



20 October 2021

Elisha Pearce  
Director, Place  
Community and Place, Greater Sydney  
Transport for NSW  
20-44 Ennis Road  
MILSONS POINT NSW 2061

Dear Mr Pearce

**SYDNEY PARK JUNCTION  
REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above. Please find attached Council's submission and community engagement report on submissions received from Council's recent consultation.

Should you or your administration have any queries, please direct these to Kendall Banfield, Senior Transport Planner, on 9335 2179.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Peter Gainsford". The signature is stylized with loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Peter Gainsford  
**General Manager**



**SUBMISSION FROM INNER WEST COUNCIL  
TO TRANSPORT FOR NSW  
ON THE REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS  
FOR THE SYDNEY PARK JUNCTION PROJECT**

**20 OCTOBER 2021**

**Introduction**

Council appreciates the opportunity to make a submission to Transport for NSW (TfNSW) on the Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the *Sydney Park Junction* (SPJ) project.

It is noted that this project originates from concerns in 2015-16 over potential traffic impacts on King Street, Newtown from WestConnex New M5 (now M8). These concerns were raised by the former Marrickville Council, City of Sydney, the Newtown Precinct Business Association and the local community.

At that time it was apparent from the New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that WestConnex would increase traffic on Campbell Street/Road and Euston Road on the southern and eastern sides of Sydney Park and decrease traffic on Princes Highway / King Street and Sydney Park Road on the western and northern sides of the park. This provided a further impetus to reclaim the spare traffic capacity for active transport and place-making along the Princes Highway / King Street and Sydney Park Road sections.

Since then the two councils have worked collaboratively with TfNSW on this project, including briefings with Inner West and City of Sydney councillors. This work has resulted in designs to reduce traffic capacity along King Street / Princes Highway and Sydney Park Road to protect King Street from excessive traffic and to improve active transport connectivity and the place function of these roadways.

Council continues to support the objectives of this project, but is keen to ensure that all of the community's comments and Council's further comments from the REF exhibition are carefully assessed and all issues resolved in partnership with Council and the community. Council requests that TfNSW undertakes a traffic study to assess the traffic issues raised and funds all design and implementation work necessary to resolve the issues. This would be regardless of whether they are within or outside the project boundary.

Largely as a result of these concerns, Council considered a Mayoral Minute at its 28 September 2021 meeting and resolved as follows:

*THAT Council:*

- 1. Urgently writes to the Minister for Transport requesting an extension of the exhibition period to 20 October in order for council to be able to brief Councillors and conduct direct consultation with the local community;*
- 2. Receive a Councillor Briefing on the Sydney Park Junction proposal as soon as possible; and*
- 3. Consults directly with the local community on the proposal as outlined by Transport for NSW in the exhibited Environmental Factors.*

In response to Resolution 1, TfNSW has granted Council an extension until 20 October 2021 to lodge its submission. Although an extension has not been granted to the community,

Council has included a summary of the issues raised by the community in this submission. In accordance with Resolution 2, TfNSW and Council staff briefed councillors on this project on 6 October 2021. In accordance with Resolution 3, Council called for submissions from the community via a dedicated Your Say webpage and letterbox drop to the suburbs of St Peters, Sydenham and Tempe. Although the focus of Council's consultation was on impacts on local walking, cycling and motor vehicle access, all issues raised have been noted.

### **Community comments from Council consultation**

From this consultation, Council received 57 written submissions directly via the Your Say Inner West webpage, three comments by phone, 19 written submissions via e-mail, 112 written comments via Facebook and three written submissions as letters. These submissions have been copied in full (without personal details) into the attached *Engagement Outcomes Report*.

It is apparent from Council's consultation that there are mixed views on the project. Whilst some submitters support the project as designed and others fully oppose it, many have expressed general support for the project's objectives whilst raising objections to specific aspects – in particular, the project's impacts on vehicular traffic movements.

The issue of greatest concern for Inner West residents and business operators is the right-turn ban from King into May Street. This would make motor vehicle access in and around the St Peters triangle (i.e. Hutchinson, Applebee & Lackey Streets) longer, more complex and time consuming. Other issues of concern are associated with this issue, such as how the right-turn ban from King into May Street would affect motor vehicle access to Tempe via Unwins Bridge Road and potentially add traffic to other streets.

It is noted that these and other issues were expressed by residents at the TfNSW online community information session held on 22 September 2021. Again, Council is keen to continue to work with TfNSW to ensure that all comments are carefully assessed and the issues resolved with input from the community.

### **Further comments from Council**

Further Council issues are as follows, noting that some of these have been raised previously at meetings and briefings:

- Council requests that TfNSW undertakes a traffic study to assess the traffic issues raised and funds all design and implementation work necessary to resolve the issues. This would be regardless of whether they are within or outside the project boundary.
- Detailed plans are requested for locations where new development is occurring or is about to occur along King Street and the Princes Highway. This is to ensure the streetscape plans of these new developments are co-ordinated with the SPJ project. Council can provide information on relevant locations.
- If the signals are removed at the King/May Street intersection as proposed, then the right-turn restriction from May Lane northbound into Goodsell Street can also be removed. If this proceeds, Council would like TfNSW to provide background information so it can be assessed by the Local Traffic Committee.
- Confirmation is sought about whether the wide footway areas to the north of May Street and within St Peters Square will be formal shared paths for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Design options to ensure that cyclists pass through shared zones at low speed should be considered. This could include a graphic design treatment of the separated cycleway on King Street as a way of signalling that this is a lower-speed environment.

- Options for maintaining separation between cyclists and pedestrians from May Street through to the northern end of St Peters Square and at all signalised crossings should be considered.
- The Princes Highway should be renamed King Street from May to Campbell Streets to assist with creating a sense of place.
- Consider reducing the length of the right-turn lane from King Street northbound into Sydney Park Road to act as a further disincentive for traffic to use this route and instead use the Campbell Street/Road / Euston Road route.
- Ensure the design speed for King Street is consistent with the proposed 40kph speed limit to assist with self-enforcement of speed.
- Consider a graphic design treatment of the roadway at St Peters Square and the cycleway on King Street to assist with speed reduction of vehicles and bicycles.
- Ensure SPJ designs and treatments are well integrated with designs and treatments for the St Peters Station upgrade.
- Council acknowledges the REF includes an assessment of cumulative construction impacts, and that most works would be undertaken during daytime work hours and according to relevant standards. Nonetheless Council would like to see an ongoing commitment to minimising impacts given the St Peters community is already fatigued from WestConnex and other construction activities.
- It is noted in the REF that tree planting would reference the street tree masterplans of the two councils. This is appropriate, but detailed landscape plans should be provided to the councils to allow for a full assessment. The plans should include a tree planting layout.
- The means by which soil volumes for the new trees has been calculated should be clarified, and whether soil vaults would be used to provide adequate soil volumes. Note that existing soils across the project area will be highly compacted, devoid of nutrients and unable to sustain viable healthy trees.
- Trees recently planted by developers along the Princes Highway in accordance with conditions of approval have been planted in structural soil. It needs to be determined how many of these trees can be incorporated in the design.
- The design should include tree planting on both sides of the Princes Highway at the southern end of the project area near Campbell Street.
- Tree planting looks to be sparse in some areas and grouped in others. A more even and dense planning regime is needed for the project to achieve 'green corridor' status.
- Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) and passive irrigation measures should be adopted to support the green infrastructure.
- Further discussions will be needed with both councils to ensure that landscaping designs and plant species chosen minimise maintenance required by the councils.
- The extent of works should be extended slightly to the north to include the Lord/King Street intersection. This is the true 'entry' to King Street, and the project could significantly improve this space.
- Further discussions are needed over ownership and maintenance responsibilities across the King Street road reserve, with a view to a formal agreement. For the 'dynamic community spaces' this agreement would need to cover funding for purchase, installation and maintenance of the 'parklets' and associated infrastructure.

- Council had previously noted that the Heritage Statement did not identify that any stone kerbs and gutters would be affected by the work. If such stonework is to be affected, consideration should be given to retaining it in-situ in the locations where footways are to be widened. This is would allow for an interpretation of the historic road alignment.

# INNER WEST



## Engagement outcomes report TfNSW proposal for Sydney park Junction, St Peters

# Contents

Summary .....	3
Background .....	3
Engagement Methods .....	4
Promotion .....	4
Engagement outcomes .....	4
<i>What did they say?</i> .....	4

# Summary

Council sought community comments specifically from St Peters, Tempe and Sydenham on how the Transport for NSW Sydney Park Junction project regarding the impacts on local walking, cycling and motor vehicle access. The engagement was opened between 1 to 18 October 2021. A total of 114 people visited the project page on Your Say Inner West, of those 68 interacted with the information on the page including downloading a document and clicking through on various items on the page and 57 provided comments.

The local community was also encouraged to leave comments on Face Book post for the project. There were 134 likes/loves, 123 comments and 12 shares.

People also provided feedback via a direct email to the Project Officer and three phone calls were received.

All comments provide by the participants ae included in this report from page XX.

Note: We have redacted all names and contacts details from the submissions include in this report.

## Background

Transport for NSW plans to reduce traffic lanes, build separated cycle ways, add wider crossings and new walking links from Princes Highway to St Peters Station, King Street and Sydney Park.

The proposals also include conversion of road space to create areas for al fresco dining, recreation and entertainment.

At its meeting on 28 September 2021, Council resolved to consult directly with the local community on the proposal as outlined by Transport for NSW in the exhibited Environmental Factors and to incorporate local community feedback into Inner West Council's formal submission to the TfNSW Review of Environmental Factors (REF) public exhibition.



# Engagement Methods

The community was invited to provide feedback online via Council's engagement hub [yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au](https://yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au)

Other options for the community to provide feedback were:

- By mail
- By phone
- By email
- Through an interpreter and voice relay via TTY and SMS

## Promotion

The project was promoted through Council's communication channels:

- Letter to impacted residents
- Social media
- Council website

## Engagement outcomes

*What did they say?*

Comments received online through [yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au](https://yoursay.innerwest.nsw.gov.au) (57)

No.	Comment
1	There is no vehicle access from the north east to the St Peter's triangle. Travelling from McEvoy or Mitchell will involve an illegal U-turn, a quick reposition via a Sydney Park car park or a rat run through Lord St. Its the worst local traffic management plan ever! And IWC has provided a whole long weekend for submissions. Who actually dreamed up this mess? Cancel the project and go back to the drawing board with proper consultation.

No.	Comment
2	<p>I welcome TfNSW's initiative to make this precinct much more people focussed. Currently it is a motorised, hostile environment and hardly a pleasant gateway to Sydney Park. Properly providing ease of access from St. Peter's station and local bike ways is welcome.</p>
3	<p>Major concern over the proposal to scrap right turns in and out of May Street. Whilst a reduction in traffic would be nice on the Princess Highway near Sydney Park, the closure of May Street to right turn traffic both in and out, funnels traffic onto other local streets such as Campbell St which is also in a residential area and has a park. Since the changes to Campbell Street, the increased traffic has been causing congestion at the intersection with Unwins Bridge Rd and this proposal will increase that congestion and also make Campbell St less safe for the local kids. Campbell St is also the main thoroughfare for school traffic at St Peters Primary.</p> <p>Also concerned about the proposal to limit right turns from Mitchell Street with similar outcomes. This does not fix any congestion issues, rather it funnels the congestion onto other roads.</p>
4	<p>There will be many problems with traffic in King Street, getting into Sydney Park.</p> <p>We have problems getting into the Park now.</p>
5	<p>The removal of the right turn from Princes Highway on to May St (and the right turn out of May St) will make it very difficult for residents on May St to enter their homes. Our car park entrance is on Applebee St and the only way to enter Applebee is a left turn from May St (you cannot turn right into Applebee from May St). This will make it incredibly difficult for us just to get into our own homes! Short of doing a U-turn on Barwon Park Rd, I have no idea how I will be able to get into my garage.</p>
6	<p>Overall, I am pleased with the TfNSW proposals for Sydney Park junction. This stretch of King Street / Princes Hwy is long overdue for conversion to a pedestrian, cyclist and community-centred zone.</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>The diversion of northbound heavy vehicles off the highway, the narrowing of the road, and the reduction of the speed limit will significantly calm traffic.</p> <p>However, there are some weaknesses in the plan.</p> <p>Firstly, the proposed separated cycleways on from King Street to Goodsell Street and along Sydney Park Road to Mitchell Road are cycleways to nowhere. Cyclists coming northbound on the new cycle path will be dumped into King Street which has no provision for cycling. This means that many cyclists will choose the footpath which is already pedestrian heavy or wrestle with the traffic.</p> <p>The same is true for cyclists travelling along the proposed Sydney Park Road cycleway; it just peters out around the corner into Mitchell Rd leaving the choice of footpath or busy road. There is still no systematic plan for joined up separated cycleways in the area.</p> <p>Another problem in this area is the dangerous situation in the shared May Lane which links St Peters station and May Street. This lane is the main conduit for pedestrians who are going to and from the Princes Hwy and has been consistently overlooked by the Inner West council and Transport for NSW. It is quite narrow and has never been made safe for pedestrians who wrestle with increasing traffic and cyclists. Before beautifying the Princess Hwy this area needs to be looked at.</p>
7	<p>'In relation to having no Right turn from King Street into May Street. This is a very inconvenient and unthoughtful change for those living in Applebee, Hutchinson, Lackey and May Street. How are we supposed to access our houses if coming from King Street?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You've removed the 'left turn' from Campbell Street into Hutchinson, which makes all of the above mentioned streets inaccessible.</li> <li>- Instead, we have to go the whole way down the Princes highway to Sydneyham to turn around?</li> <li>- Or alternatively, turn right on Sydney Park Road and venture into Lord (a deathtrap for cyclists and motorists given it's very narrow conditions).</li> </ul>

