

DATE: FRIDAY 2 OCTOBER 2015

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

Meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.30am.

BUSINESS:

- A. Attendees and apologies.
- B. Ashfield Traffic Committee minutes of 7 August 2015 was confirmed and Council's resolution at its meeting on the 25 August 2015 was noted.
- C. Next meeting of the Ashfield Traffic Committee will be held at 9:30am on Friday 4 December 2015 at Level 6, Ashfield Civic Centre, 260 Liverpool Road, Ashfield.

FORMAL ITEMS:

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

1. No Parking in lane behind Wood Street, Ashfield.	Parking restrictions	SH
2. Parking restrictions in Clissold Street, Ashfield.	Parking restrictions	SH
3. Relocation of the pedestrian marked foot-crossing in Grosvenor Crescent at the intersection with Sloane Street, Summer Hill.	Pedestrian safety.	SH
4. Summer Hill Resident Parking Scheme-Summer Hill	Parking restrictions	SH
5. Proposed pedestrian and cycleway refuge traffic device in Ormond Street at the intersection of Parramatta Road, Ashfield.	Bicycle-pedestrian refuge facility.	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
Senior Constable Sam Tohme	NSW Police Service Traffic section
Mr. Mitchell Wilson	Representative for Ms. Jo Haylen, State Member of Parliament for Summer Hill

Informal advisors:

Mr. Rabih Bekdache	State Transit Authority- Sydney Buses
Mr. Colin Jones	ASHBUG (bicycle user group)
Ms. Cathy Edwards-Davis	Ashfield Council - Director Works and Infrastructure
Mr. Boris Muha	Ashfield Council – Traffic and Projects Engineer
Ms. Satwinder Saini	Ashfield Council – Traffic Engineer
Mr. James Brocklebank (item 4)	Ashfield Council – Traffic Officer

Apologies:

Ms. Jacqui Thorburn	Representative for Ms. Jodi Mckay, State Member of Parliament for Strathfield Representative for The Honourable Linda Burney, State Member of Parliament for Canterbury
Ms. Delilah Marta	Ashfield Council – Senior Engineer-Infrastructure Design & Traffic Services.

B. Ashfield Traffic Committee minutes and Council resolution

The minutes of the 7 August 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 25 August 2015 resolved:

That the minutes of the Ashfield Traffic Committee held on the 7 August 2015 be confirmed and that the recommendations contained in the Minutes be adopted.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That the Ashfield Traffic Committee minutes of 7 August 2015 were confirmed and Council's resolution at its meeting on the 25 August 2015 was noted.

C. Next Ashfield Traffic Committee meeting

The next meeting of the Ashfield Traffic Committee will be held at 9:30am on Friday 4 December 2015 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: No Parking on lane behind Wood Street, Ashfield.

ELECTORATE: Summer Hill

DESCRIPTION:

Council has received complaint from a resident of Wood Street in regards to a vehicle parking in the narrow laneway behind Wood Street, Ashfield.

COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:

This unnamed laneway behind Wood Street is 3.2m wide and serves as a one-way access from Elizabeth Street to Station Street, as well as providing rear property and service access to businesses and residents.

Council has received complaint that a 4WD (P plate) driver intermittently parks his vehicle in the lane after 6 pm. The vehicle is parked in such a way close to the intersection to visually impair and obstruct other vehicles turning in from Elizabeth Street. These vehicles are then forced to blindly reverse back into Elizabeth Street. The resident confirms to have called Police on several occasions as well, but, has requested the need for clear signage.

Councils officer investigated the area and discovered that there is an existing “No Stopping” sign just at the corner of this laneway and Station Street. This doesn’t provide sufficient reason for users to avoid vehicle parking in the laneway or sufficient reason for officers to take enforcement actions. It was thus proposed to introduce “No Parking” on both sides of this laneway. This would keep the laneway clear of parking and residents will be able to access their properties. Consultation was carried out as a part of this proposal and Council did not receive any objections to the proposal.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The Committee members supported the officer’s recommendation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That ‘No Parking’ be installed on both sides of the unnamed lane to the rear of Wood Street, between Elizabeth Street and Station Street, Ashfield.

ITEM NO: 002**SUBJECT: Parking restrictions in Clissold Street, Ashfield.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

Council has received several complaints in regards to the safety of the road users on Clissold Street, Ashfield with vehicles parked on the road. Council has also received similar request from the members of Traffic Committee relating to the safety issues on Clissold Street due to the narrow width of road and the parking of vehicles on the road.

COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:

Clissold Street is a narrow two way road between Holden Street and Prospect Road. This street as well accommodates two way bus routes. The width of the street kerb to kerb is approximately 6.4 m. Currently the street has "No Stopping" restrictions at the intersections and bus stop locations to both sides of the road. Unrestricted parking is allowed for in remaining sections on both sides of the road. Vehicles park either on one side of the road or in a close staggered formation on both sides of the road.

The street intersects adjacent to Farleigh Street, Queen Street, William Street, Victoria Street, Tintern Street and Victoria Square at nearly 100m intervals. Opportunity is provided for vehicles to park on the adjacent streets. The intermittent stopping of the buses, invites frustration to other drivers, who are impeded in travel and held back, or end up either overtaking the buses or squeezing through between parked cars or at times not giving-way to oncoming traffic. This creates a dangerous situation and a major safety concern for the road users. STA has raised major concerns in regards to the safety with buses traversing through the street especially at the intersection with Prospect Road and Holden Street. Various Committee members requested installation of "No Stopping" signs on both sides of Clissold Street, throughout its full length between Holden Street and Prospect Road. Council officers needed to further examine the matter and consult accordingly with the affected residents.

