

MINUTES

Stakeholder Meeting - RMS Permit Parking Guidelines

**Northern Beaches Council
RMS
Manly Community Groups
Business Chamber**

held at Manly Town Hall on

FRIDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2019

ATTENDANCE:

Northern Beaches Council

Craig Sawyer	Executive Manager, Transport & Assets
Claudia Brodtke	Operations Support Officer (Minutes)
Michelle Carter	Strategic Transport Coordinator
Nikki Griffith	Manager Place & Economic Development
Patrick Bastawrous	Traffic Engineering Coordinator
Phil Devon	Manager Transport Network
Trish Chaney	Community Liaison Coordinator
Emily Carson	Manager – Parking Operations and Community Transport
Laura Kelly	Manly Mainstreet Coordinator

Roads and Maritime Service

Peter Carruthers
Dean Simmonds

Manly Business Chamber

Christina Franze
Stephen Pirovic

Manly Community Forum

Doug Carruthers
Cathy Griffin
Kandy Tagg
Janne Seletto

Greater Manly Residents Forum

Denise Keen	Chair
Nick Reid	Co-Chair and Treasurer
Sandy Hudspith	Committee Member
Nicolle Tessier	Committee Member

Families for Manly

Nicole Tessier

Meeting Start Time: 10am

1. Welcome and Housekeeping

Phil Devon thanked all of the attendees for coming to the meeting and provided an overview of the Emergency Evacuation Procedures.

2. Introduction of Attendees

Attendees introduced themselves as follows; Phil Devon (Northern Beaches Council), Emily Carson (Northern Beaches Council), Christina Franze (Manly Business Chamber), Stephen Pirovic (Manly Business Chamber), Patrick Bastawrous (Northern Beaches Council), Nikki Griffith (Northern Beaches Council), Laura Kelly (Northern Beaches Council), Nicole Tessier (Greater Manly Residents Forum and Families for Manly), Sandy Husdpith (Greater Manly Residents Forum), Denise Keen (Greater Manly Residents Forum), Nick Reid (Greater Manly Residents Forum), Peter Carruthers (Roads and Maritime Service), Dean Simmonds (Roads and Maritime Service), Trish Chaney (Northern Beaches Council), Janne Seletto (Manly Community Forum), Kandy Tagg (Manly Community Forum), Doug Carruthers (Manly Community Forum), Michelle Carter (Northern Beaches Council), James Brocklebank (Northern Beaches Council), Cathy Griffin (Manly Community Forum), Claudia Brodtke (Northern Beaches Council).

3. Northern Beaches Council

A. Why We Are Here Today

Phil Devon outlined the following on from the previous drop-ins, this meeting of Council, Community Groups and the RMS was arranged so that the RMS are able to explain more about the mandatory guidelines of the project and why we are here today in this predicament – where we have schemes operating within Manly which are not in line with the RMS Guidelines and in what direction we are heading as part of the Project.

B. Process of the Meeting

Phil Devon stated that the agenda would be followed starting with Peter and Dean from the RMS, following the agenda through. He notes that there would be limited time for questions during this process but that there would be an open discussion at the end once everyone had a chance to state their position. He also noted that whilst it is a passionate issue, that it should be kept professional.

Michelle Carter noted that an opportunity for Nicole Tessier to speak on behalf of Families for Manly would be added to the Agenda as Item 8.

4. Roads and Maritime Services

Dean Simmonds stated that Permit Parking Scheme are delegated to Council through the Traffic Committee – that these go through the Traffic Committee and are approved by the Traffic Committee, including RMS's vote.

He outlines that in order to look at a scheme, the total number of spaces are evaluated. Council is to undertake a survey to understand how many parking spaces are in the locality and then report back with a set number of on street spaces. Theoretically the guidelines are to not issue more permits than there are parking spaces e.g. 1000 parking spaces with 2000 parking permits doesn't work as there are more people trying to park than there are spaces available.

