

ABN61340837871 Telephone 02 9970 1111 Facsimile 02 9970 1200 Postal Address PO Box 882 Mona Vale NSW 1660 DX 9018, Mona Vale

Tija Stagni, Acting Principal Officer – Land Release 8am to 5:30pm Monday - Thursday, 8:00am to 5:00pm Friday Phone 9970 1318

30 August 2012

ALAN BRIGHT A/DIRECTOR, METROPOLITAN & REGIONAL PROJECTS SOUTH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & INFRASTRUCTURE GPO BOX 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Mr Ben Lusher

### Your Ref: MP09\_0162 MOD 2 MP10\_0177 MOD 11

Dear Mr Bright

### RE: COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO CONCEPT PLAN MOD 2 & PROJECT APPROVAL MOD 11, 14-18 BOONDAH ROAD WARRIEWOOD

Please find enclosed Pittwater Council's submission to the Application for Modification of the Concept Plan (MP09\_0162 MOD 2) and Project Approval (MP10\_0177 MOD 11) at 14 – 18 Boondah Road, Warriewood.

If Council can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Tija Stagni (Acting Principal Officer – Land Release) on (02) 9970 1318 or Mr Steve Evans, Council's Director of Environmental Planning & Community, on (02) 9970 1133. If required, Council staff would be happy address the Planning Assessment Commission on this matter.

Yours faithfully

Chris Hunt DIRECTOR, URBAN & ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS

Email pittwater\_council@pittwater.nsw.gov.au Web pittwater.nsw.gov.au

Mona Vale Customer Service Centre Village Park 1 Park Street, Mona Vale Avalon Customer Service Centre 59A Old Barrenjoey Road, Avalon Support Services Units 11, 12, 13 + 16/5 Vuko Place, Warriewood Boondah Depot 1 Boondah Road, Warriewood

Submission to Department of Planning & Infrastructure to MP09\_0162 (MOD 2) & MP10\_0177 (Mod 11) at 14-18 Boondah Road, Warriewood Prepared by Pittwater Council 30 August 2012





# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council understands that the current modification applications seek to amend:

- Concept Plan Approval (MP09\_0162) in regard to the car parking rate for two bedroom units for future development applications;
- Concept Plan Approval (MP09\_0162) and Project Approval (MP10\_0177 in regard to the proportion of Boondah Road required to be reconstructed;
- Concept Plan Approval (MP09\_0162) in regard to the timing which Section 94 contributions are to be paid.

The applicant's current request to reduce the car parking rate for 2 bedroom units is but one in a long line of modification applications seeking to reduce on-site parking requirements. As Council has emphasised in response to previous modification applications, the consequence of reducing car parking requirements for the development will create traffic and parking implications that will affect the amenity of future residents of this and surrounding developments; an untenable outcome for local residents and the community alike.

In regard to the required amount of Boondah Road to be reconstructed by the Applicant, Council does not agree to the developer only constructing half the road width. Council contends that the PAC in making its original determination had the benefit of all of the pertinent information in relation to the road works to be directly provided by the Applicant. The PAC, inherent in the wording of the conditions, therefore purposefully required the full width of Boondah Road to be reconstructed.

In regard to the proposed amendment to the Concept Plan regarding payment of Section 94 contributions, Council has no objection to this provided that the amendments are identical those approved under Project Approval MP10\_0177 MOD8.



## **MATTERS RAISED**

## 1. Request to Vary Car Parking Rate for Future Development

The applicant's request to reduce the number of car parking rate for two bedroom units for Stage 2 of its development from 2 spaces to 1.2 spaces per unit is of particular concern to Council and cannot be supported based on the information submitted with the application.

Council is seriously concerned about the impacts of reduced on-site parking on the existing supply of street parking on Boondah Road and Macpherson Street, and intensified traffic congestion as a result of vehicle movements in and out of kerb side spaces.