A proposal for the introduction of "No Stopping" zone along the entire stretch of the street was drafted and circulated to the residents of the Clissold Street as a part of consultation process and with a view to addressing this safety issue. Council received several replies on the consultation. Most residents in response oppose the "No Stopping" proposal and have requested to reconsider the proposal and opt for other alternatives such as re-routing the buses, provide parking to the one side on the street, making the street one way, or increase parking opportunities in the adjacent side streets.

After careful consideration, three options have been devised:

1. No Parking on both sides of Clissold Street

Introducing "No Parking" on both sides would address safety issue while taking care of the drop off and pick up rights of the residents and other commercial facilities existing on the street. This would help keeping the street clear of the parked vehicles and assist in smooth flow of the traffic.

2. No Stopping on one side and No Parking on the other

This option looks at retaining clear flow of traffic in one direction all of the times. If this proposal has to be adopted “No Stopping” will be introduced in the eastbound direction and “No Parking” will be introduced in westbound direction. This can still adequately allow for drop off and pick-up in the area.

3. No stopping on one side and Parking on the other.

Clearway for traffic could be provided right through on the northern side of the street with parking provided entirely on the south side of the street. This option shall assist the movement of vehicles while allowing parking opportunity for the residents.

Alternatively parking could be kept to the one side, either north or south in different sections of the street, e.g. south side between Holden Street and Queen Street, north side between Queen Street and Victoria Street. This measure will allow the flexibility to place parking on the side of the street where necessary for improved approach to bus stops and vehicle movement at side street intersections. However a straight line of traffic movement on the one side will not be attained for the full length of the street.

1-4 parking spots may need to be removed near intersections to allow for the safe holding of vehicles whilst giving way to opposing traffic near intersections, and improve the manoeuvrability around these intersections.

This option aims at retaining in the range of 20-30 parking spots pending to which side or sides of the road parking is best considered and to what extent further clearance is provided at the intersections.

Based on the observation that most properties on the Clissold street have a dedicated off street parking or are in the vicinity of 100 m where they can find parking, it could be considered that option 2 would provide proper two-way traffic flow with the opportunity for residents to drop off and pick up. Residents would need to resort to parking in the adjoining streets.

Option 3 would retain reasonable amounts of parking controlled with No Stopping to the opposite side and further clearance at intersections to improve the current one lane two-way flow in the street.

For long term, Clissold Street like few other streets has been flagged to be captured under the Traffic Management Plan. Council is in process of developing this plan and will come up with the strategies to assist with long term safety measures to be adopted on this street.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Council’s Traffic and Projects Engineer discussed at the meeting option 3 which allows for a reduced number of parking spaces to be controlled to the one side of Clissold Street and located well away from the major intersections of Holden Street, Queen Street, Victoria Street, and Prospect Road. “No Stopping” would be assigned to the opposite side of the parking along Clissold Street. Small sections of “No Parking” could be placed in Clissold Street opposite the intersections of William Street and the

rear access lanes coming off Clissold Street (between Tintern Road and Prospect Road) to allow some opportunity to drop off and pick up at these locations. If there is a perceived problem with the “No Parking” with regard to traffic flow, than these zones shall be converted to “No Stopping”.

The STA representative advised that Clissold Street is a vital and long established bus route. Buses cannot be removed or it is difficult remove buses out of the street. The question of likely speeding was raised if parking was completely removed in Clissold Street. The Committee concluded to accept the option of retaining a reduced number of parking spaces, however it considered that the matter be further monitored and reviewed in 12 months’ time, if not earlier under a Traffic Management Plan. The following amendment to the officer’s recommendation is made.

COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATION:

1. That no objection is raised to retain (in reduction) an approximate number of parking spaces on the one side of Clissold Street, Ashfield as follows:
 - a. 5 spaces on the southern side of Clissold Street between No.4 Clissold Street and Farleigh Street (section Holden Street to Farleigh Street).
 - b. 6-7 spaces on the southern side of Clissold Street between Farleigh Street and No.12 Clissold Street (section Farleigh Street to Queen Street).
 - c. 4 spaces on the northern side of Clissold Street between the side of No. 98 Queen Street and No. 15 Clissold Street (section Queen Street and William Street).
 - d. 4 spaces on the northern side of Clissold Street between William Street and the side of No. 40 William Street (section William Street to Victoria Street).
 - e. 5-6 spaces on the northern side of Clissold Street between the rear side of No 39 Tintern Road and Tintern Road (section Victoria Street and Tintern Road).
 - f. 5 spaces on the northern side Clissold Street between Tintern Road and No. 1A Clissold Street (section Tintern Road and Prospect Road).
2. That “No Stopping” be placed to the opposite side of the parking in Clissold Street, between Holden Street and Prospect Road.
3. Apart for the Bus stops, that “No Stopping” be placed on both side of Clissold Street at least 30-40 metres from the main corner intersections of Holden Street, Queen Street, Victoria Street and Prospect Road.
4. That small sections of “No Parking” zones be placed in Clissold Street opposite the intersections of William Street and the rear access lanes off Clissold Street (between Victoria Street and Prospect). Should problems arise; the “No Parking” will be converted to “No Stopping”.
5. That the matter of two-way traffic and the reduced retention of parking in Clissold Street be further monitored and reviewed in 12 months’ time, if not earlier under a Traffic Management Plan.

ITEM NO: 003**SUBJECT: Relocation of the pedestrian marked foot-crossing in Grosvenor Crescent at the intersection with Sloane Street, Summer Hill.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

Council is continually receiving complaints regard the safe crossing of pedestrians at the existing marked foot- crossing in Grosvenor Crescent at the intersection with Sloane Street, Summer Hill. The crossing is located right on the north-western corner of the intersection and outside of the staircase to the Summer Hill Railway Station.

