

DATE: FRIDAY 4 DECEMBER 2015 AT 9.30am

VENUE: LEVEL 6, ASHFIELD CIVIC CENTRE, 260 LIVERPOOL ROAD, ASHFIELD.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.30am.

**BUSINESS:**

A. Attendees and apologies.

B. Ashfield Traffic Committee minutes of 2 October 2015 was confirmed and Council's resolution at its meeting on the 27 October 2015 was noted.

C. The Ashfield Traffic Committee November (informal) minutes (meeting 6/2015) was confirmed by the members of the Traffic Committee. The members in turn noted that the minutes will be reported to Council for adoption at its meeting on 8 December 2015.

D. The next meeting of the Ashfield Traffic Committee will be held at 9:30am on Friday 5 February 2016 at Level 6, Ashfield Civic Centre, 260 Liverpool Road, Ashfield.

**FORMAL ITEMS:**

Items which require the elected Council to exercise its delegation functions.

1. Kiss and Ride Zone, Station Street, Ashfield.	Parking restrictions	SH
2. No Stopping Zone in Queen Street, Croydon.	Parking restrictions	S
3. Request for Disabled parking zone, outside 10 John Street, Ashfield.	Parking restrictions	SH
4. Upgrade of the intersection of Armstrong Street/Hardy Street/Queen Street to a roundabout.	Road safety	SH

(SH) – Summer Hill Electorate

(S) – Strathfield Electorate

(C) – Canterbury Electorate

**INFORMAL ITEMS:**

Items progressed with members outside of the formal Traffic Committee meeting and require the elected Council to exercise its delegation functions. - NIL

---

## BUSINESS

### A. Attendees and apologies

#### Voting members:

Councillor Caroline Stott	Ashfield Council - Acting Chairperson
Mr. Ryan Horne	Roads and Maritime Services
Mr. Mitchell Wilson.	Representative for Ms. Jo Haylen, State Member of Parliament for Summer Hill

#### Informal advisors:

Mr. Rabih Beckdache	Sydney Buses
Mr. Colin Jones	ASHBUG (bicycle user group)
Ms. Delilah Marta	Ashfield Council – Senior Engineer-Infrastructure Design & Traffic Services.
Mr. Boris Muha	Ashfield Council – Traffic and Projects Engineer

#### Others:

Ms. Melanie Zeaiter	Ashfield Automotive (item 4)
---------------------	------------------------------

#### Apologies:

Snr Const. Sam Thome.	NSW Police Service Traffic section
Ms. Jacqui Thorburn	Representative for Ms. Jodi Mckay, State Member of Parliament for Strathfield
Ms. Cathy Edwards-Davis	Ashfield Council - Director Works and Infrastructure

### B. Ashfield Traffic Committee minutes and Council resolution

The minutes of the 2 October 2015 meeting of the Traffic Committee was circulated to members and informal advisors following the meeting and were confirmed.

Council at its meeting held on the 27 October 2015 resolved:

“That the Minutes of the Ashfield Traffic Committee meeting held on 02 October 2015 be confirmed and the recommendations within be adopted, with the exception of Item 004 – Summer Hill Resident Parking Scheme which is deferred for consideration to the next meeting of Council with accompanying report; and Item 002 - Parking Restrictions in Clissold Street, which is amended as follows:

Committee recommendation, point 5 amended to read:

5. That the matter of two way traffic and the reduced retention of parking in Clissold Street be further monitored and reviewed in 6 months' time, if not earlier, under a Traffic Management Plan.”

The Ashfield Traffic Committee November (informal) minutes (meeting 6/2015) was circulated to members and informal advisors and was confirmed. The minutes will be reported to Council for adoption at its meeting on 8 December 2015.

---

**C. Next Ashfield Traffic Committee meeting**

The next meeting of the Ashfield Traffic Committee will be held at 9:30am on Friday 5 February 2016 at Level 6, Ashfield Civic Centre, 260 Liverpool Road, Ashfield.

**FORMAL ITEMS**

Items which require the elected Council to exercise its delegation functions.