The guidelines leave the assessment and eligibility process to Council and RMS are happy to go with what Council recommend as they know the Community and the area. In a nutshell the way parking permits in NSW work is that any Council will come to RMS and some may say there are 1000 spots and 1050 permits and we are happy to accept that, but giving out 5000 permits for example in this case RMS will not agree with as the system will fall down and not achieve the intent of the parking permit scheme – that is to provide residents with parking near their houses.

An attendee questioned if RMS sets the two permit per house limit. RMS stated that this is up to Council – the RMS deal with different Councils across Sydney and the key is the number of spaces to the number of permits – it is left up to Council to assess the number of passes and eligibility criteria. The RMS can provide guidelines however the key criteria is matching up the number of spots with the number of permits.

5. Manly Business Chamber

Christina Franze spoke about how, as a business owner, there is a requirement to come and go daily to your business e.g. to accommodate for peak hours, to train staff, to meet tradespeople etc. She stated that it is difficult to run a business in Manly due to the high rent and limited parking. She questioned of Northern Beaches Council what the criteria for running a business in Manly is and stated that the businesses of Manly require a parking scheme. She stated that businesses have been piggy backing of the residential scheme, and that changes need to be made. She stated that she herself doesn't live in Manly and she rides her bike to work or catches the Hop, Skip and Jump bus – she stated that this is a common situation for a number of business owners who work long hours and catch public transport to work as there are no parking spaces in Manly – and that business owners would love to have a parking scheme. She stated that there are a lot of great businesses who have sacrificed a lot for their successes – and that they all want an opportunity to continue to run excellent small businesses in Manly.

Kandy Tagg of the Manly Community Forum added that non-profit organisations in the Manly area have the same issue.

6. Manly Community Forum

Cathy Griffin thanked Christina for her talk, and stated it was great to hear of the use of bike and public transport – and commended Council for retaining the Hop, Skip and Jump bus service. She also stated that there are thousands of variations for why and who should get the permits and how it should be conducted. She stated that there are currently 11,500 permits issued for 3000 parking spaces – and wanted to understand how many residences there are who are eligible for these car spaces. It has been stated by NBC that 14% of residences take up the current three permits.

She continued to state that the RMS are here to provide advice, that they have mandatory guidelines but it is up to Council to propose a scheme to the Local Traffic Committee for voting which suits the particular areas in Manly – there are variation across Waverly and North Sydney which are pretty much the same – where permits are issued to cars which are registered to the premises, with room to move with how many permits are able to be obtained.

Cathy Griffin stated that the biggest sticking point is the visitor pass permit – she suggests that the scratchy system is unacceptable as there is an unacceptable number of scratchies (20) allowed and that this will be an administrative burden – she also questions why it should be the onus of the resident to collect the scratchies. She stated that she has the majority support, however, is dissented by Doug Carruthers (also of Manly Community Forum) in believing that the third permit should be issued attached to the household – and that these permits should be entitled to non-car owners. She also states that she believes that if this third 'visitor pass' is attached to a premise or residence that this will restrict the ability for sale.

She also asked for clarification stating that she today has driven from Seaforth to Manly – and has seen a lot of car spaces available – and asks if Council has done a study and seen how many cars with passes are parked on the road and how many are vacant on any one day or over a period of time.

She also states that everyone agrees that number plates should be attached to the passes.

Kandy Tagg states that it is not just about the number of vehicles, it's about exemptions – stating that Manly is a highly populated area which is an entertainment prescient, a transport hub and Destination Manly. She states that it doesn't make sense to keep squeezing residents out of Manly.

Cathy Griffin questions how many permits are issued to designated organisations such as the Skiff Club and the Yacht Club.

Doug Carruthers states that there are 800.

Cathy Griffin states that these are transferrable – stating they can be used five days a week when for example Sailability operates on a Wednesday so they should only have 8 passes to use on Wednesday.