## Applications to date

The Applicant's car parking proposal as now submitted seeks to reduce car parking rates below those originally proposed in its Preferred Project Report. Since the PAC's original decision three modification applications, including this current application, have been submitted relating primarily to on-site car parking requirements. As outlined in the table below, the various applications have proposed parking rates ranging from 1 space per 2 bedroom unit to 1.57 spaces per 2 bedroom unit.

Application No.	Proposed car spaces per 2 bedroom unit	PAC decision	Date Determined
Major Project Application MP09_0162	1 space	N/A	
Preferred Project for Major Project Application MP09_0162	1.5 spaces	2 car spaces per 2 bedroom units, in line with Council's <i>Pittwater 21 DCP</i>	18 January 2011
Project Approval MP10_0177 MOD 3	1.57 spaces (application was amended in response to submissions increasing rate from 1.5 to 1.57 car spaces per 2 bedroom unit)	Maintain provision of 2 car spaces per 2 bedroom unit	15 November 2011
Concept Plan MP09_0162 MOD 1	1 space	Maintain provision of 2 car spaces per 2 bedroom unit	15 December 2011
Current modification application – Concept Plan MP09_0162 MOD 2	1.2 spaces	Not determined	

Having noted that "*Pittwater faces unique transport challenges*", the PAC in its determination of 18 January 2012 and in response to each modification application has required the development to provide car parking in accordance with *Pittwater 21 DCP*. In this regard, the PAC in its determination stated:

"Having regard to the challenges of road access and public transport in the area the proposed parking in the concept plan is considered insufficient. The Commission believes the parking rates required by Council's DCP 21 are more appropriate and should apply to the site"<sup>1</sup>

In each of its decisions to the two previous modification applications, the PAC has "*remained unpersuaded that there is sufficient reason to vary the parking rate for bedroom units*".<sup>2</sup> In yet again seeking to vary car parking rates, this Application needs to clearly demonstrate and introduce new information demonstrating why the PAC's original decision in regard to car parking requirements was incorrect. This has not been done.

### Insufficient information to support the proposed change

The proponent argues in its modification application that it is not economically viable to provide two car parking spaces to each two bedroom unit as there is not a market demand. To support a reduction in parking requirements the Applicant has submitted a letter by Cardno (NSW/ACT) Pty Ltd (*'Cardno'*) which reviews the Council's car parking requirements for 2 bedroom units and a Resident Green Travel Plan (also prepared by Cardno) which recommends strategies to reduce private vehicle use.

The letter by Cardno advises that Council's car parking requirements for 2 bedroom units is excessive when compared to both the RTA's *Guide to Traffic Generating Development ('RTA Guidelines')* and the car parking requirements of other Council's in Sydney. Cardno's reasoning that parking rates are excessive is also based on selective Census data to support their claim that Council's parking requirements for unit developments are unreasonable. Their letter also relies on the utilisation of alternative transport

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PAC Assessment Report MP09\_0162, 18 January 2011.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> PAC Assessment Report MP09\_0162 MOD 1, 15 December 2011.

modes and a claim that future planned public transport improvements support a lower parking rate.

Pittwater Council asserts that the car parking rate for 2 bedroom units under *Pittwater 21 DCP* are in fact consistent with the RTA's Guidelines for medium density residential flat buildings, as the parking rates are established with consideration of the determining factors influencing local demand, namely public transport, accessibility, geography, socio-economic status and the locality and large developments.

The Applicant's traffic consultant has not reasonably addressed these determining factors. In particular, Cardno's advice has not considered:

- Existing public transport services to or near the site are limited in their frequency and also their destination;
- The most frequent public transport services are located on Pittwater Road, approximately 1 kilometre away, well beyond the 400 metre walking distance to buses which is the accepted distance to permit walking for even commuter travel;
- The Pittwater LGA is largely isolated from the rest of Sydney, and due to the distance to major centres and limited provision of public transport services, residents rely heavily on private car usage commensurate with high rates of car ownership.