**ITEM NO: 001**

**SUBJECT: Kiss and Ride Zone-Station Street, Ashfield.**

**ELECTORATE: Summer Hill**

**DESCRIPTION:**

Council has received a request from Councillor Passas for changes to the Kiss and Ride zone in Station Street suggesting that it apply only during peak periods or that its length be reduced.

**COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:**

On the south side of Station a "No Parking" (Kiss and Ride) zone of 3 car spaces in length is present. This zone is situated in the 3 car spaces nearest to the station steps. Behind this zone a further space signposted No Parking (Australia Post Vehicles Excepted) is present. This space could also be used for Kiss and Ride purposes at times when it is not in use by Australia Post vehicles.

Parking observations were undertaken in Station Street on a number of occasions during September. These observations revealed that usage of the Kiss and Ride zone is low both during and outside of peak periods. The Kiss and Ride zone and the associated No Parking restriction applies on a full time basis. During peak periods the maximum observed usage of the Kiss and Ride zone was 2 vehicles in a 5 minute period. During off-peak periods the maximum observed usage was also 2 vehicles in a 5 minute period. i.e. usage of the kiss and ride zone is relatively low at all times.

Observations were also undertaken of the usage of the 1P parking in Station Street. There are approximately 13 spaces zoned 1P and at no time was every one of those spaces observed to be occupied. The average observed parking space vacancy rate within the 1P zone was 3 spaces with turnover of the spaces good. On some occasions only 1 space was left vacant for a short period but, as stated above, at no time was there no parking space available in Station Street.

Although usage of the Kiss and Ride is currently low, the kiss and ride zone has only been in existence at this location for a few months and knowledge of its presence may still be building. Removal of the Kiss and Ride zone during off-peak periods is not considered appropriate as usage of the zone occurs at all times of the day and, once removed, it may prove difficult to reinstate. It is also evident that parking demand within the 1P zone is higher during the middle of the day and, if the Kiss and Ride zone was not in operation at those times there is a danger that there would be nowhere within close proximity to the station at which to drop off or pick up passengers.

If any action is to take place, shortening of the Kiss and Ride zone by one space is considered the most appropriate course of action at this time. No change is suggested for the adjacent No Parking (Australia Post Vehicles Excepted) zone.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

The Committee members supported the officer's report.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That the existing No Parking (Kiss and Ride) zone on the south side of Station Street be shortened by 1 parking space (6m) with the adjacent 1P parking zone extended into the space created.
2. That the 1P parking zones created be investigated for the possibility of reducing it to short term parking to allow greater turnover.

**ITEM NO: 002**

**SUBJECT: No Stopping Zone –Queen Street, Croydon.**

**ELECTORATE: Strathfield**

**DESCRIPTION:**

Council has received a request from Burwood Council for the introduction of No Stopping restrictions on one or both sides of Queen Street, west of Jones Street to reinforce parking restrictions associated with the presence of double separation lines.

**COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:**

Double separation lines have been installed on Queen Street at this location to guide motorists negotiating the bend in the road to the west of Jones Street. This assists in preventing corner cutting or veering to the wrong side of the carriageway. Because the width of the road is only 8-9m in the vicinity of the bend any vehicle parked on either side of the road will be parked within 3m of the unbroken lines and is therefore illegally parked. Vehicles parked in this fashion also force passing traffic to cross to the wrong side of the road.

The level of parking activity can be quite high particularly when sporting activities are taking place at the adjacent Centenary Park or at Wests Sports Club and its associated entertainment facilities.

The road narrows at the bend to less than 9m before widening out to 10m on the straights approaching the bend. Drivers may therefore be unaware that the road narrows and that they are parking too close to the centreline. The installation of No Stopping signs on both sides of the road where its width is less than 9m is considered appropriate.

If Council were to install No Stopping signs on both sides of the road at the bend one of the signs on the south side of the road would be sited with the Burwood LGA. Burwood Council has advised that it raises no objection to Ashfield Council installing that sign in their LGA.

