introduction of Pensioner Parking Scheme. It is recommended that Council seek formal legal advice on a Pensioner Permit Scheme, before introduction of such a scheme

The demand and associated options of providing free parking for pensioners in the City Centre, needs to be discussed and clarified with organised Aged Pensioner Groups in the Liverpool LGA, such as the Liverpool Seniors Network, Heckenberg - Busby Over-50 Group and Sydney Alliance.

In addition, the introduction of such a scheme would have a financial implication to Council. Such expenditure has not been allowed for in the 2012/2013 budget and would require additional funding to introduce and manage the scheme. Funding would also have to be provided to implement a data base and administer the scheme.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Notes the contents of this report.
2. Seek formal legal advice on a Pensioner Permit Scheme.
3. Carries out further consultation with organised Aged Pensioner Groups in the Liverpool LGA, such as the Liverpool Seniors Network, Heckenberg - Busby Over-50 Group and Sydney Alliance to assess other options of providing free parking for pensioners in the City Centre, and report back in March 2013.

SIGNED BY:

Gino Belsito
Acting Director
City Assets

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

CITY ASSETS REPORT

ORDINARY MEETING

28/11/2012

ITEM NO:	ASST 03	FILE NO:	2012/0139
SUBJECT:	TENDER ST2206 - SPORTSFIELD FLOODLIGHT UPGRADES - JARDINE, AMALFI AND HAMMONDVILLE PARKS		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE:	URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE MEETS THE NEEDS OF A GROWING COMMUNITY		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As part of Council's ongoing program to upgrade lighting at sporting facilities across the LGA, tenders were sought from suitably experienced and competent contractors for the design, supply and installation of sportsfield floodlight upgrades at the following sites:

- Portion 1 - Jardine Park, Rugby League Field, Reserve Road, Casula
- Portion 2 - Amalfi Memorial Park, Oztag Field, Reilly Street, Lurnea
- Portion 3 - Hammondville Park, Main Soccer Field, Heathcote Road, Hammondville.

Following detailed assessment of the tenders, this report recommends that Council award the tender submitted from Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd for Portion 1 - Jardine Park, Portion 2 - Amalfi Memorial Park and Portion 3 - Hammondville Park, as detailed in this report.

DETAILED REPORT:

In 2004, as part of an ongoing asset management program, Council audited its entire sportsfield floodlighting assets. The audit identified that the lighting levels on the majority of Council's sportsfields did not meet the recommendation as set out in Australian Standards for sportsfield lighting for training and competition play, due to ageing infrastructure, advances in lamp and lens technology and changed design rules. Since that time, Council has developed a renewal program for floodlighting to meet current sports lighting training and match play requirements.

As part of this ongoing program, the upgrade of floodlighting at Jardine, Amalfi Memorial and Hammondville Parks is proposed to be undertaken in the 2012/2013 Capital Work Upgrade Program.

The tender process was carried out in accordance with Council's Tendering Policy and Procedures. The request for tender was divided into three (3) separable portions as follows:

- Portion 1 – Jardine Park, Casula
- Portion 2 – Amalfi Memorial Park, Lurnea
- Portion 3 – Hammondville Park, Hammondville.

The request for tender stipulated that each portion shall be awarded as a separate contract and they may be awarded to different Tenderers.

Tenders were invited publicly through Council's eTendering portal from 3 September 2012 and in the Sydney Morning Herald on 4 September 2012 and 11 September 2012.

Tenders closed at 3.00pm on 27 September 2012, with submissions received from the following companies:

COMPANY
REES Electrical Pty Ltd
Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd
Kealec Pty Ltd t/a Sportz Lighting
ETE Services Pty Ltd

EVALUATION OF TENDERS

Preliminary assessment of all tender submissions was carried out to check for compliance with the requirements of the selection criteria and the tender document. It was found that all four tenders imposed qualifications and/or conditions that required clarifications. Information received after seeking clarification from the tenderers was either withdrawn or the information provided was satisfactory.