Council in its submission to the Applicant's Preferred Project Report has responded to each of the determining factors influencing local car parking demand. An extract from this submission is contained in **Appendix 1**.

Further Council in its submission to Project Approval MP09\_0162 MOD 1 and Concept Plan MP10\_0177 MOD 3 tendered a report by traffic consultants Traffix Transport and Traffic Planners which provided advice in regard to the proposed amendments to car parking requirements. Their report formed an important part of Council's submission to these two previous modification applications and is equally relevant to this application (See **Appendix 2**).



Cardno's advice also relies on Census data to depict the demand for residential car parking among people that live in units, citing the rates of car ownership for those people who resided in flats, units or apartments in 2006 in the Pittwater LGA. Cardno however has failed to point out that there remains a significant proportion of people who reside in units who have 2 cars or more. Council's own analysis of 2006 and 2011 Census data, as shown below, (*Note: slightly divergent from the statistics outlined in the letter from the Applicant's traffic consultant*) demonstrates that in fact there has been a decline in the number of people who reside in flats, units or apartments and do not own a car, commensurate with the increase in the number of people who own one, two or more cars.

Number of cars per flat, unit or apartment	2006 Census (ABS)	2011 Census (ABS)
0	14.5%	10.2%
1	47.9%	51.6%
2 or more	31.9%	33.7%
Not stated	5.6%	4.2%

Council in its submission to Project Approval Modification 3 (MP10\_0177 MOD 3) provided additional analysis in regard to the high rate of car ownership in Pittwater, submitting an extract from the published *Pittwater Local Planning Strategy* 2011 (Adopted July 2011) (See **Appendix 3**). In Council's opinion Cardno's statistical information does not validate their claim that Council's DCP car parking requirements are unnecessarily excessive nor is it a compelling justification to reduce car parking rates.

While the promotion of reduced parking rates is a worthy planning objective to suppress car travel and promote alternative transport modes, it is only possible if public transport is available to serve the many types of trips that residents would take. Cardno's claim that the future planned public transport improvements support a lower parking rate is not a sustainable argument given that the recent history of the public transport service in the area demonstrates otherwise. This argument therefore cannot be used to reduce car parking rates for a development that is to be built now.

The Green Travel Plan submitted by the Applicant which recommends alternative transport strategies to reduce private vehicle use is also of limited practical relevance given the specific transport issues which Pittwater faces, as already mentioned above and detailed in **Appendix 1**. In addition the streets and creek line corridors around the site do not currently have a complete network of pedestrian walkways, cycle paths and through links to access shops, transport and work facilities. These linkages will only be built as development around the site is completed and Section 94 contributions are collected. Many residents will therefore be without a complete non-vehicular transport network for a moderate period of time.

## 2. Proposed Half Construction of Boondah Road

Council's understanding is that the PAC had the benefit of all of the pertinent information to assist it in making its decision in relation to the road works to be directly provided by the Applicant.

The PAC decision would have taken into consideration the significantly increased density and associated traffic generation associated with this development and its added impacts on the local road networks.

Council interprets that the PAC required half road reconstruction along Macpherson Street noting that the opposite half road would be constructed by the opposite development - in this case it had already been constructed by the ARV development.

However along Boondah Road there is a clear distinction in that the opposite property, being the Sydney Water Sewerage Treatment Plant, is not part of the developable land associated with the release. Hence we conclude that the PAC has purposefully required the full width reconstruction of Boondah Road, and this is inherent in the different wording the PAC has applied for Boondah Road, otherwise the PAC would have stated half road reconstruction in Boondah Road.

This full width road reconstruction requirement is made even more pertinent given that the Applicant's development has extended along Boondah Road into significantly flood prone land. This in turn requires at least 200 metres of

the approximate 300 metre length of the site's Boondah Road frontage to be raised to the 1% flood level to provide suitable road access from the future Stage 2 component of the development.