---

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

The Committee members supported the officer's recommendation.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

**That No Stopping signs be installed on both sides of Queen Street commencing west of the driveway to No.2 Queen St and continuing to a point east of the driveway to No.15 Jones Street.**

**ITEM NO: 003****SUBJECT: Request for a disabled parking zone outside 10 John Street, Ashfield.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

A request has been received from the resident of 10 John Street for a Disabled Parking zone outside her house to assist with her wheel chair bound son accessing a community mini- bus outside the front of the property.

**COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:**

The applicant has submitted a Doctor's certificate and Mobility (disability) permit supporting her application. She doesn't own a car and relies on a mini-bus to come to pick up and drop off her son. The bus driver usually pulls up in the middle of the road due to parked vehicles outside the property. The house does not have a driveway and parking is scarce in the vicinity of the house. On the basis of above observations, Council carried out the consultation within 50m of the proposed location for provision of Disability Parking outside 10 John Street, Ashfield. Council did not receive any written objections, however one verbal comment was received stating the fact that he supported the provision of a disability parking zone, but that it be signposted of a standard vehicle length.

The resident has confirmed that the bus has a wheel chair ramp at the back of the mini-bus.

Normally the bus would need a clear area of around 10 metres with the wheel chair hoist lowered to the back. However it is considered that part of an adjoining neighbouring driveway could be used to lower the hoist over. In view of above, it is recommended that a 7.5m long Disabled Parking space be provide outside 10 John Street, Ashfield, and that the disabled parking space be reviewed after the period of at least one year to verify if it still is required.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

The Committee members supported the officer's recommendation.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

**That no objection be made to installing a 7.5m length disabled parking zone outside 10 John Street, Ashfield.**

---

---

**ITEM NO: 004****SUBJECT: Upgrade of the intersection of Armstrong Street/Queen Street/Hardy Street, Ashfield, to a roundabout.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

Council is proposing to upgrade the intersection of Armstrong Street/Queen Street/Hardy Street, Ashfield, to a roundabout with provisions for cyclists and crossing facilities for pedestrians, as a long-term treatment. The primary intention of the proposal is to enhance road safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, improve movements for road users, improve crossing facilities for pedestrians, reduce motorist speeds and maintain access to all existing properties. It is also intended to minimise adverse impacts on adjacent residents and business, including on-street parking. The project is currently at the concept design phase and ready to move into the detailed design phase. This report is in relation to the concept of a roundabout design at the intersection of Armstrong Street / Queen Street / Hardy Street.

Available RMS accident records have identified in the last 5 years that some 8 recorded accidents have occurred at the intersection mainly resulting of cross traffic and right through collisions (i.e. vehicles turning right colliding with opposing through traffic). Similarly, there have been previous requests from residents and the Yeo Park Primary School P & C and the school community for safe crossing facilities to be implemented around the intersection to and from Harland Street/Victoria Street in reach of the school. The current treatment at the intersection was implemented well over 20-30 years ago, and is considered outdated and in need for an upgrade given the changes in the area. The proposed roundabout will address many of these issues.

The current (triangular island) treatment to the intersection allows all turns and through movements at the intersection from Armstrong Street, Hardy Street and Queen Street (south). Queen Street (north) offers only through movement to Queen Street (south) via a slip lane under a STOP control where it merges into Queen Street (south). Hardy Street has also a STOP control at the intersection corner of Armstrong Street/Queen Street (south). Armstrong Street flows directly into Queen Street (south). The current treatment does not offer any or safe and proper crossing facilities around the intersection. **See photo of existing treatment attached.** Queen Street is currently identified as cycle route in the bike plan.

The proposed roundabout will inevitably act as a traffic calming device to orderly control the flow of traffic from all approaches to the intersection. The acute approach of Queen Street (north) into Queen Street (south) will be realigned to approach into the roundabout. All legs in approach will be under Give-way control. The physical splitter islands that are constructed to direct traffic through the roundabout, will be lengthened and widened and a cut through to provide refuge to pedestrians where the pram ramps are proposed. Pedestrians would cross the road in two stages of shorter distance and focus on viewing traffic in one direction at a time.

