



ratio

**Draft Final Report
City of Port Phillip
Sustainable Transport Policy and Parking Rates**

March 2007

#

Prepared by

Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd

“Riverwalk” First Floor

649 Bridge Road

Richmond VIC 3121

T +61 03 9429 3111

F + 61 03 9429 3011

Prepared for

City of Port Phillip

March 2007

Our Reference: 7139 Report#4.Doc

©Copyright, Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd, March 2007.

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under Copyright Act 1963, no part may be reproduced without written permission of Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd.

Disclaimer:

Neither Ratio Consultants Pty. Ltd. nor any member or employee of Ratio Consultants Pty. Ltd. takes responsibility in any way whatsoever to any person or organisation (other than that for which this report has been prepared) in respect of the information set out in this report, including any errors or omissions therein. Ratio Consultants is not liable for errors in plans, specifications, documentation or other advice not prepared or designed by Ratio Consultants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Why Sustainable Transport?	3
1.2	Background.....	3
1.3	Outline of Report.....	5
2	EMPIRICAL PARKING PROVISION RATES	6
2.1	Need for New Empirical Parking Demand Data	6
2.2	Residential Parking Rates	7
2.3	Office Parking Rates.....	11
2.4	Restaurant Parking Rates	17
2.5	Shop Parking Rates.....	20
3	SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY AND PARKING RATES	24
3.1	Sustainable Transport Policy	24
3.2	Sustainable Parking Rates	25
4	OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT OBJECTIVES	31
4.1	Context.....	31
4.2	Development Contribution Plan Overlay	31
4.3	Rezoning Requests	33
4.4	Local Planning Policy	33
4.5	Schedule to Clause 52.06-6.....	34
4.6	Planning Permit Conditions.....	35
4.7	Car Parking Advisory Committee.....	35
4.8	Options.....	36
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
 APPENDICES		
	Appendix A. Questionnaire for 2007 Parking Survey.....	39
	Appendix B. Office Parking Demand Survey Questionnaire	40
	Appendix C. Port Phillip Planning Scheme Clause 12.08.....	42
	Appendix D. Draft Planning Policy	43

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 WHY SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT?

Sustainable transport is the movement of people by modes which have a low (or lower) level of environmental impact. In particular, sustainable transport places emphasis on:

- car pooling;
- public transport;
- cycling;
- walking.

Sustainable transport modes are promoted by making them viable and attractive alternatives to drive-alone travel by private car; less usage of private cars implies less need for car parking.

In urban areas such as Melbourne, the single biggest purpose for personal travel is daily movement between home and work. As shown in Figure 1.1, this comprises about 30 percent of total travel, with school, shopping, social/recreational and other travel purposes comprising the other 70 percent.

In the City of Port Phillip, about 40 percent of travel between home and work is by drive-alone mode in private cars to office locations. Travel by all other modes to office locations, and by all modes to all non-office work locations, comprises the other 60 percent (refer Figure 1.1).

Travel between home and work is pre-planned and regular, and office work locations are typically well-served by public transport. This makes drive-alone travel to office work locations the most worthwhile “target” for conversion to sustainable transport modes.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The City of Port Phillip, both its Council and the community, have a strong commitment to more “sustainable” transport. The local motivations are numerous:

- improved environmental quality through lower levels of traffic noise, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and less reliance on fossil fuels;
- improved residential and general amenity through the reduced dominance and danger of moving vehicular traffic;
- improved urban design, through reduced visual dominance of parked cars, and less need to construct carpark driveway crossovers in established and/or heritage streetscapes;
- improved levels of personal fitness through increased reliance on walking and cycling.

Table 1.1 summarises the various “drivers” for sustainable transport policy and parking rates, and it shows the linkages to other Council policy initiatives.

TABLE 1.1: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY AND PARKING RATE "DRIVERS"

Policy	Outcome Sought
Streetscape (Clause 22.05 Urban Design Policy)	Elimination or reduction in number of crossovers
Heritage	Maintain integrity of heritage buildings - greater retention, through increasing options for viable uses/configurations, of significant buildings
Housing	Increase opportunity for the provision of higher levels of affordable and flexible housing
Urban Design	Improve building form through its relationship to the street - ie active unbroken frontages (portal eliminated), less bulk, lower height
Road User Safety Strategy	Improve pedestrian safety through elimination or reduction in number of crossovers, particularly in high demand locations
Sustainable Transport Framework/Parking Plan - Towards 2010	Encourage an exchange of some car based trips to walking, cycling and public transport

The City of Port Phillip (CoPP) has made major progress in the foundation of sustainable transport principles and policies. In 1998, it published its "Integrated Transport Strategy", which provided an overall framework for detailed policy planning for individual transport modes. In 2000, CoPP published its "Parking Plan Towards 2010", which identified the important role played by parking provision and management in moderating the usage of private cars. Since that time Council has published other related policies, including:

- Public Transport Strategy 2002;
- Cycle Plan 2005-2010;
- Walk Plan 2005-2010.

These various strategies are now integrated into Council's Sustainable Transport Framework (refer Figure 1.2).

There have been several other individual initiatives, such as Council's support for the "Flo Carshare/Flexicar" scheme and the negotiation by Council of specific sustainable transport contributions for the Red Bear project (as a trade-off for a reduced, "sustainable" level of parking provision).

To have maximum effect, the elements of the Sustainable Transport Framework must have legal force. The most effective way of achieving that is through incorporation in the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. There are three complementary ways in which that can be achieved:

- as principles in the Municipal Strategic Statement;
- as Local Policy for specific geographic areas;
- as location-specific parking rates in Clause 52.06; with associated mechanisms for cash-in-lieu or other in-kind contributions towards more sustainable transport.

In December 2005, the City of Port Phillip appointed Ratio Consultants to research these issues and to advise Council on the most effective ways in which they could be advanced.

1.3 OUTLINE OF REPORT

This report documents findings in relation to three aspects of the research work:

- Section 2 summarises research and surveys relating to “empirical” parking demand rates for residential, office, restaurant and retail/shop uses in various Activity Centres throughout Port Phillip;
- Section 3 discusses the incorporation of “sustainable” transport policy into the Port Phillip Planning Scheme, including setting “sustainable” parking rates in exchange for contributions towards “sustainable” transport infrastructure and services;
- Section 4 discusses the various mechanisms for the collection of funds to compensate for approval by Council of “sustainable” (reduced) parking provision rates for new development;
- Section 5 sets out the conclusions and recommendations.

2 EMPIRICAL PARKING PROVISION RATES

2.1 NEED FOR NEW EMPIRICAL PARKING DEMAND DATA

The “standard” parking provision rates for new uses or changed uses, as specified in Clause 52.06 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme, generally represent unrestrained usage levels of private cars. The rates are based on research and surveys undertaken in Melbourne in the 1970’s and take no account of different needs in different areas of Port Phillip (or elsewhere in Melbourne). Provision of parking at those levels tends to enshrine high levels of car ownership and usage and, once established, that “unsustainable” travel behaviour is very difficult to change.

Most parts of Port Phillip are readily accessible by train, tram or bus services. The topography is flat and the street network is very permeable. This means that many residents can fulfil their daily needs by using public transport, cycling or walking; that is, without needing to own (and garage/park) a car. As a result, parking demand rates for most land uses are generally lower than the “standard” rates of Clause 52.06. Accordingly, Council Officers routinely apply parking dispensations, down to levels that are understood to be supported by empirical studies.

Before considering the case for further dispensations (ie in return for developer contributions to fund sustainable transport infrastructure or services), it is important to substantiate the “empirical” levels of parking demand in Port Phillip for the key land uses, that is:

- medium and high-density residential;
- offices;
- cafes and restaurants;
- shops.

In 1991, the Inner Municipalities Regional Association (IMRA) Parking Study included the results of extensive parking demand surveys for residential, office and restaurant uses (but **not** for shops). The surveyed areas included South Melbourne, Port Melbourne and St Kilda, being the three areas now comprising the City of Port Phillip. The IMRA survey results are becoming increasingly outdated.

Other relevant sources of empirical parking demand data are:

- Ratio Consultants extensive surveys throughout Port Phillip (for Council) in relation to the medium and higher density residential developments and restaurants;
- one-off surveys done by other Consultants, for many sites throughout the City, as a basis for Planning Permit applications or subsequent VCAT hearings.

To ensure that Council’s “empirical” parking rates are soundly based, additional research and surveys were carried out for each of the four target land uses.

2.2 RESIDENTIAL PARKING RATES

2.2.1 Context

Clause 55 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme (ResCode) specifies parking provision rates for medium-density housing in developments of up to four levels. These rates are:

- 1.0 resident spaces for one and two bedroom dwellings;
- 2.0 resident spaces each for three bedroom or larger dwellings;
- 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling.

There appears to be a growing trend, especially in and around Port Phillip Activity Centres where school, shopping and social/recreational destinations are readily accessible by “sustainable” travel modes, for some residents to choose not to own cars. In this context, the ResCode parking rates may well be too high.

2.2.2 ABS Census Motor Vehicle Ownership Data

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) collected data at the 2001 Census which included the car ownership rates of all households. The average (mean) vehicle ownership rates for Port Phillip in 2001 were:

- 0.78 for one-bedroom dwellings;
- 1.28 for two-bedroom or larger dwellings.

Ratio Consultants commissioned ABS to carry out an analysis of this data for the City of Port Phillip, so as to show average motor vehicle ownership rates for each Census Collector District (CCD), separately for each size and type of household¹. This allowed the rates to be mapped. The results of this analysis are shown as follows:

- Figure 2.1 shows average household car ownership rates for one-bedroom dwellings;
- Figure 2.2 shows average household car ownership for two-bedroom or larger dwellings.

There is some (but not substantial) evidence that the CCD's with lowest average car ownership, especially for one-bedroom dwellings, are clustered around the railway stations, and along the light rail and tram lines. This indicates that proximity to frequent and identifiable public transport services is a factor in reducing the need to own a private car.

¹ “Motor vehicles” include cars, motorcycles and scooters. ABS was not able to analyse the data separately for cars only. However, because cars comprise about 96 percent of motor vehicles owned in Victoria, and probably a similar proportion in Port Phillip, the effect of that issue is very small.

The ABS analysis also allowed the identification of CCD's in which households owning no motor vehicles were located. The results are as follows:

- Figure 2.3 shows the location of CCD's with a substantial number (25 or more) one-bedroom dwellings with no motor vehicles;
- Figure 2.4 shows the location of CCD's with a substantial number (25 or more) two-bedroom or larger dwellings with no motor vehicles.