No.	Comment
	<p>Hot tip: Absolutely no one wants 'alfresco' dining on the Princes Highway. This as a selling point is a bit of a stretch.</p>
8	<p>Thanks for the chance to provide feedback as I missed the TfNSW deadline. I live in Crown St, St Peters, so am one of the closest residents to the Sydney Park Junction proposal.</p> <p>I think the overall aims of the project are fantastic ie slowing down cars and reducing traffic, increasing safer and friendlier pedestrian streetscapes, creating a village atmos with outdoor dining and cycleways etc.</p> <p>My concerns are about the reduction in parking spots and no public plans to handle the amount of cars looking for a place to park. At the moment, parking spaces for Sydney Park users are already under huge pressure especially on weekends. Am wondering if the park side of Barwon Park Road can become parallel or diagonal parking, to create a lot more spots. Barwon Park Road is certainly wide enough to allow this and I think this has been considered before by council.</p> <p>The other concern I'd like to flag is more traffic will potentially be coming into Barwon Park Road, to enter the existing car park (the new entrance will be via Barwon Park Road). On busy days more cars will end up going straight down Barwon Park Road (not into the car park, especially if there's a queue) and I suspect MORE cars will exit Barwon Park Road at the south end although this isn't allowed. Already a fair number of cars are doing this, against street signage. There is nothing to prevent them from doing it. Am flagging this as a possible issue, as Barwon Park Road could easily become an intermittent ratrun into Campbell, if enough traffic is funnelled down and can't get a parking spot.</p> <p>That's it.</p>
9	<p>The proposed additional greening and completion of the bicycle lanes are fantastic. As a resident of Lackey St however, the removal of the ability while in a vehicle to turn right into May St from the Princes Highway is not. How do TfNSW propose the residents and business owners of Lackey, Applebee and Hutchinson Streets access their properties when approaching from the north? Unless the right turn into Hutchinson Street from Campbell St is reinstated? Approaching</p>

No.	Comment
	from King St will mean more traffic diverted into Edgeware Rd via Alice St, through a school zone unnecessarily. Or a journey completely around Sydney Park so as to make a left turn into May St. This will be the same from the direction of Erskineville or Alexandria.
10	I am concerned that the proposal for Sydney Park Junction appears to increase tiled and paved space instead of green space with grass and trees. So as well as causing a bottle neck for cars and trucks by reducing the speed limit and reducing the number of lanes, this proposal will also make yet another open, windswept space for me to battle through as a pedestrian. I do not see any benefits in this proposal and only yet more inconvenience for local drivers and pedestrians.
11	I think this is a great plan. It will make princes highway much more pleasant and livable. It will make access to Sydney park easier for pedestrians. I also approve of some of the measures to reduce traffic in St. Peter's, like the no right turn on may st. I live on goodsell st, so it might slightly affect the time it takes for me to get home by car, but I gladly accept that to reduce the amount of cars and trucks driving through St. Peter's. I just hope transport NSW doesn't rush this, and for example the square close to st Peter's station will be of good quality. It would also be great if they add some more trees/green on these squares/side of the street.
12	This is a fantastic project. I use the park alot and the park upgrade is amazing. In addition, I am a cyclist so the separated cycleway will encourage my family to cycle to the park more often
13	This project is amazing. I am a female cyclist who uses the park regularly. Having a separate cycleway together with less cars on the road will make St Peters and Sydney Park much more enjoyable to be in
14	<p>1. I live on Council St and it is challenging as it is accessing my property. Removing the right hand turn onto May St will impact me significantly.</p> <p>2. I will be forced to use the intersection of Campbell St and May St to access my home which is significantly more dangerous than May and Princess Hwy.</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>3. There is a childs pump track planned for the Camdenville Park near the corner of Campbell and May which will have even more traffic using what is already a dangerous intersection.</p> <p>4. Camdenville Oval attracts many midweek users and as it is many already turn into Council St from May St against the One Way traffic. By forcing people to access Camdenville park from the west it will only increase the amount of people driving the one way down Council St.</p> <p>5. There is a financial burden placed upon me if the plan goes ahead, extra cost/time in taxis, deliveries and fuel.</p> <p>6. Princess Hwy is a major arterial rd and to change the speed to 40km is in my view ridiculous.</p> <p>7. I cross Princess Hwy twice a day to access Sydney Park and have never once found it dangerous.</p> <p>8. The traffic on May St has reduced significantly since the opening of other roads, no need for further changes.</p> <p>9. The initiative is to benefit local residents, last time I checked my rates notice my property is zoned light industrial? Furthermore, the impact this will have on local businesses is significant.</p> <p>10. This is clearly a proposal to justify the building the white elephant that is WesConnex and they are trying to force people onto it. As it is, I have already had friends come to visit who accidentally found themselves travelling half way to Beverley Hills.</p> <p>11. As a cyclist I have to say the bike lanes are a waste. They are hardly used and a significant inconvenience. I feel they are being used as a tool to get the vocal minority that are hard core cyclists to support the project.</p> <p>12. The aim of the project is to apparently benefit local residents. Many users of Sydney Park do not live in our immediate vicinity and will only be clogging our roads further.</p> <p>13. No consideration has been given to children accessing St Peters Public School and the proposed increase of traffic on Campbell St.</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>14. The proposed works will be taking place during the night as well. They said they will work no more than two nights in a row for residents. We have experienced enough night road works for a lifetime and should not be required to put up with any more. Furthermore, the only reason they say two nights is because if they do it 3 nights in a row they have to provide alternative accommodation.</p> <p>15. There has been minimal consultation and the council notification was the first official notice I was provided about the project. They were good enough to give flyers to people living in Erskineville where the right turn onto May St does not impact them.</p> <p>16. The no right turn at Mitchell St is also ridiculous. People will just enter the carpark and do a u-turn.</p>
15	<p>As a resident of Hutchinson Street, I have grave concerns about the proposal in its current format.</p> <p>1. Proposing to stop the right hand turn into May Street will result in traffic flow to impact small suburban streets and create issues for mail delivery, couriers, food delivery and impact the ability for the small business owners and residents of Hutchinson St, Applebee St and Lackey St and the surrounds to travel to key places in the area and back to this location without having to take divers that add additiional trip times. This, combined with the additional traffic flow observed for the short time that the upgraded Marrickville metro provided, will create gridlocks and chaos for our small community.</p> <p>2. Creating an outdoor dining area will impact the small businesses along King Street that have fought to keep their business alive throughout COVID by removing parking spaces and creating an on-flow of parking issues for our community in the surrounds. This, combined with the parking being removed at precinct 75, could minimise the ability for residents to find adequate parking for themselves and limit the amount of business along this end of King Street, which is finally starting to flourish after many years of having multiple stores vacant.</p> <p>3. The residents of St Peters have suffered enough with ongoing development, which is disruptive to our environment with the West Connx, works at Marrickville Metro and the metro lines recently</p>

No.	Comment
	introduced in May street. There are more than enough dining and entertainment areas nearby. Could there instead be an opportunity to add an additional venue within Sydney Park itself?
16	Any project that supports and encourages improved people traffic over vehicle traffic, not only is an improvement on the environment, but general well being of the residents and visitors to the area. Having had to live through increased traffic and pollution ( at it's height during the Westconnex project) over the last few years, it is with cautious optimism that I hope this proposal is implemented. I would hope that as part of this proposal that a lot more trees are also installed, to not only replace the ones that were destroyed as part of Westconnex, but to help the fight against climate change
17	Will these "upgrades" improve the traffic flow? Once upon a time, on most days, i would ride my vintage Yamaha motorcycle to work nearby. Back then King St Newtown often became a "parking lot", after even a minor traffic accident. I hear from other locals, that still need to commute up King St, that it is now even worse. Could tfNSW consider underground subways, to Sydney Park & St Peters station. Just suggesting another underground option to avoid any further traffic chaos, in our very heavily congested area, thanx.
18	<p>This is a wonderful proposal, all proposed changes are well considered and tackle major issues of compromised walkability, too fast and too much traffic, and severely compromised cyclist safety. There will also be major aesthetic gains through implementing the proposal as is. Blocking access to May street from Princess Highway is particularly welcome as it will improve the lives of the many May street residents. Lowering the car speed limits and the number of lanes per direction on Princess Highway is another excellent aspect of the proposal, which will contribute to pedestrian and cyclist safety while keeping air pollution and noise levels down. Priority pedestrian crossings will streamline and accelerate access to Sydney Park and will encourage more families from the local community to visit and enjoy the park.</p> <p>In conclusion, I fully and wholeheartedly support this wonderful proposal as is, once the project is finished this area will be a tremendous asset to Inner West and Sydney as a whole. Congratulations</p>



No.	Comment
19	<p>I have seen the plans for St Peters Junction and am very excited. It promises to greatly improve the liveability of the area and both lifestyle and work options will benefit.</p> <p>With the increased population of the area this is important.</p> <p>As a cyclist and walker, the increased space for both would be invaluable for improving the workability of the area as well as benefitting the environment.</p> <p>The improved public spaces will help offset the imposition of increased traffic from Westconnex and the growing local housing.</p>
20	<p>As a pedestrian, there is no safe way for me to cross over Barwon Park Road at its intersection with Princes Highway. I have to be aware of cars coming from multiple directions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Cars coming from Princes Highway into Barwon Park Road, and then they can go in 2 different directions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1) Further down Barwon Park Road</li> <li>1.2) Loop back out to Princes Highway</li> <li>1.3) Some may illegally enter the no-entry to the carpark</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) Cars coming from of the carpark</li> <li>3) Cars coming from Barwon Park Road</li> </ol> <p>The entrances and exits for the near by service station add even more complexity.</p> <p>Another issue I've observed about this intersection is cars coming from Barwon Park Road turning right onto/over Princes Highway. This is a very common path due to the traffic coming from the carpark. This is dangerous for multiple reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Traffic can be parked on Princes Highway, reducing visibility when looking left. They have reduced visibility of oncoming traffic.</li> <li>2) Low cars cannot see past the curve of the hill when looking left, again reducing visibility of oncoming traffic.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment
	<p>3) There is no merging lane on Princes Highway, which means that when cars pull out there is nowhere for them to go when they realise traffic is coming from the left. This blocks traffic coming from the right.</p> <p>One last point, as a pedestrian. There is no safe and convenient way to cross Princes Highway near Short Street. Obviously the safe option is to walk either way to the traffic light crossing, but this rarely happens. Especially for people like food delivery services who drive in from one direction and need to deliver to the other side of the road - these people are under tight financial constraints and take higher risks.</p> <p>And also, more greenery please! Princes Highway has too much concrete and too many buildings. Take inspiration from the nearby Erskineville area.</p>
21	<p>I used to live a couple of blocks away from this project location, and my gym was right on the intersection of King St and Concord St, so I walked past this area a couple of times a week. I would have loved these improvements when I was there. Seeing what is planned makes me want to return (via public transport or bike), and spend money and time in the local shops.</p> <p>These are such fantastic first steps in prioritising active and public transport. I'd have really liked to see more bike lane connectivity, and seeing one lane each way on King St/Princes Highway made into bus lanes so that the private car is given lower priority than public transport, but the project as it stands is so much better than the status quo already!</p> <p>Appreciate the lower traffic speeds (although would be happy with 30km/h for an area that could be further activated into a pedestrian friendly area). Appreciate the extra pedestrian crossings, but more would have been good (as in Committee for Sydney's Reclaiming the High Street report).</p> <p>A Cycling Without Age program should be funded by TfNSW or CoS and IWC. These are electric cargo trishaw with trained volunteers who</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>help those unable to ride themselves. I've heard stories of those who would normally take a taxi to get groceries having to go the long way around and paying unaffordable amounts? By providing a Cycling Without Age electric trishaw, bicycle use would be further normalised. An electric cargo bike library for residents (as in Canberra, and which is supported by the ACT Gov) would also be helpful:  <a href="https://cyclingwithoutage.org.au">https://cyclingwithoutage.org.au</a> <a href="https://see-change.org.au/cbrebikelibrary">https://see-change.org.au/cbrebikelibrary</a></p> <p>Construction should be during the day to minimise disturbance to residents.</p>
22	<p>More cycle paths are a great idea in that areaLove more pedestrian footpaths helping to cross from st Peter's station across Princes Highway to keep us safe</p>
23	<p>I am in favour of beautifying this area of Princes highway / King Street.</p> <p>HOWEVER, PLEASE DO NOT BLOCK THE RIGHT TURN INTO MAY STREET FROM PRINCES HIGHWAY. Access to dwellings in Hutchison and Lackey street will be severely impacted if cars cannot turn right into May Street. There is no other access point to this area from the north.</p>
24	<p>I'm not keen on the ban on the right turn into May Street from Princes Highway/King St. I live on Goodsell Street and it will make getting into my street, via car, more painful, requiring me to drive further on many occasions. I don't really see the benefit of the ban either. I know that the project is intended to make the roads in the area more local and quiet – but May Street has become a lot less busy since Campbell Street was widened and opened already. I'm happy with the rest of the proposals.</p> <p>On a different topic – the letter that was dropped to my house wasn't on Inner West Council letterhead/didn't have the new Inner West Council branding and looked a bit 'fake'.</p>
25	<p>So as a resident in Hutchinson St, how are we to access the street. From the proposal I saw, May St will not be accessible from Prince's Hwy and it is no long accessible by turning right on Campbell St.</p>