Currently Council has funding available this financial year under the Special Rates Variation Program to design and construct a roundabout. In order to complete construction of the approved treatment by the end of June 2016, it is necessary to obtain Council approval on the layout concept by December

---

2015. This then allows just enough time to finalise the details in the design (including drainage, lighting, signs, markings, etc.), procure materials, engage contractors (if needed) and construct it. Delays will impact the 15/16 Council budget, future budgets and construction of the project.

### COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:

As part of the process, consultation was carried out with a number of key stakeholders and with local residents / businesses around the intersection. Discussions and meetings have been carried out with Police, RMS and the Ashfield Automotive owner regard to the proposed plan. Discussions were also made with the STA regard to bus movements around the intersection, and similarly Canterbury City Council (in near boundary to Ashfield) has been notified of the proposed upgrade to the intersection. Through the relevant discussions with the above authorities and Ashfield Automotive, and in view of the above responses, it is considered that the general consensus of the roundabout is supported, however with changes needed to the plan.

Residents / businesses in the following streets were directly invited to provide comments on the proposal, at total of 230 premises.

- Armstrong Street from Hardy Street to Hillcrest Avenue,
- Queen Street from Hillcrest Avenue to Hanks Street,
- Hardy Street from Armstrong Street to Hanks Street,
- Ashford Street and Goodwin Avenue, and
- Segments of Harland Street and Seaview Street as captured in a 100m radius of the intersection.

A copy of the letter and concept plan to residents seeking their comments on the proposed implementation of the roundabout was provided to the members of the Traffic Committee and Ward Councillors. **A copy of the letter and plan is re-attached to this report.**

In response to the consultation, Council received responses from 208 households/businesses which included 26 separate responses and 2 petition submissions.

One petition included signatures from 176 households (91 within the consultation area and 85 outside the consultation area – ranging from Ashfield to Western Australia) supported the proposal on condition that parking and access to Ashfield Automotive is provided. 15 accompanying letters were with this petition, 11 from Automotive tow truck companies, auto and electrical part services, and 4 from local street residences, either supporting the proposal on condition or objecting to the proposal.

A second petition included 8 households in Hardy Street objecting to the proposal.

Where a household has signed a petition and submitted a separate letter/email, their position stated in their letter/email was recorded. Where a household has signed both petitions, their position has



been recorded as undecided. A summary of the responses is below and a summary table of all responses is attached to this report.

Street	Number Support	Number Support with conditions	Number Oppose	Undecided	Total
Armstrong Street	1	10	1		12
Ashford Street	1	4	1		6
Goodwin Avenue	2	4	5		11
Hanks Street	1	9	1		11
Hardy Street	3	20	12	2	37
Queen Street	0	22	6		28
Service Avenue	0	7	0		7
Beyond consultation area*	1	79	5		85
Automotive tow, and parts delivery services to 1 Hardy Street**	0	4	7		11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>208</b>

\* Ranges from households across Ashfield – Dulwich Hill – Western Australia

\*\* Business submissions.

The collective **support** to the proposal indicated the following reasons for their support:

- Reducing speeding through Armstrong/Queen Street,
- Improving the difficulty in vehicles accessing through the intersection,
- Minimising near misses with traffic crossing and moving through the intersection,
- Improving pedestrian facilities to cross at the intersection.
- Eliminating the running of the STOP sign from Queen Street North to South
- Eliminating not obeying the STOP sign in Hardy Street.

The collective **supportive with conditions and objections** to the proposal raised the following issues.

1. Property accesses are affected for residents and businesses, particularly Ashfield Automotive.
2. Loss of parking in the area for residents and businesses.
3. Inappropriate / dangerous placement of pram ramps and pedestrian refuge across Hardy Street.
4. No marked pedestrian (zebra) crossings are proposed



5. Increase traffic and residential health / safety issues for Hardy Street residents.
6. Right turn from Harland Street to Queen Street is restrictive / difficult due to median island
7. Increased queuing in Harland Street and Queen Street (south approach)
8. Provisions for cyclists in Hardy Street.
9. Inadequate information and time for consultation.
10. Inadequate planning and design.

