**REGIONAL ROUTE 2 (PARRAMATTA ROAD TO MARRICKVILLE PARK VIA WEST STREET) DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN: CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

The Regional Route 2 (RR2) draft concept plan was placed on public exhibition from 13 July to 13 August 2017. Following public exhibition, issues raised in submissions were considered, and where feasible have informed modifications to the proposal.

Issues raised in submissions from community members and other stakeholders, such as RMS, Sydney Buses and Sydney Trains are outlined in this report, along with a Council officer response.

**PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF THE DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN**

During the public exhibition period:

* Approximately 1,100 letters were sent to residents, businesses and property owners along the proposed route and surrounding areas informing about the changes
* Public exhibition of the draft concept plan was advertised to the wider community in the Inner West Courier, on Council’s website and via Council’s social media
* The draft concept plan and accompanying reports were made available for viewing by community members on Council’s website and at Petersham Service Centre
* Information about the proposal was accessed 1,200 times from Council’s website
* 42 community submissions were received by Council

**86% of all respondents stated “support” (57%) or “support with changes” (29%) for the proposal. 14% of respondents stated they did “not support” the proposal.**

**Of the 42 submissions received, 10 (24%) were from residents along the route. Of these, 60% indicated either “support” (50%) or “support with changes” (10%) for the proposal. 40% of respondents along the route indicated they did “not support” the proposal.**

**ISSUES RAISED IN COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS DURING PUBLIC EXHIBITION**

24 submissions (57% of all submissions) by community members indicated support for the draft concept plan.

In other submissions, the issues most frequently raised by community members were:

* More separated bicycle paths are needed (10 submissions)
* Do not support the proposed removal of seven parking spaces on Frazer Street (5 submissions)
* The proposed left turn restriction at Ducros Street will adversely impact residents travelling by car (4 submissions)
* West Street north of the railway line is wide enough to accommodate a separated bicycle path (3 submissions)

Issues raised in public exhibition submissions, and a Council officer response, have been tabled in the following pages to accompany the revised concept plan, for review by Council’s Local Traffic Committee and decision by Council on whether to approve the proposal.

| **COMMUNITY FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC EXHIBITION** |
| --- |
| **Topic** | **Community comments** | **Council officer response** |
| **Route options** | The route should provide better connectivity to the surrounding streets and local landmarks, for example by linking to Wardell Road. | Measures to improve wayfinding would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
|  | Routes connecting to the city should also be improved | Council is also currently developing plans for other bicycle routes, including a route from Lewisham to Newtown that would link to the inner city bicycle route network. |
|  | Improve bicycle access at Petersham Station with a ramp to the existing pedestrian underpass | This is outside the scope of this project. |
| **Route design and treatments** | The route should include more separated bicycle pathsUnidirectional separated bicycle paths are preferred | Consistent with Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy, the proposed route aims to encourage more people to travel by bicycle for short trips by catering for riders of all ages and abilities, particularly more vulnerable, inexperienced and less confident riders. This includes encouraging riders to travel in mixed traffic conditions where traffic volumes are suitably low in accordance with national guidelines for appropriate bicycle infrastructure. |
|  | Shared paths can slow riders downShared paths increase hostility towards bicycle ridersCouncil policies explicitly support bicycle riding, rather than parking or traffic, yet the route appears to prioritise parking and traffic over bicycles by placing bikes on shared pathsCouncil should support bicycle riding on all footpathsSchool children should be allowed to ride on all footpaths | Shared paths are proposed where alternatives are not feasible without significant traffic or parking impacts or would deter less experienced bicycle riders from using the route. Appropriate shared path markings and signage would be used to increase awareness for bike riders and pedestrians when sharing the path. |
|  | A separated bicycle path should be provided on West Street north of the railway line, as this section is wide enough to accommodate a bicycle path | Given traffic lane width requirements to accommodate buses, there is insufficient space for a separated bicycle path without removing a parking lane. Removal of a parking lane on this section of West Street would not be supported by Council. |
|  | Motorist awareness of the shared path on West Street should be improved at driveway crossings | Appropriate shared path markings and signage would be used to increase awareness for motorists and shared path users when sharing the path. |
|  | A bicycle crossing/access should be provided from the West Street shared path to Petersham Park | Bicycle riders would be able to access Petersham Park via the two existing pedestrian crossings on this section of West Street. |
|  | West Street south of Railway Terrace may be unsafe for riders, due to school and TAFE traffic | Safety risks associated with higher traffic volumes due to school traffic are reduced in this area by the existing 40km/h school zone. |
|  | The West Street to Ducros Street connection may be confusing to bicycle riders | Measures to improve wayfinding through the intersection would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
|  | There is a conflict point where bikes would turn right from Morgan Street onto the Livingstone Road shared path | The concept plan has been amended to propose a protected right turn bay for riders. |
| **Pedestrians** | The shared path over the rail corridor is very narrowPrefer that space be taken from cars travelling over the rail corridorProvide a separate bicycle bridge over the railway line to avoid the West Street bridge pinch point | Alternatives to the existing path have been excluded due to high cost and/or high impact to regional road and State road traffic. Signage and pavement markings to encourage low rider speeds on the path over the bridge could be considered further at the detailed design stage of the project. |
| **Traffic** | The proposed left turn restriction on Ducros Street will:* add to motor vehicle travel time
* is unfair to car commuters
* will adversely impact residents and businesses
* will result in more traffic on Livingstone Road and Wardell Road

