2.5 Current Parking Controls

In 2012, the then Minister for Planning rezoned 240 hectares of Fishermans Bend to the Capital City Zone via the Planning Amendment C102.

The Amendment applied the Capital City Zone (CCZ) to land previously zoned Business 3 Zone, Industrial 1 Zone and Industrial 3 Zone within Fishermans Bend in Port Melbourne and South Melbourne, and land zoned Mixed Use Zone at 400 City Road. The C102 Amendment introduced a Parking Overlay and an associated schedule to the overlay for the Fishermans Bend Urban Renewal Area.

The explanatory report supporting Amendment C102 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme states “The introduction of a Parking Overlay to the Fisherman’s Bend Urban Renewal Area is required to set maximum parameters to ensure sustainability objectives”. No other significant details are provided.

The shift from minimum parking requirements to maximum limits represents a significant change in parking policy.

The land uses and the maximum parking rate provisions identified within the overlay are shown in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Fishermans Bend Parking Overlay Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Rate (Maximum)</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each 150 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of assembly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted retail premises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail premises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To each 100 sq m of gross floor area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adoption of maximum provisions seeks to address and achieve the target mode splits identified earlier. The adoption of maximum provisions, however, has potential adverse impacts to certain precinct parking approaches.

A review of recent Planning Applications suggests that on average, developers are providing car parking at an average ratio of **0.6 spaces to each dwelling**. The cross referencing of the distance to the CBD shows that in the majority of cases these developments are very close to the CBD, enabling developers to sell apartments without parking.

A snapshot of recent apartments and their number of car parking spaces is provided in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: On-Site Car Parking & Dwelling Numbers, Fisherman’s Bend Drawn from a Selection of 2015 Planning Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Distance from CBD (km) (as crow flies from Old GPO)</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>Car Spaces</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134-150 Buckhurst Street, South Melbourne</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-232,234-238 Normanby Road, Southbank</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Salmon Street, Port Melbourne</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171-183 Ferrars Street, South Melbourne</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Buckhurst Street, South Melbourne</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-35 Tholsthwalte Street</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-78 Buckhurst Street</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165-167 Gladstone Street</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Distance from CBD (km)</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Car Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-238 Normanby Road</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-59 Thistlethwaite Street</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Montague Street</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-87 Gladstone Street</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Port Phillip, Planning Permit Application Register (accessed online via https://eservices.portphillip.vic.gov.au)

2.6 Parking Precinct Stations

Before moving forward, it is important to clearly define the term Parking Precinct Station (PPS) in the context of this study.

Centralised parking structures have been constructed since the early 1900s, with the first multi-storey car park being constructed to service a hotel in Chicago in 1918. Since then, centralised parking buildings have been constructed to achieve a wide range of objectives.

For the purposes of this study, Parking Precinct Stations are defined as:

**Centralised parking that is provided in lieu of parking within nearby developments.**

"Nearby" means that PPS are within easy walking distance (400m) of the development.

The PPS model does not exclude the use of unbundling parking from residential developments; however, PPS could be on-site if the carpark is serving surrounding land uses.

Unbundling parking compels developers to sell or lease parking independently of residences or commercial leases. The unbundling of parking from sales and leases may naturally lead to the market delivering parking precinct stations.

This trend is being observed in the City of Melbourne’s CBD and Docklands Parking Plan 2008-2013 makes the following observations:

'With many new residential buildings applying for less than one space per dwelling, the trend with residential developments in the CBD has been for the amount of car parking as part of the development to be reduced. The signals are mixed though because a market in car spaces in commercial car parks has also emerged with residents hiring spaces allocated to commercial parking. For example, in the Paramount development, there is a 400 space car park which has been sub-divided into individual car space lots and they have been sold on the open market and some bought by owners of residential units. These arrangements will continue to be supported by the City of Melbourne because they involve taking a commercial space presumably used by a commuter and converting to a residential space which is more likely to be used in non-peak periods.'

While this market led approach appears to lead to consolidated parking, it is not explicitly in lieu of car parking on-site. Rather, the car parking services market demands and therefore, similar to a privately owned car park in the CBD, an assessment of the development application (for the car park) must be considered by the Strategic City Planning Policy for the area.
4.7.2 EXO Building 852 Collins Street

The 12 storey EXO Building in Docklands comprises eight storeys of car parking, with a total of 642 spaces. Above this is four storeys of apartments.

It was built as a part of the Victoria Harbour Precinct of Docklands, which formed part of the Lend Lease master-planned area of the publicly owned Melbourne Docklands precinct.

