

## Inner Melbourne Action Plan

### Progress Report

#### Action 3.3 - IMAP Regional Approach to Parking Management

---

##### Purpose

1. To update the IMAP Implementation Committee on the progress of Action 3.3 Regional Approach to Parking Management.
2. To seek approval from the IMAP Implementation Committee on Actions recommended following completion of investigations.
3. To seek endorsement and resources for a further IMAP Working Group to conduct research on the value of parking spaces in Activity Centres.

##### Background

4. IMAP Action 3.3 seeks a regional approach to parking management and aims to deliver a common and consistent approach to parking management across the Inner Melbourne Region based on the economic, environmental, streetscape, travel patterns and traffic impacts of different on and off-street car parking arrangements.
5. Given the broad scope of the brief, the working group determined to limit itself to three essential areas of activity, these being:
  - Parking measures to mitigate car travel
    - hierarchy of parking type to mitigate demand
    - integrated travel plans for new developments
    - car sharing
  - Provision of parking in new developments
    - parking rates and design standards for car parking
    - bicycle parking provisions
  - Management of existing parking supply
    - a common approach to pay parking
    - the use of residential parking zones,
    - the mix of long stay and short stay parking in activity centres
    - a hierarchy of parking to be catered for in both commercial and residential areas

##### Progress to Date

Following the initial work to identify gaps and differences in approach between each Council, presented to the Committee in February, the working group has attempted to progress each of the tasks assigned as outlined below.

Some of the tasks have required actions on the part of State Government or its Agencies, and are therefore dependent on such actions occurring.

## 6. Parking measures to mitigate car travel

### Hierarchy of parking to mitigate parking demand

Following approval by the Committee in February 2009, each member Council has been requested to adopt its use in determination of parking supply decisions. As will be discussed later, it will also be recommended as one of the key principles in management of existing parking supply.

### Integrated Travel Plans (ITPs)

A sub group has been undertaking significant research in this area, by reviewing State Government policies, the practices of some Councils and the results of relevant VCAT decisions.

Currently so called Green Travel Plans (GTPs) are submitted by the traffic consultant for the applicant and primarily based on reducing the parking supply required. Members on the working group expressed concern that there is limited advice available on what the content of such integrated travel plans should be, what level of parking demand reduction could occur, what uses, types and scale of development integrated travel plans should be applied to.

A discussion paper has been prepared (Attachment A) which outlines the thinking of the group, following the research undertaken.

Essentially, a summary of the sub-group's work is :

- the investigation undertaken has shown that there is a lot of confusion about the difference between ITPs and GTPs and when they apply - the two terms seem to be used interchangeably. Advice from the Department of Transport (DoT) still lacks clarity and therefore **we recommend that IMAP formally seek clarification from DoT (i.e. via formal letter).**
- The DoT Advisory Note on Integrated Transport Plans (Attachment B) suggests residential developments of more than 200 lots or units, or new retail/office developments  $\geq 10,000 \text{ m}^2$ , or extensions  $\geq 10,000 \text{ m}^2$  to retail centres  $\geq 20,000 \text{ m}^2$ , or another development which in the view of the Responsible Authority is likely to generate significant travel demand are the "major developments" which would warrant preparation of an ITP. To broaden the definition of a 'major development' or to examine any other circumstances under which ITPs should be required, a detailed empirical analysis is necessary (because neither the DoT Advisory Note guidelines nor examples based on the experience of other Local Authorities eg. Darebin have shed any light on how to define these circumstances/thresholds). This demands expertise and resourcing beyond the capacity of the working group. Furthermore, there are resourcing implications associated with implementation on a wider scale i.e. the more Planning Permit applications falling into the broadened 'threshold/criteria', the more Council resources required to review them, monitor them, and enforce them. **As such we recommend that ITPs be applied to 'major developments' as defined by the Department of Transport's Advisory Note on Integrated Transport Plans.** This would mean, on average 10-15 applications Planning Permit Applications a year, at each Council – a number that current Statutory Planning, Traffic Engineering, Transport Planning and Planning enforcement staff can handle.
- A recent VCAT decision (1472/2009) against City of Darebin's requirement for a GTP deleted any reference to the 'Travel Plan' from the preamble of the permit and condition 1 on the basis that it "*can not be enforced*"; and it "*seems to fail every one of the accepted tests of the validity of a permit condition*". Given this and the DoT are still determining when it is appropriate to apply conditions of permit requiring GTPs, **we recommend that IMAP Councils agree NOT to require GTPs as part of the planning approval process until such time as DoT makes a determination that provides a clear direction on when/how they should be applied.** Further, ITP's should not relate to 'travel behaviour change' initiatives to be pursued after completion of the development but only those measured which can be introduced as part of the development, and clearly shown on the plans etc.
- Finally, in recognition that travel behaviour change 'tools' like GTPs can be effective when applied on a voluntary basis and outside of the statutory planning process, **we recommend that IMAP advocate for State Government to target/work with EXISTING large trip**