Detailed assessment of the tenders was carried out based on the advertised assessment criteria and an order was placed with Corporate Scorecard for a financial assessment of Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd and REES Electrical Pty Ltd. It was found that the tender submission by Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd fully met the requirements of the selection criteria and would be the most advantageous for the proposed sportsfield floodlight upgrade works for the following reasons:

- Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd tender were based on the published assessment criteria and provides the best value to Council.
- Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd have demonstrated satisfactory previous experience, with this type of project.
- Referee checks and Council's own experience with the recommended tenderer indicates their good past performance.
- An independent financial assessment of the activities of Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd was carried out covering the key areas of business structure and financial operations. The financial assessment rated Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd as "Sound".

Full details of the submitted tender prices are contained in a separate confidential attachment.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The delivery of sportsfield floodlighting upgrades is funded as follows:

- Jardine Park - \$120,000 Section 94 Development Contribution and Special Rate Variation.
- Amalfi Memorial Park - \$100,000 Special Rate Variation, General Funds, \$30,647 NSW Community Building Partnership Grant and \$15,000 cash contribution from Liverpool Oztag.
- Hammondville Park - \$130,000 Special Rate Variation and General Funds.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Accepts the tender submitted by Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd for Portion 1 - Jardine Park, Portion 2 - Amalfi Memorial Park and Portion 3 - Hammondville Park for the Lump Sum amount of \$307,230.00 (including GST).
2. Notes that the Acting Director City Assets will finalise all details and sign the Letter of Acceptance of the Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd tender, giving it contractual effect, in accordance with his delegated authority.
3. Keeps confidential the attachment pursuant to the provisions of Section 104(2Xc) of the Local Government Act 1993, as this information would, if disclosed, confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the Council is conducting (or proposes to conduct) business.

SIGNED BY:

Gino Belsito
Acting Director
City Assets

Attachments 1. Company Details
 2. Confidential Report

Attachment 1 - Company Details

CORPORATE DETAILS	
Registered Name	Premier Lighting and Electrical Pty Ltd
Registered Address	PO Box 10 Hornsby NSW 1630
OFFICEHOLDERS	
Director Name	Suburb & State
Michael Ficker	Hornsby NSW

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ORDINARY MEETING

28/11/2012

ITEM NO:	COMM 01	FILE NO:	2006/0660
SUBJECT:	LIVERPOOL YOUTH COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE:	DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES ARE TRANSPARENT AND THE COMMUNITY HAS OPPORTUNITIES TO BE INVOLVED		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council established the Liverpool Youth Council in 1999. The Youth Council provides Council with an annual report detailing its activities in the previous financial year.

This report presents the Liverpool Youth Council's Annual Report 2011-2012 (attached under separate cover). It outlines activities undertaken by Youth Councillors, provides information on current members and recommends that Council receives and notes the report.

This report also seeks the endorsement of one newly recruited Liverpool Youth Council member for the 2012-2014 term.

DETAILED REPORT:

In May 1999, Council endorsed a Youth Strategy that included the establishment of the Liverpool Youth Council. Since that time, the Liverpool Youth Council has become a dynamic forum that reflects the needs of young people and the commitment of Council to young people. During the 2010-2012 Youth Council term, there were 15 committed, enthusiastic and hardworking young people involved in Youth Council activities.

The purpose of the Liverpool Youth Council is to provide a link between young people and Council and to act as a consultative mechanism. It provides an opportunity for young people to have their say and to develop skills in leadership.

Each year the Youth Council produces an annual report detailing their activities over the previous financial year. The 2011-2012 annual report is attached under separate cover for the information of Council. Below is a summary of highlights.

Liverpool Youth Council Annual Report 2011-2012

The highlights for the Liverpool Youth Council in 2011-2012 includes:

- Delivery of the Street Legacy II event celebrating Youth Week in April 2012;
- Volunteer support at the Triple Threat 2012 Youth Week event;
- Planning of youth activities at Council's Australia Day Event in January 2012;
- Ongoing delivery of the RADAR radio program on 2GLF, including increased promotion of the program;
- Development of an ongoing relationship with the Liverpool Leader and increased positive media for Youth Council;
- Assistance in the collation of survey data for the Youth Strategy 2012-2017; and
- Involvement in consultations and training.