The two figures also show the percentages of the dwellings in the identified CCD's which have no motor vehicles. As expected, with most of the identified CCD's being close to public transport routes, many have a high percentage of households with no cars.

Again, there is evidence of a link between households with no cars and fixed rail public transport accessibility, especially for one-bedroom households, and for two-bedroom dwellings in the inner parts of South Melbourne. This suggests that it would be reasonable to allow concessional parking rates for residential development, including concessions allowing no on-site parking at all, in locations which have those special accessibility characteristics.

Further analysis of the ABS 2001 census data provides some insights into the demographic characteristics of households in Port Phillip which owned no motor vehicles, as follows:

- (a) Whereas 24 percent of all households in Port Phillip had annual incomes up to \$26,000, the majority (55 percent) of households owning no cars were in that income category. This confirms the traditional close correlation between car ownership and household income.
- (b) Whereas only 14 percent of households in Port Phillip were sole-parent families, a much higher proportion (29 percent) of households owning no cars were in that category.
- (c) Whereas 42 percent of households in Port Phillip had only one person normally resident, a much higher proportion (64 percent) of households owning no cars were in that category. This is logical in that single-person households are more able to operate without a car than are larger households.

This brief analysis suggests that there are particular demographic groups in the Port Phillip municipality, namely low income, sole-parent and single-person households, with the lowest car ownerships. These households are therefore the least likely to need off-street parking associated with their residential accommodation.

Reducing the parking requirements for new residential developments typically reduces construction costs, so it typically increases the affordability of own-your-own or rental accommodation. This means that low income, sole-parent and single-person households are the ones most likely to benefit from any move to reduced residential development parking requirements in the City of Port Phillip.

Although the Planning Scheme cannot realistically have different parking rates for dwellings based on the income or family structure of their likely occupants, it can (and already does) have different rates for different dwelling sizes (i.e. one, two, three or more bedrooms). Since low income, sole-parent and single-person households are more likely to require (or be able to afford) smaller dwellings, there is a case for a reduction in parking requirements for such small dwellings.

2.2.3 Survey of Car Ownership and Parking

There are various reasons why some people do not own or operate a car, including:

- they may be too young, too old, disabled or otherwise physically unable to drive;
- they may have chosen never to learn to drive;
- they may not be able to afford to own and operate a car;
- they may have another car owner to drive them around as/when needed;
- they may have sufficiently good access to work, school, shop, social/recreational or other destinations that they can conveniently use public transport, cycle or walk;
- they may consider cars to be environmentally wasteful and choose to use “sustainable” travel modes as a matter of principle.

In all of the above situations, those people who do not own cars do not need a parking space at their apartments or houses. So, being able to choose to own or occupy a dwelling without on-site parking (obviously at a saving in purchase price or rental level) is convenient for them.

In other situations, people own or occupy dwellings without on-site parking, but park their cars in nearby local streets (eg with Resident Permits) or in commercial car parks.

There are few areas throughout the City of Port Phillip where local streets can accommodate more overflow residential parking, so Council is **only** approving new residential developments, with reduced provision of on-site parking, in situations where it expects that some of the occupants will not own cars (e.g. for one or more of the various motivations listed above).

To provide additional information on this issue, specific to new residential developments in the City of Port Phillip, a substantial survey was undertaken in February 2007. The survey was targeted at recently-approved residential developments where:

- reduced rates of parking may have been approved and constructed; and
- on-street parking was not readily available to accommodate overspill owner/occupant parking from the new development.

The selection criterion for the survey sites was a Planning Permit condition disallowing owners/occupants from being issued Resident Parking Permits.

Council provided a list of about 4,700 apartments and townhouses with the relevant Planning Permit conditions. Site inspection identified about 1,500 of these as being completed, occupied and in relevant locations. A questionnaire was mailed to each address (refer Appendix A) and 229 responses (15.2 percent of the number distributed) were received. This revealed:

- an average car ownership of 0.99 for **one** bedroom apartments (slightly higher than the Port Phillip average from 2001 ABS data)
- an average car ownership of 1.34 for **two** bedroom or larger apartments (slightly higher than the Port Phillip average from 2001 ABS data);
- 8 apartments with no parking **and** no car owned;

- 15 apartments with no parking, with a car owned and parked elsewhere;
- 22 apartments with a parking space **but no car**;
- 125 apartments with one or two parking spaces and the same number of cars;
- the remaining 59 apartments with at least one parking space and at least one car, but with either not enough or too many off-street parking spaces.

Further analysis was done for the 44 survey responses indicating that the household owned more cars than parking spaces. As shown in Table 2.1, the majority of those “excess” cars were parked on-street. A check was made of the nominated streets and it was found that, in most cases, there were no resident restrictions applying in those streets. Other parking locations indicated for excess cars were commercial carparks, on-site visitor spaces and at friend’s or relative’s properties.

Table 2.1
Location of Parking for Excess Cars

Location ¹		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
On-street nearby ²	where resident permits apply	5	11.4%
	Where no resident permits apply	29	65.9%
Commercial carpark ³		5	11.4%
On-site visitor spaces		2	4.5%
Friend’s / Relative’s property		3	6.8%
Total		44	100.0%

The results of the survey indicate that a low level of provision of off-street parking does not necessarily discourage car ownership. It does, however, also reveal a substantial number of households having off-street parking but not owning cars. This suggests that, in the interests of maximising housing choice and affordability (as well as sustainable transport) it is a valid planning principle to allow some apartments to be approved with no parking.

2.2.4 Conclusion on Empirical Rate for Residential Uses

The results of the ABS data from 2001 show that the Res-Code requirements for resident parking are, more or less, appropriate for apartments in the City of Port Phillip. There does, however, appear to be a substantial number of households, especially one-bedroom apartments, who do not need off-street parking; it would be appropriate for, say, 20 percent of small apartments in new developments to be allowed with no parking provision.

¹ In some situations, there were more than one location nominated.

² Nominated on-street locations were St Kilda Rd, Carlisle St, Nelson St, Ormond Rd, Docker St, Hartbury Ave, Milton St, Henry St, Nott St, Rouse St, Wells St, Bank St, Dorcas St, Acland St, Barkly St, Deakin St, Marriott St & Chaucer St.

³ Nominated car park locations were Wilson / Coles / Acland Court and George Cinema.

There are numerous other residential developments, currently in progress, where Council has approved substantial reductions in on-site parking. It will be important to monitor the car parking demands of those developments, as they are completed, to extend the understanding of the motives and car parking behaviour of the owners and occupants in such situations. Similarly, it will be important to obtain and analyse ABS data from the 2006 Census, when it is available, to check overall trends in car ownership.

2.3 OFFICE PARKING RATES

2.3.1 Context

Clause 52.06 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme specifies a car parking rate for “office” of 3.5 spaces per 100 square metres of net floor space. That rate is generally regarded as representing an appropriate rate for middle and outer suburban locations of Melbourne, but too high for inner suburban locations such as Port Phillip.

2.3.2 ABS Journey-To-Work Data

The ABS collects information at each Census on the journey-to-work characteristics of all working people in Australia. At the time of the 2001 Census, 52,702 people travelled to work locations each day in Port Phillip. The “major occupations” of those people are listed in Table 2.2. The first three occupational categories, in combination, suitably describe “office” workers; that grouping comprised 29,603 people (56.2 percent of total workers with job locations in Port Phillip).

Summary data is routinely available from the ABS which shows the number of people who use various travel modes from one Local Government Area (LGA, identical to Municipalities or Council areas) to other LGA's. So, data is routinely available on, for example, the number of people who drive cars each day from all Melbourne LGA's to Port Phillip. Ratio Consultants commissioned ABS to analysis the 2001 Census data further, so as to identify:

- travel mode for “office” workers only;
- work location destinations at Transport Zone (TZN) level **within** Port Phillip.

Figure 2.5 shows the pattern of Transport Zones in Port Phillip and Table 2.3 shows the number of people who drove cars daily to offices in those zones in 2001.

Table 2.2
Major Occupation of People Working in Port Phillip
(ABS 2001)

Major Occupation ²	Persons	
	Number	Percent
Managers and Administrators	7,187	13.6
Professionals	14,310	27.2
Associate Professionals	8,106	15.4
Sub Total	29,603	56.2
Tradespersons and Related	4,068	7.7
Advanced Clerical Sales	2,209	4.2
Intermediate Clerical Sales	8,946	17.0
Elementary Clerical Sales	3,493	6.6
Labourers and Related	1,913	3.6
Inadequately described	349	0.7
Employed but occupation Not Stated	70	0.1
Total	52,702	100.00

² Excludes "worked at home", "did not go to work", "not stated".

Table 2.3
Car Drivers to Office Work Locations in Port Phillip Transport Zones
(ABS 2001)

Destination Transport Zone	Persons by mode of travel		Percent Car Driver
	Car Driver	Total	
65	1,780	2,372	75
66	101	143	71
67	1,747	2,179	80
68	909	1,256	72
69	193	244	79
70	108	146	74
71	392	565	69
72	316	407	78
73	281	348	81
74	140	177	79
75	1,099	1,225	90
76	1,704	2,084	82
77	1,254	1,554	81
78	374	415	90
79	4,037	5,623	72
80	870	1,060	82
81	408	504	81
82	585	834	70
83	181	245	74
84	4,837	7,215	67
85	631	783	81
86	174	223	78
Total	22,121	29,603	75

The analysis shows that, overall, 75 percent of office workers drove cars to work and parked in Port Phillip on a daily basis in 2001. The highest levels of car driving, understandably, were in the industrial areas of Fishermans Bend (TZN's 75, 78). The lowest levels were in St Kilda and along St Kilda Road/Queens Road (TZN's 71, 82, 84).

Offices typically accommodate an average of five persons per 100 square metres floor area (more for uses such as telephone call centres, less for offices with large amounts of data processing hardware or other equipment). That means that the average parking demand rate for office land uses in Port Phillip at 2001 Census, both on-site and off-site combined, was:

75 percent of 5 workers per 100m² = 3.75 parking spaces/100m² office floor area.

In any office on any day, about 20 percent of people are absent on holidays, sick leave, interstate business travel etc. In situations where a pool of on-site office carparking is shared between those at work each day, the number of parking spaces needed is reduced accordingly, as follows:

$$\text{Shared Parking Demand} = 0.8 \times 3.75 = 3.0 \text{ spaces}/100\text{m}^2$$

However, if on-site parking spaces at a particular office are reserved for particular occupants (drivers), and these spaces are left vacant when those people are absent, the (unshared) demand is the full 3.75 spaces per 100m².