No.	Comment
26	<p>I fully support the proposal. The area around Sydney Park is in need of good, safe, separated cycleway improvements, and the best way to achieve that is by re-allocating road space away from cars and using instead for cycling and walking.</p> <p>The reduction of the speed limit is fantastic.</p> <p>The added pedestrian crossings are fantastic.</p> <p>The new cycleways are fantastic.</p> <p>The changes to the intersection with May St and Princes highway are fantastic.</p> <p>The alfresco dining is fantastic.</p> <p>This is the kind of adjustment to use of road space that is well over due and so many areas throughout the inner west deserve the same. My only suggestion would be to re-allocate more space away from cars. For instance it would be great to continue the separation of cars and cycles at the intersection of Sydney Park Rd and Princes Highway, rather than making pedestrians and cyclists share the same space. There is still plenty of space dedicated to drivers that could be re-allocated to make this happen.</p> <p>I hope that this project leads to more projects like it in the area that re-allocate road space away from cars and use it for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
27	<p>I think the proposal is a great idea, it's a shame it doesn't start at Campbell Road or earlier.</p> <p>Fully supportive.</p>
28	<p>My concern is the narrowing of Princes Highway from 6 lanes to four and reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>Because of the amount of traffic on the road this is going create problems for all drivers especially transport drivers and buses which already have difficulty keeping to their schedules.</p>

No.	Comment
	We do not need any more areas for dining, recreation and entertainment, there are already sufficient in the area. There is a large park and many smaller ones.
29	Fantastic ideas and design. The increase in cycling and walking safety will enable my family to cycle to Sydney Park and surrounding areas instead drive as we currently do.
30	Sounds incredibly dodgy to me. Trying to force road users on to their motorways by stealth. The TfNSW link is already closed and there are no other references to it. Something isn't right with all this secrecy. Perhaps you could send me a copy of the proposal?
31	I think the proposed plan for St Peters Junction is excellent and will make the streets safer for all road users. I live on Barwon Park Road and can see how these changes will make driving safer at the end of our street. It will be safer for all the pedestrians who cross the road at that point near the BP service station and have to be so careful of cars flying down Barwon Park Road from the highway. The changes will make walking, cycling and driving safer for my young family and the added greenery is needed in that area too. Great proposal to return the road and surrounding streets to the community.
32	My major concern is the removal of a right turn into May Street from Princes Hwy. I do not drive but due to my age and chronic illnesses frequently need to travel by taxi, the additional distance travelled to my home in Unwins Bridge Road would result in a hefty increase in taxi fares. There will be a problem with emergency vehicles, extra travel time will reduce their response time. From the information I have seen there does not seem to be a way into the streets bounded by Princes Hwy, May Street and Campbell Street, I am wondering how the residents and business owners would access their premises. I do look forward to better footpaths and more places to cross Princes Hwy,
33	In general the intentions are great however vehicular access for the occupants/ businesses of St Peters Triangle (Hutchinson St, Lackey St, Applebee Street) has not been considered. It is not possible to turn into Hutchinson from Campbell Street if coming from Princess Hwy and with the proposal to remove the right hand turn into May Street

No.	Comment
	<p>from the Princess Hwy it will be a disaster for some. If coming down Sydney Park Road trucks would be forced through Lord or Alice Street. Lord is not suitable for trucks. Is it possible to provide either a right turn off Campbell into Hutchinson for local traffic only or change the directions of Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee with an entry off May Street.</p>
34	<p>I live within the St. Peter's triangle and I feel there is no consideration of the quality of life in this proposal.</p> <p>The removal of the right turn at princes highway and may street will remove access to St. Peter's triangle from Newton Alexandra direction. This will further contribute to the</p> <p>isolation and loneliness of this area which should be vibrant. It has suffered through the introduction of westconnex and it's disconnection of the St. Peter's triangle.</p> <p>The removal of the right turn will further move traffic onto other roads such as Campbell. Since the introduction of westconnect, the increase traffic pollution has led to me live with closed windows and doors. This is not any way to live. This proposal will further push traffic on to Campbell and increase my confinement.</p>
35	<p>As a resident of Sydenham and a business owner based in St Peters, I believe the proposal will be an improvement on the area.</p>
36	<p>My name is.....</p> <p>I live work and bring up my child in what is known as The St. Peter's Triangle. Hutchinson, Lackey &amp; Applebee Streets. The only entrance to these streets is via May and Campbell street, there is no right turn from the other direction. As this is the only vehicle access the removal of the Mitchell Rd and May Street right turns will hinder my ability to drive between Alexandria to access, Bunnings, Pet Warehouse, my local GP and back home. All of these trips are vehicle necessary as I carry loads.</p> <p>I work as a local bus driver I need to point out how important the right turns are for buses traveling to Tempe bus depot, while the depot can be accessed via the HWY, to keep to tight running times buses often</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>need to use May and Unwins Bridge as an alternative exspecially during peak times.</p> <p>I wish to echo the St Peters Triangle residents points below with regards to removing the right turns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local traffic forced into rat runs. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extra driving time for locals on all trips especially west of Princes highway resulting in more surface traffic especially Lord Street, Goodsell Street, Alice Street etc.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Increased traffic on Campbell Street West. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a six-lane road which is next to a busy playground and school. Currently not a school zone, with people regularly running the lights or using it as a place to u turn to get back on to PHW</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Reduced access for emergency services. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Vehicles unable to cross a hard median strip on HWY, would have to perform a U turn at major intersections instead.</li> <li>b. We have an aging population who will need increased ambulance assistance at times of truma.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Delayed / lost deliveries to homes and businesses. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Numerous residents do not get deliveries both post and food because it's just too difficult to navigate as it is, this problem will escalate.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Extra cost of taxi travel and inconvenience with rideshare cancelling because they can't figure out the one-way system. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There are numerous residents in the triangle who require regular medical care and patient transport options often taxis or rideshares that are already impacted,</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. No option to divert traffic down May St when major incidents happen on Hwy</li> </ol>

No.	Comment
	<p>a. When incidents happen on HWY it is often necessary for traffic to be diverted via May. This option being removed will hinder incident / traffic management.</p> <p>7. Mitchell Rd, Sydney Park Rd, Princess HWY &amp; May Street are all major route roads removing the ability to turn right also affects wider Inner West communities including Tempe, Stanmore, Alexandria, Enmore, Newtown &amp; Sydenham</p> <p>8. Folks wanting to visit the area will be discouraged due to complexity of access to the area, such as visitors, park users, those wanting to explore local small business and visit family.</p> <p>9. The area is rapidly being developed, how are large vehicles meant to access the area to construct these developments if there is no way to access the area. Discourages developers.</p> <p>10. The traffic studies were conducted before the WestConnex project was completed and not reflective of the current traffic flow.</p> <p>a. It can take up to 20 minutes to do a big shop, one that requires a car from Lackey Street to Marrickville metro using Bedwin Rd a distance of 1.4 kilometres during peak hours.</p> <p>b. The congestion on the railway bridge was already problematic, this proposal will make it worse for those who live west of Princes Highway. Despite the lane widening it's the rapid sequential traffic lights that don't sync that causes mass delays.</p> <p>c. The left turn on to May Street from Bedwin Rd regularly results in the lane being blocked as the other lane is right turn only. Most of the traffic is turning left from May Street to Sydney Park Road so this issue will persist given the current proposal.</p> <p>d. We understand that some people are supporting the idea of having less traffic on May Street. This idea would be counterproductive moving traffic from a light mixed industrial road to residential Streets. More people locally would be negatively affected than positively with the loss of the May Street intersection.</p>



No.	Comment
	<p>Possible solutions</p> <p>For May Street, please consider an alternative solution, for instance restrict vehicles turning at May Street to cars &amp; busses only. This will provide the traffic calming measures and access for locals and small business.</p> <p>Alternatively allow a right turn 'Local Access Only' from Campbell into Hutchinson.</p> <p>While I support the cycling infrastructure and pedestrian friendly direction of this proposal I believe it can be done without removing right turns. I would hate to think that these aspects have been incorporated to green wash the funneling of traffic towards wx at the expense of our local roads.</p> <p>I understand that TransportNSW wish for people to use alternative transportation but with the 422 bus service to the CBD now cut at railway square. The 370 to Leichhardt soon cut at Sydney Uni and the new Metro link not stopping at St Peters it seems that our alternatives are being taken away as well.</p> <p>Yes to the project but keep the right hand turns,</p>
37	<p>I think it's excellent to provide additional cycleway options connecting the various inner west suburbs as well as a link into the city. the more people we can get out of cars and onto alternative forms of transport the better. Opening up for more al fresco and access to the park is a great option also. My concern is around the amount of traffic that comes from Princes Highway up King Street as the road into the city and beyond, trucks especially. What can be done to re-route those onto more appropriate roads and regain the wonderful King Street for pedestrians (including less abled i.e. wheelchair) and cyclists alike?</p> <p>Many thanks,</p>
38	<p>You cannot remove lanes from hwy to force everyone to use wesconnex and pay for the privilege !!! We have been asking for a red arrow function to last about 10 seconds longer so there aren't regular car accidents at the Unwins bridge intersection at Richardson cres in Tempe but was told it would interrupt with traffic flow that</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>Sydney just can't afford to interrupt so your idea seems totally preposterous.....</p> <p>We also don't need more dining etc we have king st for that , just STOP ugly apartments from being built on the Hwy or it's going to look like every other ugly ruined suburb along it in Sydney</p>
39	<p>Hello. Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <p>I'm resident at 60 -82 Princes Highway. I fully support the project. There is such high pedestrian traffic in the area now, this will provide excellent amenity and calm traffic which is often aggressive.</p> <p>One question I have relates to vehicle access to my building via Barwon Park Road.</p> <p>Now being one way, Barwon Park Road is much quieter, a great improvement.</p> <p>However, with the removal of the right turn from Euston Road to Sydney Pary Road, we are forced onto Mitchell Road. Mitchell Road is not suitable to carry the amount of traffic that it does, unless parking is removed. The project suggest the right turn from Mtichell Road onto Sydnet Park Road may also be removed. If that is the case, when travelling from Surry Hills/Erskinville by car, it will be very difficult to enter Barwon Park Road from Princes Highway.</p> <p>Thanks again.</p>
40	<p>I am loving the proposal for changing the street scape around the 6 lane Princes Highway as it meets Sydney Park. This road is no longer a major arterial road and the suggestions for reducing the lanes down to 4 along including the highlights below is very welcoming and forward thinking by council. Well done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bike lanes</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wider footpaths</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outside dining seating</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced speed limit to 40km per hour from King to Campbell St</li> </ul>