Requests in turn have been made to Council, including that from Police, to enhance road safety for pedestrians and motorists in the area.

COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:

The matter was last reported to the Ashfield Traffic Committee at its meeting in June 2014.

It was advised at the meeting that Sydney Rail (through the request of Council) agreed to program and remove a brick pillar at the entrance to the staircase and replace it with a slender steel column to support the awning to the staircase. This would greatly improve the sighting of pedestrians leading out onto the crossing for oncoming traffic. This was soon after implemented, and was actioned based on the advice and previous suggestion to removing the brick pier by the shopkeeper/residents in the area.

Furthermore, Council also proceeded to upgrade and improve various crossing regulatory/warning signs in the area, and similarly install a rubber speed cushion to the east of the crossing in Grosvenor Crescent to control traffic speeds in the west bound direction.

Needless to say, following these remedial works, there have been further police report and public claims of pedestrian incidences or near misses at the above crossing.

Available RMS crash statistics from 2009 to June 2014 identify 4 recorded incidences in the period of 5 years. 3 are pedestrian injury related focused at the crossing with pedestrians hit on the near(left) or far (right) sides by vehicles approaching from the east of Grosvenor Crescent or turning right in from Sloane Street. The crash statistics identify the incidences had occurred in the afternoon in dry and fine conditions. The fourth incident is of non-injury with a vehicle veering off left and hitting parked cars just west of Sloane Street.

In further monitoring of the area, it is observed that many of the pedestrians are seen to lead and rush out onto the crossing from both sides, with little or no due care given to observe oncoming traffic. Pedestrians are more so obscured coming out of the staircase and northern corner of the crossing to vehicles heading eastbound. This coupled with the problem of vehicle concentration in manoeuvring through and around the intersection with the crossing right at the corner, is considered to be the primary cause with the pedestrian-vehicle issue at the intersection.

In prior discussions with residents and shopkeepers, a favoured suggestion was raised that the crossing be relocated west to the area near the lifts of the station to enhance pedestrians safety and similarly improve pedestrian accessibility to the lifts.

It is of this view that Council proposes to relocate the crossing some 10 metres west away from the intersection and construct and widen the footpath to 2.1 metres on the southern side of Grosvenor Crescent outside the staircase. Fencing will be erected on both sides of Grosvenor Crescent to guide pedestrians to the relocated crossing, and around to the existing crossing in Sloane Street (west side), and an existing pedestrian refuge in Grosvenor Street (south side, east of Sloane Street).

Shopkeeper/residents in the near proximity to the crossing were invited to comment on the proposal. No objections were received. It is considered imperative that pedestrian safety is enhanced in the area rather than the convenience and desire to cross right at the intersection. The existing crossing in Sloane Street is well utilised and caters satisfactorily to direct pedestrians to and from the east side of the intersection of Sloane Street and Grosvenor Crescent.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The RMS representative was of the view that the relocated crossing be raised and that the existing speed humps in both approaches to the crossing be removed. Council officers advised that funding is only limited to the relocation of the crossing (at road level) with the retention of the speed humps to either side of the crossing. The Committee members supported the officer's recommendation to relocating the crossing. In addition the Committee recommended that Council consider application for RMS grant funding for any future raising of the crossing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the pedestrian marked foot- crossing in Grosvenor Crescent at the intersection with Sloane Street outside the staircase to the Summer Hill Railway Station, be relocated some 10 metres west of its existing location.
2. That pedestrian safety fencing be installed on both sides of Grosvenor Crescent to direct pedestrians to the relocated crossing in Grosvenor Street, and around to the existing crossing in Sloane Street (west side), and the existing pedestrian refuge in Grosvenor Crescent (south side, east side of Sloane Street).
3. That the footway to the southern side of Grosvenor Crescent outside of the staircase of the Summer Hill Railway Station be widened to 2.1metres in width.
4. That Council consider RMS application for grant funding for any future raising of the crossing.

ITEM NO: 004**SUBJECT: Summer Hill Resident Parking Scheme-Summer Hill.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

Council has undertaken parking investigations and consultation in regard to a proposal for a resident parking scheme in the streets surrounding Summer Hill Station and shops. The outcomes of the investigations and consultation are outlined in the following report

COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:**Background**

In 2014 Council implemented a resident parking scheme in the Ashfield CBD and Croydon CBD (Areas 1,2 & 6). Smaller resident parking areas have subsequently been introduced in Croydon, near Parramatta Road (Area 8), in Hawthorne Parade (Area 9) and in Somerville Avenue (Area 7). In addition, the Transitional Resident Parking zone (in Nixon Avenue, Charlotte St, Wood Street and Grainger Avenue) has now been transitioned to the wider Ashfield Resident Parking Scheme now operating as Area 3. Residents of Summer Hill have been writing to Council for some time asking for the introduction of Resident Parking restrictions in their area as parking pressures continue to intensify.

Since the introduction of the Ashfield Resident Parking Scheme residents of Summer Hill have been consistently advised that Summer Hill will be the next area investigated for introduction of a resident parking scheme.

Investigations conducted prior to consultation

Council's Resident Parking Permit Policy has established some criteria which must be satisfied before resident parking restrictions can be considered for an area. One of these criteria is that Council must have received at least 3 requests for resident parking restrictions or a petition within the last 12 months. Many more than 3 requests have been lodged and it is considered that there has been a general expectation among many in the Summer Hill community that a resident parking scheme will be proposed at some point.