It should be noted that the office worker parking demand levels calculated from the ABS data do not include any provision for visitors to offices.

2.3.3 Survey of Office Parking Demand

So as to consolidate and update the findings from the ABS Journey-To-Work data analysis, a survey was conducted of various offices in locations throughout Port Phillip. The survey sites were selected to cover:

- the major concentration of offices along St Kilda Road (TZN's 79 and 84 from Table 2.3);
- various outlying areas such as Albert Park and St Kilda.

For each selected office, a representative of the occupying organisation was contacted to obtain approval of the survey. A formal letter requesting assistance and a short questionnaire were then forwarded (refer Appendix B). The questionnaire sought information on the amount of office floorspace occupied, maximum number of staff, car driving/parking behaviour of staff and maximum visitor parking demands.

Recent data from parking demand surveys at two other offices was also collated and added to the analysis, as follows:

- the offices of Aviva, being one of the pilot sites for the Department of Infrastructure's (DoI) Travel Smart Workplace program;
- the offices of Transurban, for which Travel Smart parking surveys had recently been undertaken.

These two office sites, on the eastern side of St. Kilda Road, are actually in the City of Melbourne. However, their parking demand characteristics provide a useful supplement to the surveyed sites on the western (City of Port Phillip) side of that road.

The surveyed offices are located on Figure 2.6 and the survey results are summarised in Table 2.4. The results show:

- a range of **staff** parking demands from 1.6 to 3.8 spaces per 100m² floor area;
- a range of **visitor** parking demands from 0.1 to 1.0 spaces per 100m² floor area;
- a range of total parking demands from 1.7 to 4.6 spaces per 100m² floor area;
- no discernable relationship between location or size of office and parking demand rate.

Table 2.4
Summary of Office Parking Demand Surveys

Address	Occupant	Floor space (m ²)	Max Staff	Staff Parking (spaces)	Staff Rate (spaces/100m ²)	Visitor Parking (spaces)	Visitor Rate (spaces/100m ²)	Total Rate (spaces/100m ²)
370 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Far East Consortium	300	11	5	1.6	2	0.7	2.3
480 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Sunland	500	20	17	3.4	5	1.0	4.4
509 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Aviva	12,735	800	200	1.6	8	0.1	1.7
541 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Transurban	4373	320	110	2.5	10	0.2	2.7
580 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Liberty Oil	2,650	100	75	2.8	5	0.2	3.0
636 St Kilda Road Melbourne	Cadbury Schweppes	17,245	900	630	3.6	45	0.3	3.9
204 St Kilda Road St Kilda	Frid Property	300	6	6	2.0	2	0.7	2.7
151 Clarendon Street South Melbourne	ERM Consultants	746	46	26	3.5	3	0.4	3.9
232 Clarendon Street South Melbourne	PPM Consultants	600	25	23	3.8	5	0.8	4.6
170 Bridport Street Albert Park	Sweeney Research	1,350	40	32	2.3	10	0.8	3.1
54 Inkerman Street St Kilda	Neometro Architects	200	11	5	2.5	2	1.0	3.5
24 The Esplanade St Kilda	Omni Property	1000	50	35	3.5	5	0.5	4.0
Total/Weighted Average		41,999	2,329	1,164	2.8	102	0.2	3.0

The Cadbury-Schweppes office at 636 St Kilda Road was surveyed in 1991, as part of the original IMRA Study. At that time, the surveyed parking demand rate (including visitors) was 2.8 spaces per 100m². The surveyed rate in 2006, at 3.9 spaces per 100m², was noticeably higher.

The weighted average of office staff parking rate from the 2006 survey, that is 2.8 spaces per 100m² floor area, was slightly lower than the shared staff parking rate calculated from the 2001 ABS data (ie 3.0 spaces/100m²). The survey sample was too small to justify a conclusion that office staff parking demands in Port Phillip have actually fallen over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. However, it is encouraging to note that two of the lowest staff parking rates in the 2006 survey were observed at the offices of Aviva and Transurban, both of which had been promoting sustainable transport behaviour as part of Dol's Travel Smart Workplace program. This indicates that more broadly-based promotion of sustainable travel by staff at office locations in Port Phillip could lead to general reductions in parking demand.

2.3.4 Conclusion on Empirical Rate for Office Uses

Both the ABS and the extra survey data suggest that 3.0 staff parking spaces per 100m² floor area is an appropriate empirical rate for office uses in the City of Port Phillip. With no conclusive indication that the rate varies with office location or size (ie a similar range of rates applied for small offices in Activity Centres to large offices along St Kilda Road), the same empirical rate seems to be applicable to staff parking in **all** office situations.

2.4 RESTAURANT PARKING RATES

2.4.1 Context

The Port Phillip Planning Scheme requires car parking for restaurants at a rate of 0.6 spaces per seat. That rate is generally regarded as being too high, even for isolated locations with a high level of dependence on car travel, and especially in accessible locations such as Port Phillip.

In February 2000, Ratio Consultants carried out interview surveys at 11 café/restaurants, throughout the City of Port Phillip, to establish the parking demands of patrons as the basis for more realistic parking provision rates. The locations of the surveyed restaurants are shown on Figure 2.7. The results of the 2000 surveys are provided in Table 2.5; they showed:

- lunchtime parking rates ranging from 0.00 to 1.50 spaces per patron (average 0.52) for weekdays and 0.32 to 0.63 spaces per patron (average 0.39) for weekends;
- evening parking rates ranging from 0.29 to 0.63 spaces per patron (average 0.42) for weekdays and 0.09 to 0.67 spaces per patron (average 0.40) for weekends.

The parking demand rates in Table 2.5 include both patron and staff parking.

2.4.2 New Surveys of Restaurant Parking Demands

Additional parking demand surveys were carried in May 2006 at 18 cafes and restaurants in the following Activity Centres (refer Figure 2.7):

- Carlisle Street, Balaclava;
- Ormond Road, Elwood;
- Fitzroy Street, St Kilda,
- Acland Street, St Kilda;
- Bay Street, Port Melbourne
- St Kilda Road, St Kilda;
- Victoria Avenue, Albert Park;
- Clarendon Street, South Melbourne; and
- Armstrong Street, Middle Park.

Table 2.5
2000 Restaurant Survey Results
(Includes Staff Parking)

Restaurant/Café	Location	Type	Maximum Seating Capacity (seats)	Parking Demand per Patron (Sample Size)			
				Weekday Lunch	Weekend Lunch	Weekday Dinner	Weekend Dinner
Monroes	Fitzroy St, St Kilda	Family	245	0.35 (14)	0.38 (30)	0.36 (31)	0.32 (41)
One Fitzroy St	Fitzroy St, St Kilda	Upmarket	250	0.35 (10)	0.32 (15)	0.37 (41)	0.32 (47)
Topolinos	Fitzroy St, St Kilda	Family Pizza	336	0.61 (4)	0.33 (8)	0.38 (20)	0.40 (40)
KL Café	Acland St, St Kilda	Malaysian	55	0.93 (3)	0.48 (20)	0.45 (12)	0.36 (14)
Deverolli's	Acland St, St Kilda	Family	116	0.41 (11)	0.33 (59)	0.39 (43)	0.60 (27)
Scheherezade	Acland St, St Kilda	Traditional Jewish	60	0.00 (1)	0.63 (2)	0.49 (33)	0.30 (26)
Ruby Ruby	Bay St, Port Melbourne	Trendy	73	0.57 (9)	0.39 (4)	0.63 (6)	0.31 (13)
The Rose	Bay St, Port Melbourne	Upmarket	120	0.55 (11)	N/A	0.56 (35)	0.09 (5)
Café Saigon	Victoria Avenue, Albert Park	Japanese	132	0.61 (2)	0.58 (3)	0.44 (40)	0.23 (26)
Vic Av Pasta & Wine	Victoria Avenue, Albert Park	Good quality pasta	95	0.76 (4)	0.44 (23)	0.39 (29)	0.56 (49)
Café Tarrango	Ormond Rd, Elwood	Alternative	24	1.50 (3)	0.62 (9)	0.42 (18)	0.67 (24)
Zartowa Café	Ormond Rd, Elwood	Upmarket	110	0.50 (16)	0.37 (24)	0.29 (26)	0.30 (30)
Weighted Average				0.52 (88)	0.39 (197)	0.42 (334)	0.40 (342)

NB. Staff demands are included in all demand values

The results of these 2006 surveys are summarised in Table 2.6 and show³ :-

- lunchtime parking rates ranging from 0.13 to 0.88 spaces per patron (weighted average 0.33) for weekdays (weekends not surveyed);
- evening parking rates ranging from 0.00 to 0.55 spaces per patron (weighted average 0.36) for weekdays and 0.13 to 0.52 spaces per patron (weighted average 0.25) for weekends.

³ Staff parking demand was not surveyed in 2006. Data from the 2000 surveys was used to derive an overall average staff parking demand of 0.05 spaces per occupied seat. That allowance was added to the surveyed customer parking rates to produce the aggregate rates in Table 2.6.

