

**Item 22.****Parking - Mobility Parking - Parkham Street, Surry Hills**

TRIM Container No.: 2023/700476

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Committee endorse the reallocation of parking on the northern side of Parkham Street, Surry Hills between the points 5.5 metres and 13.3 metres east of Olivia Street as "Mobility Parking Only".

**Voting Members for this Item**

<b>Voting Members</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>
City of Sydney	[Insert]	[Insert]
Transport for NSW	[Insert]	[Insert]
NSW Police –Surry Hills PAC	[Insert]	[Insert]
Representative for the Member for Sydney	[Insert]	[Insert]

**Advice**

Advice will be updated after the meeting

**Background**

A resident of Parkham Street, Surry Hills has requested a mobility parking space in front of their house. The resident has advised they are not in a wheelchair but cannot physically walk far.

## **Comments**

Parkham Street, Surry Hills east of Olivia Lane is designated for one-way traffic flow eastbound with an approximate width of 7 metres. The road and footway grades are relatively flat adjacent to this proposed space.

The kerb space, where the changes are proposed, is currently “2P 8am-10pm, Permit Holders Excepted Area 18” on the northern side of the street.

Under existing conditions, vehicles park on the northern side of the street which reduces the trafficable lane for one-way traffic flow to an approximate width of 4.6 metres. The remaining width is allocated for on-street parking.

Footpaths (approximately 1.5 metres wide) are provided on both sides of the street.

The Australian Standard for on-street mobility parking (AS 2890.5 – 2020) requires spaces to be 7.8 metres long and 3.2 metres wide.

A 7.8 metre long bay is proposed and with consideration for the width of existing parking lane in Parkham Street, a 3.2 metre wide bay can be accommodated within the carriageway.

Although the resident requesting this space is not in a wheelchair and kerb ramps are not necessary for them to use this space, the City will investigate installing ramps at this site should the proposal be endorsed.

## **Consultation**

The City consulted local residents and businesses in the area. There were 29 letters sent out with one response received supporting the proposal and one response received opposing the proposal due to loss of parking.

## **Financial**

Funds are available in the current budget.

**MICHAEL RIMAC, ENGINEERING TRAFFIC OFFICER**