**THE FULL DEBACLE - WELLINGTON POINT PARKING TRIAL**

Here’s What Council’s Officers Recommended on September 4, 2012 in the City Services Meeting chaired by Cr Boglary:

Officers’ Recommendation
That council resolve to retain the status quo to parking apportionment (between normal and car trailer unit spaces), and enforcement be undertaken with an emphasis on weekends and public holidays.

That recommendation from the Manager of City Infrastructure, Mr Murray Erbs came after he noted (in part) in his report:

*Since the 2010 redevelopment Council has received numerous enquiries and complaints concerning parking bays designated for exclusive use by vehicles with boat trailers only.*

*Following internal stakeholder meetings it was decided that a community engagement forum should be held to identify all relevant issues, concerns and constraints being voiced by directly affected stakeholders, and to establish the key outcomes for implementing acceptable improvements.*

*Stakeholders include representatives from directly affected organisations such as boating and fishing groups, local businesses and residents, Queensland Police Service, and a small number of individuals who have personally contacted Council on this issue.*

*The community engagement forum was held on Tuesday 10July 2012 starting at 6:00pm to finish 8:00pm at the Redlands Cricket Club and received a good attendance. See attachment 2 for PowerPoint Presentation.*

*The Guidelines for Provision of Recreational Boating Facilities 1996 recommends the minimum of 90 CTU parking spaces for a 4 lane boat ramp and 45 CTU parking spaces for a 2 lane boat ramp.  Therefore a minimum of 135 CTU parking spaces is recommended for the two boating ramps at the reserve. Currently there are 75 CTU parking spaces.*

*It is therefore recommended that status quo to current parking with enforcement be proposed for Council approval.*

(Ramp It Up notes that a CTU is a car-trailer unit – a means of expressing boat trailer spaces).

**BUT HERE’S WHAT COUNCILLORS VOTED TO DO:**

Supporting the officers’ recommendations were Cr Elliott and Cr Hewlett.

Voting to over-rule the officers’ recommendation were Crs Bishop, Gleeson, Beard, Talty, Edwards, Hardman, Ogilvie, Williams and Boglary

Council then voted for a trial of shared parking:

Moved by:                    Cr K Williams

Seconded by:              Cr P Bishop

That Council resolve to undertake a trial of shared parking (cars and cars with trailers) along the first row of car trailer unit parking adjacent to toilet block between 1:00pm and 10.00pm and review after 3 months.

For: Crs Bishop, Gleeson, Beard, Talty, Edwards, Hardman, Ogilvie, Williams and Boglary
Against: Crs Elliott and Hewlett

And here’s the motion moved by Cr Boglary and passed at council’s September 19, 2012 General Meeting:

Moved by:                 Cr W Boglary

Seconded by:           Cr P Bishop

That Council resolve as follows:

1.         To undertake a trial of shared parking (cars and cars with trailers) along the first row of car trailer unit parking adjacent to toilet block between 1:00pm and 10.00pm and review after 3 months;

2.         That a briefing note be provided to Councillors on the methods of data collection and analysis as it will be used to review and assess the trial;

3.         That a trial commence for two drop off zones within two normal car spaces, one located near the western playground and one near the southern boat ramp.  This trial is to commence immediately and the time be limited to 15 minutes; and

4.         That enforcement continue to be undertaken for compliance with the existing signage. Suitable notification of any future changes to Car Trailer Unit access should be given with consultation to the general public and stakeholders.

For: Crs Bishop, Gleeson, Beard, Talty, Edwards, Hardman, Ogilvie, Boglary and Williams.

Against: Crs Elliott and Hewlett.

You can check this for yourself on council’s web site**:**

http://web01.redland.qld.gov.au/robo/minutes\_agendas/jul12-jun13/index.htm

Then go to minutes/September 04 city services/1.1 wellington reserve).

Cr Boglary later wrote to residents advising**:**  *“I am not comfortable with the wording of the motion I just moved in the general meeting concerning the below agenda item as it does not represent what I had wanted to achieve.”*

A couple of other noteworthy comments in Cr Boglary’s newsletter which refer to the September 4 City Services Meeting include**:**

“*Before I could have my addition to the offices (sic) recommendation discussed*, so I could have it moved, the alternative recommendation was moved by another councillor.

*Alternative: Undertake a trial of shared parking along the first row adjacent to toilet block after 1 p.m.*

*This actually came as a surprise to me as there was not enough detail in the motion and the process etc had not been discussed.*

*In hindsight, I should have voted against this motion, but I knew I had till (sic) the General (sic) to do some word smithing.”*

And this one:

*“Since that meeting I have had discussions with various users of the Point and they also express concern that the detail of the trial process had not been discussed, let alone a trial discussed.”*

*“Also, who are the target users to benefit from the trial?”*

**Hellooooo -Earth to Council - Is anyone home?**

Isn’t this exactly what Ramp It Up supporters have been saying all along?

If you are going to over-rule a sensible recommendation from Council that sits in accord with the spirit and prevailing recommendation from the Department of Transport, Maritime Safety Queensland, then maybe it would be a good idea to first know what your alternative trial is going to measure and how the results will be interpreted.

Instead, the good citizens of the Redlands and visitors alike, saw a motion passed … and Council now is trying to figure out what they meant when they passed it.

So what exactly was it that Cr Boglary wanted to move, but didn’t?

We asked her and here’s what she told Ramp It Up:

* That the trial be deferred until a trial assessment method is defined and the necessary equipment be installed to measure the trial’s effectiveness.   Suitable equipment could include a webcam and weather station to collect accurate data on CTU usage and weather conditions. This equipment should be investigated and costed.
* That a trial commence for two drop off zones within two normal car spaces, one located near the western playground and one near the southern boat ramp.  This trial is to commence immediately and the time be limited to 15 minutes.
* That enforcement continue to be undertaken for compliance with the existing signage. Suitable notification of any future changes to CTU access should be given with consultation to the general public and stakeholders.

**QUESTIONS STILL TO BE ANSWERED**

So the key questions remain:

If that’s the motion you wanted to move, why didn’t you move it?

If there was a mistake in the motion that was passed, why did you move it in the first place?

And if the Minutes were inaccurate, why didn’t you correct them at the next meeting and advise residents that you had done so?

Finally, what does it say about the Councillors who moved and supported a motion to conduct a trial, given that according to officers, there was never any budget to enable such a trial to be conducted, (let alone work out what such a trial would entail)?