TABLE 2.6
2006 Restaurant Survey Results
(Includes Staff Parking)

Restaurant/Café	Location	Type	Capacity (seats)	Parking Demand per Patron (Sample Size)		
				Weekday Lunch	Weekday Dinner	Weekend Dinner
Hot Honey	Armstrong St	Restaurant/Café	40	0.45 (55)	-	-
Santiago	Armstrong St	Restaurant		-	0.50 (21)	0.25 (51)
KL Café	Acland St	Café	60	0.61 (9)	0.37 (20)	0.15 (22)
Deveroli's	Acland St	Restaurant	150	0.42 (20)	0.23 (40)	0.21 (33)
Scheherezade	Acland St	Restaurant	60	-	0.49 (9)	0.33 (19)
The Rose	Bay St	Restaurant/Bar	210	0.32 (36)	0.38 (66)	0.27 (66)
Twentyonenine	Clarendon St	Restaurant	33	0.88 (6)	-	-
Fine Korean Cuisine	Clarendon St	Restaurant/Take Away	24	0.28 (14)	0.55 (2)	0.35 (9)
The Old Paper Shop Deli	Clarendon St	Restaurant	45	0.40 (24)	-	-
One Fitzroy	Fitzroy St	Restaurant/Bar	420	0.55 (2)	0.38 (9)	0.16 (9)
Monroe	Fitzroy St	Restaurant	260	0.38 (9)	0.28 (14)	0.26 (29)
Topolinos	Fitzroy St	Restaurant/Take Away	340	0.23 (12)	0.25 (21)	0.20 (70)
Café Saigon	Victoria Ave	Restaurant	120	0.55 (2)	0.44 (19)	0.30 (8)
Vic Ave Pasta	Victoria Ave	Restaurant	70	-	0.00 (3)	0.13 (14)
Zartowa Café	Ormond Rd	Restaurant	100	0.34 (33)	0.51 (12)	0.30 (21)
The Olive Tree	Park St	Restaurant	-	0.13 (102)	0.27 (28)	0.25 (84)
Boccone	Carlisle St	Restaurant	-	-	0.38 (6)	0.52 (18)
Rolls Japanese	Carlisle St	Restaurant/Take Away	-	0.43 (39)	0.47 (20)	-
WEIGHTED AVERAGE				0.33 (363)	0.36 (290)	0.25 (453)

The results of the 2006 surveys show generally lower demand results than in 2000. This may be due to the proliferation of restaurants in Activity Centres in recent years, making them more easily accessible for local workers and residents to walk. Alternatively, or as well, it may be due to more use of carpools or taxis to comply with drink driving regulations.

There was no evidence of different parking rates at lunchtime versus evenings. This suggests that there may be a similar level of walk-in patronage during both time periods (eg local workers at lunchtime, local residents in the evenings).

Further, there was no evidence of Activity Centre location influencing the surveyed parking rates. As shown in Table 2.7, a similar range of parking demand rates (both high and low) were found in very accessible areas such as Fitzroy Street and less accessible areas such as Elwood.

Table 2.7
Restaurant Parking Demand by Activity Centre Location
(2000 and 2006 surveys combined, weekend dinner only)

Activity Centre	Number of Restaurants Surveyed	Parking Demand (Spaces per Occupied Seat)	
		Minimum	Maximum
Fitzroy Street	6	0.16	0.61
Acland Street	6	0.00	0.63
Bay Street	3	0.09	0.63
Victoria Avenue	4	0.00	0.76
Elwood Village	3	0.29	1.5
Armstrong Street	2	0.25	0.50
South Melbourne	4	0.25	0.88
Balaclava	2	0.38	0.52
TOTAL	30	0.00	1.50

2.4.3 Conclusion on Empirical Rate for Restaurants

The surveys, both from 2000 and 2006, suggest an empirical rate of 0.3 (customer plus staff) parking spaces per restaurant seats for all areas of Port Phillip.

2.5 SHOP PARKING RATES

2.5.1 Context

Clause 52.06 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme specifies a car parking rate for “shop” of 8.0 spaces per 100 square metres of leasable floor area. That rate is generally regarded as excessive, with rates in the range 3.0 to 5.0 spaces per 100 square metres for “specialty” shops, and up to 6.0 spaces per 100 square metres for supermarkets and Discount Department Stores, typically being applied in inner-suburban areas such as Port Phillip.

2.5.2 Survey of Shop Parking Demands

So as to establish empirical parking demand rates for “shops” in Port Phillip, a survey was conducted at a range of supermarkets and specialty shops in various Activity Centre locations.

For each selected shop, the owner/manager was approached to obtain approval for the survey, and to obtain information on leasable floor space and staff attendance/car parking activity on the afternoons of busy weekdays (i.e. Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays).

Survey staff then conducted direct observations and interviews at the survey sites as follows:

- the number of adult customers in each shop was counted at half-hour intervals from 12.00 noon to 5.00pm on a busy weekday in October 2006;
- a representative sample of adult customers was interviewed on departure from each shop to determine the proportion of car drivers.

The surveyed shops are located on Figure 2.8 and the survey results are shown in Table 2.8.

Table 2.8
Summary of Shop Parking Demand Surveys

Activity Centre	Shop Name	Shop Type	Leasable Floor Area (m ²)	Peak Staff		Peak Customer		Peak Parking Rate (spaces /100m ²)
				Attendees	Parking	Attendees	Parking	
Bridport Street Albert Park	Bibas Hardware	Hardware	125	3	0	3	1	0.8
	Guardian Pharmacy	Pharmacy	75	4	2	2	1	4.0
	IGA	Supermarket	290	6	4	17	5	3.1
	Newspower	Newsagency	196	3	2	4	2	2.0
	Rundalls Wine	Cellars	215	4	4	4	3	3.3
Carlisle Street Balaclava	Coles Supermarket	Supermarket	2590	48	22	77	36	2.2
	Priceline Pharmacy	Pharmacy	245	8	6	10	4	4.1
	Safeway Supermarket	Supermarket	1640	22	18	32	12	1.8
	Simrod Hair Design	Hair Dresser	95	6	5	4	2	7.4
	Vintage Cellars	Cellars	215	3	3	4	2	2.3
Ormond Road Elwood	Elwood Cellars	Cellars	230	3	2	5	3	2.2
	Foodworks	Supermarket	280	4	4	8	4	2.9
	Lesle Roth Pharmacy	Pharmacy	115	3	3	2	1	3.5
Armstrong Street Middle Park	IGA	Supermarket	414	10	10	11	5	3.6
	Middle Park Pharmacy	Pharmacy	76	3	2	4	1	3.9
Bay Street Port Melbourne	Bolis	Men's Clothing	57	2	1	1	1	3.5
	Readings	Book Store	430	5	2	12	5	1.6
	Silky Waves	Hair Dresser	75	2	0	2	1	1.3
	Telstra Shop	Communications Retail	150	4	4	4	2	4.0
South Melbourne Central	Eyetopia	Optometrist	85	1	1	1	1	2.4
	Kamikaze	Women's Clothing	123	1	1	3	2	2.4
	Mitchel McCabe	Men's Clothing	125	2	2	1	1	2.4
	Optus World	Communications Retail	56	4	4	6	4	14.3
	Piano Time	Bulky Goods Retail	102	2	2	4	2	3.9
	Retravisision	Bulky Goods Retail	275	6	3	3	1	1.5
	Swish	Women's Clothing	123	4	4	10	5	7.3
Acland Street St Kilda	Acland Photo	Photographic	120	2	1	2	1	1.7
	Hairroom Salons	Hair Dresser	120	8	8	7	2	8.3
	Jays Jays	Clothing	80	2	1	5	1	2.5
	Safeway Supermarket	Supermarket	2225	21	18	50	11	1.3
Fitzroy Street St Kilda West	Moss	Homewares	75	2	1	4	2	4.0
	Renaissance Supa IGA	Supermarket	1200	21	10	31	7	1.4
TOTAL			12222	219	150	333	131	2.3

The shop surveys showed a wide range of parking demands, both for staff and for customers. The rates for combined (staff plus customer) parking demand ranged from 0.8 to 14.3 spaces per 100 square metres leasable floor area, with a weighted average of 2.3 spaces per 100 square metres.

There was no noticeable difference in rates between specialty shops and supermarkets. As shown in Table 2.9 no noticeable variation in rates by shop size or location.

Table 2.9
Shop Parking Demand by Activity Centre Location

Activity Centre	Number of Shops Surveyed	Parking Demand (Spaces per 100m ²)	
		Minimum	Maximum
Bridport Street, Albert Park	5	0.8	4.0
Carlisle Street, Balaclava	5	1.8	7.4
Ormond Road, Elwood	3	2.2	3.5
Armstrong Street, Middle Park	2	3.6	3.9
Bay Street, Port Melbourne	4	1.3	4.0
South Melbourne Central	7	1.5	14.3
Acland Street, St Kilda	4	1.3	8.3
Fitzroy Street, St Kilda West	2	1.4	4.0
TOTAL	32	0.8	14.3

The relatively low rates, especially for the supermarkets, indicates a high proportion of walk or other non-car-driving modes of customer travel. This is demonstrated, for example, by the Acland Street Safeway where, out of a peak number of 50 customers, only 11 were car drivers. On the other hand, most of the supermarkets had a high proportion of staff who drove and parked; for example 10 out of 10 staff at the Armstrong Street IGA and 18 out of 22 staff at both the Carlisle Street and Acland Street Safeways.

2.5.3 Conclusion on Empirical Rates for Shops

Eighty-five percent of the surveyed parking demand rates were found to be at or below 4.0 (staff plus customers) spaces per 100 square metres, suggesting that as an appropriate empirical rate to apply to new shop developments throughout Port Phillip.

3 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY AND PARKING RATES

3.1 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY

The City of Port Phillip already has an extensive research background in relation to Sustainable Transport Policy. As indicated in Section 1.1, it has carried out research and community consultation leading to individual transport policy issues, namely:

- Parking Plan Towards 2010;
- Public Transport Strategy 2002;
- Cycle Plan 2005-2010;
- Walk Plan 2005-2010.

These four policies, together with the formative Integrated Transport Strategy (1998) and Road User Safety Strategy (2002-2007) contribute to Council's Sustainable Transport Framework (refer Figure 1.2). However, there is not yet a concise Sustainable Transport Policy Statement incorporated in the Port Phillip Scheme.

The Port Phillip Planning Scheme does already have an overall State Planning Policy Framework Statement relating to sustainable transport (Clause 12.08), reproduced as Appendix C). However, to be effective in supporting issues such as reduced parking provision for new developments, in exchange for sustainable transport infrastructure or services, two additional policy statements are required in the Planning Scheme:

- a specific reference in the Municipal Strategic Statement relating to sustainable transport and the principle of trade-offs between provision of on-site car parking and sustainable transport contributions;
- a specific Local Policy which provides further details; an outline of such a policy is provided at Appendix D.

The Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) has recently issued a Practice Note relating to the preparation of Integrated Transport Plans (ITP's) for Major Developments. It states that:

“An ITP seeks to influence travel behaviour (travel demand) by giving priority access to sustainable modes (walking, cycling and public transport) and by planning to take other actions (e.g. Green Travel planning) to support and encourage access by non motorised means.”

The City of Port Phillip should support the DSE's initiative relating to ITP's and, when appropriate, include a requirement in its Planning Scheme for them to be prepared for major developments.