The Policy also requires that parking occupancy levels on street must exceed 75% of available supply on a typical weekday. On-street parking surveys have been conducted throughout all streets within a 750m walking catchment of the Summer Hill station. 750m is the approximate distance that the average person can walk in 10 minutes and reflects a reasonable outer limit for a distance that might prove attractive for a commuter to park to walk to the station and/or work.

The outcomes of these occupancy surveys were shown on maps tabled at the meeting and revealed that most streets within the 750m walking catchment have parking occupancies exceeding 75%. Some streets, or parts of streets, at the fringes of the area have occupancies less than 75% and on this basis some of the streets in which occupancy surveys were conducted were removed from the proposed scheme boundaries (as discussed below) prior to consultation to ensure that overall occupancies throughout the consulted scheme area remained above the 75% level.

To the North of the Station, Parramatta Road is a significant obstacle to pedestrian connectivity with its high traffic volumes and limited crossing points, as a consequence, parking occupancies in streets such as O'Connor Street, Nicholls Street, Logan Ave, Stanton Road and Haberfield Road are all below 75% and the overall occupancy level for the area to the north of the station falls below 75% if they are included in the resident parking scheme area. The above streets, plus Ramsay Street and Percy Street, all of which have many homes with two or more off-street parking spaces, were excluded from the proposed resident parking scheme area to yield an overall occupancy level within the proposed scheme area of 78%.

To the south of the station, despite parking occupancies in some fringe streets falling below 75%, the overall occupancy level is still well above 75% (at 81%) and the only parts of streets excluded from the potential scheme area are Moonbie Street (south of Junction Rd) and Old Canterbury Road (south of Junction Rd). The boundaries of the proposed resident parking scheme area showing a draft signposting plan and the area consulted were marked on maps tabled at the meeting.

Number plate surveys have also been undertaken in many of the streets within the proposed resident parking scheme area. The purpose of these investigations was to ascertain how many of the vehicles currently parked on street during business hours belong to residents. Given the high density of development in some of the streets there was concern that much of the on-street parking activity may already have been largely residential in nature. In this way, the introduction of permit parking restrictions would do little to improve the availability of parking for residents.

The number plate surveys have revealed that throughout the proposed resident parking area approximately half of the on-street parking activity is residential in nature i.e. around half of the vehicles parked on street were present in the same location during the day and also after 6:00p.m. In some streets, such as Gower Street and Sloane Street there are higher levels of resident related parking activity (due to higher densities) however, as these streets are also in close proximity to the station, and suffer from very high parking occupancies (greater than 90%) the introduction of permit parking restrictions will assist those residents to maximise the use of the available on-street parking resource.

Further to the survey work noted above, Council has also undertaken additional survey work to identify and document the number of on-site parking spaces that are currently available on each property within the proposed resident parking scheme area. This additional work has been undertaken to allow Council to ensure that the correct number of permits are issued to each residence, should the resident parking scheme progress. The data will also assist in staff to gauge the maximum number of restricted parking spaces that might be required.

Draft Resident Parking Scheme (RPS) Signposting Proposal

The draft signposting maps and consultation areas provided the following information for residents participating in the consultation process:

- The properties in the RPS area which could participate in the scheme if eligible.
- The streets/street side which will be signposted for permit parking.
- The time limit restrictions which are proposed to apply i.e. 2P (8am-6pm Mon-Fri) Permit holders excepted – Area XX
- The location of existing parking restrictions
- The location of proposed new No Parking zones



From the maps it can be seen that permit parking restrictions were proposed only for one side of the street and not both sides. The reasons for this are:

- a) For consistency with the resident parking scheme areas which have been established elsewhere in the LGA
- b) So that the available on-street parking is shared more equitably between residents, commuters and employees.
- c) To limit transfer of commuter parking activity to neighbouring areas.

The determination of this allocation of kerb space was also based to some extent upon the probable number of permits that may be issued for each street/RPS area, taking into account the on-site parking spaces that are currently available on each property within each street/RPS area. It should be noted however that experience with existing resident parking areas has shown that many residents who appear to be eligible for resident parking permits do not obtain them (e.g. because their car is absent from the area during office hours, they do not own a car, etc) i.e. the amount of kerb space allocated to resident parking restrictions is not a precise exercise. If the proposed scheme is introduced, the length of kerb space allocated to resident parking restrictions can be reviewed based upon the number of actual permits issued.

Consultation

There are over 3500 homes and business premises in the streets within the proposed resident parking scheme area described above. Consultation letters were hand delivered to each of these premises and to homes lying on the fringes of the proposed resident parking areas. In all, approximately 3700 consultation letters were distributed. Residents were invited to provide their views on a proposal to introduce resident parking restrictions on one side of each street within the subject area. Residents were given at least 2 weeks to respond however late responses were also taken into consideration.

The consultation strategy adopted to communicate the proposed Residential Parking Permit Scheme comprised the following forms of communication.

- A letter box drop to each household within the RPS scheme areas, including a cover letter, feedback sheet, an information sheet and maps of the proposed resident parking scheme areas/signposting. Residents were also advised that they may also respond via email or to a web based survey (a significant proportion of the responses were lodged via the web based survey)
- A page was created on Council's website with an easy link for on-line submissions plus links to Frequently Asked Questions, Information sheets, area maps and other relevant background information.
- Copies of all documentation were available at Council's Customer Services Counter with Customer Services and Engineering staff available to respond to enquiries.