The raising of Boondah Road will require a sizable lift of the road formation above the current road level and obviously would be required to be full width, if not there would be an unsafe vertical drop off at the road's centreline. There is also a need for a suitable transition to taper back to the existing road surface at the southern end. From a practical construction perspective the road works also need to be carried out at the one time, the project therefore lending itself to be undertaken by one provider through a specific and specialised contract operation.

Unfortunately Council does not have the benefit of what the PAC ultimately packaged for the Section 94 contribution required for Stage 1 of the development, or what it intends for the requisite Stage 2 contributions, in terms of the overall concept approval.

Council's *Warriewood Valley Section 94 Contributions Plan* does include a nominal allowance for road reconstruction along Boondah Road, but did not necessarily envisage the significant increase in development nor the extent of road works now required. Boondah Road is requiring to be reconstructed to support the land release and the Applicant's development. The road itself is almost 1 kilometre in length, with the Applicant's frontage representing approximately 30% of this length.

Given our interpretation of the current PAC requirements in relation to the Boondah Road reconstruction, as outlined above, Council does not agree to the Applicant only constructing half the road's width. As such, the existing conditions should remain unaltered.

If the PAC in assessing this modification application arrives at different interpretation of what it required and amends the Concept Plan and Project Approval to only require half width construction of Boondah Road, then the reasons for this departure will need to be clearly articulated. The Section 94 contributions made by the Applicant should also be scrutinised to ensure that



Meriton has also contributed toward its pro-rata share of the Boondah Road reconstruction.

## 3. Section 94 Contributions Payment Schedule

Council understands that this request to modify the Concept Plan is intended to reflect the changes to the Project Approval approved under MP10\_0177 MOD 8 to ensure consistency between the two approvals in regard to the payment of Section 94 contributions.

Council does not object to this request provided any amendments to the Concept Plan in regard to the timing of payment of Section 94 contributions is consistent with what was approved under the previous Project Approval modification.

Submission to Department of Planning & Infrastructure to MP09\_0162 (MOD 2) & MP10\_0177 (Mod 11) at 14-18 Boondah Road, Warriewood





APPENDIX 1 Extract from Pittwater Council submission to Preferred Project Report for Major Project Application MP 09\_0162 8 October 2010

# **WATER COUNCIL**

### **Car parking Provision for Preferred Project**

Pittwater Council asserts that the car parking rates under *Pittwater 21 DCP* is consistent with the recommendations of the RTA's *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments* for medium density residential flat buildings as the parking rates are established with consideration of the specified factors influencing local demand... Response to each determining factor is as follows:

### Public transport accessibility

- The high rate of car ownership per dwelling/household in Pittwater is primarily due to the fact that the existing limited bus system does not provide a viable and convenient alternative to the use of the private car.
- The existing bus service to the City in Macpherson Street is adjacent to the site, however this bus service does not provide access to many areas of Pittwater, Warringah and adjacent Council areas (such as Chatswood and Macquarie Park), and is irregular out of peak hours, particularly at night and during weekends.
- The Strategic Bus / Regional Transport Corridor operating in Pittwater Road is approximately 1km from the development site. Over the 1km length, only 250 metres of footpath has been constructed between the development site and Pittwater Road. Additionally, the section of Macpherson Street east of the site is currently a rural road prone to frequent flooding, and will only be upgraded when local development contributions are received to fully fund the upgrade of this section of Macpherson Street.
- The current rural conditions of section of the pedestrian walk together with the distance to the Strategic Bus Corridor (at Pittwater Road) will, in fact, discourage public transport usage. Further, these conditions do not comply with requirements established and adopted by various State Departments, including the Department of Planning, Department of Health and Department of Infrastructure and Investment (formerly NSW Ministry of Transport).
- Sydney Buses has no current proposal to provide new services to areas not already being serviced, nor of providing direct cross regional bus services for Pittwater residents. The lack of direct cross-regional public transport services for which comfortable bus interchanges are available associated with the crowding and extended travel times, make the few existing services unattractive to Pittwater residents, resulting in private cars being the preferred choice of travel mode (includes travel to work trips to employment centres in adjacent Council areas where the aim of subregional plans is for these trips to be by public transport). In fact, recent proposals by Sydney Buses have included suggestions to cease vital services to areas off the main roads as they were not profitable (steep terrain and narrow roads mean Sydney Buses cannot access many areas, forcing dependence upon cars by the residents and their visitors).
- The RTA has no current proposals to upgrade any main road servicing Pittwater, Warringah or adjacent Local Government Areas to increase the traffic capacity in the foreseeable future.
- While the Metropolitan Transport Plan identifies Pittwater Road and Mona Vale Road as transport corridors (bus only lanes are being introduced to Pittwater Road), the additional buses being provided by this Plan to service this area will reduce the current level of crowding and reduce travel times especially on peak hour and late night services, however will do little to improve the attractiveness of the service due to ongoing passenger congestion south of Dee Why (including Military Road) and further, there are almost no services on Mona Vale Road. The Metropolitan Transport Plan does not propose to increase the capacity of Pittwater Road, Mona Vale Road and Wakehurst Parkway to facilitate improvements to public transport.

### b) Geography

• The Pittwater Council area is large, spread out and isolated from the rest of Sydney with all access being via only three main roads which are heavily congested. Sydney GPO is approximately 30km from development site. The current bus

# 🔆 PITTWATER COUNCIL

timetables estimate a travel time of 55 minutes (for buses only) during the peak period.

- Internally, much of the terrain is steep so that bikes/walking/public transport are not realistic options. For this reason, cars remain the transport option of choice for all residents (including future residents of this proposed development) to visit friends, obtain goods/services and travel to work journeys both within Pittwater and to other Local Government Areas.
- The terrain and geographical location of Pittwater does not make it a reasonable conclusion by the Applicant to reduce the resident parking rate below that specified in *Pittwater 21 DCP*.

### c) Socio-economic

- Pittwater residents/households are generally mobile and affluent, who can afford and demand private vehicles to support their lifestyle, and for convenient access to the services/facilities they use in Pittwater and the rest of Sydney. This desire cannot be satisfied by the existing public transport system which is evident in Pittwater.
- The future residents of this development will experience the same difficulties and needs. It is unreasonable and inappropriate to reduce the resident parking rate below that specified in Pittwater 21 DCP.

### d) Locality and large developments

- On-street parking opportunities in Warriewood Valley, particularly in the streets surrounding the site are already extremely limited. With the exception of Macpherson Street west of the site, sections of Macpherson Street east and Boondah Road south currently are substantially rural roads.
- There is evidence that demand exceeds supply in adjacent developments where the DCP parking rates were applied.
- A reduction in the resident parking rate applied to the site is unreasonable as there would be significant parking shortfall. This will result in congestion in surrounding streets as people try and park in available limited kerbside parking and, in turn, adversely impacting the safety and amenity of residents in the surrounding area.



### APPENDIX 2 Traffix Transport and Traffic Planners Advice provided 27 September 2011



Reference: 11.313v2

27 September 2011

traffic & transport planners

suite 3.08 level 3 46a macleay street potts point nsw 2011 po box 1061 potts point nsw 1335 t: +61 2 8324 8700 f: +61 2 9380 4481 w: www.traffix.com.au director graham pindar acn: 065132961 abn: 66065132961

Pittwater Council PO Box 882 Mona Vale NSW 1660

Attention: Mr Chris Hunt, Director of Urban & Environmental Assets

Re:

Meriton Part 3A Application, Warriewood 14-18 Boondah Road Section 76W Application to Major Project No. 10\_177 Stage 1 Car Parking Provision