3.2 SUSTAINABLE PARKING RATES

3.2.1 Extent of Likely Parking Demand Reduction

By promoting sustainable transport modes, especially for travel from home to work, Council is seeking to achieve a reduced reliance on usage of private cars. Less usage means less need for private car ownership; that, in turn, means less need for parking at home and at the workplace (especially office or shop workplaces). To the extent that a shift does occur in travel behaviour, from car driver to sustainable transport modes, there can be a reduction in provision of car parking in new residential and commercial developments.

The first consideration when deciding on the relevant extent of reductions in parking provision rates (in exchange for contributions for sustainable transport), is that the implied shift in travel behaviour must be reasonably achievable.

Individual demonstration projects relating to “sustainable transport” have shown varying levels of services in Melbourne and elsewhere. For example:

- the Smart Bus initiatives along Springvale Road and Blackburn Road have increased weekday patronage by 23 percent;
- the Travel Smart project relating to St Kilda Road offices have shown some substantial reductions in drive-alone travel; 36 percent of employees at Aviva used that mode in 2004 reducing to 25 percent in 2005;
- the Travel Smart pilot project results from Perth (all trip purposes combined) have shown a 10 percent reduction in car-driver trips, with cycling being the major growth mode.

Based on the above examples, it appears that the maximum likely reduction in private car usage for travel in Port Phillip, at least in the short-term, would be 25 percent.

Other important considerations are as follows:

- the reductions should be large enough to provide a significant financial inducement to property developers (ie through less cost for basement parking);
- the reductions should not be so large that, if the anticipated shift to sustainable travel does **not** occur over time, the local community is burdened in perpetuity with additional competition for scarce on-street parking;
- the reductions should be consistent with the broader objectives of Melbourne 2030 (ie the initial objective of achieving 20 percent of all travel by public transport by 2020).

In all of those extra respects, a 20 to 25 percent reduction in parking provision rates is considered to be appropriate.

3.2.2 Reduced Rates for Residential Development

Council has already established informal criteria for reduced parking provision for residential development in some areas of Port Phillip. As part of recent planning decisions, it has indicated that a reduction of parking is acceptable in residential proposals which:

- are located within or close to an Activity Centre (eg no more than 200 metres away from the edge of a centre);
- are in close proximity (ie no more than 200 metres walk) to fixed rail or convenient/accessible/high frequency public transport;
- are located in areas where adjacent streets have Resident Permit protection;
- have generous provision of bicycle parking and storage;
- are in walking distance (ie 400 metres) of a full-line supermarket (typically 1500 square metres floor area or larger);
- comprise or include dwellings which must be small (aimed at the lower end of the market);
- accept that no Resident Permits will be issued to future owners/occupants.

A review of responses to the survey discussed in Section 2.2.3 indicates that, even though most owners/occupants still had cars, there was less reliance on them as the dominant mode of transport. This means that Council's informal criteria are realistic.

If all the above criteria are met, it is considered generally realistic to reduce on-site resident parking provision for (say) one and two bedroom dwellings from the ResCode rate of 1.0 spaces, to 0.8 spaces. That is, for example, in a 10 unit development, eight units would each have a single car space, while the other two would have none.

Other factors which could be considered to justify parking reductions in particular cases are:

- locations being within a mixed-use development, or in employment precincts such as St Kilda Road, where residents are likely to occupy work places within walking distance;
- provision of on-street FloCarshare/Flexicar parking spaces;
- provision of Smart Cars, motor scooters or bikes as part of residential purchase packages and/or special parking for such vehicles;
- subsidised public transport fares for an initial period;
- developer funding of establishment/account fees for on-line shopping services;
- other contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure or services.

3.2.3 Reduced Rates for Office Development

In any urban area such as Port Phillip, travel between home and work is dominant. Also, as shown in Table 2.2, "office" is the dominant occupation type of people who travel to work locations in Port Phillip. Those two factors, in combination, make "travel to office" the most worthwhile target of any campaign promoting sustainable travel modes. Further, because "travel to office" is typically repeated day after day, and because it is often amenable to conversion to public transport or cycle modes, it is worth setting ambitious targets for a change to sustainable travel habits.

In terms of rates of parking provision, this means that a reduction exceeding the 20 to 25 percent achievable/attractive/defensible target referred to in Section 3.2.1, may be appropriate.

The most ambitious target would be, say, a 30 percent reduction below the “shared empirical” parking rate from Section 2.3, that is:

70 percent of 3.0 spaces/100m² = 2.1 (say 2.0) spaces per 100m² office floor area

In order to achieve a reduction in car driver travel to match such a reduction in office parking provision, the locational attributes listed in Section 3.2.2 (for residential development) would need to apply. In addition, a comprehensive package of sustainable transport infrastructure or services would be essential. This may include:

- workplace provision of subsidised train/tram/bus fares (subject to Fringe Benefits Tax);
- preparation and implementation of a carpool scheme, including “guaranteed ride home” arrangements;
- on-site displays of public transport maps and timetables;
- upgrading of local bus/tram stops, shelters etc with DDA compliant pedestrian access facilities;
- financial contributions towards bike paths which directly and substantially assist in cycle usage for travel to the subject site;
- on-site provision of parking for motor scooters or motorbikes;
- full compliance (or more) with Clause 52.34 bicycle storage requirements (as lockers at ground level adjacent to main building entrance);
- full compliance (or more) with Clause 52.34 requirements for showers and change rooms for cyclists;
- providing special information technology facilities, such as remote access to file servers, to facilitate people working from home (ie telecommuting);
- other contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure or services.

Many of these actions would be effectively facilitated by formal participation in the Dol Travel Smart Workplace scheme, and documented/approved as a Green Travel Plan or Integrated Transport Plan.

3.2.4 Shop and Restaurant Developments

As discussed in Sections 1.1 and 3.2.3, the most worthwhile target for sustainable transport policy in the City of Port Phillip is “travel to office”. This means that sustainable parking rates are most relevant for residential and office land uses.

For shops and restaurants, it is often not possible or convenient for people (especially customers) to use carpool, public transport, cycle or walk modes. For example, shoppers often need a car to transport their purchases, while some restaurant patrons would find cycle and walk modes inappropriate at night.

Accordingly, it is not proposed to formulate lower (sustainable) parking rates for shops and restaurants, but to continue the application of empirically-derived rates.

3.2.5 Summary

Table 3.1 provides a summary of the empirical and “sustainable” parking rates for office and residential land uses, with empirical rates for shop and restaurant land uses.

For Council to consider a proposal suitable for the sustainable rate, all the ‘Requirements to Obtain Sustainable Rate (upper limit)’ must be met. To consider the lower (minimum) end of the sustainable rate, a proposal must demonstrate compliance with the ‘Requirements to Obtain Sustainable Rate (lower limit)’ to the satisfaction of the Council. These conditions must be met before they will be considered (and possibly approved) by Council.

The standard (Clause 52.06) rates are included in Table 3.1 for comparison purposes.

All of the parking provision rates for dwellings apply to resident parking only. Visitor demand, typically at the ResCode rate of 0.2 spaces per dwelling, is generally best accommodated on-street or in other off-site locations.

For offices, the Planning Scheme rate includes provision for visitors. The empirical and sustainable rates apply to office/staff/employees only. Again, provision for visitors is best accommodated off-site.

For restaurants and shops, all parking provision rates include both staff and customer demands.

Figure 3.1 shows the areas within the City of Port Phillip where the main sustainable parking criteria apply, that is:

- in Activity Centres, or within 200 metres of the edge of the centre;
- within 200 metres of fixed rail public transport;
- strict on-street parking controls (ie Resident Permits) apply in nearby streets;
- within 400 metres of a supermarket.

Figure 3.2 shows the areas where all of the first three main criteria apply, those being the areas where sustainable parking rates for residential and office uses are most justifiable. The St Kilda Road corridor has been included in the “may be considered” category; although the whole corridor is not an Activity Centres, multiple and high frequency public transport (tram) services ensure a sufficient level of non-car accessibility to make sustainable parking rates potentially applicable for the whole corridor.

Table 3.1
VARIOUS PARKING PROVISION RATES

Land Use	Standard Planning Scheme Rate (spaces)	Empirical Rate (spaces)	Sustainable (Reduced) Rate (spaces)	Necessary Conditions for Sustainable Rate
Dwelling 1 or 2 bedroom 3 bedroom	1 each 2 each	1 each 2 each	0 - 0.8 each 1 each	<p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (upper limit)</p> <p>Within or no more than 200 metres walk to edge of an Activity Centre</p> <p>No more than 200 metres to fixed rail public transport</p> <p>No more than 400 metres to supermarket</p> <p>Strict control of on-street parking in surrounding streets</p> <p>No Resident Permits for future owner/occupants.</p> <p>Provision of motor scooter/motorbike parking on site</p> <p>Small dwellings only</p> <p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (lower limit)</p> <p>Participation in car share scheme or other similar initiatives</p> <p>Be located within a mixed-use development or in an employment precinct</p> <p>Other contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure or services.</p> <p>Other initiatives to reduce usage and/or ownership of motor vehicles</p>
Office	3.5/100m ²	3.5/100m ² (unshared) 3.0/100m ² (shared)	2.0 - 3.0/100m ² (unshared) 2.0 - 2.8/100m ² (shared)	<p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (upper limit)</p> <p>Location in an Activity Centre</p> <p>No more than 200 metres to fixed rail public transport</p> <p>Strict control of on-street parking in surrounding streets</p> <p>Provide the full bicycle and amenities provision as required under Clause 52.34</p> <p>Provision of motor scooter/motorbike parking on site</p>

				<p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (lower limit)</p> <p>Total supply of car parking is pooled or shared (Section 173 agreement)</p> <p>Subsidised public transport</p> <p>Exceed bicycle and amenities provision as required under Clause 52.34</p> <p>Upgrade bus/tram stops or other works to facilitate public transport usage directly applicable to site</p> <p>Participation in car share scheme or other similar initiatives</p> <p>Other initiatives to reduce usage of motor vehicles</p>
Shop				
Specialty Shop	8.0/100m ²	4.0/100m ²	N/A	N/A
Supermarket	8.0/100m ²	4.0/100m ²		
Restaurant	0.6 per seat	0.3 per seat	N/A	N/A

4 OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT OBJECTIVES

4.1 CONTEXT

In the past, the City of Port Phillip and other Local Government Authorities have allowed land use development to proceed with “concessional” rates of parking provision, mainly on the basis that:

- public transport was readily available;
- on-street or public off-street parking was available in the area;
- mixed use efficiencies applied;
- there was a parking “credit” available from a pre-existing use on the land;
- empirical studies showed lower levels of parking provision to be sufficient.