No.	Comment
	<p>☑ The wider footpath and dining areas etc should extend all the way to Campbell St Lets get this done ASAP.</p>
41	<p>Generally supportive of the plan. However it will create an issue for access to residents and businesses in Hutchinson St, Lackey St and Applebee St. Access to these streets (St Peters Triangle) is via the one way Hutchinson St off Campbell St via a left turn heading south only. Traffic coming south from King St / Sydney Park Road currently turn right into May St from Princes Hwy in order to access left turn into Hutchinson St. If this May St right turn is removed, as proposed, then it will be almost impossible for residents to access these streets. There is no right turn into Hutchinson St from Campbell St since the widening from the WestConnex project. The St Peters Triangle has undergone, and continues to undergo, significant residential development with most access to these new developments via Hutchinson St. Either the right turn at May St needs to remain or the right turn from Campbell into Hutchinson reinstated.</p>
42	<p>While many people know of 31 Princes Highway as an 'arts space', it has numerous creative industries inside that generate substantial turnovers, employ up to 60 local arts workers and stimulate the local cultural and creative economy. However, there is no provision for parking/ loading zones for local businesses sited on the Princes Highway. This one building houses some 30 creative industries that rely on a client/ customer access, deliveries, drop-offs etc via the Highway. Previously we utilised the loading zones at the back of the building but these have all succumbed to resident metered parking. In the absence of any industrial provision, the loss of vehicle access to the front of the building could see any/ all of these businesses lose their competitive advantage and potentially have to relocate, which will in turn see the demise of this acclaimed creative space.</p> <p>Can you please advise what options there are for local businesses who access and logistics is severely restricted by this project.</p>
43	Fully supportive of this project
44	<p>'In general im supportive of the aims/objectives of the proposal, however as a local resident living on Goodsell Street I do have concerns regarding the impact on continued access to May Street</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>and Goodsell Street (from the Princess Highway). In particular this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removing the right turn from Princess Highway into May Street (proposed removal of the traffic lights). Travelling southbound on Princess Highway local residents will no longer be able to turn right into May Street (for onward access to Goodsell St and adjacent local streets). This will put local residents at a disadvantage including reducing the ease of vehicle access from the Princess Highway to St Peters railway station (from Goodsell St). This will also inadvertently impact the ease of access for large railway maintenance vehicles needing to access St Peters railway station (i.e. trackwork) from the designated entrance on Goodsell Street. The justification for removing the right turn into May Street seems to be focused on reducing passing/through traffic but hasn't considered the impact to local residents? I would argue that only a small proportion of passing/through traffic from the Princess Highway turns right into May Street (the majority of traffic from King St and Sydney Park Road continues southbound along the Princess Highway). Therefore I would argue that the benefit of removing the right turn into May Street is outweighed by the detrimental impact to local residents.</li> <li>- In response to the above concerns (removing the right turn from Princess Highway into May Street) has TfNSW considered the benefits of installing a roundabout at the intersection of Barwon Park Road and Princess Highway (instead of the proposed traffic lights)? this would enable local residents travelling southbound on Princess Highway to use the roundabout and circle back onto May Street for access to local streets including Goodsell Street.</li> <li>- Proposed cycleway on the northbound side of Princess Highway that will be crossing the entrance to Goodsell Street. This doesn't seem logical/safe in terms of having a cycleway that crosses the entrance to Goodsell Street from the Princess Highway? i.e. northbound vehicles will be trying to turn left into Goodsell St from the highway (and have to crossover the cycleway and dodge passing cyclists?). How is that going to work safely in practice? Especially considering larger vehicles that are required to enter Goodsell St from the highway (commercial vehicles, garbage trucks, railway maintenance vehicles etc).</li> </ul>

No.	Comment
45	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <p>I am a St Peters resident and live in the triangle Lackey/Applebee/Hutchinson.</p> <p>The proposal looks great and I am hoping it will be going ahead. However, it would be fantastic if you could also resolve car-access to the above mentioned streets/triangle as currently it looks like a significant detour is required to get to our properties. Thank you!</p>
46	<p>I disagree with the proposal as it seems reducing the traffic lanes will just create more traffic in the area</p>
47	<p>This is the feedback I provided to TfNSW:</p> <p>Although I support the attempt to reduce traffic in the Junction and encourage cyclists, it seems the needs of nearby residents, who use Sydney Park Road, the Princes' Highway and May Street to get to their homes, have not been considered. It's all very well to encourage more traffic onto Euston and Campbell St, but those who live or work close to May St and the Princes Highway will have less options.</p> <p>The recent introduction of no right turn out of Euston Road into Sydney Park Road has already made the trip to my home more difficult, and many of the proposed changes put local residents of May St and the Simpson Park Triangle (a one-way system encompassing Hutchinson Street, Lackey Street and Applebee Street in St Peters) at a considerable disadvantage.</p> <p>There is only one entry point to the Simpson Park Triangle area that provides access to all of the streets: a left turn off Campbell St into Hutchinson St.</p> <p>Before WestConnex there were four possible approaches to this entry point. Recent changes in Campbell St prevent a right hand turn, and the proposed changes will prevent access via May St when travelling from the north or east.</p> <p>1. No right turn from King Street into May Street</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>Driving South on King St, residents will no longer be able to access this entry by turning down May St. They will need to turn south earlier at Alice St and cross the railway line using Bedwin Rd.</p> <p>2. No Right hand turn out of May Street onto the Highway</p> <p>Residents wishing to access the petrol station between Barwon Park Road and the Princes Highway will need to drive down May Street and turn left into Barwon Park Road, past the Princes Highway.</p> <p>In order to return home to the Simpson Park Triangle, they currently have to exit the petrol station onto the highway, facing south, turn right onto Campbell Street, continue across the railway bridge and then do a loop back to it (under the bridge), meeting traffic flow on the short right turn strip onto the the bridge, facing east.</p> <p>3. No right hand turn out of Mitchell Road into Sydney Park Road</p> <p>Local traffic travelling on Mitchell Road will not be able to access the Princes Highway (where the issue of no right turn into May Street reappears) or Lord or King Streets. They may decide to overcome this problem by crossing Sydney Park Road and entering the car park directly opposite the mouth of Mitchell Road, and then doing a circle around the car park, allowing them to exit onto the left hand side of Sydney Park Road, but this would create traffic congestion and unsafe practices within the car park (as drivers are in "getting somewhere else", as opposed to a more careful parking mode). The only other route is via a right hand turn into Coulston Street and up to the Princes Highway. This would congest traffic on Mitchell Road and, once the right hand turn is achieved, direct traffic into an increasingly narrow road and send it out into the highway, facing south, at a very short passage between the traffic lights between the end of King Street and the intersection of the Princes Highway and Sydney Park Road, which is already extremely congested at peak periods. Not only will this inconvenience locals attempting to get to St Peters, but it will be unpopular with the residents in the apartment blocks in Coulston Road, who would not have expected their local access street to have turned into a major through-way.</p> <p>The proposal, as currently indicated, would appear to allow free traffic flow through Westconnex corridors but, if not completely</p>

No.	Comment
	snookering local residents, it seriously disadvantages them and, additionally, creates major traffic hazards that will not enhance the safety and amenity objectives of the Sydney Park Junction Plan.
48	As a resident of St Peter's I think this plan looks fabulous! Very keen to have more cafes/afresco dining at our door step. Love the inclusion of more green space/curb side garden as well as footpath accessibility to Sydney Park. Looks great :)
49	As a local resident living in an apartment block with a car, my main concerns are street parking which is already quite scarce, particularly due to COVID which has made sydney park even busier. By implementing the proposed changes, it will severely limit the number of street parking space available even further. Many apartment blocks around St Peters don't offer a car space, so this will cause a massive problem for lots of us, local residents. As a local pedestrian, the current set up works perfectly fine and safe to get around the area and access the park. It's completely unnecessary to make all these changes and reduce the number of street parking, when it's already a big challenge us for us to find street parking, since sydney park is heavily frequented by people from all over the city.
50	Concern with the intersection at Princes Hwy and May Street no longer turning right when travelling south. Many people in the area need to turn right into May Street to access businesses and residents.
51	Looks great. Cycleways are a must - ideally from the start of May Street all the way down Unwins Bridge Road. Unwins Bridge Road is marked on maps as "cycle friendly" but it most definitely is not, particularly when the left lanes are full of parked cars and cyclists are required to pull into the central lane to get around them
52	I am a resident of 1 Goodsell St. I am concerned at the proposal to remove the right turn from King St into May St and from May St down May Lane. That is presently the only convenient way to access Goodsell St when coming from the direction of the city or Alexandria/Centennial Park. If the two right turns are removed, it will add significantly to every journey, which will be extremely inconvenient for residents of Goodsell St.

No.	Comment
53	<p>In general, I think this is an excellent proposal. The reduction in traffic along Princes Hwy will add a lot to the livability of the area.</p> <p>I have three concerns about the potential impact to residents of the apartments along Princes Hwy:</p> <p>1) Privacy – according to the photos, some of the seating that will be placed along the expanded footpath area will look directly into the bedrooms of residents.</p> <p>Could the project team consider canopies or some other method to prevent people in these seats being able to see directly into bedrooms?</p> <p>2) Noise from dining/entertainment – although the traffic likely produces noise with higher db, traffic largely produces a homogeneous noise that is not distracting. Music and conversational noise from diners, while lower db, can be more distracting.</p> <p>The canopies suggested above will help limit the amount the conversational noise would affect residents. Could the council also consider limits on the volume of outdoor music and limits on outdoor dining late at night?</p> <p>3) Street lighting changes – I did not see any mention of the potential changes to street lighting. Will the proposals change the location or brightness of street lighting, and how will the impact on residents be minimised?</p>
54	<p>This is a great proposal to make St Peters better for living. However, one aspect I am extremely concerned about is that it looks like the outdoor seating on Princes Highway will be set up to look directly into residents' bedrooms on the same and opposite side of the road. Currently, passers-by only have a glancing look and anyone standing and staring would be sticking out. By contrast, offering a pay-for-seat view directly into my bedroom that can be occupied for extended periods would be a huge violation of my privacy. With floor-to-ceiling windows, would I have to constantly police what my young child wears in our bedroom so nobody can look up her skirt, or keep the blinds closed all day? If I have a baby, do I need to close the blinds every time I need to breastfeed in my own home? Please be mindful</p>



No.	Comment
	<p>you do not enable harassment of women, and set up all seating so there is no direct view into any bedrooms. This can be done by selecting suitable locations or mandating canopy cover above the seating areas that would block the views into our bedrooms. If we want to keep St Peters a great suburb for living, please do not issue an open invite to peeping toms.</p>
55	<p>We are writing to express our opinions and concerns in reference to the St.Peters/ Sydney Park Junction project</p> <p>We appreciate TFNSW attempts and proposal of increased green &amp; leisure spaces and cycleways.</p> <p>This however will come at high costs and detriment to many existing and established business in the area, specifically with the removal of all general parking and road access.</p> <p>We are an established family run motorcycle business on the western side of Princes Hwy, between Short St &amp; Campbell Rd, operating in the same location successfully for almost 20 years now.</p> <p>We (and many other local established businesses) rely heavily on the general parking and road accessibility along Princes Hwy for our everyday business operations. We are a specialised and well known business focusing on two historic and unique motorcycle brands, and have a high flow of regular customers from all over Sydney (&amp; NSW) that require general convenient access and parking when accessing our store. This along with our general staff parking which is also crucial element to our general business running. Convenient access to our shop is also of the utmost importance for the regular general deliveries and the regular larger truck delivery accessing our store with supply of brand new motorbikes, which has been the crux of our business for almost 2 decades. Other regular heavier vehicle access is also crucially required for many other general services, such as: the breakdown motorcycle drop off and pickups and our repair and service center, also other ongoing regular services such as oil, tyre, metal and general waste recycling, as required to support industries such as ours.</p> <p>Removal of all this general access and parking would be so detrimental to us and will no doubt be the end of our long established business. Our area has already suffered greatly with the loss of</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>crucial parking spots on Princes Hwy in the past 2 years due to the WestConnex development and road changes.</p> <p>*Other points of concern on the proposal is removal of the RH turn into, and from May St, which will cause extra traffic congestion, confusion and time consuming inconvenience for general and local traffic flow.</p> <p>*And the concern of the mid road barrier which is potentially an issue in emergency situations, with restricted alternative routes available if urgent access of emergency services such as ambulance and fire vehicle services etc.</p> <p>Ironically the encouragement of increased excessive development and high density occupancy in the area that require increased traffic flow, parking and accessibility, in an already high demand, congested and stressed area, is now then accompanied with the proposal of further reducing these facilities and restricted traffic flow and access. Reality is that Princes Hwy will always be a main artery road and to attempt to restrict traffic flow, access and parking would only divert the issues elsewhere and cause many other extreme issues and inconveniences to the numerous commuters and business operators that regularly require these in the area.</p> <p>We are pleading that Council and TfNSW could please seriously review these concerns that highly disadvantage the long existing and established businesses, and to please perhaps find an alternative compromise to satisfy both ideals and allow us to continue trading as per normal.</p> <p>The area on Princes Hwy between Short St and Campbell St, are all in the same situation, all established and existing successful businesses – including another larger automotive service &amp; repair workshop, Post Office, Real estate agency and bus stop, (with a large hardware on the eastern side) would all suffer this same abovementioned disadvantages as a consequence of the proposed changes.</p> <p>*WE are therefore suggesting to perhaps omit the small section of Princes Hwy between Short St to Campbell St (on both sides) from these restrictive and disadvantaged proposals that where these</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>existing businesses exist. Perhaps the cycleway be diverted an alternative route between Campbell St and Short St through the Simpson Park and Applebee St. (As used by many existing cyclists anyway).</p>
57	<p>I strongly oppose the restricting of right turn lanes from the Princes Highway into May Street. This restriction will force local traffic into daily additional driving time and rat runs particularly Alice St. If I cannot turn right at May Street I will need to turn at Alice St and then onto an already busy Edgeware Rd, or travel a further 2km down to Railway Road and then turn right (no right turn arrow) at Unwins Bridge Road. Adding 2.7km for each trip home on already congested roads. This additional travel could determine life and death in emergency services situations.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the removal of traffic lights from the May Street / Princes Highway intersection. Reducing the lanes of the Princes Highway from six to four and then expecting locals to be able to navigate out of May Street onto an already congested Princes Highway without a set of lights, will force rat runs on Goodsell Street and Edgeware Road. Edgeware Road is already heavy traffic seven days a week at the intersection of Unwins Bridge Road. With further developments (230 apartments at Precinct 75) slated for the area as well as the continuing Metro project, the peak hour traffic has limited options.</p> <p>Reducing the speed from 60km to 40km on the Princes Hwy between Campbell St and May St makes no sense when you think that Campbell St is not 40km and has a park and school in the direct vicinity. I also strongly oppose the restricting of right turn lanes from Mitchell Road onto Sydney Road. This will force me onto King Street as an alternate route returning home which is the exact opposite of what this is supposed to achieve. Reducing parking on King Street will have a direct impact on small business. If customers cannot park, they have to choose between residential streets, Lord St and Wells St or the convenience of Marrickville Metro and the death of business on South King. I cannot carry a 15kg sack of flour from Fiji Market to a parking on a side street. While I support the increasing pedestrianisation of the area, it needs to be done in a manner that considers the already at capacity surrounding roads of Edgeware, Sydney Park and Unwins Bridge.</p>