The apartments utilise 64 of the car parking spaces, and the remaining bays are now privately managed at rates that are equivalent to Melbourne CBD pricing. The monthly charge is $500 and there are 100 users who have purchased this membership. The operator reports that the car park is nearly always full by 9am (as a result of the early bird discounts).

The EXO Building was developed as a parking precinct station for the surrounding buildings, which have on-site parking provision that is limited to servicing and disabled parks (Figure 4.12).

The centralised provision of parking has allowed the activation of the street (Figure 4.13). The design of pedestrian priority shared spaces (Figure 4.14) have led to low volumes of traffic accessing the rear of the surrounding buildings, which are seasonally well used by the surrounding offices.

Victoria Harbour is now developed, it is fully tenanted and the surrounding residential market is strong.

Victoria Harbour is home to the head offices of a number of blue-chip firms (ANZ, NAB and KPMG) and the Docklands area is the most expensive rental market in Central Melbourne.

The majority of people in this area either walk or catch public transport to Docklands (currently 54.8% of trips are active travel/public transport), which is likely to increase in response to the areas growth and the significant uplift in new trams services to the area delivered in early 2014.

For comparison, the CBD percentage of active travel and public transport is 69%, for context Southbank is 42.6% and Box Hill is 13.7%.

There are many aspects of Docklands’ urban renewal that are successful. Though the public perception of Docklands might be negative, given that it is 15 years into a 25-year plan, when completed this public perception is likely to change.

The City of Melbourne’s Parking Plan made the follow general observations about the area:

“Throughout the consultation for this plan, residents from Docklands have expressed their frustration about a lack of residential parking. This relates to the limited on-street parking and the expense of off-street parking for residents who don’t have parking spaces as part of their
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apartment allotment. Residents have also reported that on occasions when they have struck a special deal for off-street parking, the car parks had closed due to new development. ⁹

Figure 4.12: Parking Provision in Victoria Harbour

There is limited commercial parking in the immediate vicinity to the EXO building. Using Clause 52.06 Car Parking rates, GTA estimates that the buildings in the area would require 1150 spaces, instead of the 688 provided. This represents a reduction in parking of circa 40%.

It is somewhat unrealistic to assume that no parking overlay would apply to a site so close to the CBD, however, it provides an indication of the parking supply that was able to be reduced while still achieving wider development outcomes.

Figure 4.13: Streetscapes Near the EXO Building

The centralised parking in the Exo building preserve the on-street frontage of the surrounding buildings.

Access to the rear of the adjoining buildings is limited to services and therefore the area is pedestrian priority through the use of shared spaces.

4.8 Key Findings

4.8.1 Urban Renewal Areas

There are numerous parking consolidation schemes attached to large residential redevelopment sites. These sites generally have parking policies that are a part of the wider eco-philosophy of the development. These developments usually have less parking and provide incentives to promote sustainable travel e.g. free public transport travel pass or membership to car club.

A key theme running through the residential case studies is that parking management has been considered as a part of the eco-development philosophy and not just an isolated tool to reduce car use and promote mode share.

4.8.2 City-Scale Parking Stations

Antwerp and Barcelona are widely regarded as being best practice in achieving transport policy outcomes. Barcelona is particularly relevant for Fishermans Bend as its current transport mode shares are the same as Fishermans Bend’s 2051 targets.

These two successful case studies share similar characteristics:

- Parking management schemes are closely controlled by Government (or quasi-public statutory authority).
- The car parking is managed to achieve holistic outcomes. In the case of Antwerp, the aim is to maximise the use of on-street parking to stimulate the local economy and ensure that the use of off-street parking is for local residents. In the case of Barcelona, the parking policy aims to reduce the amount of on-street parking and then reallocate this space to sustainable modes.
4.8.3 Victorian Examples

The market has positively responded to the urban renewal strategies at Victoria Harbour, including the use of consolidated parking to cater for some of the demand. The EXO Building and the surrounding activation of on-street frontages, including capitalising on the low-traffic rear of buildings, has had positive urban realm outcomes.

Given that the Docklands area still has 10 years until completion, it is potentially too early to make a full assessment of the development. Based on an initial review, the use of a central parking station appears to have been effective way to improve urban realm outcomes and play a role in achieving transport mode shares that are nearing best Australian practice (50% active/walking).

4.9 Summary

In summary, across the three case studies the key themes are:

- Primarily, parking precinct stations appear to be most effective as a tool to improve urban realm outcomes.
- Parking precinct stations can be effectively used to support a shift to more sustainable travel.
- Parking precinct stations are rarely provided and/or charged in a full cost recovery model, emphasising the need for Government leadership in current models.
The Impact of Implementing Parking Maximum Limits

There is a significant amount of research into maximum parking limits in the United Kingdom. In response to an increase in congestion, parking maximum policy was introduced across the United Kingdom in the 2000s.