Typically, developers have been able to benefit from such concessions by a reduced need for construction of costly, off-street parking. Some of the construction savings would typically be passed on to purchasers, but often the concessions resulted in windfall gains to developers.

The City of Port Phillip now wants to recoup some of those windfall gains, by linking concessions in parking provision to developer funding of sustainable transport infrastructure or services. This would apply especially to residential and office developments, which meet the necessary pre-conditions set out in Table 3.1. The intention is to use the collected funds to improve the standard of sustainable transport modes in the vicinity of the subject site, sufficiently to ensure a meaningful reduction in car usage (and hence in parking demand).

The initial expectation was that a Parking Precinct Plan would be the appropriate mechanism for such arrangements. However, the Victorian Government has not indicated strong support for that approach.

The following sections set out the other available statutory mechanisms for applying concessional (‘sustainable’) parking provision rates, in exchange for financial contributions from developers as well as achieving the general sustainable transport objectives.

4.2 DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION PLAN OVERLAY

The Victorian Planning Provisions (VPPs) only allow for the planning process (i.e. planning permits) to collect monies or require the provision of works through the implementation of a Development Contribution Plan Overlay. A DCPO can require a contribution in many areas, but typically relates to infrastructure, drainage or car parking provision. This process effectively takes the place of ‘cash in lieu’ car parking requirements, as it was previously known.

The raising of a “special rates” scheme for car parking, which has previously been done in the late 1990’s for Fitzroy Street, falls outside the parameters of the planning process.

Port Phillip will be familiar with the process of a DCPO through the implementation of such a plan in Port Melbourne for public infrastructure works in its former industrial areas. Developments, such as the Envelope Factory and the TEAC site, are subject to these contributions.

A review of all planning schemes within Victoria reveals that 11 Local Government Authorities have implemented DCPO’s. They are:

Casey	Monash
Darebin	Nillumbik
Glen Eira	Port Phillip
Manningham	Whittlesea
Maribyrnong	Wyndham
Maroondah	

The majority of these LGAs and the DCPOs are located in outer suburban growth corridors and seek funds for the implementation of basic infrastructure, such as roads, parks and community centres. The DCPO in Darebin is also for this type of infrastructure, albeit in an established urban setting and is not related to car parking.

The only local government to implement a DCPO related to car parking is the City of Monash, which has a contribution plan for the Glen Waverley Activity Centre. The DCPO seeks to raise \$1.296 million dollars towards a \$2.468 million car park in Bogong Avenue, Glen Waverly for 144 vehicles. The scheme allows for the payment of a \$9,000 contribution per car park (adjusted for CPI) for non-residential spaces in the DCPO area. The DCPO relates to the Glen Waverly Activity Centre Parking Precinct Plan (Sept 03), which also reduces the car parking rates for shop to 4 spaces per 100sqm, restaurant to 0.45 spaces per seat and beauty salon/hairdresser to 6 spaces per 100sqm.

There appears to be no planning reason why a DCPO could not extend to meeting sustainable transport objectives, in particular the collection of funds for the improvement in public infrastructure, such as entrances to light rail, provision of bicycle lanes, better access to shower facilities etc. However, such an approach would require extensive documentation regarding how the money will be collected, how it will be spent, justification of the equity of the collection of funds and of course, a demonstrated need. It is considered that such an alternative is not a viable option for the City of Port Phillip given:

- the high level of research required for such an option to be approved as an amendment to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme;
- the on-going administrative complexity.

Ultimately the collection of funds through a Development Contributions Plan Overlay is not considered to be a viable option for Council. This is consistent with discussions with Council’s legal counsel and the longer term view of the Department of Sustainability and Environment, which is discussed in greater detail in Section 4.7.

4.3 REZONING REQUESTS

As part of the planning scheme amendment process, where Council consent must be obtained to proceed, Council is afforded a significant opportunity to negotiate particular outcomes. Such outcomes could include the provision of funds, construction of works to encourage public transport usage (such as the upgrade of tram or bus stops) or the provision of public bicycle parking facilities. Such requirements can be negotiated and implemented through a Section 173 agreement, largely as a result of the absence of a right of review for rezoning requests.

The rezoning and redevelopment of the Red Bear site in South Melbourne is an example of such negotiation, where the City of Port Phillip was able to negotiate a significant contribution towards sustainable transport initiatives. It would be appropriate that the application of these funds and their implementation in achieving sustainable transport initiatives are publicised to promote the Council's agenda.

Whilst this option is desirable for Council, it would have limited application only given the relatively small number of requests for rezoning. Accordingly, it is not realistically feasible for Council to rely on the planning scheme amendment process for sustainable transport contributions.

4.4 LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Four municipalities in Victoria have car parking policies within their Local Planning Policy Frameworks, being Melbourne, Boroondara, Manningham and Stonnington. Each of these policies are different in the objectives and application.

The **City of Melbourne** has a local policy on the provision of car parking in the Capital City Zone, effectively seeking to discourage commuter parking and give priority to short term parking requirements. This is generally known as the Parking Limitation Policy.

The **City of Stonnington** Parking Policy primarily seeks to increase the supply of parking and provides a framework for the consideration of car parking dispensation. Accordingly, this policy is not considered to be of assistance in this exercise, given the emphasis in Port Phillip is in providing sustainable transport options and reducing dependency on car usage.

The **City of Boroondara** has a detailed local policy (Clause 22.03) that effectively replaces the standard rates in Clause 52.06-6, (although there has been some recent conjecture at VCAT on this point). This policy effectively provides two sets of car parking generation rates for areas either within or outside the Camberwell Junction Policy Area and establishes criteria for the consideration of car parking dispensation. The City of Boroondara does not appear to take a consistent approach in the application of Clause 22.03, and frequently requires greater provision of car parking, particularly in relation to the use of offices. This local policy was based on research undertaken by Ratio in the mid to late 1990s for the City of Boroondara but this work is not incorporated into the Planning Scheme.

The **City of Manningham's** local policy effectively seeks to minimise traffic volumes and encourage use of public transport but does not contain detail on how to achieve these objectives.

None of the planning schemes reviewed had any meaningful reference on how to decrease car usage and car ownership or the increased use of public transport. There were also no policies or references to the diversion of parking investment funds to sustainable transport infrastructure. Accordingly, the development of sustainable transport initiatives by the Port Phillip will be a first in Victoria for the introduction of policies on this subject matter.

Given the ability for local planning policy to be used effectively within the Victorian Planning Provisions to achieve stated objectives, it would be appropriate to explore the introduction of detailed local policies to implement Council's objectives regarding reduced car parking rates and sustainable transport alternatives.

4.5 SCHEDULE TO CLAUSE 52.06-6

Two local government authorities have implemented reduced car parking rates through the Schedule to Clause 52.06-6. This has been done in combination with a Parking Precinct Plan, which has been incorporated in each Planning Scheme.

In the Schedule to Clause 52.06-6 of the **Melbourne** Planning Scheme, a series of car parking rates are established within the Capital City Zone and the Royal Melbourne Showgrounds. These rates, in some instances, prohibit the construction of long term car parking spaces, particularly in the Central Activities District. A Parking Precinct Plan, known as the "Car Parking in the Capital City Zone (May 2002)" is incorporated in the Planning Scheme.

The Schedule to Clause 52.06-6 of the **Manningham** Planning Scheme provides for reduced rates in two areas. For Doncaster Hill, for which a car parking precinct plan has been prepared, this reduces the car parking requirements for this area as follows:

- Office: 2.5 spaces per 100sqm
- Dwelling: 1.1 spaces for one-bedroom and two-bedroom
2.1 spaces for three-bedroom
- Restaurant: 0.36 spaces per seat
- Shop (other than supermarket etc): 4 spaces per 100sqm
- Restricted retail premises: 1.5 spaces per 100sqm

A parking precinct plan is also incorporated into the Manningham Planning Scheme for the Jackson Court Shopping Centre, reducing the standard rate for shop to 2.7 spaces per 100sqm and 0.4 spaces per seat for restaurant.

Both schedules to Clause 52.06-6 involve the incorporation of Parking Precinct Plans into the Planning Scheme. Again we do not recommend this as a viable option at this point in time, given the extensive research required for a parking precinct plan to be approved. The variation of car parking rates in the schedule alone would also not allow for the introduction of assessment criteria against which applications for reduced car parking would be assessed.

4.6 PLANNING PERMIT CONDITIONS

The final option for the implementation of sustainable transport initiatives is to negotiate with developers on a case by case basis as part of the Planning Permit process. There are various examples of frameworks for agreements which could be sought in such negotiations, such as:

- a) Policy Number 3.7.1 of the Town of Vincent (WA) Planning and Building Policy Manual states that a reduction in the number of parking bays required may be considered by the Council where the applicant/developer provides evidence that alternative transport modes will be encouraged and used by employees, clients, and/or customers of the subject development. This evidence must be presented in the form of detailed substantiated report, and include the implementation of initiatives such as discounted public transport tickets, high occupancy vehicle car bays (to encourage car pooling), a shuttle bus or similar service, free/hire bicycles, or similar schemes. The number of car bays discounted is at the discretion of the Council.
- b) Darebin City Council has recently issued its “Guidelines for the Application and Implementation of Travel Plans for New Development in Darebin”.
- c) The Department of Infrastructure/Department of Sustainability and Environment has recently issued a Practice Note relating to Integrated Transport Plans for Major Developments.
- d) The recent use of Green Travel Plans as planning permit requirements in the City of Melbourne for significant car parking reductions outside the CAD.

Negotiating Planning Permit conditions is unlikely to be a viable alternative on its own as conditions on permits (or Notices of Decision), such as those requiring monetary contributions or substantial works are likely to be voided at VCAT if appealed.

4.7 CAR PARKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Victorian Government has established an Advisory Committee on parking. This Committee is a response to the State Government initiative on cutting red tape in planning and seeks to review the car parking provisions within the planning scheme, including implementing the recommendations on the integration of Melbourne 2030 policy objectives and streamlining the current parking provisions.

In line with current thinking, it is likely that this review will seek to:

- Review the car parking rates in Clause 52.06, potentially with the introduction of maximum car parking rates in certain circumstances
- Bring sustainable transport to the forefront of the planning system, including the encouragement of alternative modes of transport
- Seek to review the car parking precinct plan process, to make it more accessible for local government, including the collection of funds and integrate the ability to seek cash in lieu donations to be spent on alternative transport measures

- Introduce a mechanism to recognise the role of Green Travel Plans in reducing dependency on motor vehicles

It is likely that the work undertaken by the advisory committee will take several years to come to fruition and be part of the Victorian Planning Provisions. The draft report of the Advisory Committee is likely to be made available for public comment in the end of March 2007. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the City of Port Phillip to continue its own work on sustainable transport and reduced car parking criteria.

