

Item 40.**Parking - No Parking - Eglinton Lane, Glebe****TRIM Container No.: 2019/453327****Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Committee endorse the reallocation of parking on the southern side of Eglinton Lane, Glebe, between the points 10 metres and 23 metres (two car spaces) east of Edward Lane as: "No Parking".

Voting Members for this Item

Voting Members	Support	Object
City of Sydney	[Insert]	[Insert]
Transport for NSW	[Insert]	[Insert]
NSW Police – Leichhardt PAC	[Insert]	[Insert]
Representative for the Member for Balmain	[Insert]	[Insert]

Advice

Advice will be updated after the meeting.

Background

In September 2019, the City received a request from a resident of Eglinton Road for consideration to remove parking opposite their driveways in Eglinton Lane to gain access to their garages.

The proposal was referred and endorsed by the Committee at the 21 November 2019 meeting, however, the report did not include feedback received during consultation.

The City did not proceed with the proposal and have prepared this report which includes feedback received during consultation for the Committee's endorsement.

Comments

Development Application D/2016/480 approved the installation of garages at the rear of 34 and 36 Eglinton Road in Eglinton Lane.

Eglinton Lane is a 5.6 metre wide, two way street with parking on the southern side of the street. Parking is currently signposted as "2P 8am-6pm Mon-Fri Permit Holders Excepted Area G"

Road Rules 2014 prohibits drivers from parking across a driveway or in any other way which blocks access to a driveway. In narrow streets like Eglinton Lane, cars parked opposite the driveways obstruct or prevent vehicles from entering or exiting the garages. Section 6 of the Roads Act 1993 gives land owners a right of vehicle access between their land and the public road.

On-site inspection shows that parking is required to be removed opposite the driveways in order to provide vehicular access to the garages.

Consultation

The City consulted local residents and businesses in the area. There were 54 letters sent out with no responses supporting the proposal and six responses opposing the proposal due to concerns about the assessment of Development Application D/2016/480 and the loss of parking.

Financial

Funds are available in the current budget.

TANZ ALAM, ENGINEERING TRAFFIC OFFICER