Doug Carruthers states that this is addressed in the Draft Framework.

Cathy Griffin states the new framework means that there will be no boat and trailers in the Permit Areas which she believes is a good thing.

Doug Carruthers introduces himself and states his long-term twelve-year involvement with the Manly Community Forum as well as his engineering background. He states that he sees a practical approach – that the RMS guidelines states that Council have flexibility in setting up parking schemes- that the RMS will provide advice but if Councils do propose to employ a scheme it must comply with the guidelines. It also states that the authorities have discretion over the total number of permits issued and how they distribute these permits – noting that the number of permits should not exceed the number of available spaces – and that where the number of requests exceeds the number of permits only residents who do not have access to non-restricted kerb side parking can apply. A more lenient approach is in the Guidelines also which provide Council with the flexibility to issue more permits than spaces – that Council can issue multiple permits to a household. He also states that adding the registration number to the passes will eliminate the on-selling of these. He states that he is pleased that in some extenuating circumstances that three permits may be issued. He also states that he believes that three one week permits for tradesmen is not enough – asking if perhaps three could be issued for the DA with the expected length of building works.

7. Greater Manly Residents Forum

Nick Reid states that this started with the RMS sending Council a letter stating that they must comply with the Parking Scheme Guidelines, but that the RMS have just said that the guidelines are not mandatory. He stated that Council have stated that they have no room to move from these guidelines and that these guidelines must be enforced.

He states that he supports the communicated goal of the process – and the eradicating the black market will solve many problems.

He states that regarding retrospective legislation, this scheme does not work – that there will be significant ramifications – in relation to rates payable vs amenity received. He states that people who have spent less, and not developed their property of who is tenant in a boarding house will have more amenity than those who have constructed off street parking and that this is discriminatory against families. He also states that the proposed visitors parking permit is against the Council's Social Inclusion Policy.

He continues by stating that the proposed parking scheme is also anti-property – as it will result in a negative effect on property values and cause mortgage stress; as mortgages are revalued every 18 months and that if the amenity has changed the mortgage goes up.

He states that Manly is unique - a one size fits all will not work – properties were constructed 80 to 100 years ago when there were smaller streets and smaller cars. He states that the existing scheme which was bough in prior to these mandatory guidelines has been poorly administered which has created the black market – particularly through the removal of registration numbers. He also states that Council's assessment of parking is erroneous and questions how Council have come up with the off-street number.

He also thanks RMS for their clarification and states that Council have misinterpreted the letter received from RMS – and requests a copy of the letter. He also states that what RMS have clarified is crucial – that the guidelines are not mandatory.

Cathy Griffiths notes that we do need to come up with a scheme which will need to go to the Local Traffic Committee which is RMS is on and that they will need to approve.

8. Families for Manly

Nicolle Tessier stated that Families for Manly are disappointed with the overall process thus far and that the majority of residents under the current scheme have been happy with the only complaint being the removal of registration numbers from the stickers, and administrative error which has created the black market which Council is unable to police. She also states that she has a complaint to make that when the Councils merged and the on-street beach parking was changed that everybody on the Peninsula was able to park on the beach – initially just for four hours which was fine – but when the registration number was taken off the parking stickers, people can park in Isthmus all day long as long as they remove their car once.

She also states that in specific areas such as Little Manly, Tower Hill and Isthmus there are issues with parking – but in other areas the system is working beautifully and residents think that it is fair and that the majority of residents do not use the visitor pass on a regular basis.

She stated that Families for Manly oppose the Draft Framework on many fronts, and that a petition she has created has already received 200 signatures opposing the changes – and that most people did not understand the Draft Framework until she gave them information. She continues to state that the Draft Framework is discriminatory against families and fails the fairness test. She also states that for the tradesmen passes it is very rare to get written contract these days. She also agrees that the proposed 20 visitor passes are against the Council's Social Inclusion Policy – and states it is insulting the Council have offered and additional 10 passes over Christmas time.