Residents were advised in the consultation letter that responses were due by 4th September 2015. The contractor undertaking the delivery of letters was required to provide a GPS track to verify that letters were delivered to all streets within the resident parking scheme area. Unfortunately, the GPS track revealed that part or all of some streets were missed and a follow up delivery was subsequently undertaken to those streets and the closing date for comments extended to 11 September. Late submissions are still being accepted and at the time of drafting this report responses from 598

separate addresses have been received. The 598 responses include a 63 name petition opposing the resident parking scheme. The petitioners have been added as individual responses opposing the introduction of resident parking restrictions.

In analysing the feedback it is apparent that multiple responses have been received from several residences. Where those responses express the same views only one response has been recorded. In a handful of cases opposing viewpoints from the same residence have been received, in these instances both responses have been recorded as they cancel each other out. 16 respondents have not provided their residential address (13 of these were opposed to the introduction of resident parking restrictions). These responses have been accepted although there is some doubt about their validity as there is no way of determining which address or street they represent or even if the response is from a Summer Hill resident. After filtering out duplicate responses from the same address the outcome of the consultation is that 276 respondents (46.2%) have indicated their support for the introduction of resident parking restrictions in their street. 318 respondents (53.2%) have indicated that they oppose the introduction of restrictions. 4 respondents did not indicate whether they were in support or opposition to the restrictions.

Council's letter to residents urged them to respond but advised that if no response was received it would be assumed that they were supportive of the introduction of resident parking restrictions. Council's Resident Parking Policy stipulates that "a minimum 50% resident support from the properties within the proposed RPS area is required to proceed with the installation of a RPS.." While on this basis it could be said that more than 50% of residents would be supportive of the introduction of resident parking restrictions (only 8.6% of the 3700 consulted have lodged submissions in opposition to restrictions) several respondents have objected to the assumption being made that non respondents are supportive and have stated that only those who have responded should be taken into consideration. This criticism is acknowledged however, as has been explained to those residents, Council makes that statement to encourage as many as possible to make their views known. The fact that over 15% of those consulted have lodged a submission (a good response rate) suggests that this approach has been successful. It is also considered that Council's statement is more likely to draw responses from those who are opposed while those who are supportive are more likely not to respond as they will expect that their silence will be taken as support.

An analysis of the responses on a street by street basis was tabled at the meeting to assist the committee to gauge the variations in the consultation outcomes. Although there is strong support for the introduction of resident parking restrictions, particularly from streets nearer to the station and those with very high parking occupancies, it is undeniable that some streets appear to be strongly opposed to the introduction of resident parking restrictions.

If streets (or sections of streets) in which strong opposition has been recorded are removed from the resident parking scheme area the support level from respondents from the remaining streets as a whole is greater than 50%.

These streets are discussed below:

On the basis of the responses received, only one street, Teakle Street, has had more than 50% of the homes from the street registering opposition to resident parking restrictions. Louisa Street and Drynan Street have both had more than 45% of the homes in the street registering opposition. In each of these streets it is probably difficult to justify their inclusion within the resident parking scheme area given the opposition level and the fact that on-street parking availability is quite good. In addition, removal of Junction Road (west of Henson Street), Carrington Street (south of Wellesley St) and Spencer Street (south of Wellesley St) from the resident parking scheme area may also be appropriate given that parking is currently readily available in these areas and high levels of objection to resident parking have been received from homes in these localities.

On-street parking occupancies in Haig Avenue and French Lane are low and only two responses have been received from these streets, both opposed to resident parking. French Lane also has no residential addresses on its frontages and, given the isolated nature of these two streets and the fact that all homes in Haig Avenue have off-street parking, the benefit of introducing resident parking restrictions is considered limited at this time.

Oaklands Avenue has drawn responses from 4 of the 9 homes in the street, 3 of the responses are opposed to the introduction of restrictions and there is some doubt about the merit of introducing restrictions in that street. Further analysis reveals that there are 6 properties with a frontage to Oaklands Avenue that may be eligible for permits (i.e. they have one or less off-street parking spaces) which would mean that a resident parking restriction on one side of the street will assist in making parking more readily available for some residents and for short term visitors.

Other notable outcomes from the consultation include:

Respondents were asked to indicate what days and hours they would prefer resident parking restrictions to apply. Of the 318 people who responded to that question 43.7% indicated a preference for restrictions applying Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm, 37.7% indicated a preference for restrictions applying 8am to 6pm everyday and 18.6% indicated a preference for restrictions applying 8am to 6pm Mon-Fri and 8:30am to 12:30pm on Saturday. Based upon this response restrictions applying 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday are recommended.

Residents were asked to advise if they parked on street. 81.6% of those who responded to that question do park on street suggesting a high degree of reliance upon on-street parking.

Residents were asked if they considered that parking was a problem in their street. 64% of those who responded to the question indicated that it was. It is noted that although this figure is well above 50% the percentage of respondents supporting the introduction of resident parking restrictions is significantly lower at 46.2%.

Residents were asked to advise if they had off-street parking. 50.6% of those who responded advised that they did have one or more off-street parking spaces. This contrasts with Council's off-street parking surveys which revealed that 69.1% of homes within the surveyed area have off-street parking. i.e. residents without off-street parking were over represented among the respondents.

Residents were also asked to indicate how many cars were driven by residents at their home and how many off-street parking spaces they had. Of those who responded to the questions, there were 935 cars driven by residents at the address but only 358 off-street parking spaces available indicating again that respondents tended to have a high degree of reliance upon on-street parking.

Response to key issues arising from consultation

There were a number of recurrent issues that were raised in the general comments section of the consultation response form. These issues are described below with a response to the concern indented and in italics.

Off-street car spaces and/or driveway is too small to park on, will we be able to get a permit?

There is provision in the application process for residents to raise any special circumstances. These are then reviewed by staff and a permit issued if the issue is found to be justified. Small parking spaces are assessed on a case by case basis.