The evidence suggests that parking maximisation limits are effective at reducing car use. London, for example, has seen an ongoing and significant shift away from car use.10

Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that this has had an economic impact on the financial viability of development.11 However, in a review of the effectiveness of maximum parking limits, problems of overspill parking were highlighted as particularly acute in historic towns due to the narrow and more restrictive street layout.12

Generally, however, the sound evidence from the UK concludes that in areas of good transport accessibility parking maximisation limits are an effective lever to promote sustainable transport and reduce congestion.

Implementing Parking Precinct Stations with the Current Parking Requirements

The Capital City Zone sets the maximum parking provision for developments in the Fishermans Bend Precinct. This policy aims to reduce the amount of car parking to influence transport demand in favour of more sustainable modes. Any changes to policy (PPS or otherwise) should assess the impact on the amount of car parking and the resulting impact on the Vision for Fishermans Bend.

In the Capital City Zone, an overlay applies where developers could provide zero parking.

It is likely that certain types of development would be less (or more) likely to contribute to car spaces to support development. Contributions also depend on the precinct station ‘product’ (or offer) in terms of distance and quality. HafenCity illustrates this where significant effort has been made to provide a high quality product.

To provide an estimate of the potential reduction in car parking by use, the theoretical cut-turn parking with and without precinct parking off-site is estimated in Table 5.1. This indicates the potential of the policy to support demand management objectives.

Summary of Review of Parking Policy Options

Implementing maximum parking limits is an effective policy to reduce the supply of car parking.

Implementing maximum limits, alongside PPS, is likely to be an even more effective policy to reduce car parking supply. Although there are a range factors that contribute to the use of car versus other modes, a reduction in the amount of car parking provided in Fishermans Bend is likely to be important to achieving the aspirational mode shares outlined in the Fishermans Bend Vision.

The continued maximum policy (developers being able to reduce parking provisions to zero) may create challenges to the way in which PPS are funded.

11 http://www.camden.gov.uk/comm/service/stream/asset/AssetId=3414526
12 Department for Transport (June 2008) Research into the Use and Effectiveness of Maximum Parking Standards
6. Conclusions and Implementation

6.1 Conclusions

The analysis demonstrates that Parking Precinct Stations can deliver a range of beneficial outcomes when developing urban renewal areas.

Given this, analysis demonstrates that there are a range of options for implementing PPS in Fishermans Bend. We have represented two scenarios that illustrate worked examples for implementing PPS at Fishermans Bend:

Scenario 1 is likely to deliver a 'non-traditional' approach to car parking in Fishermans Bend.

It will likely be challenging to adopt this non-traditional approach due to the scale of Fishermans Bend, the ownership patterns and public transport coverage. Under this option, developers and purchasers at FB may baulk at investment if they consider PPS to be too risky, which could ultimately stifle development.

Scenario 2, though a more complex policy, provides a more flexible option that can evolve to meet the needs of a growing community, the development and public transport phasing.

It is therefore recommended that Scenario 2 be progressed to more detailed planning.

6.2 Implementation

The PPS Implementation Plan shall require the following foundations in order to achieve the desired outcomes. These include:

- PPS will need to be underpinned by early provision of public transport and active transport infrastructure on the ground.
- PPS will require a range of new approaches to owning, leasing, managing parking by either by/with body corporates and/or establishment of a quasi-public statutory authority. This will be a challenge for the market and will require a certain determination by government.
- It is unlikely that the private sector will deliver PPS if higher profits can be realised by other types of development. Thus, PPS will need to demonstrate commercial viability as well as represent the highest and best use of land, to ensure developer confidence.

The following provides an outline the key steps to realising Parking Precinct Stations in Fishermans Bend:

i. The Fishermans Bend Integrated Transport plan should reflect the broad aim to define Precinct Parking Zones.

ii. Develop in greater detail the potential demands associated with future development within Parking Precinct Zones and identifying potential sites which could facilitate PPS. This provides the basis to further ensure the principles of Need, Nexus, Equity and Accountability can be satisfied.

iii. Develop funding strategy based on the areas and suitability for Parking Precinct Zones, including Spatial analysis at a precinct level to determine appropriate sites and capacities.
iv. Review suitable parking levels (Highlighted as red line in Figure 5.6).

v. Develop business case and 'contribution' rates depending on use and mandatory requirements.

vi. Consider and draft required amendments to the Schedule to the Parking Overlay and incorporate into the Melbourne and Port Philip Planning Schemes through a planning scheme amendment process.

Figure 6.1: Implementation of PPS