She also states that the Draft Framework negatively impacts on the property value and that lawyers are currently looking into the legal implications related to retrospective changes of property use. She also states that the changes don't reflect the feedback of residents and that what was endorsed by Council doesn't match what the community has been told during the Consultation Period. She is also disappointed because Council have stated that these guidelines are mandatory with no leeway – but that the RMS Guidelines state that the Parking Permit scheme needs to be balanced with community needs – which gives the opportunity to provide a long term visitor pass rather than the scratchy system.

She also raised concerns about the cost of the stickers, stating that \$47 for the first permit seems excessive for cost recovery. She states that consultation was not needed for a Parking Permit scheme, that long term visitor parking with the street address on it will manage the black market – as requests that Council doesn't punish working families who put money into constructing off street parking – taking the pressure off the street – requests Council doesn't now take the parking off those residents.

9. General Discussion and opportunity for questions

Cathy Griffin states that for a house with adult children to compete with a boarding house which is allowed one pass per room is not equitable and that everyone should have equitable access to the public space. She states that the system changes upon amalgamation, and the removal of registration number is when the problems begun.

Janne Seletto questioned how much flexibility was in the guidelines.

Peter Carruthers stated that the flexibility is in place to assist with designing a scheme – and that what is important is to keep in mind the intention of the scheme – e.g. that there are equal spaces for permits. For example, double the number of permits would not be allowed, but after the original issuing permits for spaces, following a parking visibility check on several days, there is capacity to come back to the RMS to ask for an increase.

Nicole Tessier questions if it is correct that the RMS mandate that Council consider the off-street parking.

Peter Carruthers states that this component of the guideline is not mandatory and that there is flexibility to work within the scheme to come up with way of approaching an equitable solution.

Nicole Tessier questions why the community has been misled.

Phil Devon states that the definition is mandatory guidelines which are based on an approval process – that if Council proposed and RMS don't agree it will be taken to the Regional Traffic Committee.

Nicole Tessier questions if it is mandatory in relation to reducing permits.

Phil Devon states that Council is moving towards a compliant scheme.

Nicole Tessier questions that she has asked this question in past weeks and been told repeatedly that Council don't have leeway – and that many residents have been told this. She is disappointed as what is mandatory is bringing the system in line with the parking spaces and permit and that the community shouldn't have been led to believe that the off-street parking and limit of two permits per house was mandatory - from prior meetings everyone walked away feeling confused and couldn't bring guidelines and framework together.

Peter Carruthers states that it is mandatory to get approval for existing and current schemes and that in defence of Council the proposed scheme must apply to the RMS Guidelines and that the RMS haven't articulated well enough that the spaces per permits are the guidelines.

Kandy Tagg states that Manly is a unique area that didn't have enough spaces to begin with, that the guidelines are an oxymoron and that the RMS have over thirty Council to deal with that they are tarring Manly with the same brush.

Peter Carruthers states that the guidelines are a flexible solution.

Cathy Griffin states that without exception everyone has said that the old scheme suited and worked and that Manly have unique circumstances and that Parking Scheme shouldn't have to be the same across all of the Local Government Area – and states that the framework is word for word the City of Sydney's parking scheme – and that Manly needs it's own system that suits it – and that the community all agrees that's how they want the scheme managed – and that this will reduce the black market dramatically.

Sandy Hudspith states that what needs to be legally tested is what is a guideline and what is a standard – stating that from the Guidelines that parking authorities, Councils and declared authorities are under no obligation to establish parking schemes in areas of operations, and that if they do propose to have a permit scheme they must comply with the RMS guidelines – Manly's is already established so why is there a need to change it – just administer the current scheme properly.

Nicole Tessier questions if it is correct that the guidelines are mandatory for classified roads and advisory for local roads.

Dean Simmonds states that is correct – due to the different approval classified roads are RMS and local is Council but this must go through to Traffic Committee that RMS sits on.