The following comments are offered in response to these issues:

1. Property accesses are effected for residents and businesses, particularly Ashfield Automotive

A concern has been raised with 220 residential property driveway directly onto the roundabout. The design is proposed to be modified to include an additional driveway area for turning the vehicle in a forward direction from 220 Queen Street to address the concern. All other driveways will be examined to see that vehicles can manoeuvre close to kerb and not hit the splitter islands when reversing. If necessary driveways will be widened.

A concern has been raised with access for tow trucks to the Ashfield Automotive premises. The proposed concrete splitter island in Hardy Street would interfere with current tow truck activity. Tow trucks currently turn across traffic in Hardy Street and reverse into the service bays (or corner property holding area) on the Ashfield Automotive premises to unload vehicles. The tow trucks are required to park at right angles across the northbound traffic lane in Hardy Street whilst unloading vehicles. Anywhere up to 10 minutes can occur to unload vehicles. All motorists in Hardy Street approaching the intersection either wait for the activity to complete, which may take anywhere up to 10 minutes to unload a vehicle, or incorrectly overtake the parked tow truck into the opposing traffic lane (wrong side of the road). This activity apparently can occur any time of the day or night, even when the business is closed. Currently no traffic control measures are put in place.

The purposes of the solid splitter island are: for channelling and controlling motorists and cyclists approaching the roundabout (include speeds); providing delineation (guidance) for road users especially during adverse weather and lighting conditions; as well as for providing a refuge crossing facility for pedestrians. This issue has been discussed directly with Ashfield Automotive and RMS on site. To address this issue a number of actions are proposed during the detailed design phase of the project. These include:

- Modifying the design to remove the solid splitter island and replace it with a low-profile mountable / flush splitter island. This will provide similar access to the premises, however, will reduce safety for cyclists and pedestrians, and motorists during adverse weather and lighting conditions.
- Modifying the design to remove the dedicated left-turn lane from Queens Street (south) into Hardy Street.
- Modifying the design of the central island roundabout and/or kerbside extensions on the Queen Street (south) and Armstrong Street approaches to provide greater deflection for

---

motorists (slowing motorists speeds on approach and through the roundabout), as well as to provide appropriate turning paths for buses along the Queen Street route.

- Relocating the pram ramps and providing kerb extensions for pedestrians crossing Hardy Street further south of the intersection. It should be noted that pedestrian fencing is not considered to be an option to guide pedestrians to this facility as it cannot be installed on both sides. Pedestrian activity is proposed to be monitored and safe crossing practices will be promoted to schools, residences, businesses in the area.
- Ashfield Council assisting Ashfield Automotive by liaising with the owner of Ashfield Automotive, RMS and Police in preparing Traffic Control Plans for the tow truck practices and supplying these to Ashfield Automotive for their implementation at all times when a tow truck obstructs traffic in Hardy Street.

## 2. Loss of parking in the area for residents and businesses

Parking is always of a concern, however irrespective of what treatment is proposed, there is always a degree of loss of parking as required to safely accommodate any traffic device and provide for the necessary sight distances, visibility of pedestrians and traffic movements. Where the design can be modified to provide retain parking it will be done, however this will not be known until the detailed design with all the proposed modifications are included. With the proposed design, pedestrian refuges are proposed near to the intersection to utilise the regulatory No Stopping restrictions of corners, and/or placed next to driveways to utilise clearance distance of the driveways and minimise the impact to parking in the area. It should be noted that Council is required to adhere to No Stopping distances according to RMS Technical directions.

A concern has been raised with loss of on-street parking on Hardy Street outside Ashfield Automotive. Ashfield Automotive claim that parking of customers vehicles (waiting for or completed service) on Hardy Street outside their premises is crucial for their business operations. As the design is proposed to be modified to remove the solid splitter island and crossing facility for pedestrians to accommodate their vehicle access needs, during the detailed design phase of the project reducing the No Stopping zone outside their premises to retain more parking will strongly be considered in the detailed design phase (including negotiations with RMS). Council will also liaise with the owner of the Ashfield Automotive on this matter.