More detailed information about Liverpool Youth Council initiatives is included in the Annual Report 2011-2012.

Youth Council Members for the 2010-2012 Term

The Liverpool Youth Council members completed their two year term at the end of June 2012. The members, the suburbs they live in and their ages are shown in the table below.

Name	Name
Adrian Vincent	Jessica Marcellienus
Alexa Jaryn	Kadhum Al-khuzai
Andrew Olivares	Mark Helou
Bradley Birnie	Michael Rutherford
Cassandra Veale	Neha Indap
Christian Atkins	Nikole Vamarasi
Diana Vincent	Winnie Jobanputra
Jessica Follers	

Youth Councillors represent a diverse range of suburbs across the Local Government area including Busby, Casula, Hinchinbrook, Liverpool, Lurnea, Miller, Prestons, Sadleir, Voyager Point and Wattle Grove. They range in ages from 17 to 21 years old.

The Youth Council would like to thank their Councillor delegates, Mayor Ned Mannoun and Councillor Wendy Waller for their support and involvement in the Youth Council. Members have appreciated the input and advice of Councillor delegates on a variety of issues.

Membership for 2012-2014 Term

In line with the Youth Council Charter, a new Youth Council is recruited for each two year period. At its meeting on 27 July 2012, Council endorsed 11 newly selected members. In order to make up the committee membership of 12 young people, it is proposed that Marcelo Lacardi-Rauth be endorsed as a member.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Funding for the Liverpool Youth Council is allocated within the budget of the Community Services Unit. There are no further financial implications arising from this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Allows representatives from the 2010-2012 Youth Council to present the Liverpool Youth Council Annual Report 2011-2012 in open session of Council.
2. Receives and notes the Liverpool Youth Council Annual Report 2011-2012 and thanks its members for their contributions, including those of Mayor Ned Mannoun and Councillor Wendy Waller.
3. Endorses Marcelo Lacardi-Rauth as a member of the Liverpool Youth Council for the 2012-2014 term.

SIGNED BY:

Farooq Portelli
General Manager

Attachments: Liverpool Youth Council's Annual Report 2011-2012 (under separate cover)

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE REPORTS

ORDINARY MEETING

28/11/2012

ITEM NO:	CORR 01	FILE NO:	2011/0467
SUBJECT:	INCOMING AND OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE		
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN	THE COMMUNITY IS SUPPORTED BY A WELL MANAGED AND RESPONSIVE COUNCIL		
REFERENCE:			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council at its meeting of 28 April 2010 resolved the establishment of a new standing agenda item in all Council meeting agendas called "Correspondence". All incoming and outgoing correspondence, in whatever form, including emails, faxes, letters and submission resulting from a Council resolution must be tabled in Chambers and be put on the agenda at the next scheduled Council meeting. Council notes rule 27 of the Code of Meeting Practice.

DETAILED REPORT:

INCOMING CORRESPONDENCE			
Date	From	To	Details
29/10/2012	The Hon Gladys Berejiklian, MP Minister for Transport	Farooq Portelli, General Manager	Response to letter regarding Liverpool Free Shuttle Bus review
5/11/2012	The Hon Geoff Provest, MP Parliamentary Secretary for Police and Emergency Services	Farooq Portelli, General Manager	Response to letter regarding CCTV Surveillance as part of the proposed safety initiatives for the Liverpool City Centre.

OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE			
Date	From	To	Details
Nil			

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receives and notes the report.

SIGNED BY:

Farooq Portelli
General Manager

Attachments:

1. Letter from Gladys Berejiklian to Farooq Portelli regarding Liverpool Free Shuttle Bus review.
2. Letter from Mr Geoff Provest to Farooq Portelli regarding CCTV.