Off-street car spaces at home unit development are unallocated can I get a permit?

Council has records of the number of units and the number of off-street parking spaces at unit developments. If the number of parking spaces is one per unit (which is often the case) each unit is assessed as having one parking space. Where the number of spaces is less than 1 per unit and these are unallocated (i.e. lease agreement does not indicate any ownership of the space) a permit would normally be issued.

Where the unit development was approved after 1997 in accordance with the Resident parking Policy it would be ineligible for permits.

Taxis and taxi-driver's private cars occupy much of the parking at the eastern end of Carlton Crescent

The introduction of resident parking restrictions on one side of Carlton Crescent will introduce some control on taxi related parking activity as Taxi drivers will be ineligible for permits unless they live in the subject street and meet other permit eligibility requirements.

Parking is worst in the evening due to restaurant/café parking.

Other than at the lower end of Moonbie Street and Morris Street and in the upper end of Sloane Street this problem is not widespread. Evening restrictions would receive a low level of enforcement (if any) so are unlikely to be effective.

Evenings are the worst time as residents return home from work.

In some streets, such as Sloane Street and Gower Street where there is a significant proportion of unit development this is certainly true. Extending resident parking restrictions in to the evening to control this parking activity would be pointless as it would penalise the

residents the restrictions are designed to assist. Evening restrictions would also not be enforced regularly so would be unlikely to be effective.

Parking is not that much of a problem further from the station. Resident parking is not necessary.

Parking observations confirm this. Parking activity is generally lighter in streets or sections of streets further from the station and shops and restrictions may not strictly be necessary at present. If restrictions are introduced only in those streets nearer to the station where parking activity is heavier it is likely that the parked vehicles will relocate to these quieter streets and Council may then have to come back and install restrictions at a later date.

The Resident Parking Scheme is just a revenue raising exercise for Council.

Council will undoubtedly generate revenue from the proposed \$50 fee for a 2nd permit and from parking fine revenue however this is offset by the costs associated with installing, maintaining and administering the resident parking scheme.

Council needs to issue visitor parking permits.

Many Council's issue visitor parking permits so resident's visitors, tradesmen etc can also park on an unrestricted basis within the resident parking zone. In most cases these Council's have resident parking schemes which apply on both sides of the road.

Ashfield Council has adopted an approach where restrictions are introduced only on one side of the street leaving the other side free for visitors, commuters and others ineligible for permits. Unless this approach is amended the provision of visitor parking permits is not recommended.

Permits should be provided to all homes regardless of how many off-street spaces they have.

The purpose of a resident parking scheme is to provide a greater opportunity to access on-street parking for those residents with insufficient off-street parking. Issuing permits to homes with adequate off-street parking discourages the use of that parking and limits the effectiveness of the resident parking scheme.

Resident parking permits should only be available for vehicles which cannot be parked off-street.

A 4 hour rather than a 2 hour restriction would suit visitors better.

A 4 hour restriction would allow for longer term visitor parking but it would also make it easier for those ineligible for permits to relocate their vehicles at lunchtime to avoid getting parking fines. A 4 hour restriction is not recommended for streets close to the station/shops where a 2P restriction is considered most appropriate. A 4P restriction could be considered for fringe areas where drivers are less likely to want to move their vehicles at midday. In these fringe areas however parking activity is not as intense and spaces will probably be available for longer term visitors on the unrestricted side of the road.

Council needs to mark driveways, particularly on the unrestricted side of the road.

Parking across or partly across driveways is an ongoing issue throughout the LGA. The cost associated with marking all driveways on a street would be prohibitive. Driveway linemarking does not change the law in any way but may give peace of mind to residents and may, in some cases, assist in keeping driveways clear of parked vehicles. Council is currently looking at a procedure for the marking of driveway lines on a user pays basis.

Weekends are the worst near Ashfield Park.

This is acknowledged and introduction of resident parking restrictions which apply 7 days a week on the residential side of Ormond Street and adjacent side streets might be justified.

Restrictions should be both sides of the road.

As explained above Council's approach is to introduce restrictions only on one side of the road for consistency with other resident parking scheme areas within the LGA, so that the available on-street parking is shared more equitably between residents, commuters and employees and to limit transfer of commuter parking activity to neighbouring areas.

If restrictions are introduced both sides of the street, visitor parking permits would need to be issued and Council may need to consider adjusting the permit entitlements so that more homes would be entitled to permits (e.g. for families owning several vehicles and with adult children still at home).

Don't want a No Parking restriction in the lanes at the rear of Carrington Street and Nowranie Street.

Many respondents from Carrington Street and Nowranie Street have raised concerns about the proposal to introduce a No Parking restriction in the rear lanes of Smith Street, Carrington Street and Nowranie Street. Parts of the lane at the rear of Smith Street already have No Parking restrictions as parked vehicles in this lane were regularly preventing property access.

The reason for proposing No Parking in these lanes was to prevent vehicles shifting from Carrington Street, Smith Street and Nowranie Street into the lanes if 2P restrictions were introduced. Given the level of opposition expressed, it is now proposed that No Parking only be introduced where it is clear that parked vehicles will create problems for property access. The remainder of the lanes will be left untouched and action taken only if found necessary in the future.

Where will visitors park in narrow streets where resident parking is proposed on one side with No Parking on the other? (Louisa Street, Short Street and Lindsay Avenue).

In Louisa Street, Short Street (between Henson Street and Moonbie Street) and Lindsay Avenue it was proposed that 2P resident parking restrictions be introduced on one side of the street with No Parking introduced on the other. This is because these streets are too narrow to allow parking on both sides. Current practice is that parking in these streets tends to be

confined to one side however if resident parking restrictions are introduced on one side it would be necessary to ban parking on the other to control all day parking activity.