Dear Chris,

We refer to the subject Modification and in particular to the Traffic Report prepared by Halcrow Traffic consultants, which outlines the justification for the proposed amendments. In this regard, we advise as follows:

Residential Parking for the Two Bedroom Units

We note that our previous submission dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 2010 in relation to the original Stage 1 Project Plan raised concerns over the reduction in parking for the two-bedroom units as then proposed, which was from 2.0 spaces/unit under DCP21, to 1.5 spaces per unit. These concerns were made in the context of the absence of any demonstration as to how the resultant increased reliance on public transport would be met. These concerns were presumably supported by the PAC in determining the Application and are reflected in the current approval which binds the parking provision to DCP21. In our view, these concerns, as raised in our original submission, remain valid in the context of the current modification.

The following points are emphasised:

- The basis of DCP21 parking rate of 2.0 spaces/unit needs to be understood if it is sought to be varied. The applicant has provided no consideration of the genesis DCP21 and its present relevance to local parking needs within Pittwater LGA.
- The RTA's Guideline refers to the ability of Council's to adopt local parking plans that more accurately reflect local needs. In this regard, Section 1.4 of the RTA's Guideline specifically states that the RTA's parking requirements are the minimum desirable requirement; while Council's parking codes reflect the minimum mandatory requirement (Section 1.4 refers). In our view, it is unreasonable to arbitrarily require compliance with the RTA Guideline, without a clear understanding of the basis of the DCP rate and the problems that might be

1





created by a departure from the DCP in this case, as well as in relation to any precedent that might be set by any approval that may be granted.

- It is noted that Halcrow accepts that the reduced parking will in tum reduce private car travel and hence traffic generation. The consequence is that these trips will be transferred onto public transport. In this regard, no assessment has been undertaken of the ability of existing buses to accommodate the expected demand from the development generally even if it is assumed that compliance with DCP21 is achieved, as per the current consent. In the event that DCP21 is not met, this will create a further demand on bus services;
- In the event that the DCP21 demand in fact occurs and insufficient resident parking is provided within the site, the consequence will be an unacceptable level of reliance on onstreet parking. This will be exacerbated by the associated removal of extensive on-street parking that was previously proposed, arising from the deletion of the through site road connection. This is discussed further below in the context of visitor parking.
- It is emphasised that on-street resident parking relates to the effective full-time, long-term and effective permanent use of a public asset, which is inappropriate and unsound planning.

In summary, the decision of the PAC, which supported Council's DCP21 provision for residential parking for this development, should remain the relevant control so that the objectives that underpin DCP21 are not compromised. This is notwithstanding the views of the RTA which seem to overlook the importance of DCP21 which is a statutory parking instrument that is specifically attuned to local needs.

#### Visitor Parking

The Stage 1 development accommodates 226 units and on the basis of Council's DCP21 would require 76 visitor spaces, based on application of a rate of 1 space/3 units. The current consent is understood to require 46 spaces, based on a rate of 1 space/5 units. We note our previous advice that the reduced rate of 1 space/5 units is generally supportable as if reflects the RTA's requirement for medium density dwellings. This rate is also the same as the RTA's rate for high density developments in sub-regional centres.

However, we strongly oppose the adoption of any rate lower than 1 space/5 units for the following reasons:

- Council's DCP is arguably entitled to require parking for visitors to accommodate peak demands, rather than 'typical' demands based on the RTA's Guideline. Nevertheless, the rate of 1 space/3 units is high, and probably reflects demands above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile demand level. As a minimum, the onus should be on the applicant to justify a departure from the DCP through surveys of a comparable development and to our knowledge, this has not occurred.
- The policy implications of a departure from the DCP and the implications for any precedent this would create is a matter that the applicant should address.
- The rate of 1 space/7 units referenced by Halcrow relates only to a high density residential dwelling in a regional centre, which includes the Sydney CBD and North Sydney. These centres are characterised by a very high level of public transport accessibility, as well as high density land uses where many people would walk. This is not applicable to Warriewood Valley.