Another concern has been raised with loss of on-street parking in Armstrong Street outside Excelsior Jones Café. As the design proposed solid splitter islands and crossing facilities for pedestrians on Armstrong Street, reducing the no Stopping zone most likely will not be possible, however it will be strongly considered in the detailed design phase (including negotiations with RMS). Council will also liaise with the owner of the Excelsior Jones Café on this matter. It should be noted that a bus zone is on Queen Street outside the Café.

## 3. Inappropriate / dangerous placement of pram ramps and pedestrian refuge across Hardy Street

A concern has been raised that the pram ramps and refuge island across the corners of Hardy Street are in conflicting and hazardous locations due to the Ashfield Automotive activities on one side. The design as mentioned above will be modified to relocate the pram ramps and providing kerb extensions for pedestrians crossing Hardy Street further south of the intersection between

---

---

driveways. This will require additional removal of on-street parking outside residential properties, however will retain on-street parking in the vicinity of Ashfield Automotive.

4. No marked pedestrian (zebra) crossings are proposed

A concern has been raised that no pedestrian (zebra) crossings have been provided at the roundabout or in its vicinity, in particular in Queen Street (south) before Harland Street. Pedestrian (zebra) crossings are not appropriate at roundabouts as they interfere with the traffic operations and reduce road safety for all road users (including pedestrians). Pedestrian refuges are most appropriate and as such all Standards and Technical Directions provide for refuges. The designs for the refuge islands will in accordance with RMS requirements for lengths and widths.

A pedestrian refuge in Queen Street (south) is appropriate to cater for pedestrian access to/from Harland Street towards Hardy Street, as well as avoid conflicts with cars and buses needing to turn right from Harland Street into Queen Street. Pedestrian activity is proposed to be monitored and safe crossing practices will be promoted to schools, residences, businesses in the area, organisations for the visually impaired, etc.

5. Increase traffic and residential health / safety issues for Hardy Street residents

A concern has been raised that traffic volumes will increase on Hardy Street and cause health and safety issues for residents. Currently, motorists cannot turn from Queen Street (north) into Hardy Street. The majority of traffic from Queen Street travels towards Old Canterbury (using Queen Street). Traffic travelling towards a Hardy Street destination currently proceeds along Queen Street, turns left into Hanks Street and turns into Hardy Street (left or right). Existing traffic volumes are higher along the southern section of Hardy Street (away from the roundabout).

The proposal will allow traffic from Queen Street (north) to turn into Hardy Street. It is anticipated that traffic volumes will increase along Hardy Street between Armstrong Street and Hanks Street, and will also decrease along Queen Street (south) and Hanks Street between Queen Street and Hardy Street. The current traffic volumes in Hardy Street, between Armstrong Street and Hanks Street are considered low, and traffic volume increases in Hardy Street would be considered to be within the local road capacity of the street. The design of the roundabout is itself a traffic calming treatment. Should there be a future issue with traffic speeds in Hardy Street, these can be monitored and addressed with additional traffic calming.

6. Right turn from Harland Street to Queen Street is restrictive / difficult due to splitter island

A concern has been raised that the splitter island restricts right turn movements from for motorists including buses from Harland Street into Queen Street. It has been advised that there is a high right turn vehicular movement at this intersection from Trinity Grammar particularly in the morning and afternoon school peaks. The design will be modified to reduce the length of the splitter island in Queen Street (south) to allow cars and buses to turn right from Harland Street into Queen Street. The pedestrian refuge crossing facility in that splitter island will also be moved closer to the proposed roundabout.

7. Increased queuing in Harland Street and Queen Street (south approach)

A concern has been raised that queue lengths and traffic delays will increase in Harland Street at the intersection with Queen Street (south), especially in the school morning and afternoon peak periods. It has been advised that motorists to/from Trinity Grammar School are encouraged to travel along the route Victoria Street – Harland Street – Queen Street (south) in the schools morning and afternoon peaks. It is suggested that the traffic queues are monitored during school days at the Harland Street / Queen Street intersection to determine if further future actions are necessary.