No justification for the proposed change is providedThe left turn restriction will increase traffic in Allans AvenueMaria Street should be used for the route instead of Ducros Street, as this type of restriction already exists there | The proposed changes at Ducros Street address RMS concerns about the risk of collision between riders and vehicles turning from New Canterbury Road, and are supported by RMS. The number of vehicles accessing Ducros Street from New Canterbury Road is considered low (200 vehicles per day); these vehicles would be required to travel an additional 550 metres via Wardell Road and Morgan Street to access Ducros Street. |
|  | A bicycle track would not fit on Ducros Street | A separated bicycle path is not proposed on Ducros Street. The concept plan proposes a mixed traffic treatment on Ducros Street, where bicycles and cars shared the roadway. |
| **Parking** | The loss of parking on Frazer Street is not supported:* there is high demand for these spaces by visitors to Marrickville Park, particularly as a result of recent improvements
* there will be more traffic on Bishop Street looking for parking spaces

The parking loss should be offset or mitigatedAngled parking should be provided on Frazer Street as per the arrangement on Llewellyn Street at Enmore ParkProvide a toucan crossing for bikes and pedestrians on Frazer Street | The proposed removal of parking spaces is to accommodate a pedestrian/bicycle refuge on Frazer Street, previously approved by Council in 2015 as part of the Marrickville West LATM. To reduce the proposed parking impacts, the concept plan has been amended to reduce the width of the proposed refuge from 3.0m (desirable width) to 2.5m (consistent with the minimum technical standard), which allows 2 of the seven spaces to be retained.The concept plan has also been amended to remove the existing refuge located 30 metres to the west near Bishop Street, resulting in 4 additional parking spaces provided on Frazer Street to offset the removal of spaces nearby. Given the proposed refuge would be wider than the existing refuge, cater for bicycles, and directly link with Marrickville Park, it would provide a better crossing facility than the existing refuge. |
| **Other** | This proposal is a poor use of public fundsFix roads for cars before developing bicycle routes | Council has committed to supporting and promoting bike riding, including by providing a network of bicycle routes. The proposed improvements are intended not only for those already riding, but for those interested but concerned about safety. |
|  | Bicycle riders should be required to carry IDBicycle riders don’t obey road rules | Noted. |
| **OTHER STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN** |
| **RMS** | Traffic counts and RMS approval are required for proposed shared environment intersection treatments on the route | Traffic counts have been provided to RMS for review; no objections to the proposed changes were raised. |
|  | RMS have no objections in principle to the proposed Ducros Street changes subject to review of a Traffic Management Plan for RMS approval.  | The Traffic Management Plan has been reviewed by RMS; no objections to the proposed changes were raised. |
| **Sydney Buses** | No objections to the draft concept plan | Noted. |
| **Sydney Trains** | The cycle route requires works or use of Sydney Trains bridges. Council will be required to follow protocols as stated in the Interface Agreement between Sydney Trains and Inner West Council. | Noted. |
|  | Council will also need approval from the asset owner RailCorp before the works can be undertaken. | Noted. Approval for any changes to RailCorp assets will be sought during the development of detailed designs for the route. |
| **Bike Marrickville** | Suggest:* a storage box on Flood St for southbound riders at Parramatta Rd, with an advanced signal phase to allow the riders to go a bit before cars
* a southbound lane from Parramattta Rd to at least Station St so riders can access paths across the park and up into Lewisham.
 | In accordance with RMS requirements, a bike storage box on Flood Street would require a bicycle lane on approach to the storage box. There is insufficient space available to provide a bicycle lane.Confident riders will continue to have the option of travelling in traffic lanes. |
|  | Provide blue routefinding directional signs on local streets along the route. The bike logos everywhere are optional. | Measures to improve wayfinding would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
|  | The crossing of Railway Terrace needs to be improved - e.g. longer phase so riders heading north could get onto the bridge | Noted. Phase times would be reviewed by RMS as part of any changes to the signalised intersection. |
| **Bike Leichhardt** | Improved access and safety crossing Parramatta Rd is a priority- proposed bike lanterns will help but will result in longer waits than in the traffic lane | Noted. Phase times would be reviewed by RMS as part of any changes to the signalised intersection. |
|  | A bike lane on east side of West St past the park is preferred. At the very least to Station St. Acknowledge constraints near the railway bridge.More confident riders should have the option of using an uphill bike lane as part of a hybrid treatment e.g. Lilyfield Rd and Booth St.Acknowledge difficulties of removing parking on West St even if it is non-residential. Support the shared path from Thomas St to Parramatta Rd and the bike crossing there, as the left turn lane is a safety and legal problem for cyclists going north to Flood StThere may be a safety problem if cyclists waiting to cross from the footpath store too close to the corner and the track of large turning vehicles. Some protection may be needed, such as a concrete blister on the corner. An almost Dutch style intersection treatment could be implemented with blisters on all four corners. | Confident riders will continue to have the option of travelling in traffic lanes. |
|  | Dangers of driveway crossings of shared path on West St. | Appropriate shared path markings and signage would be used to increase awareness for motorists and shared path users when sharing the path. |
|  | Consider bikes in-lane over the rail bridge with advanced storage box in the middle lane. | In accordance with RMS requirements, a bike storage box on West Street would require a bicycle lane on approach to the storage box. There is insufficient space available to provide a bicycle lane. |
|  | The current bike shoulder in Flood St is too narrow, particularly northbound, putting cyclists close to car doors.The initial connection to Flood St shoulder lane might need some thought, to prevent conflict between cyclists entering Flood and motorists crossing Parramatta Rd into Flood. | Improvement to the shared path/bike lane transition on Flood Street would require removal of one parking space. To be considered further at the detailed design stage |
|  | Consider shared path option via Old Canterbury Rd, particularly given proposed bike route improvements as part of the Parramatta Rd revitalisation. | Noted. |