Restrictions on Edward Street need to extend all the way to Old Canterbury Road.

Council's original proposal was to introduce Resident Parking restrictions on the west side of Edward Street only to the north of Wellesley Street. Several respondents from Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road have requested that restrictions extend the full length of Edward Street to manage overflow parking from the Flour Mills development.

Residents of the Flour Mills development will be ineligible for resident parking permits under Councils Resident Parking Policy which does not allow permits to be issued to residents of unit or town house developments approved after 1997. There is therefore a danger that residents from that development unable to park off-street may monopolise on-street parking in Edward Street if resident parking restrictions do not extend the full length of the street. A subsequent follow up letter to Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road residents advising that restrictions may be considered for the full length of Edward Street has drawn no opposition and the extension of restrictions along the full length of the western side of Edward Street is now proposed.

Objection to non-respondents being assumed as supportive of the proposal.

As has been discussed earlier, many respondents (all in opposition to the scheme) have objected to the wording in Council's letter stating "If we do not receive a response from you it will be assumed that you support the proposal to introduce a resident parking scheme in your street." This statement has been included to encourage a higher response rate from residents, particularly from those who might have objections to the proposal. Residents frequently object to proposed actions after the consultation period has closed and when decisions have already been made. In some streets, particularly Teakle Street, Drynan Street and Louisa Street, there has been a high response rate and it is clear that there is a high level of opposition to resident parking restrictions and Council will therefore find it difficult to justify the introduction of restrictions in those streets. In other streets, while there might be a slight majority of responses opposed to restrictions the percentage of respondents compared to residents of the street is low and many who are supportive will have elected not to make their views known as they will assume that Council will accept their silence as support.

Restrictions are shown with a gap in front of parks on Carlton Crescent and Gower Street. 2P should extend across the frontage of the park.

As these parks have no residential premises fronting them the introduction of restrictions was not originally considered appropriate. After considering resident feedback and taking account of the high parking occupancies in these streets, the high density of development and the strong support for resident parking restrictions it is now considered that the resident parking restrictions should extend across the frontage of the parks. Most park users will visit for less than 2 hours and the resident parking restrictions should free up some parking spaces for visitors to the park as well as increasing the available parking for residents of the street.

Restrictions should be 7 days near shops.

There are existing timed parking restrictions in Lackey Street, and parts of Carlton Crescent, Grosvenor Crescent, Sloane Street, Smith Street, Moonbie Street, Morris Street and Nowranie Street which apply Monday to Saturday. These restrictions will be retained should a resident parking scheme be introduced with no resident parking exemption applying in these commercial zones.

Council asked respondents to indicate what days and hours they would prefer restrictions to apply if a resident parking restriction were introduced. Of those who responded to this question 43.6 % indicated a preference for restrictions applying Monday to Friday with 37.5% indicating a preference for restrictions applying Monday to Friday. In Morris Street and Moonbie Street this result was reversed with close to 50% of respondents indicating a preference for restrictions applying every day. At this time, it is not proposed to implement restrictions applying every day however this could be reviewed once the restrictions have been operational for some months if weekend parking activity is found to be created problems in these streets.

Will Council be employing additional enforcement officers to ensure resident parking restrictions are effective?

A number of respondents have raised concerns about an apparent lack of enforcement given to existing restrictions with a consequence being that compliance with those restrictions is low. The Summer Carpark has been cited as a location which receives low levels of enforcement by several respondents. Many residents have also stated that if additional enforcement resources are not applied to the Resident Parking Scheme it will be pointless introducing the restrictions.

It is agreed that the restrictions will need to be regularly enforced to ensure commuters adhere with the time limits.

Proposed Course of Action

Based upon the consultation outcomes and parking investigations it is considered that Council should proceed with implementation of the resident parking scheme over the bulk of the consulted area with restrictions to apply in most areas between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri.

The following changes to the proposal circulated for consultation are considered appropriate:

- Teakle Street, Drynan Street, Louisa Street and Junction Road (west of Henson street), Carrington Street (south of Wellesley Street), Spencer Street (south of Wellesley Street), Haig Avenue and French Lane are not to have resident parking restrictions introduced given the low levels of support for the restrictions from these streets, the level of off-street parking and the availability of on-street parking.
- Resident parking restrictions on Edward Street should extend over the full length of the western side of the street.

-
- No Parking restrictions in the lanes at the rear of Smith Street, Carrington Street and Nowranie Street should be minimised with restrictions only to apply in locations where parking physically prevents property access
 - Resident parking restrictions in Ormond Street, Gower Street (north of Parramatta Road) and Pembroke Street should apply everyday given the weekend parking activity associated with Ashfield Park
 - Resident Parking restrictions in Carlton Crescent and Gower Street will be extended across the frontage of the reserves in those streets a) to increase the available parking for permit holders and b) to provide short term parking restrictions for park users.

The Summer Hill Resident Parking Scheme will be divided into five areas. These are located within logical areas divided by major roads and the rail line:

- Area 9 is cited to the north of Parramatta Road and includes Sloane Street and Hawthorne Parade. This area is small at present but this allows for it to be expanded if restrictions are required at a later stage elsewhere in Hawthorne Parade, or in streets such as Stanton Rd or Haberfield Rd.
- Area 10 is situated south of Parramatta Road, east of Liverpool Rd and north of the rail line.
- Area 11 is situated south of Parramatta Road and west of Liverpool Road.
- Area 12 is situated south of the rail line and extends as far south as Smith Street and as far west as Prospect Road
- Area 13 is situated south of Smith Street, extends as far east as Edward Street and as far south as Junction Road.