No.	Comment
56	<p>DO NOT restrict/close any lanes near Sydney Park. I travel to the Eastern Suburbs from Tempe each day to work, at any time between 7.30 and 11.00 am. I return between 6pm and 8 pm. I have only ever seen 10 cyclists IN TOTAL in 10 years. NOT JOKING! Not even the food deliverers use that lane. Never ever seen even one.. The temporary bike lane has made such a bottleneck for King St/Princes Hwy/ Unwins Bridge Road/Sydney Park Rd / Mitchell St that I have had to add 15 minutes to my travel time, which was already at least 45 minutes to start with. The traffic jam snakes its way far down Unwins Bridge Rd on some days, because of the bottleneck at the Junction at Sydney Park Rd. GET RID OF the unused Sydney Park Road bike lane and change it back to a normal lane. What about a bike lane THROUGH THE PARK ?</p> <p>PLEASE consider the local residents - I've lived in the Inner west for almost 40 years and the commute East is getting so bad I'm trying to find work closer to home. The first of many bottle necks is Sydney Park Rd. Do NOTHING to impede the car lanes. Not enough people ride bikes for this to be a viable plan. Sitting on pavements next to a major roadway? Not enough Carbon Monoxide for you ? Obviously, the place for lovely sitting is under the trees IN THE PARK . Build facilities WITHIN the park. People are not stupid...they will find their way out of the train station , across the road, to something pleasant in the middle of the greenery.</p> <p>It seems obvious that whoever has hatched this plan does NOT live locally, and is COMPLETELY UNAWARE of the daily traffic problems even closing down ONE lane has caused.</p> <p>I beg you, ABANDON this project, however pretty it looks. It is COMPLETELY IMPRACTICAL !!!!! Save your money for a project that is ACTUALLY beneficial to the locals. Develop places within the park instead. What about an upmarket cafe ,with tables and chairs , like in the Botanical Gardens ? It would make money for you too...just think about it....People ride round the park then put their bikes in the racks near the cafe while they sip their coffees. In the meantime, the rest of us can drive without worrying how late to work we'll be...</p>
57	<p>I am impressed with the vision to make the area between Sydney Park, King st, St Peters station more highly pedestrian &amp; cycle friendly.</p>

No.	Comment
	<p>It would make it much safer given the high use of Sydney Park by families with children &amp; people using park for recreational activities &amp; dog-walking.</p> <p>I do wonder what is going to happen to the vehicles though? Currently traffic comes off Princes highway or Sydney Park rd to make its way down King st &amp; into the city. Another route is via Mitchell st. Where will this traffic go? Euston st is too narrow, only single lane each way, between Sydney park road &amp; Elizabeth st.</p> <p>King st is already a bottle neck of traffic at peak times, such that you only travel down there at off-peak times (COVID restrictions aside), this could be worsened &amp; transmitted up the Princes Highway if traffic speeds are slowed to 40km/hr to accommodate the pedestrianised areas.</p>

#### Phone calls (3)

No	Conversation
1	Lives in the St Peters triangle & strongly objects to the project because of impact on vehicle access. This was followed by e-mail, with issues recorded in e-mail list for inclusion in submission.
2	All issues discussed are within the e-mail received soon after the phone call. See summary in e-mails list.
3	Operates dry-cleaners at 55 Princes Highway, St Peters. Supports the project overall, but concerned about loss of kerbside parking. I explained that existing kerbside parking arrangement would be retained.

#### Comment received via an email (19)

Some email submissions were a duplicate of submissions made through Your Say Inner West site.

No	Email
1	<p>Subject: Feedback on St Peters /Sydney Park Junction Proposal I think that the first thing we need to get straight and that is when the park was given to the residence /council in 1988 the Government did not provide any support. The community and the South Sydney council for many years planted trees and prepared the site. We love our park and are grateful to Sydney Council for the upkeep of the park, their staff do an amazing job. It is a great space and even more important with the massive increase in apartment dwellings which do not include green spaces. I listened to the information session you ran. I felt that the presenters had a 'script' and that is what they stuck to. Many of the questions raised were half answered. Credit though to at least giving the community a feeling of having a say. Your objective appears to be: Transport for NSW wants to improve connectivity at St Peters to make it more walkable, bikeable and people-friendly. 1. Not Addressed in this proposal is the link up with St Peters Interchange. The current goal is the same one that the Govt espoused when the St Peters interchange was launched. I understand why NSW Transport does not want to address or have any responsibility for the St Peters Interchange mess. However, the WestConnex project was to deliver to the community over 6 hectares of parkland (2 areas) as compensation for the impact of WestConnex on residents and the environment. This interchange carved 19,294 square meters from Sydney Park, and cut down over 800 trees. The new green space with cycle paths, walking paths and landscaping was heavily promoted by the NSW Gov't to appease the locals as A Green Link that will provide new cycle and pedestrian connectivity between Camdenville Park, Simpson Park and Sydney Park. This was to be completed by 2019 and the site remains closed to the public even though it has playground equipment on top of the toxic hill. I am not even going to go there how this could have happened. But when residents are doing external renovations, we have to have the soil tested before construction can commence. Many of the residents are cynical about the ability of the NSW Transport/ Govt to deliver. I think there is a lot of evidence that it does have trouble delivering eg Interchange, ferries, train carriages, light rail blow outs etc etc. Our area is also housing the Metro trains and have to deal with the construction works for that however, it is a bit hard to be as enthusiastic as your communications when St Peters is not even a</p>

No	Email
	<p>stop on the line and therefore no benefit to this community and we are concerned with the train service we will end up with as the Bankstown line is for Metro. Another issue not relevant to this project but it does demonstrate how our community has had to give up, deal with over the past 5 years. This Sydney Park Junction in St Peters is very much linked to the St Peters Interchange project. You may want to ignore this project and pretend that this is not part of the current proposal. However, with any business plan you need to scope the "whole" picture and not just bits that suit your outcomes. It is obvious that the whole area needs to have a workable plan and the outcomes that were/ are promised to the community are delivered.</p> <p>What I want answered is: Are you still going to bury your head in the sand over the St Peters Interchanges and ignore it? Are you going to keep the community updated on what is going to happen to this project? Remember it was an obligation to compensate the community. Obviously, you have made billions on the recent sale therefore you have the funds to rectify the problem and give us our green link!!!! I await your response and have included a photo to remind you of what many call the "Hill of Sorrows".</p> <p>2. Sydney Park Junction Modelling: Couldn't find the source for the actual usage by bike riders, pedestrians and actual traffic, especially trucks pre WestConnex and now. The reason there has over the past few years seen many trucks using this area is the NSW Transport projects and once they are completed this will be reflected in the traffic. Modelling often does not really reflect the actual traffic flow and we saw this when the extension to Marrickville Metro was proposed. At that time the NSW transport finally acknowledged after locals spent weeks counting cars and showed that Edgeware Road was often at "capacity". The Response 'the market will dictate and drivers will find other routes rather than being stuck in traffic. Road Data Missing: There does not appear to be any modelling for Edgeware Road or Campbell Street just that the new traffic rules will divert there. Need to address what the impact will be on surrounding streets including Lord Street.</p> <p>The parking spaces are important as conducting a very limited count over several days in the park , showed about 60% of the park is used by dog owners either solo, or with /without kids and if not in</p>

No	Email
	<p>walking distance these people would drive to the park. (Obviously they aren't coming by train nor are the families with small children.)</p> <p>Dynamic Community Space</p> <p>Sounds good but what does it actually mean? For some reason proposals always show cafes and people sitting around. The last thing we need is to have more green space taken and made available for fresco dining or cafes. The building apartment across from the brickworks seems to be the designated area for the community space. I doubt though that families with small children would be comfortable with having the children so close to the bicycle path and main road whilst they have coffee time with friends. Also this space does not seem to be leased yet therefore the commercial use is unknown. We could end up with a brothel to compete with the one up the road.</p> <p>Currently there is a small café in the park near toilets and this appears to be a gathering spot for everyone. Keep this existing space and give it a bit of a makeover. Not sure if you are aware that King Street has lots of wonderful cafes and restaurants which should be supported and not make it tougher for them to stay in business. People do use the park for picnics and it seems most bring their own supplies.</p> <p>Landscaping</p> <p>It seems to me that concept drawing look better than reality. Nice that we will be getting 50 new trees which I hope the species are nominated by the Sydney Park landscapers to ensure it fits with the Park. (We are still owed 750 trees!!!!).</p> <p>There seems to be a lack of imagination when it comes to trying to hide an eyesore. For example the new bridge, bicycle path, walk way over the railway line at Edgeware Road is a concrete block which attracts graffiti and this is what it looks like and the landscaping is 3 little trees.</p> <p>Why not do what was done over the bridge on the brick wall, which is a wall with vines. This could be done on the concrete slab and would be so much nicer to the eye and discourage graffiti. Also pity the pathway is smaller for foot traffic than the bicycle path. It is</p>



No	Email
	<p>interesting when two prams meet in opposite directions one has to reverse as you can't see them approach.</p> <p>I guess Covid19 has given us to take the opportunity to really look at what is happening around us. And we have become cynical because of the lack of transparency and accountability with failed projects.</p> <p>Don't forget that many of us have a vested interest in this park as we have watched this park go from a dump to what it is now and it was also through the efforts of the locals who contributed time and energy in planting the trees.</p> <p>I hope you can honestly answer the queries in my feedback.</p>
2	<p>Hi Kendall</p> <p>Thanks for the invitation to have my say on this proposal (as per the letterbox flyer)</p> <p>I support the proposal. St Peters has suffered so much disruption over the last several years, all of which was for the benefit of greater Sydney. It's great to see something proposed that's just for our local benefit.</p> <p>I like the idea of making "The Junction" more of a St Peters geographical community heart (what we currently lack) by narrowing the highway to four lanes, slowing the traffic speed to 40kmph, widening the footpaths and making them more "cafe/restaurant/bar" friendly all the way down to Short Street, introducing the new pedestrian crossings on the highway (especially the one down near Short St) and linking up better with Sydney Park over the road.</p> <p>It's a pity nothing is proposed regarding using the brickworks buildings. They are a bit of an eyesore all boarded up, especially now that a graffiti vandal has spray painted all over them.</p> <p>I don't have strong views about the cycle pathway. I'm not a cyclist myself these days, but I respect that lifestyle choice. I would just ask that whatever they do doesn't impact pedestrian safety.</p>