2

traffic impact studies | expert witness | local govt. liaison | traffic calming | development advice | parking studies pedestrian studies | traffic control plans | traffic management studies | intersection design | transport studies





The previous scheme enjoyed a significant 'safety valve' provided by the extensive onstreet parking that was available within the internal road linkages. The modified plans remove the internal through road, with deletion of a 600 metre long section of 7.5 metre wide roadway that would have accommodates up to 100 parking spaces, assuming 6 metres per space and parking on one side only. The net loss of up to 100 on-site spaces, which is additional to the loss of on-site visitor parking provision of 13 spaces (46 less 33 as now proposed) is a matter of concern.

Removal of Through Road

As discussed above, the deletion of the through road raises issues concerning parking supply for visitors, as well as residents should the demand for parking be higher than the DCP21 rates which we note are minimum requirements. The following matters are also raised:

- The deletion of the through site link reduces the ability of emergency vehicles to access the southern side of the development. This is a matter for assessment but is outside our area of expertise.
- The deletion of the through site link will reduce the permeability of the site by service vehicles, including removalist vans. It is unclear, for example, how removalist vans would gain convenient access to the southernmost buildings F, G and L.
- The road closures at both ends of the retained portions of internal road do not provide any turning area and will therefore result in unacceptable reversing movements, with attendant safety implications.

In summary, the consequence of the current modifications will be to impose unnecessary and avoidable pressure on on-street parking, to a degree that will be unacceptable and may introduce safety concerns. Please contact the undersigned should you have any queries or require any further information regarding the above.

Yours faithfully,

traffix

Graham Pindar Director

3



APPENDIX 3 Extract from *Pittwater Local Planning Strategy – Planning for Pittwater towards 2031* Section 4.5.11 – Analysis Car Ownership



#### PITTWATER LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY 2011

### 4.5.11 Analysis of Car Ownership

Analysis of car ownership in 2006 shows 86.8% of households own at least one car. Overall, 28.7% of households owned one car, 42.2% owned two cars and 15.9% owned three cars or more. The major differences between car ownership in the Pittwater LGA compared to the SSD are a larger percentage of households with 2 vehicles (42.2%compared to 30.2%) and a smaller percentage of households with 1 vehicle (28.7%compared to 36.4%).

Figure 13: Car ownership, Pittwater LGA and SSD Source: Informed Decisions, 2009



Residents in the Pittwater LGA have a high dependence relative to the SSD for private car ownership and use.

It is also understood that there are comparatively fewer people in Pittwater using public transport compared to the SSD. Most people in the region prefer the use of private vehicles and this trend can be attributed to several factors including a lack of viable alternatives, inconsistency of public transportation service and long travel times.

### 4.5.12 Forecast Housing Trends

The existing and expected future population profile and age structure as discussed in Chapter 4 (Our community) and the housing consumption patterns and housing supply and demand discussed below, are important considerations that inform the process of planning for future housing in the Pittwater LGA.

The three major household types in the Pittwater LGA, as shown in Figure 14, are couples with dependents, couples without dependents and lone person households. This trend in housing consumption is consistent with the Sydney Statistical Division. Figure 14 shows the number of different household types and how they are expected to increase between 2006 and 2021. The largest increases in households are forecast to occur in the couples without dependents and lone person household categories. Households consisting of couples without dependents are forecast to increase from 6,189 in 2006 to 7,905 in 2021, which is an increase of 27.7% (1716 households). Lone person households are forecast to increase from 4,623 in 2006 to 6,249 in 2021, which is an increase of 35.1% (1626 households). Households consisting of couples with dependents are forecast to increase from 7,915 in 2006 to 8,863 in 2021, which is an increase of 11.9% (948 dwellings), less than half the rate of increase expected from the aforementioned categories.