However, Council should seek to take advantage of the potentially new and less onerous requirements for the collection of funds to support its sustainable transport objectives if and when the recommendations of the Car Parking Advisory Committee are implemented.

4.8 OPTIONS

The City of Port Phillip has four options:

- (d) Wait for the outcomes of the State Government Advisory Committee on car parking and then take action once the recommendations are known;
- (e) Introduce a Development Contributions Plan Overlay, which would also require work akin to a Parking Precinct Plan to satisfy the tests of need, nexus, accountability and equity. This DCPO would seek to collect monies for the implementation of sustainable transport initiatives for applications that require a dispensation in car parking;
- (f) Introduce a schedule to Clause 52.06-6, which may require a Parking Precinct Plan. However, preliminary discussions with DSE indicate that other strategic work may be appropriate for the Minister to support the schedule. However, such an option would not allow for the implementation of sustainable transport initiatives beyond reducing the standard car parking requirements; and
- (g) Introduce a Local Policy (as per the City of Boroondara) specifying amongst other matters, revised car parking rates and detailed criteria that would enable the reduction in car parking. This could include decision guidelines that would further Council's objectives, such as contributions to sustainable transport in specific circumstances.

The recommended option, at least initially, is to proceed with a Local Planning Policy; a draft of such a policy is provided at Appendix D.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The City of Port Phillip, both its Council and the community, have a strong commitment to more sustainable transport. To complement the various transport strategies already in place, Council should now incorporate its Sustainable Transport Framework in the Port Phillip Planning Scheme:

- as principles in the Municipal Strategic Statement;
- as Local Policy for specific geographic areas (e.g. Activity Centres);

“Sustainable” transport is the movement of people by modes which have a low level of environmental impact, particularly carpooling, using public transport, cycling or walking. In areas such as Port Phillip, the greatest potential for a move to more sustainable transport is to persuade office workers to commute by sustainable modes, rather than as drivers of private cars.

The Port Phillip Planning Scheme has excessive requirements for car parking for new developments. A series of surveys for key land uses determined that actual (empirical) parking demand rates are generally lower than those set out in Clause 52.06; in the case of shops and restaurants, the empirical rates are about half the Planning Scheme rates. Applying these lower rates to future applications for Planning Permits will prevent excessive provision of car parking and hence excessive promotion of private car ownership and use.

Further reductions in parking provision rates should also be permitted, especially for selected residential and office developments, so as to restrain the level of reliance on private cars for the dominant home-to-office commuting behaviour. Conditions which would need to be met for developments to qualify for this lower “sustainable” parking rate would be:

- location within, or close to an Activity Centre;
- close proximity (maximum 200 metre walk) to fixed rail or other convenient/accessible/high frequency public transport;
- strict control and enforcement of adjacent on-street parking to prevent overspill;
- generous provision of bicycles, motor-scooter or other “sustainable” transport facilities;
- for residential dwellings, to have small and/or affordable floor areas and be within 400 metres walk of a supermarket;
- other contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure or services.

The households in Port Phillip least likely to own cars are those occupied by low income families, sole-parents or single persons. Allowing a proportion of new residential dwellings to be developed without off-street parking, with associated reductions in accommodation costs, will also assist in maximising overall housing choice and affordability.

The minimum sustainable parking provision rates in such situations would be:

- zero parking for one-bedroom and two-bedroom dwellings;
- one parking space for three-bedroom or larger dwellings;
- 2.0 spaces per 100 square metres floor area for offices and shops;
- zero parking for restaurants involving a change of use.

In consideration for agreement by Council to apply the “sustainable” parking provisions rates to selected residential and office developments, Council would require developer contributions to provide or improve sustainable transport infrastructure or services. There are five ways in which collection of such funds could be formalised:

- by establishing a Development Contribution Plan Overlay to the subject site; this procedure is technically and administratively very complex;
- by negotiating contributions as part of land rezoning requests; this is relatively simple, but can only be applied in the (relatively few) situations when land rezoning is actually required to facilitate development;
- by formulating and applying a Local Planning Policy;
- by preparing a special schedule to Clause 52.06 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme, as part of a Parking Precinct Plan;
- by imposing conditions in Planning Permits; such conditions would be subject to review by VCAT.

Council should liaise closely with Officers of the Department of Sustainability and Environment to establish which of the above options is the most likely to be effective, and supported by the Victorian Government. Initial indications are that preparing a Local Policy, of the type set out in Appendix E, would be the most effective.

Appendix A. Questionnaire for 2007 Parking Survey



2 February, 2007

Our Ref. 7139#Survey Letter 02.02.07/AC:ac

The Occupier

Error! MergeField was not found in header record of data source. / Error! MergeField was not found in header record of data source.

Error! MergeField was not found in header record of data source. VIC Error! MergeField was not found in header record of data source.

City of Port Phillip Sustainable Transport & Parking Study

In recent years the City of Port Phillip has approved many residential apartment developments on the condition that their owners/occupants will not be issued with Council parking permits. The reason for this is that Council recognises the shortage of on-street parking in many areas, and considers that existing residents should have priority in using it, over owners/occupants of new apartments.

Council is expecting that owners/occupants of new apartments will increasingly adopt "sustainable" transport modes, that is walking, cycling and public transport, so will need less car parking. To test this expectation, Council has appointed Ratio Consultants to survey owners/occupants of recent apartment developments who do not have Council parking permits, in relation to their car ownership and parking behaviour.

Your apartment has been selected as suitable for survey.

The survey involves a short questionnaire for you to complete (please turn over). Enclosed is a post-paid envelope for the completed survey form.

All data collected will be kept strictly confidential.

For more information you can contact Paul Smith from the City of Port Phillip on 9209 6450 (PSMITH@portphillip.vic.gov.au) or Russell Symons from Ratio Consultants on 9429 3111 (russells@ratio.com.au).

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'N R Symons'.

N R Symons
Director
Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd

on behalf of the City of Port Phillip

Appendix B. Office Parking Demand Survey Questionnaire

Car Parking Demand

Name

Address

Survey Questionnaire

1. What is the total floor area of the offices which your company, (and associated companies if relevant), occupies at the above address (include all floor levels)?

..... square metres

2. How many staff are typically on-site in the office floor area from 1) above?

..... staff

3. How many of the staff from 2) above regularly drive a car to work and park at/near your office building?

..... staff drivers

4. What is the most number of visitors you would have on-site at anyone time?

..... visitors

5. How many of the visitors from 4) above would you estimate to drive a car when they visit your office?

..... visitor drivers

Please send this completed questionnaire by fax to Russell Symons at Ratio Consultants on 9429 3011. Receipt by end of October would be appreciated. Thank you for your assistance.

N R Symons, Ratio Consultants

#7139

Appendix C. Port Phillip Planning Scheme Clause 12.08

- Incorporating water-sensitive urban design techniques into developments to:
 - Protect and enhance natural water systems.
 - Integrate stormwater treatment into the landscape.
 - Protect quality of water.
 - Reduce run-off and peak flows.
 - Minimise drainage and infrastructure costs.

Groundwater

Protect groundwater and land resources by:

- Preventing the establishment of incompatible land uses in aquifer recharge or saline discharge areas and in potable water catchments.
- Encouraging the siting, design, operation and rehabilitation of landfills to reduce impact on groundwater and surface water.

Air quality

Ensure that land-use and transport planning and infrastructure provision contribute to improved air quality by:

- Integrating transport and land-use planning to improve transport accessibility and connections.
- Locating key developments that generate high volumes of trips in Principal and Major Activity Centres.
- Providing infrastructure for public transport, walking and cycling.

Native habitat and biodiversity

Protect native habitat and areas of important biodiversity through appropriate land-use planning by:

- Developing regional catchment strategies to guide Landcare projects, local landscape plans and whole farm plans.
- Development native vegetation management plans to achieve a net gain in native vegetation by improving and creating habitats.
- Protecting critically important flora and fauna habitat and important landscapes such as the coastal areas, the Dandenong and Yarra Ranges, the Yarra Valley, Western Port and the Mornington Peninsula.

12.08 Better transport links

12.08-1 Objective

To create a more sustainable transport system by integrating land-use and transport.

12.08-2 Strategies

Principal Public Transport Network

Upgrade and develop the Principal Public Transport Network and local public transport services to connect activity centres and link Melbourne to the regional cities by:

- Establishing fast train services that serve key regional cities and townships and connect them with Principal and Major Activity Centres along the radial routes leading to Central Melbourne.

- Improving connections to Principal and Major Activity Centres that are not adequately serviced by the Principal Public Transport Network and public transport services and interchanges at stand alone shopping centres.
- Ensuring new activity centres are connected to the Principal Public Transport Network as they develop.
- Identifying key strategic transport corridors capable of providing fast, reliable and frequent public transport services.
- Supporting the Principal Public Transport Network with a comprehensive network of local public transport services.
- Designing local bus services to meet the need for local travel as well as providing for connections to the Principal Public Transport Network.
- Achieving greater use of public transport by increasing densities, maximizing the use of existing infrastructure and improving the viability of the public transport operation.

Improve the operation of the existing public transport network with faster, more reliable and efficient on-road and rail public transport by:

- Improving the movement, efficiency and reliability of the road-based public transport by road-space management measures including transit lanes, clearways, traffic-light prioritisation and stop design.
- Improving the rail network by identifying and treating rail 'red spots' and expanding rail corridor speed and loading capacities.

Transport planning

Plan urban development to make jobs and community services more accessible by:

- Coordinating improvements to public transport, walking and cycling networks with the ongoing development and redevelopment of the urban area.
- Concentrating key trip generators such as higher density residential development and Principal, Major and Specialised Activity Centres on the Principal Public Transport Network.
- Requiring integrated transport plans to be prepared for all new major residential, commercial and industrial developments.
- Providing routing, bus stop and interchange arrangement for public transport services in new development areas.
- Providing safe pedestrian and cycling access to activity centres, public transport interchanges and other strategic redevelopment sites.