No	Email
	<p>I like the idea of not permitting a right turn from the highway into May Street. I'd be disappointed if that was overturned. There must be ways of adjusting traffic flows on Appleby and Hutchinson Streets to overcome their access concerns?</p> <p>I know people over at Alexandria want to maintain their ability to turn right out of Mitchell Rd onto Sydney Park Rd, but I think that would just continue to promote drive through traffic at The Junction that can go just as easily via Euston Road and Campbell Road. I spend a fair bit of time over in Alexandria (at my GP, Bunnings, grocery shops, etc), and I'm quite prepared to sacrifice my ability to turn right for the sake of keeping The Junction a more pedestrian and cyclist friendly place.</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.</p>
3 (also submitted via YSIW see no 40)	<p>Good Evening Kendall,</p> <p>I am loving the proposal for changing the street scape around the 6 lane Princes Highway as it meets Sydney Park. This road is no longer a major arterial road and the suggestions for reducing the lanes down to 4 along including the highlights below is very welcoming and forward thinking by council. Well done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Bike lanes</li> <li>☑ Wider footpaths</li> <li>☑ Outside dining seating</li> <li>☑ Reduced speed limit to 40km per hour from King to Campbell St</li> <li>☑ The wider footpath and dining areas etc should extend all the way to Campbell St</li> </ul> <p>Lets get this done ASAP.</p>
4	<p>The new bike lanes are all very good, however the approaches to the park are missing. Especially going North up Unwins Bridge rd and May st.</p>

No	Email
	<p>If a truck is parked on Unwins Bridge you have to take the outside lane, which can be dangerous, I often have to wait while cars shoot passed usually going really fast.</p> <p>May street has the same problem.</p> <p>Also riding inside Sydney Park is no fun, without any bike lanes which requires alot of dodging and weaving..</p> <p>The new bike lanes would be much better if these issues were addressed.</p> <p>Thanks for your time</p>
5	<p>While I am strongly supportive of the plans to improve the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, install pedestrian crossings at Short Street and reduce the speed limit, I am strongly opposed to the removal of the right hand turns at May Street and Mitchell Road. I understand the Dept of Transport will be meeting with senior traffic officers from IWC this week to discuss these plans.</p> <p>Removing this right hand turn will make it extremely difficult to access Goodsell, Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee Streets by motor vehicle. Access to Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee Street has already been made significantly more difficult when WestConnex cut off the right hand turn from Campbell Street. This plan will make it even worse.</p> <p>Residents and businesses in this St. Peter's Triangle will be adversely affected by the removal of right turns for vehicles at May Street, which will force drivers coming from the East to drive significantly longer distances and/or choose circuitous, difficult to navigate, routes on small local streets (particularly unsuitable for vans and trucks), and which may include dangerous right hand turns. For example, googlemaps shows a 25% increase in the driving distance from Waterloo or Rosebery to Hutchinson, Lackey or Applebee Street in St Peters.</p> <p>Vehicles coming from the east would be forced onto the small, residential streets, Coulson, Concord and Lord if they cannot turn right onto May Street. Alternatively, if a right hand turn is made into</p>

No	Email
	<p>Campbell Street is made, vehicles will have the choice of reaching the Triangle via Florence or Brown St &amp; Conway Place. These alternatives move traffic onto small residential roads and involve dangerous right hand turns onto Unwins Bridge Road.</p> <p>As a cyclist, I will benefit from this proposal but I am concerned about the extra driving time for my immediate neighbours and the decreased access for emergency services and delivery drivers. Additional taxi costs will all cause problems for us, but especially elderly neighbours who do not drive.</p> <p>I support the wishes of many residents to reduce traffic on May Street and Unwins Bridge Road. This could be better achieved by placing a 3 tonne limit on both the right hand turn from Princes Highway and the full length of these roads down to Tempe, the limit to be monitored and enforced with camera technology.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing how you will support residents of our small streets retain reasonable access to their homes.</p>
6 (also submitted via YSIW see comment 55)	<p>We are writing to express our opinions and concerns in reference to the St.Peters/ Sydney Park Junction project</p> <p>We appreciate TFNSW attempts and proposal of increased green &amp; leisure spaces and cycleways.</p> <p>This however will come at high costs and detriment to many existing and established business in the area, specifically with the removal of all general parking and road access.</p> <p>We are an established family run motorcycle business on the western side of Princes Hwy, between Short St &amp; Campbell Rd, operating in the same location successfully for almost 20 years now.</p> <p>We (and many other local established businesses) rely heavily on the general parking and road accessibility along Princes Hwy for our everyday business operations. We are a specialised and well known business focusing on two historic and unique motorcycle brands, and have a high flow of regular customers from all over Sydney (&amp; NSW) that require general convenient access and parking when accessing our store. This along with our general staff</p>

No	Email
	<p>parking which is also crucial element to our general business running. Convenient access to our shop is also of the utmost importance for the regular general deliveries and the regular larger truck delivery accessing our store with supply of brand new motorbikes, which has been the crux of our business for almost 2 decades. Other regular heavier vehicle access is also crucially required for many other general services, such as: the breakdown motorcycle drop off and pickups and our repair and service centre, also other ongoing regular services such as oil, tyre, metal and general waste recycling, as required to support industries such as ours.</p> <p>Removal of all this general access and parking would be so detrimental to us and will no doubt be the end of our long established business. Our area has already suffered greatly with the loss of crucial parking spots on Princes Hwy in the past 2 years due to the WestConnex development and road changes.</p> <p>*Other points of concern on the proposal is removal of the RH turn into, and from May St, which will cause extra traffic congestion, confusion and time consuming inconvenience for general and local traffic flow.</p> <p>*And the concern of the mid road barrier which is potentially an issue in emergency situations, with restricted alternative routes available if urgent access of emergency services such as ambulance and fire vehicle services etc.</p> <p>Ironically the encouragement of increased excessive development and high density occupancy in the area that require increased traffic flow, parking and accessibility, in an already high demand, congested and stressed area, is now then accompanied with the proposal of further reducing these facilities and restricted traffic flow and access. Reality is that Princes Hwy will always be a main artery road and to attempt to restrict traffic flow, access and parking would only divert the issues elsewhere and cause many other extreme issues and inconveniences to the numerous commuters and business operators that regularly require these in the area.</p>

No	Email
	<p>We are pleading that Council and TFNSW could please seriously review these concerns that highly disadvantage the long existing and established businesses, and to please perhaps find an alternative compromise to satisfy both ideals and allow us to continue trading as per normal.</p> <p>The area on Princes Hwy between Short St and Campbell St, are all in the same situation, all established and existing successful businesses – including another larger automotive service &amp; repair workshop, Post Office, Real estate agency and bus stop, (with a large hardware on the eastern side) would all suffer this same abovementioned disadvantages as a consequence of the proposed changes.</p> <p>*WE are therefore suggesting to perhaps omit the small section of Princes Hwy between Short St to Campbell St (on both sides) from these restrictive and disadvantaged proposals that where these existing businesses exist. Perhaps the cycleway be diverted an alternative route between Campbell St and Short St through the Simpson Park and Applebee St. (As used by many existing cyclists anyway).</p>
7	<p>Hope all is well with you. I have a concern about this proposal by TFNSW that they and IWC have yet to fulfil a commitment to install the Junior BMX Pump Track in Camdenville Park.</p> <p>You may recall Marrickville Council had approved the commencement of the work just before Westconnex flagged interest to take control of the corner of the park as a laydown area.</p> <p>Westconnex committed to IWC in 2015 to fund the BMX track as a gesture of delay to the community project. That commitment got passed on to TFNSW because Transgrid then wanted by 2018/9 to build the cable bridge that is also a new cycle path and so Transgrid contractors occupied the location for about a year through 2020.</p> <p>However all that infrastructure work is completed now but I heard IWC have not planned for anything to happen until mid 2023 for Camdenville Park or the BMX track to get back on track as it was, being fast tracked back in 2015 by Marrickville Council who were</p>

No	Email
	<p>ready to commence work with a specialist contractor Dirtz , Brett Barnes to build the track.</p> <p>There were at least two Recreation Needs Studies by LGA council that recommended the track was a big positive for the area, and it was all completed, design, public consultation etc. by 2015.</p> <p>It's really a concern that corporate memory in IWC is evaporating over this commitment and the staff seem pretty dismissive of the efforts made by the group of us who got that project up through proper process and three unanimous votes through council at various stages of approval.</p> <p>I was a volunteer member of the Transport Committee over several of those years, and I took a positive approach to Westconnex as an inevitable thing and to have a seat at the table was better than only conflict. I asked that Westconnex RMS come and address the Transport Committee which they did. At the time mostly about Parramatta Road issues they spoke about.</p> <p>Clr Chris Woods, myself and a Mary Street long time resident went into the RMS offices at North Sydney with the design team and PR to talk about local issues for navigability of pedestrian and cycle around the roads infrastructure and how traffic would flow through the area etc. We had an hour and half meeting with them at that early stage of design process back in 2013.</p> <p>Now as of 2019 The parks guy Arron at IWC from Leichhardt council calls me " mate" when speaking to me as if I'm his mate or some crank from the community he isn't interested in, and the former disgraced CEO Michael Deegan met with me and Clr Pauline Lockie in 2019, and Deegan said I should set up a meeting with Transgrid to try and get cooperation on the BMX going ahead. He received a letter from NSW MP Ron Hoenig inquiring after the fate of the BMX Track project in 2019. Next thing I get a letter from Deegan as CEO telling me I'm banned from making contact with IWC for 1 year in the topic of the BMX! Couldn't hardly believe that.</p> <p>Then I got a letter from a solicitor on behalf of Deegan threatening me not to talk about him or facts related to his work history as published the public domain like ABC news and that I should pay \$500 to the solicitor for the letter I received on behalf of Deegan.</p>

No	Email
	<p>Threw it in the bin. So what's the deal with TFNSW and IWC and more infrastructure works for St Peters?</p> <p>I know this change to Princes Highway was slated to occur by discussion with Westconnex back when they had a community meeting and information centre in St Peters Burrow Road. The then PR response, a guy named Prince told me the Highway would be calmed and down rated along that section north of Campbell Street for traffic as part of the King Street gateway commitment to Newtown businesses not to allow traffic increases after Westconnex.</p> <p>Prince also told me he, as a long time RMS employee in his opinion believed that had we had the BMX track already installed as was supposed to have happened in 2015, that the RMS would not likely have tried to use the location for a laydown, respectful of the community use of the Track if it was already there.</p> <p>It was really disappointing that a motion at Marrickville Council back then by Greens councillors to defer the track commencement and build be deferred for three months, pending what Westconnex might want to do with the location! Hard to believe when the Greens were so anti Westconnex that they pulled that stunt as 'being responsible about spending money' on a community facility that might get taken away.</p> <p>But they may have effectively killed the project then but for that IWC say they will definitely build the BMX track and recognize the TFNSW commitment to fund this also. As mentioned the BMX track is part of records at council.</p> <p>Nice words still by IWC to build this, but it's been so long waiting, no fast track urgency anymore, and still no action yet that the opening is now clear to proceed as infrastructure works are completed and the area is clear and free of works use.</p> <p>Are we now going to see yet another claim to need to use the area for a works laydown for Sydney Park Junction and we never get this Park upgrade for Camdenville or the BMX track?</p>
8	Hi Kendall



No	Email
	<p>We hope you are having a good week!</p> <p>On the weekend, we received a notice from Inner West Council regarding Transport for NSW's Sydney Park Junction, St Peters proposal.</p> <p>You may also be aware that Councillor Vic Macri had alerted Tempe residents to this proposal and its particular impact on our small suburb, for which we are grateful given there has been no direct community consultation from Transport for NSW with Tempe at all.</p> <p>We believe this a major and/or deliberate oversight by Transport. Coming from Newtown/CBD direction, there are only 2 ways to access Tempe - either from the Princes Highway or Unwins Bridge Road (and to access Unwins Bridge Road, you still need to use the Princes Highway - currently turning right either from May Street or Railway Road).</p> <p>I am not including the Campbell Street intersection in this figure as this is a deliberate Transport WestConnex construction which was neither justified nor warranted by the local community - Transport is now trying to retrofit these changes by forcing motorists to use this intersection and justify its existence.</p> <p>Major Tempe impact</p> <p>There has been no direct consultation by Transport with Tempe residents, which is extremely concerning given our suburb will be disproportionately impacted given the only way to access our suburb coming from Newtown, the Eastern Suburbs and the CBD is either from the Princes Highway (turning right at the Railway Road intersection) or via May Street, which becomes Unwins Bridge Road.</p> <p>We believe the proposed Sydney Park Junction proposal disproportionately disadvantages Tempe residents given the access issues to our suburb.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned there has been no specific consultation with the Tempe community regarding the May Street changes. Many Tempe residents I have canvassed on this issue use the May</p>