Janne Seletto states that visitors shouldn't be treated the same as the other – with raw number of permits versus the spaces – and that this is not fair as visitors are not day in day out. She states it is important that visitor parking is not considered in the same way, as Manly do not have any spaces and the visitor parking permits may get used only five times a year.

Dean Simmonds questions how you can be sure that they are visitor parking permits and are not being used as additions for someone to park every day.

Janne Seletto asks if there is any possibility.

Dean Simmonds states that they will ask how to administer and enforce that.

Phil Devon states that was a key difference and the driver in-between.

Cathy Griffin states that 14% of the properties take three passes – that not everybody is taking advantage of the entire system and taking three – there is no assumptions, but this reduces the number dramatically – questions who is actually using the passes.

Kandy Tagg asks how many people at the meeting have three and how many of these people use it all the time.

Nicole Tessier states she only uses her third pass for visitors and Cathy Griffin states she also uses hers for family members.

Denise Keen states that the scheme worked extremely well previously and that when it was being administered correctly and was policed it was fair and equitable - and that the scheme now doesn't affect her as so no longer resides in Manly – however looking at what is proposed it is wrong and unequitable – she states that it is needed to be defined where it sits and who we need to be talking about our issues with – that residents will need to work with Council to work out what is required here. She also states that Manly is a geographically and historically different area – with historic issues that need to be understood by Council. She states that taking away spaces who people who have put in car spaces makes nonsense of the entire permit parking scheme and it must be equitable as the bottom line. People must also be able to have visitors and tradespeople and not be booked for that – and not be spending their lives going to Council. It will also cost Council money and they will have to put on more staff. She states that what Council is planning won't work and will not be accepted.

Craig Sawyer states that therefore Council has been widely consulting with the Community – putting the proposal out there. He continues to state that feedback and further clarity is important – that Council is listening, and that Council will be going back to Council before the report with feedback from community and resident groups.

Cathy Griffin recommends that Council Staff withdraw the current framework and not come back and say we are doing a trial – but withdraw and say what we are doing is going to register and put in a different proposal more similar to what the residents are proposing and then put this to RMS.

Craig Sawyer states that Council will be going back to Councillors with the feedback – including linking vehicles to locations.

Cathy Griffin asks if the framework for discussion will be included.

Craig Sawyer states that a lot has been taken from the discussion including permits with restrictions available, changes to tradespeople permits and that this will be considered.

Cathy Griffin asks for a feel of what Council is going to advise Councillors – will Council be sticking with the current scheme and managing it?

Craig Sawyer states that adjustment is required, and that Council will need to clarify further with the RMS.

Greater Manly Residents Forum asks to clarify that there is flexibility around the guidelines.

Craig Sawyer states that Council will put that on their website and give greater clarity around that.

Greater Manly Residents Forum states that needs to go on there today as the organisation will go back to its members and state that there has been a miscommunication.

Craig Sawyer states that Council will look at better communicating that with the community.

Nicole Tessier states that she would like Council to look at the process and how the Draft Framework got to be endorsed by Council on the 29th of August, as she presented and was ignored, and that all the Councillors voted for it – she questioned if the Councillors have read it – and states that if they have not it should not have been voted upon as this would never be implemented or accepted by the people in Manly.

Cathy Griffin states that many of the Councillors read the report and not the Framework.

Nicole Tessier asks why the Draft Framework was produced in the way it was – a copy of past framework from the City of Sydney Council and why it was not individual and tailored and why it was endorsed.

Cathy Griffin states that what the Councillors endorsed was for the Draft Framework to be out on exhibition.