8. Provisions for cyclists in Hardy Street

A suggestion has been raised to identify Hardy Street for cyclists. Currently Queen Street is the identified cycling route on the “Ashfield Council Cycling Map and Guide” bike plan through this area. Cyclists are permitted to travel on any street, regardless of markings. There are also additional safety hazards in Hardy Street due to activities at Ashfield Automotive, so may not be a suitable route to promote / identify (mark). The detailed design phase will include cyclists using this route, however, not necessarily as an identified / marked route.

9. Inadequate information and time for consultation

A concern was raised that inadequate information was provided on the proposal and that period for providing comments was too short. This is a project on a local street network, the information provided for the consultation was consistent with information provided for other similar local road network projects. It is not required or expected to undertake Environmental Impact Statements for local projects. Two weeks was provided for consultation, this was consistent with consultation on other similar traffic projects. The timing in this particular instance was also governed by achieving meeting agendas to deliver the project prior to June 2016.

10. Inadequate planning and design

A concern was raised that inadequate planning had gone into this proposal and thought with the design. The project was at the concept design phase, where this type of feedback is gathered to then work on the detailed design for the project. The next phase of the project, if approved to continue, is the detailed design phase.

Additional (late) information to the report.

A meeting was held on site on Monday 30th November with Council officers, Councillor Mark Drury, MP for Summer Hill Ms Jo Haylen and her traffic committee representative, business owners from Ashfield Automotive, Excelsior Jones Cafe and residents (141 Queen Street and 27 Hardy Street).

The major concerns of the businesses and residents were heard and the following advice was provided to consider in amending the plan:

- That the solid splitter island be removed in Hardy Avenue and that a low profile mountable/flush splitter island is provided in Hardy Avenue for tow trucks to mount over and negotiate in reversing outside the Auto repair shop in Hardy Street. Ashfield

Automotive would need to undertake appropriate traffic control with tow truck activity in the area.

- That the pedestrian facility proposed on the corner of Hardy Street be relocated further south away from the conflict area of the intersection to possibly outside Number 5 Hardy Street. By doing so, this would retain the 3 parking spaces outside the Ashfield Automotive premises. However parking elsewhere would need to be lost to accommodate the relocated pedestrian facility. Rather than a pedestrian refuge, kerb extensions could be built out at the point of relocation. This requires less sight distance clearance than that of a refuge and loss of parking is therefore minimised. This form of treatment still offers adequate facility for pedestrians to cross.
- The splitter island in Queen Street (near Harland Street) together with the pedestrian refuge would be set back north away from the intersection of Harland Street to allow traffic and buses to turn right from Harland Street into Queen Street.

Other matters that were raised was the queuing of traffic in Harland Street, general loss of parking, the increase in traffic, health and safety to residents in Hardy Street, and the planning/process and timing of consultation. These matters were noted and have been addressed and itemised above.

It was also viewed that traffic counts would need to be assessed in the area to determine any liable affect in Hardy Street.

In response to the traffic counts, the following available traffic count figures are shown below:

- Queen Street, north of the intersection registered volumes back in June 2014 of 2622 vehicles per day (vpd) with 1056 northbound and 1567 southbound.
- Queen Street south of the intersection registered volumes back in June 2014 of 8808 vpd with 4234 northbound and 4574 southbound.
- Armstrong Street, north of the intersection registered volumes back in June 2014 of 6752 vpd with 3833 northbound and 2920 southbound.
- Hardy Street, between Armstrong Street and Hanks Street last registered volumes back in June 2002 of 791 vpd with 526 northbound and 239 southbound.

These figures are considered still representative to date with little or no real traffic increase over the years with development in the area. At worst case the 1567 vehicles per day from Queen Street (north) heading south, if all led into Hardy Street, would increase total volumes to around 2400vpd. This is considered well within the capacity of a local road. Never the less, Council will still monitor traffic volumes in Hardy Street, to determine if further actions are necessary.