No	Email
	<p>Street turn for a variety of reasons. These include the dedicated 2 right-hand turning lanes, which mean a large number of cars can safely queue on the Princes Highway, the consistently synchronised traffic lights at the May Street intersection, and how May Street becomes Unwins Bridge Road, making it ideal to specifically access Tempe, including my street.</p> <p>The May Street intersection is appropriately synchronised, allows a safe number of vehicles to wait on the Highway for the arrow and allows a sufficient number of vehicles to safely turn.</p> <p>Both Campbell and Railway Rd intersections do not do any of these things. Railway Rd in particular is dangerous with the large number of heavy vehicles using this road and Transport for NSW is well aware of the dangerous UBR-Railways Rd intersection as there have been multiple representations from the Tempe and Sydenham community to make this intersection safer.</p> <p>There is only one right-hand turning lane at the Railway Rd-Princes Highway intersection, which backs up quickly given the large volume of heavy transport vehicles which use this intersection. It also means fewer cars can safely turn and also funnels cars to the dangerous Railway Rd-Unwins Bridge Rd intersection.</p> <p>Inappropriate Campbell St intersection</p> <p>To force people to use the Campbell Street-Princes Highway intersection (instead of the current May Street right-hand turn) is inappropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly, there is only right-hand turning lane which means after 4-5 cars queuing, it will mean unsafe traffic gridlock on the Princes Highway as cars can not safely queue in the right-hand lane and will be stopped in the middle lane. This will be exacerbated by the Sydney Park Junction, St Peters proposal which is proposing one fewer lane on the highway, so it will be essentially a double whammy for motorists attempting to access Tempe. The Campbell Street traffic lights are not appropriately synchronised often only allowing 2-3 cars to turn so this will create further congestion, the lights are even worse at Campbell Street-Unwins Bridge Road (Town and Country) intersection. We use this intersection every Sunday morning</p>

No	Email
	<p>travelling to Newtown and it allows a ridiculous maximum of 3 cars travelling straight ahead from Unwins Bridge Road into May Street.</p> <p>The May Street intersection is much safer and we ask for this to be retained – it has 2 dedicated right-hand turning lanes and an appropriately synchronised signalised traffic flow. The WestConnex-created Campbell Street intersection is not safe, is not properly synchronised, and has only one right-hand turning lane, which does not accommodate enough vehicles even now. If the May Street turn is no longer available, this will mean even further (dangerous) gridlock as cars back up wanting to turn right at Campbell Street. This chaos will be further amplified if there are fewer lanes which Transport for NSW is advocating – this is a very dangerous double-whammy combination.</p> <p>Lane reduction = LA-style gridlock</p> <p>The Sydney Park Junction proposal also promises absolute gridlock by reducing the Princes Highway and King Street from six lanes to four lanes from Campbell Street to Sydney Park Road.</p> <p>Sydney Park Road is a major link road from the Inner West-Eastern suburbs and is also used by the 348 and 370 bus services, which are the main regular (not peak hour) public transport bus routes which link the 2 areas. This gridlock will also affect the 422 service, again the only bus route from Tempe-CBD, which many Tempe residents heavily rely on.</p> <p>If the May Street turn is no longer available, this will mean even further (dangerous) gridlock as cars back up wanting to turn right at Campbell Street. This chaos will be further amplified if there are fewer lanes which Transport for NSW is proposing – this is a very dangerous double-whammy combination, particularly if there will only be one lane turning right from the Princes Highway to Sydney Park Road.</p> <p>Mitchell Road changes also not welcome</p> <p>Restricting the right turn from Mitchell Road on to Sydney Park Road to buses only is also short-sighted and again impacts Inner West-</p>

No	Email
	<p data-bbox="384 275 1374 488">Eastern suburbs linkages for locals. This is another clumsy attempt to retro-fit the unpopular and unwanted WestConnex and force people to use these costly new intersections, which have been created with little thought for traffic patterns and what locals are using now.</p> <p data-bbox="384 528 1362 824">It is disappointing that Transport is billing this as a people-friendly multimodal St Peters Square connecting Newtown, St Peters and Sydney Park when these proposed changes are far-reaching, do not only involve Newtown and St Peters and impact on existing Eastern Suburbs linked transport networks and a number of other suburbs such as Tempe, which Transport hasn't even bothered to consult with or consider.</p> <p data-bbox="384 943 1150 981">Other Transport for NSW changes impacting Tempe</p> <p data-bbox="384 1021 1385 1317">While I understand the Sydney Park Junction proposal is specifically focused on the St Peters area, Transport for NSW's approach to community consultation leaves a lot to be desired. By not specifically acknowledging the flow-on effects to Tempe (which you can only access from the north via the Princes Highway or Unwins Bridge Road) or to surrounding streets at St Peters, it is not authentic engagement by the Department.</p> <p data-bbox="384 1357 1374 1608">Transport for NSW has also been dismissive of Tempe community attempts for a safer local solution to the Bunnings development on the Princes Highway (corner of Smith St) and the need for an additional signalised intersection for both exit and entry points to be on the Princes Highway (not the exit to be on to Smith Street, which will ultimately funnel 1000+ cars down local Tempe streets).</p> <p data-bbox="384 1648 1390 1906">Transport for NSW is also not open to making the Railway Rd-Unwins Bridge Rd intersection safer with dedicated right-hand turning arrows. Given the high volume of heavy transport using this intersection, it is disappointing that Transport is not amenable to a more common sense traffic solution, not just to this intersection, but to Tempe community concerns more generally.</p> <p data-bbox="384 1946 1378 2024">This is in addition to the Gateway project - which while making Mascot streets safer with less intensive heavy vehicle movements -</p>

No	Email
	<p>it will be doing the exact opposite for east Tempe residents with a huge increase in traffic and noise, with very little mitigation, given East Tempe will have the Princes Highway on one side and now the Gateway on the other.</p> <p>You may also be aware, Kendall, that the Tempe local community had to go to ABC radio and the Sydney Morning Herald for a workable solution when maintenance work on the stairs at Tempe Railway station meant a level-access ramp was going to be closed (story below) but there is still no sign when the station will be getting a lift, or if the Banksia/Waterfall/Tempe line will be expected to absorb customers from St Peters and Erskineville stations when they join the T4 Illawarra line from 2024. Ditto when the Bankstown line stations are closed for Sydney Metro work, including Marrickville station, and whether train passengers from the Bankstown line will then be bused to either Tempe or Sydenham stations. It is highly likely Marrickville station users will drive to Tempe to use our line creating further impact on our small suburb.</p>
9	<p>Hello</p> <p>I want to applaud these ideas from the council!! thank you .this area has become utterly dead! There are no supermarkets, cafes, restaurants or anything useful for the huge and growing population who live or work here. I bought 2 properties here nearly 20 years ago .. its actually ore "dead" now than it was then..</p> <p>I would love to be kept informed of any developments !</p> <p>Wendy Sharpe Artist</p> <p>( I painted the Women's Empowerment Mural in Newtown and there is a vast 6m high mural of me on the new Marrickville metro..</p>
10	<p>I am writing to you to express my strong support for the Transport for NSW's Sydney Park Junction, St Peters Proposal.</p> <p>As a May Street resident with young kids who use Sydney Park regularly and as someone who commutes to work by bicycle, I appreciate the thought that has gone into the proposal, particularly:</p>

No	Email
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved cycle-ways and cycling safety</li> <li>2. Safer and convenient pedestrian access to Sydney Park across the Princes Highway</li> <li>3. Reduced westbound traffic along May Street from the removal of the lights and the right turn off the Princes Hwy</li> <li>4. Some angled parking on May Street</li> <li>5. Wider footpaths, social spaces and more trees at the St Peters / King Street / Princess Hwy junction</li> </ol> <p>I would support further improvements to the proposal including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Measured to reduce eastbound traffic and speeds along May Street including chicanes, pedestrian safety islands and a 40km/h speed limit.</li> <li>2. Additional signage and lighting to encourage vehicle drivers to respect the new raised pedestrian crossing at the eastern end of May Street</li> <li>3. Additional parking for people using Camdenville Park (angled parking)</li> <li>4. Additional parking for May Street residents / businesses (angled parking)</li> <li>5. Improved storm water drainage on May Street</li> </ol>
11	Great idea in general, but please don't block the right turn from Princes into May.
12	<p>Hi Inner West team,</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to provide feedback on the Sydney Park Junction, St Peters proposal.</p> <p>I am a resident at 35 Princess Hwy. My unit is located on Barwon Park Road.</p>

No	Email
	<p>Currently on weekends Barwon Park is very busy due to vehicles travelling to the park and having very limited parking in Sydney Park. I am concerned the new plan will create a lot more traffic on Crown Street and Barwon Park Road.</p> <p>From the proposed mapping it appears vehicles will be unable to turn right from May Street onto Princess Hwy and enter the Park. I suspect with the new plan's vehicles will travel on Campbell Street turn left onto Crown Street, then onto Barwon Park Road to enter the park. I feel this will create a lot more traffic on Crown Street. Crown Street is a very narrow road and is unable to cope with large volumes of traffic. Will Crown Street be upgraded?</p> <p>How can we have limited traffic on Barwon Park ? Traffic volumes are high now with local traffic, westconnex workers and the park I believe the new proposal will increase traffic but I really hope not.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my email and concern.</p>
13	<p>Wanted to share this with you; our submission to the TfNSW submission about the Sydney Park Junction proposal.</p> <p>This submission was prepared in some haste and there may have been issues we missed. Overall I feel that while the proposal is well intentioned, it doesn't really fully consider all the connectivity and amenity issues in our area. For example, shouldn't improvement of the top end of May Street be included in the thinking, given there are already businesses establishing there? (and on Applebee St). Doesn't some consideration need to be made for how we deal with empty shopfronts under all these new apartment blocks? I really think the no right turn onto May St is a mistake, but instead that it should be restricted to one lane and traffic slowed on May St.</p> <p>Interested to be involved in further discussions if there are any.</p> <p>Hi there,</p> <p>We're writing as residents of 17 St Peters Street, St Peters to provide feedback on the Sydney Park Junction proposal.</p>

No	Email
	<p>Broadly, we're in favour of this proposal, and agree that increasing connectivity between the St Peters, Newtown, Erskineville and Alexandria communities and Sydney Park makes sense. However, there are aspects of this proposal which will have unintended consequences and will negatively affect the community. Our concerns and alternative recommendations outlined below.</p> <p>Key Concerns</p> <p>The two new no right turns will make it more difficult for local community to be connected to essential services and each other, will push local community onto small residential streets, and increase surface traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No right turn from Princes Hwy onto May St</li> </ol> <p>We're concerned that removing the May St right turn will in effect just replace May Street with Campbell St (west of Princes Hwy), but with additional Westconnex traffic. This will create high volumes of high speed traffic close to the school and park.</p> <p>Campbell St is bounded by a school and the newly revamped Simpson Park. Even during Covid when traffic volumes have been low, there have been a number of concerning incidents with children at the Campbell Street/ St Peters Street traffic lights, and illegal u-turns at the intersection. Replacing May St with Campbell St doesn't fix anything, it just increases the danger and pollution near children's play areas.</p> <p>Maintaining some lower speed vehicular access to May St will support the local shopfronts which are already there and building up a fledgling collection of local shops on May Street. We'd encourage you to support them, not crush them.</p> <p>The triangle of homes and businesses around Applebee St/Lackey St/ Hutchison St will be particularly negatively</p>



No	Email
	<p>impacted by this no right turn, with very severely limited access to their streets, and difficult access for deliveries, emergency services and for vehicular access to businesses. As a local resident I use businesses in that triangle, and on occasion have to use a car to access them because I'm collecting bulky items. This action will make me less likely to access these local businesses.</p> <p>Cutting off May St at Princes Hwy doesn't provide for alternate access during an emergency. For example if Campbell St needed to be closed due to an accident, then traffic would have to be diverted via Tempe.</p> <p>2. No right turn from Mitchell Road onto Sydney Park Road</p> <p>If you can't turn right onto Sydney Park Road from Mitchell Road, people will use Coulson St instead - an even more residential area. Not a great solution.</p> <p>This will also result in more local traffic on Euston Road, which is already at capacity and being used for trucks.</p> <p>It's important to note that this isn't about people finding 'rat runs'. It's about local community trying to access key services, such as Marrickville Metro, King St shopping and services in Alexandria. While it would be ideal if we were all a bit less car dependent, and the bike lanes will go towards helping this, cutting communities off from each other isn't the solution.</p> <p>Traffic flows since Westconnex was finished haven't yet been measured - we've been in lockdown the whole time. Our anecdotal experience as local residents is that we're already using Mitchell Road much less frequently, but it is still an important option for us on some occasions. We believe this measure is overkill</p> <p>3. Princes Hwy Shopping Precinct</p>