Nicole Tessier asks why the formal recommendation after the consultation period was not updated, and states that the summary of changes being brought in on the website omits the most contentious issues – two permits per house and the removability of eligibility if you have two off street parking spots – was this on purpose? Any reasonable person in this group will ask the same question – the feedback I have been given by my residents in my group is that the website is innocuous. It goes to the perception and branding of Council – it needs to be formally reviewed and looked at – communication – the State Government and RMS care a lot about fairness, transparency and honesty – if you look at this process it is very hard to find the details – a document of over 230 pages which is not clear and not in plain English.

Cathy Griffin states that of the 15 Councillors which are ward bases, Manly only have three who residents can count on to support what the residents want – and that one of the articulations are to harmonise the scheme and policies and the others will not understand the detailed nuances that are very Manly specific.

Nicole Tessier asks if Council can have two separate residential schemes.

Dean Simmonds states that it usually runs under one residential scheme.

Janne Seletto suggests in working closer to getting the system on the market – before implementing the Draft Framework – if a one-year trial of things to stop the black market would be acceptable to go forward – not getting there yet but moving that way?

Dean Simmonds states that is what Council is looking at through this, bringing it back to something that is more reasonable.

Craig Sawyer states that Council is listening to the community, implementing off those recommendations and then seeing if further things need to happen.

Cathy Griffin states that the residents don't want the Framework – and that they propose it is rejected or withdrawn.

Nicole Tessier seconds this motion.

Craig Sawyer states that he understands that the residents do not like the scheme the way it is at the moment and that Council staff will be looking at it and taking it to the Councillors.

Denise Keen states that this is about residents and businesspeople who are working and living in Manly – not about somebody's perspective or idea or Northern Beaches management – and states that surely Council is going to do the right thing for the area.

Craig Sawyer states that at the heart of the scheme is to provide parking for residents and others who don't have parking available.

Kandy Tagg states that residents are being penalised for the black market – and that the system was rolling along fine until amalgamation and that things are different in the Manly Ward.

Craig Sawyer states that there is no scheme elsewhere on the Northern Beaches.

Kandy Tagg states that Council is going to make permit parking across the board from Palm Beach to Manly.

Phil Devon states in various locations this can be investigated, however that there will not be a blanket scheme.

Kandy Tagg asks if this is true.

Dean Simmonds states that this is up to Council.

Cathy Griffiths states that Major Regan stated that a scheme cannot be implemented in Queenscliff until it is fixed up in Manly when he was the mayor of Warringah and now, he has repeated that as mayor of the Northern Beaches.

Craig Sawyer stated that the main drivers are to regularise the scheme and to stop inappropriate use of the scheme.

Cathy Griffiths states that without presenting the City of Sydney Council Framework that Council just needs to register parking permits with registration – that the approach for business people is not satisfactory because the vehicle has to be registered to your business – but you are using your personal car – there is no reason Council can't look and see this is legitimate. She recommends one pass which has business parking permit on it which can be used in the Isthmus area – and states that this will stop the black market and satisfy business requirements. She also states that she doesn't believe this fairly translated to local business in Manly and that is you can demonstrate you are a business person operating a particular car you should get a permit – this is not articulated in the framework and she asks the Council withdraw the framework and put forward something which reflects this.

Nick Reid asks if the framework is going to be extended and if there is going to be clarification around flexibility.

Craig Sawyer states that Council will clarify flexibility, however, will not withdraw the framework as Council have approved this. The first Council meeting to present this at will be in October and that Council can only recommend extending the timeframe as we have received a lot of community feedback.

Nick Reid states that they need to get notice out to their members and it is dangerously close to the 29th.

James Brocklebank asks if RMS would support a scheme which supports a permit for vehicles off street.

Dean Simmonds states that without seeing the scheme they cannot give feedback.

Cathy Griffiths states that there are plenty of vacant spots and questions how many cars parking on a regular basis within the permitted areas are -even with all the permits issued.

Craig Sawyer states that this is due to the normal use of the scheme where people are out during the day and then coming back at night with their cars and coming in the day with various uses- states that Council will get something to clarify on the website by Monday and extending the consultation period by two weeks.