**generators like tertiary institutions, schools and hospitals etc. to encourage them to develop and maintain GTPs (similar approach to that currently applied in UK).**

### **Car Sharing**

Car sharing is a recent transport option in which residents and businesses are able to gain membership to a car sharing organisation and can then book the use of a shared car as they need. Car share offers the advantage of occasional car use without the costs and responsibilities of car ownership. It is more flexible and convenient than hire car systems. Expected benefits from car sharing for the individual are a significant reduction in transport cost, reduced environmental footprint, induced participation in active and public transport and for the parking authority, a reduced residential parking need as each car share vehicle is known to take a significant number of cars off the road. Further wider transport benefits are reduced car trips due to the need to "think before driving".

Following the Committee's endorsement of car sharing in February this year, Yarra and Melbourne have continued with operating car sharing. Stonnington has again considered the issue, but not yet accepted the use of on-street public parking spaces for car sharing and requested further research. They have however, encouraged car sharing spaces in off-street car parks associated with major developments, and the first site close to Chapel Street, South Yarra is about to come on-stream. The feasibility of such an approach will be interesting as the car sharing industry suggests spaces are better located in full public view on-street to achieve maximum benefit.

In the interim, VicRoads has advised they are about to release some guidelines for car sharing schemes for application state-wide. (A draft of these is shown in Attachment C).

The working group considered car sharing an important tool to assist in the mitigation of parking demand in inner suburban areas. The group **recommends that the State guidelines be employed across the IMAP area, when endorsed by Vic Roads.** There is considerable merit in a consistency in approach, in achieving public acceptance, familiarity and eventually take up of such schemes. If member Councils require more specific direction in their management of car sharing from that provided by Vic Roads, it is suggested they develop these directions independently, and share experiences, research and ideas across the region, at an officer level.

### **7. Provision of parking in new developments**

As reported previously, the working group agrees there is merit for both Councils and the development community to have a common approach across the IMAP region on :

- Parking rates for both vehicles, bicycles and motorcycles
- Assessment of capacity required; and,
- Standards defining the provision of such spaces.

The progression of this is dependent on the State Government review of Clause 52.06 of the Planning Scheme (relating to the provision of parking). This was expected to be released early 2009, but despite advice months ago that it is imminent nothing has eventuated to date. This release will provide direction to IMAP councils on a common approach. The working group **recommends that when, or if, the State Government eventually releases the review of CI 52.06, a separate working group be convened to develop an IMAP response.**

### **8. Management of existing parking supply**

The working group had previously reviewed current Council approaches to pay parking and parking management methods.

The discussions of the group since this review have concluded it is not appropriate for a uniform approach to parking management methods. It was felt that member Councils needed the flexibility to

adopt parking management approaches that best suited the needs of the activity centres and other parking generators they were managing.

Rather it was felt a better approach was to agree on a set of basic principles based on sustainability and the progressive increase in the proportion of travel demand by sustainable transport modes to inner city trip generators.