### Conclusion

In summary, Council is proposing a roundabout at the intersection of Armstrong Street / Queen Street / Hardy Street, to a roundabout with provisions for cyclists and crossing facilities for pedestrians, as a long-term treatment. The primary intention of the proposal is to enhance road safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, improve movements for road users, improve crossing facilities for pedestrians, reduce motorist speeds, maintain access to all existing properties and minimise adverse impacts on adjacent residents and business, including on-street parking. The project is currently at

the concept design phase and is ready to progress into the detailed design phase. The majority of the community consultation appears to support the concept of a roundabout at the intersection of Queen Street / Armstrong Street / Hardy Street. The main concerns raised can be addressed through the detailed design phase.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

Presentation by Melanie Zeaiter for Ashfield Automotive at 1 Hardy Street:

- No objection to roundabout
- Concerns with parking removal – 3 spaces (has interest in property next door)
- Concerns with splitter island as it interferes with business operations
- Someone from business can be there to assist with traffic control at all hours.

Tabled Canterbury Council has no objections.

Main Committee discussion involved:

- Concerns with pedestrians safety
- Concerns with visibility issues for motorists on Queen Street (north) towards Armstrong Street.
- Roundabout may cause additional traffic queuing issues
- Alternative option of re-aligning cross roads at intersection and providing crossing facilities for pedestrians.

The Police advised following the meeting that they supported the alternate option above with additional line marking measures to be considered, and that police concerns with the pedestrian facility in Hardy Street be further looked into.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

That the upgrade of the intersection of Armstrong Street / Queen Street / Hardy Street to a roundabout is not supported and instead proceeds to the detailed design looking at realigning the intersection to cross roads with Stop control at Queen Street (North) and Hardy Street and subject to the following:

1. That the detailed design phase include provisions for the following modifications:
  - Remove the central island and realign the intersection to create cross roads with Stop control on Queen Street (North) and Hardy Street.
  - Crossing facilities for pedestrians provided in Armstrong Street, Queen Street (North) and Queen Street (South)
  - Relocate pedestrian facilities in Hardy Street further south of the intersection
  - An additional driveway area for turning the vehicle in a forward direction for 220 Queen Street is investigated.
  - Remove the solid splitter island in Hardy Street and replace it with a low-profile mountable / flush splitter island.
  - Remove the dedicated left-turn lane from Queen Street (south) into Hardy Street.



- 
- Reduce the length of the refuge island in Queen Street (south) to allow cars and buses to turn right from Harland Street into Queen Street and move the pedestrian refuge crossing facility closer to the intersection.
  - Investigate / negotiate with RMS reducing the No Stopping zone on each approach to be in line with RMS requirements.
2. That Council officers liaise with the Excelsior Jones Cafe owner in relation to parking along Armstrong Street outside the Café.
  3. That Council officers continue liaising with the Ashfield Automotive owner in relation to access, parking along Hardy Street outside their premises, and Traffic Control practices for tow trucks.
  4. That Council officers assist Ashfield Automotive by liaising with RMS and Police in preparing Traffic Control Plans for the tow truck practices, for Ashfield Automotive to implementation at all times when a tow truck obstructs traffic in Hardy Street.
  5. That the detailed design layout, sign and marking plans for the intersection be technically discussed through the Traffic Committee prior to construction.
  6. That Council officers monitor traffic queues during school days in Harland Street at the Harland Street / Queen Street intersection to determine if further actions are necessary.
  7. That Council officer's monitor after construction is completed and traffic patterns have established the pedestrian crossing activity and practices in the area to determine if further actions are necessary.
  8. That safe pedestrian crossing practices are promoted to nearby schools, residences, businesses in the area, and organisations supporting the visually impaired.
  9. That Council undertakes traffic counts in the affected streets and monitors traffic volumes to determine if further actions are necessary, including but not limited to traffic calming in Hardy Street.
  10. Review Hardy Street as a designate cycle route and include provisions in the detailed design for potential cycle lanes.
  11. Council advises the community of Council's resolution.