Coordinate development of all transport modes to provide a comprehensive transport system by:

- Requiring transport system management plans for key transport corridors and for major investment proposals.
- Reserving land for strategic transport infrastructure.
- Incorporating the provision of public transport and cycling infrastructure in all major new State and local government road projects.

Review transport practices, including design, construction and management, to reduce environmental impacts by:

- Careful selection of sites for freight generating facilities to minimise associated operational and transport impacts to other urban development and transport networks.

Road network

Manage the road system to achieve integration, choice and balance by developing an efficient and safe network and making the most of existing infrastructure by:

- Making better use of roads for all road uses through such techniques as the provision of wider footpaths, bicycle lanes, transit lanes (for buses and taxis) and specific freight routes.
- Selectively expanding and upgrading the road network to provide for:
 - High-quality connections between regional cities.
 - Upgrading of key freight routes.
 - Ongoing development in outer suburban areas.
 - Higher standards of on-road public transport.
 - Improved key cross-town arterial links in the outer suburbs.
- Improving road networks where public transport is not viable, and where the road development is compatible with the Neighbourhood Principles and urban design objectives.
- Improving roads in developing outer-suburban areas to cater for car, public transport, and freight, commercial and service users.
- Improving the management of key freight routes to make freight operations more efficient while reducing their external impacts.
- Ensuring that road space complements land use and is managed to meet community and business needs.
- Upgrading major arterial road links from Metropolitan Melbourne to regional cities.

Walking and cycling

Give more priority to walking and cycling in planning urban development and in managing the road system and neighbourhood by:

- Ensuring Neighbourhood Activity Centres are located within convenient walking distance in the design of new subdivisions.
- Encouraging the use of walking and cycling by creating environments that are safe and attractive.
- Developing high quality pedestrian environments that are accessible to footpath-bound vehicles such as wheelchairs, prams and scooters.
- Developing local cycling networks and new cycling facilities that link to and complement the metropolitan-wide network of bicycle routes – the Principal Bicycle Network.
- Providing improved facilities, particularly storage, for cyclists at public transport interchanges and rail stations.
- Providing bicycle end of trip facilities in commercial buildings.

Promote the use of sustainable personal transport options by:

- Ensuring development provides opportunities to create more sustainable transport options such as walking, cycling and public transport.

12.09 Geographic strategies

Decision making by planning and responsible authorities must have regard to the following incorporated document:

- Activity Centres and Principal Public Transport Network Plan, 2003

and the following reference documents (as relevant):

- Melbourne 2030 – Planning for Sustainable Growth (Department of Infrastructure 2002)
- Upper Yarra Valley and Dandenong Ranges Region – Regional Strategy Plan (1996)
- Port Phillip and Westernport Regional Catchment Strategy (Port Phillip Regional Catchment and Land Protection Board, 1997)
- Victorian Coastal Strategy (Victorian Coastal Council 2002)

Appendix D. Draft Planning Policy

22.12 CAR PARKING AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

This policy applies to all applications for the dispensation of car parking under Clause 52.06, Clause 55 and/or the dispensation of bicycle facilities under Clause 52.34 of the Planning Scheme.

22.12-1 Policy Basis

- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 12.01) which seeks to improve access by walking, cycling, public transport to services and facilities, improve environmental performance.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 12.05) which supports initiatives that provide for safer walking and cycling routes and improved safety for people using public transport.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 12.08)) which seeks to create more sustainable transport and maximize usage of existing public transport infrastructure.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 14.02-2) which seeks to ensure local area planning assists and complements transport systems.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 17.01-2) which seeks to provide good accessibility by all available modes of public transport (particularly public transport) and safe pedestrian and cycling routes.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 18.01-2), which seeks to facilitate pedestrian access to public transport.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 18.02), which seeks to ensure access is provided to development, based on all modes of public transports, using forecast demand and minimizing impacts on existing transport networks and the amenity of surrounding areas.
- State Planning Policy Framework (Clause 18.03), which seeks to integrate bicycle travel with land use and development planning and encourage cycling as an alternative mode of travel.
- City of Port Phillip MSS (Clause 21.03), which recognizes the demand for on-street car parking throughout the municipality and traffic congestion.
- City of Port Phillip MSS (Clause 21.05), which emphasizes the importance of public transport and other alternative forms of transport and the need to maintain and enhance public and private infrastructure.
- City Plan 2005, which identifies current and potential transport and access projects within the City of Port Phillip.

- Parking Plan Towards 2010, which seeks to reduce the impact of cars on the local community and environment and to develop specified parking rates for new development by neighbourhood to include opportunities for reduced car use.

22.12-2 Objectives

To encourage greater use of “sustainable” transport modes, that is walking, cycling, public transport and car pooling, with an associated reduction in private motor vehicle dependence.

To encourage the provision of adequate infrastructure and services for sustainable transport modes, ensuring users are well informed of these services and facilities.

To establish sustainable car parking rates within Activity Centres, recognizing the availability and usability of alternative transport modes, including improvements to private and public transport infrastructure and transport services.

To encourage the provision of bicycle spaces and amenities for cyclists in accordance with the requirements of Clause 52.34, recognising that where dispensations in car parking are sought, such facilities should be provided in excess of these requirements.

22.12-3 Policy

General

It is policy to:

- Encourage greater use of sustainable modes of transport, such as walking, cycling, public transport and car pooling, for new development, so as to achieve greater mobility and safety for the community and positive outcomes for the environment.
- Encourage a reduction in private motor vehicle dependence for new uses and development.
- Encourage the provision of adequate infrastructure and services for sustainable transport modes.
- Ensure users are well informed of sustainable forms of transport, services and facilities.
- Require the provision of car parking in accordance with the attached table.
- Recognise the capacity for reduced car parking for residential, office, shop and restaurant uses in instances where a number of criteria are met, such as:
 - sites are within a short walking distance (200 metres) of fixed rail;
 - sites are located within Activity Centres or are areas immediately adjacent to Activity Centres (within 200 metres);
 - there is provision of bicycle parking for all users, including the provision of on-site lockers and showers;

- the topography is well suited to walking and cycling;
 - for residential development, there is good access to retail and community facilities (with a preference for sites to be within 400 metres walking distance of a supermarket); and
 - where initiatives are undertaken to reduce the reliance on motor vehicle usage.
- Ensure existing and future residents are aware of Council's Local Law which will not issue residential or visitor parking permits for new residential developments.
 - Any requests for a dispensation of car parking are accompanied by a detailed car parking analysis, prepared by a qualified Traffic Engineer. Such reports must demonstrate:
 - justification of the lower than Empirical Rate of on-site parking contained within the table to this Clause;
 - any way in which the utilisation of alternative transports modes is encouraged by the development, including contributions to infrastructure and public awareness;
 - that the planning objectives of this clause can be met on a continuing basis.
 - Council may consider the payment of cash in lieu of the provision of car parking in situations where there is a strategy for the provision of off-street public parking or the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure or services.
 - Require the provisions of Clause 52.34 are met except for in exceptional circumstances. Where sustainable car parking rates are sought to be applied, bicycle parking and amenities should be provided in excess of the requirements of this clause.

Decision Guidelines

- In applying the upper limit for the sustainable (reduced) car parking rate, the ability of a use and/or development to meet all of the conditions.
- In applying a sustainable (reduced) car parking rate that is less than the upper limit (but not lower than the lowest limit), the ability of a use and/or development to meet the additional conditions. The lower the sustainable rate of car parking, the greater the onus placed on the proposal to demonstrate a real and substantive reduction in car ownership and usage.
- Whether the development will make a real and substantive contribution to reducing private vehicle usage?

- Whether the dispensation in car parking will increase usage of sustainable forms of transport, such as walking, cycling, public transport and car pooling.
- Whether the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the proposal will not increase demand for on-street parking and will meet the needs of future residents/employees/customers.
- Whether the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure or services, in lieu of on-site provision of car parking, will be effective in reducing private vehicle usage and parking demand.

22.12-4 Policy references

Integrated Transport Strategy Nov 1998

City of Port Phillip Parking Plan, Towards 2010

City of Port Phillip Cycle Plan 2005-2010

City of Port Phillip Walk Plan 2005-2010

City of Port Phillip Public Transport Strategy 2002

City of Port Phillip Road User Safety Strategy 2002-2007

Ratio Discussion Paper (or similar)

Table 1 Clause 22.12

Land Use	Empirical Rate (spaces)	Sustainable (Reduced) Rate (spaces)	Necessary Conditions for Sustainable Rate
<p>Dwelling</p> <p>1 or 2 bedroom</p> <p>3 bedroom</p>	<p>1 each</p> <p>2 each</p>	<p>0 - 0.8 each</p> <p>1 each</p>	<p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (upper limit)</p> <p>Within or no more than 200 metres walk to edge of an Activity Centre</p> <p>No more than 200 metres to fixed rail public transport</p> <p>No more than 400 metres to supermarket</p> <p>Strict control of on-street parking in surrounding streets</p> <p>No Resident Permits for future owner/occupants.</p> <p>Provision of motor scooter/motorbike parking on site</p> <p>Small dwellings only</p> <p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (lower limit)</p> <p>Participation in car share scheme or other similar initiatives</p> <p>Be located within a mixed-use development or in an employment precinct</p> <p>Other contributions to sustainable transport infrastructure or services.</p> <p>Other initiatives to reduce usage and/or ownership of motor vehicles</p>
Office	<p>3.5/100m² (unshared)</p> <p>3.0/100m² (shared)</p>	<p>2.0 - 3.0/100m² (unshared)</p> <p>2.0 - 2.8/100m² (shared)</p>	<p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (upper limit)</p> <p>Location in an Activity Centre</p> <p>No more than 200 metres to fixed rail public transport</p> <p>Strict control of on-street parking in surrounding streets</p> <p>Provide the full bicycle and amenities provision as required under Clause 52.34</p>

			<p>Provision of motor scooter/motorbike parking on site</p> <p>Requirements to obtain sustainable rate (lower limit)</p> <p>Total supply of car parking is pooled or shared (Section 173 agreement)</p> <p>Subsidised public transport</p> <p>Exceed bicycle and amenities provision as required under Clause 52.34</p> <p>Upgrade bus/tram stops or other works to facilitate public transport usage directly applicable to site</p> <p>Participation in car share scheme or other similar initiatives</p> <p>Other initiatives to reduce usage of motor vehicles</p>
Shop			
Specialty Shop	4.0/100m ²	N/A	N/A
Supermarket	4.0/100m ²		
Restaurant	0.3 per seat	N/A	N/A