Attachment D is a brief discussion paper on the 6 principles agreed by the group. It is **recommended the Committee endorse the following 6 principles for management of existing parking supply in activity centres :**

- i. That a user pays approach be adopted in the provision and use of all public parking
- ii. The IMAP Sustainable Transport Framework be used as the primary determinant of the allocation of public parking spaces
- iii. That parking generated by an Activity Centre, be contained within the Centre
- iv. The provision of parking in new developments be provided at below the empirical parking rate for the centre
- v. That parking enforcement be consistent and transparent to the motorist
- vi. The proportion of longer term or employee parking supply be successively reduced in favour of customer and service parking supply

## 9. Further Research

The IMAP 3.3 working group has identified a need for further research into the relationship between parking and its value to an activity centre. What are the consequences economically and on network access, of replacing parking with public facilities, or removal for transport management or public safety?

Such research is particularly topical given the current "Keeping Melbourne Moving" program and its policy direction regarding clearways.

A Project Plan for further details of the research proposal is attached (Attachment D).

The working group **recommends a new group be convened and appropriately resourced to manage the research proposal identified.**

## Conclusion

The working group has experienced many challenges progressing Action 3.3. Considering the content of the attached Discussion Papers (attachments A & D), it is recommended that the current working group be wound up and further groups initiated to progress specific tasks as opportunities are identified.

## 10. Partnering with State Government

- Seek clarity from Department of Transport on their proposed approach to the use of Integrated Transport Plans for major developments.
- As defined by the Department of Transport's Advisory Note, apply Integrated Travel Plans to 'major developments' across IMAP councils (refer attachment .
- Seek clear direction from Department of Transport on when/how Green Travel Plans should be applied as part of the planning approval process and their agreement to not apply Green Travel Plan conditions to permits, until such clarification is made.
- Advocate to State Government to target/work with existing large trip generators like tertiary institutions, schools and hospitals etc. to encourage them to develop and maintain Green Travel Plans (similar approach to that currently applied in UK).

## 11. Green Travel Plans

IMAP Councils agree to not apply Green Travel Plans as part of the development approval process for applications considered by them.

12. State guidelines on Car Sharing (attachment C)

Adopt the 'Guidelines for the Implementation of Car-Share Parking' once released and implement across the inner Melbourne region.

13. Principles of existing parking supply in activity centres (attachment D)

- That a user pays approach be adopted in the provision and use of all public parking
- The IMAP Sustainable Transport Framework be used as the primary determinant of the allocation of public parking spaces
- That parking generated by an Activity Centre, be contained within the Centre
- The provision of parking in new developments be provided at below the empirical parking rate for the centre
- That parking enforcement be consistent and transparent to the motorist
- The proportion of longer term or employee parking supply be successively reduced in favour of customer and service parking supply

14. Future Research (attachment E)

Convene a new working group to scope a research proposal on the value of parking to Activity Centres including budget and resource requirements and timelines.

15. Review of Clause 52.06

Convene a separate working group to develop an IMAP response when, or if, the State Government releases the review of CI 52.06 of the Planning Scheme.

## Recommendations

## 16. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

- a) **Note** this concluding report and **endorse** the 6 principles for management of existing parking supply in activity centres.
- b) **Support** formal clarification with Department of Transport on their proposed approach to the use of Integrated Transport Plans for major developments and Green Travel Plans.
- c) **Agree** to not request Green Travel Plan conditions on Planning Permits.
- d) **Agree** to apply Integrated Travel Plans to major developments as defined by the Department of Transport's Advisory Note
- e) **Approve** advocacy with State Government to target large trip generators to encourage them to develop and maintain Green Travel Plans, outside of the development approval process.
- f) **Support** the application of State guidelines on Car Sharing across the IMAP area (once released)
- g) **Approve** the proposed research direction on the *value of parking to activity centres*.
- h) **Support** an IMAP response to the review of CL 52.06 of the State Government Planning Scheme (once released).