Nick Reid states that Council don't get Manly – and asked that they educate themselves on it – stating that they are not stating that they are better just that they are different.

Craig Sawyer states that they are listening.

Nicole Tessier states that problems were caused by the change to beachfront parking and implores Council to relook at this and change it to a maximum of four hours for one day and not unlimited parking for all Northern Beaches residents as this has taken away from Manly residents – with 20 spaces lost for Isthmus residents – this was not recognised and has put further pressure on Ocean Beach. She also states that in order to fix the problems put the registration number on permits and the address on visitor passes so they can't be sold – and then to come back in a year and have a look – come March next year those permits are voided and the problem goes – Council should fix how many they are issuing.

Cathy Griffin states that she will support that – and that is the recommendation which should be going to Council – and that the framework should be withdrawn.

Nicole Tessier states that people who catch the ferry can get six hours parking in Manly and that Manly is being used as a commuter park and that this hasn't been acknowledged.

Cathy Griffin states that the answer is reducing the number of hours you can stay on the beach and that this higher turnover will also assist businesses. She also requests that Council revisit the number of passes going to the Surf Club, Skiff Club etc.

Nicole Tessier adds that the registration numbers need to be re-added. She also states that there are unintended consequences from these sorts of things.

Cathy Griffin states that the visitor parking permits also need to be withdrawn as this has not been accepted at all.

Kandy Tagg states that there are three demographics to be considered; families, renters and businesses who are being disadvantaged – and questions what the point of change is as every group is being disadvantaged.

Nick Reid states that it has been established that the issue is all from the black market – that the new system will disenfranchise businesses and residents and will make it harder not improve the situation – and that this will not stand and will not be accepted by residents despite the Council and Traffic Committee as Manly is different and they stand up.

Cathy Griffin states that Council should pay attention to the no detriment rule – the legal term.

Stephen Pirovic asks what about trailers, campervans and boats -which are taking up more than one or two spots and sit there for months – and is informed they are not provided for under the draft framework.

Michelle Carter clarifies actions to be taken by Council as follows:

- Engagement to be extended to 13 October 2019
- That the Draft Framework with the opportunity to amend is not final and is on exhibition for comment and that Council take these comments back and the Framework is then developed
- Council take on board that parking permit schemes have been in place in Manly for several years and takes on board the historical issues and beach parking issues
- Council will clarify by Monday regarding the flexibility of the RMS – and provides feedback to RMS that the wording in the Permit Parking Guidelines document should be amended around that
- Council are listening and there is possibly further opportunity to brainstorm further and have an open and honest conversation – nothing that Council aren't hearing from the people who don't have off street parking and that it has to be fair and equitable for all and that is her opinion on parking across Northern Beaches Council.

Nicole Tessier clarifies that she is not representing people with big homes and garages.

A member of Greater Manly Residents Forum states that he would not have bought his property if it did not have off street parking at the time – and that this Framework will be devastating to a lot of investment decision and that property value will erode.

Craig Sawyer states that Council understand that and have heard it several times.

Nicole Tessier states that many residents don't have off-street parking and oppose the framework as there is no problem getting parking and they don't see why you are making changes in relation to tradesmen, careers and visitors - and that she would caution against off street vs those that don't have off street as this is a divisive way of thinking.

Michelle Carter states that Council would also like to state that they have no rush on this, and there is no internal deadline and Council just want to find the right fit.

Denise Keen states that they represent a large number of people who we distribute to and give feedback to, and that they see them as their voice – and that just because you are hearing from one organisation that is one person – that is coming from a broad range of people

Michelle Carter states that this is reassuring to Council.

Kandy Tagg states that the Manly Community Forum distributes to 4000 households and are representing everybody.

Nicole Tessier states that 600 people have given her permission to be at the meeting and that this is not a case of protect my patch.

Michelle Carter thanks them for clarifying and states that she is happy to organise a time to further work on this.

End Time – 11.37am