Maps showing the proposed amended resident parking scheme with streets and assigned area boundaries were tabled at the meeting, and are described under the recommendation below.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The STA representative requested that all Bus stops within the Resident Parking Scheme be signposted with "Bus Zone". The Committee members supported the officer's recommendation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

1. That A 2P parking restriction (permit holders excepted) be established in the following streets applying between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday unless noted otherwise:

Area 9- Sloane Street (north of Parramatta Road) east side

Area 10- Dover Street, west side

Kensington Road, north side

Bogan Street west side

Sloane Street (south of Parramatta Road), east side

Gower Street (east of Liverpool Road), north side

Sunning Place, west side

Oaklands Avenue, east side

Grosvenor Crescent, north side

**Area 11- Bruce Street, west side (south of Ormond Street)
Bruce Street, east side (north of Ormond Street)
Ormond Street, south side (8am to 6pm Everyday)
Pembroke Street (south of Ormond Street), east side, (8am to 6pm Everyday)
Gower Street (north of Liverpool Road), west side, (8am to 6pm Everyday)
Tideswell Street, west side**

**Area 12- Chapman Street, west side
Fleet Street, west side
Allman Avenue, west side
Smith Street, south side (east of Nowranie Street)
Smith Street, north side (west of Hardie Avenue)
Carlton Crescent, south side**

**Area 13- Prospect Road (north of Drynan Street), east side
Lindsay Avenue, west side
Henson Street (north of Junction Road), east side
Bartlett Street, west side
Moonbie Street (north of Junction Road), east side
Morris Street, west side
Nowranie Street, east side
Carrington Street (north of Wellesley Street), east side
Spencer Street (north of Wellesley Street), east side
Edward Street, west side
Wellesley Street, north side
Lorne Street, south side
Junction Road (east of Henson Street), north side
Regent Street, south side
Short Street, north side**

- 2. That the residents of the subject streets be invited to apply for permits.**
- 3. That the resident parking scheme be reviewed in no less than 12 months time to assess its effectiveness and the need for any expansion (or contraction) of its extents.**
- 4. A “No Parking” restriction be introduced on the south side of Short Street between Henson Street and Moonbie Street.**
- 5. A “No Parking” restriction be introduced on the east side of Lindsay Avenue.**
- 6. A “No Parking” restriction be introduced generally on one side of lanes at the rear of Smith Street, Carrington St and Nowranie Street with restrictions introduced only as needed where parking activity is preventing access to vehicular access/garages.**
- 7. That Council give consideration to the need for additional enforcement resources to be applied to the Summer Hill Area to enable an appropriate level of enforcement to be given to the restrictions.**

ITEM NO: 005**SUBJECT: Proposed pedestrian and cycleway refuge traffic device in Ormond Street at the intersection of Parramatta Road, Ashfield.****ELECTORATE: Summer Hill****DESCRIPTION:**

Council is proposing to construct a shared pedestrian and cycleway footpath on the southern side of Parramatta Road, outside Ashfield Park, between Dalhousie Street and Orpington Street. This route will connect the shared path on Parramatta Road to the on-road route on Gower Street via Ormond Street. In addition a proposed pedestrian and cycleway refuge traffic device will be constructed at the intersection of Ormond Street and Parramatta Road.

COUNCIL OFFICERS REPORT:

The proposed refuge traffic device at the intersection of Ormond Street and Parramatta Road is part of a cycleway upgrade to connect the on-road cycleway on Orpington Street to the off-road shared pedestrian and cycleway on Parramatta Road continuing along to the on-road route on Gower Street via Ormond Street. These works will also improve pedestrian safety in crossing Ormond Street at the Parramatta Road intersection.

Various pedestrian treatment options were considered at the intersection which included combinations of pedestrian refuges and kerb extensions at various distances from Parramatta Road. Many of these options were unfeasible due to the significant loss of parking on both sides of Ormond Street. Council officers have discussed these options onsite with RMS representatives.

The final option tabled at the meeting is a combination of these options for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the intersection of Parramatta Road and Ormond Street.

The kerb on the western side of Ormond St shall be widened by approximately 1m to accommodate the pedestrian and cyclist refuge. One restricted parking space is lost on the eastern side and 2-3 parking spaces are lost on the western side of Ormond Street. (Other options resulted in significant losses in parking on both sides of the street).

Council previously considered an off-road cycleway on the western side footpath of Ormond Street to connect Parramatta Road and Gower Street; however due to the recent planting of trees on the western side of Ormond Street along Ashfield Park, this option was not possible.

This project has received RMS grant funding under its program "*Infrastructure Projects- Connecting Centres for Cycling Connecting Centres- Cycling infrastructure*" for 2015/2016. These works form part of the approved funded project for off-road shared path cycle way connection on Parramatta Road between Ormond Street and Orpington Street.

Council has consulted residents in the area on the above works, and the closing date for submissions is Friday 10th October 2015. It is anticipated that due to the proposed Resident Parking Scheme in Ormond Street, the resulting impact of the loss of one restricted parking space on the eastern side will have little effect on the business.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The RMS representative advised that parking is required to be at least 3 metres clear of any proposed double painted centreline in approach to the refuge. It was agreed that the centreline marking could be shortened and painted offset towards the park to minimise the impact on any further removal of

parking to the resident side of the street. The Committee members supported the officer's recommendation with minor design alterations to the plan.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That no objection is made for the construction a pedestrian and cycleway refuge traffic device on Ormond Street at the intersection of Parramatta Road, Ashfield.

INFORMAL ITEMS

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

NIL