No	Email
	<p>It's worth noting that beautification of the Princes Hwy between King St and Campbell St won't help to increase occupancy in empty shops - which were proliferating even before Covid. While it would be lovely to see this as a highly utilised, pedestrian friendly area, we're curious: what measures are being taken to ensure this doesn't end up just another empty strip beneath apartments?</p> <p>SUMMARY - Alternative Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a single lane right turn from Princes Hwy to May St for local traffic only. Include traffic calming measures on May St.</li> <li>• Add a school zone into Campbell Street (west of Princes Hwy), to improve safe access to the school on Church St and St Peters Street.</li> <li>• Maintain a single lane for right turn from Mitchell Rd to Sydney Park Road</li> </ul> <p>We look forward to hearing more about the outcome of this consultation.</p>
14	<p>As a ratepayer &amp; resident of Goodsell St St Peters I am enquiring whether there is likely to be an increase in traffic in Goodsell St as a result of the above project</p> <p>If this is likely I hope the Inner West Council will object to the plan.</p>
15	<p>I have viewed the Sydney park junction proposal, and I am concerned about what the closure of right turns into and out of May St will mean for residents and businesses of St Peters who appear to have been forgotten in this proposal.</p> <p>Whilst I agree with aspects of the proposal to make the area more cycle-friendly, this comes at a significant cost for locals who require cars to access the area.</p>

No	Email
	<p>I would like some questions answered regarding how locals will be impacted -</p> <p>1. Under this proposal how do businesses and residents of Lackey st, Hutchinson St, Applebee St access their properties when coming from the City on the Princes Highway without looping all the way down Campbell St?</p> <p>2. How do residents of St Peters, Brown, Florence and Church Streets turn right onto the Princes Highway with the removal of May St right turn. The current proposal would funnel all drivers down Florence/ Brown and Silver St towards Unwins Bridge Rd. This proposal would create excessive traffic in Silver Street (a narrow residential street)</p> <p>3. What is the reasoning behind closing the right turn access into and out of May street and why is the success of this proposal contingent on moving this intersection to create the proposed Barwon Park rd intersection when the same thing could be achieved whilst retaining this current intersection?</p> <p>4. What is the benefit of this proposal on local residents who require cars for essential work that is not possible to be undertaken via cycling or public transport options due to distance and lack of public transport routes?</p> <p>5. This proposal would add time for emergency services to access St Peters and surrounds, how do you mitigate this?</p>
16	<p>Dear Madam Mayor.</p> <p>Your idea of widening footpaths and creating al fresco dining areas for this precinct is brilliant.</p> <p>I reside at 147 princes highway .(opposite pro cycles) and the ugly westconnex Cambell st junction.The area from St Peter's station to my property is dead. Community shops were bulldozed to make way for roads but to the present there are no supermarkets ,liquor outlets, greengrocers,etc. Just bike outlets! Try walking along the princes highway to pro cycles and check for yourself. The community of ever increasing flats has no community identity or</p>

No	Email
	centre. So I applaud your initiative to turn that junction into something with a heart.
17	<p>Hello Kendall,</p> <p>Regarding the planned Sydney Park Junction, I would like to express my reactions.</p> <p>It is a wonderful idea to improve the facility and appearance of this area. In association with the obvious people-friendly atmosphere of Sydney Park, the new plan provides a wider access for people to experience an open enjoyment of the area, and a decrease in the speed limit would make access to Sydney Park and St Peters Station safer.</p> <p>My major reservation with the proposed plan is with the restriction of access to and from May Street by the addition of a blockage by an impassable centre barrier in the Princes Highway. There would therefore be no right-turn access to May Street from the Newtown side, and no right-turn access to the Princes Highway from May Street.</p> <p>As a resident of Hutchinson Street in the St Peters triangle, I would find it extremely complicated and time-consuming to exit and have access to my home, due in part to the fact that the streets in the triangle are one-way. I am not advocating a change to two-way streets, as this would mean a return to heavy traffic and 'rat-running' through the triangle. I do, however, feel that retaining the access to and from May Street, provided safety is retained, would save the amenity of the triangle area.</p>
18	<p>Hi Kendall</p> <p>Further to the latter drop from Council regarding the proposed Sydney Park Junction works please see below my email to TfNSW giving my support to the proposal and also confirming that it is my view that the proposal should be wholly supported by Council as contributing to the outcomes envisaged for the St Peters Triangle and May Street in particular under the Precinct 25 controls of the Council DCP 2011</p>

No	Email
	<p>Looking forward to seeing Council push for the outcomes that have been in place for this part of St Peters for the last decade (and beyond) and supporting the plan being put forward by TfNSW</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposal i am in full support of the proposal.</p> <p>I am a resident on May Street and I would like to see the proposal extend along May Street in consideration of the Inner West Council's St Peters Triangle Strategic Context under their DCP 2011 and to discourage heavy vehicles heading east along May Street by incorporating either traffic control devices or vehicle weight limits and to direct them to utilise the Campbell Street access to Euston Road for the access into the industrial parts of Alexandria which they are currently using May street as a short cut. This will assist with the intended change of character from industrial to a potential village type character desired under the current DCP 2011 precinct 25 controls. Importantly the precinct controls envisage May Street to be a pedestrian dominated environment and if the junction works were able to recognise the future character of May Street this may encourage a faster realisation of this zone and remove the rat run that is currently the nature of the road.</p> <p>Hopefully with consultation with Inner West Council and the desired outcome of May Street this project and create a positive enhancement of the area to encourage reduced vehicle traffic and create an interconnected zone between Sydney Park, St Peters Triangle and pedestrian connections between St Peters Station and the newly completed Marrickville Metro. This could also result in the character of South King Street extending further towards higher density residential areas, which will be of great benefit in the post Covid 19 era</p>
19	<p>Hi and apologies for the late response, I have not been on email for the past week... hopefully the response can be included? I am a resident of May Street St Peters in a Heritage listed property backing on to Camdenville Park and have owned the property here for 23 years.</p>

No	Email
	<p>I have witnessed considerable changes in the immediate area including the WestConnex and Light Rail, and all will or have had a considerable impact to us and I support change, and they have or will deliver benefits to us.</p> <p>This proposal has my full support as it will be a game changer for our community in particular for;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cycling safety, access and available connected routes</li> <li>2. Improved and safer access to Sydney Park across Princes Highway</li> <li>3. Reduced traffic flow along May Street which is a busy thoroughfare and poses concerns with Camdenville Park and the quantities of kids which use this facility</li> <li>4. Social facilities, wider paths and more trees</li> <li>5. Reduced traffic speeds along existing roads outlined to name a few</li> </ol> <p>However I would like to raise a couple of concerns which my immediate neighbours concur with;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May Street will have the right turn removed to travel westbound down May Street (which we support greatly), we agree this will dramatically reduce traffic flow in the westerly direction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. We also note the traffic lights will be removed and a raised pedestrian crossing will be installed and again we support this proposal</li> <li>b. What we do have concerns with is what measure will be implemented to manage the traffic flow Eastbound along May Street, to prevent cars trying to take a 'shorter route' which has 'no lights' to slow them at Princes Highway? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. We feel this will likely increase Eastbound traffic</li> <li>ii. Increase traffic speed</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

No	Email
	<p>iii. Placing residents and children using Camdenville park at greater risk</p> <p>iv. And potentially increase risk to pedestrians crossing at the May Street crossing, if speeds and quantities of traffic are maintained, with drivers focussed more on trying to beat traffic flow on Princes hwy and less focussed on pedestrians</p> <p>c. Can we propose the following on May Street, in particular along the Southbound length of Camdenville Park</p> <p>i. Angled parking, as has been proposed at the top end of May Street perpendicular to Princess Highway?</p> <p>1. This has been proposed before though was knocked back by council and RMS as May Street was a State road and angled parking is not permitted on a state road</p> <p>2. Would it be correct to assume May Street will be reinstated as council owned local road?</p> <p>ii. A couple of chicanes are installed at either end of the parallel parking area to assist with traffic quietening?</p> <p>1. This will also assist with the shortage of parking spaces we lost in our street due to Westconnex and the challenges we have finding parking when local community sports are held in Camdenville Park</p> <p>iii. Can we propose that the speed limit is reduced along May street to 40Km/h, aligning us with the speeds being adopted along Princes Hwy and Sydney park Road?</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration,</p>

Facebook comments (134 likes/loves and 12 shares and 123 comments of which 112 are included.)

No	Facebook comments
1	I thoroughly support this proposal! It will calm traffic and make the area so much life beautiful. Plus we need to shift our transport to more environmentally friendly and cost effective alternatives.
2	Plans for the St Peters square look fantastic, needs lots of seating, native plants and shade if pedestrians are actually going to use the space. No right turn onto May St is a terrible idea, people still need access to St Peters triangle
3	Are there really enough cyclists on the roads to justify closing off car lanes? I live and work in the inner west and traffic is already a nightmare just trying to get 2 suburbs across. And with ghetto apartments built on every corner means an increase... See more
4	agreed. Also turning that strip of princes highway into a 40km an hour zone is going to congest peak hour morning traffic up even more. Unless that is their intent, to annoy people enough into using tolled roads?
5	They gotta justify the bazillion dollars spent on the motorways
6	that they then sell to private operators at a fraction of the cost it took to build them who charge us a fortune in tolls
7	<a href="https://youtu.be/9xXZaLMIXvs">https://youtu.be/9xXZaLMIXvs</a> Seven Bad Arguments Against Bike Lanes
8	Excellent proposal. The capacity reductions and turn restrictions will help to reduce traffic & congestion. And who would say no to less traffic? But may need some additional traffic calming/filtering to ensure extra traffic isn't diverted onto local/residential streets.
9	I think it's great that they want to reduce the amount of car traffic on the roads. But it can only work if there is a corresponding increase and improvement in public transport.
10	I don't trust anything tFNSW do. Read the fine print people, it's always about the cars.
11	You're commenting as Nicholas Langley.
12	It's good on the basis heavy traffic will be diverted to westconnex and this will be moreso local traffic. Traffic calming measures should flow through to side streets to reduce rat runs, like decreased local road speed from these state roads, narrow points, coloured or textured surfaces, etc. Also, the cycleway at the moment is pretty poorly connected and it would be great to see IWC, COS and Transport for NSW work to put in a separated cycleway from this junction up the full length of King Street towards the city, Universities, Broadway, CBD, etc. Separated cycleways are a terrible patchwork across the whole city, and we could



No	Facebook comments
	get this right now.
13	especially agree about cycleways! We have some excellent cycleways that end in weird, nowhere spots and leave cyclists confused as to whether they should join major 4-6 lane roads, or try to weave through pedestrians (both unsafe options). And excellent example is the lovely new path and separated bridge over the train line on Bedwin Rd / Edgeware road. No method for cyclists to go anywhere west or north, just to head back towards St Peter's station!
14	especially agree about cycleways! We have some excellent cycleways that end in weird, nowhere spots and leave cyclists confused as to whether they should join major 4-6 lane roads, or try to weave through pedestrians (both unsafe options). And excellent example is the lovely new path and separated bridge over the train line on Bedwin Rd / Edgeware road. No method for cyclists to go anywhere west or north, just to head back towards St Peter's station!
15	how do residents that live in the St.Peters triangle of Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee Street get to their homes. They currently turn right into May and then left at Campbell and left again at Lackey. What will they do?
16	Rippon maybe the cyclists could pay to finish the cycleways the rest of the road uses pay for...maybe put a toll on the cycleway to increase the revenue. Wait a minute the tolls paid by the 5 cyclewat users wouldn't pay for the toll booth..what am I thinking?
17	tolls don't pay for roads ya numpty, taxes do. Every cyclist pays GST, income tax, MVT, fuel excise if they also have a car, etc. I pay tens of thousands in tax every year as do many other cyclists.
18	I'm also a car driver (which contributes to tax), and a PAYG taxpayer, and also a rate payer. Besides, we don't live in a user pays society but want to encourage a healthy and accessible society regardless of financial means, don't we?
19	Rippon fair play..just opinions at the end of the day we don't really have a say either do we?
20	or ask council for \$25000 to address their issues like 2 streets in Tempe just got to oppose Bunnings ...yes you read right \$25000 for some cardboard signs to hang on fences....
21	They need to include EV charging in the plan and sort out access to the St Peters Triangle.
22	Cutting off the right hand turn at May street is going to force traffic onto king street and surrounding residential streets, that doesn't sound like a great idea.
23	Campbell I can see that would impact the people around that pocket of Erskineville near Mitchell Rd, but if you're traversing from Alexandria to Unwins Bridge Rd, for example, it's actually much easier already to use Euston and Campbell, so it might work. Time will tell
24	Brendan Riche we have no access to our streets from Campbell heading west. Only access is via May then Campbell eastbound

No	Facebook comments
25	why would it? It would make people use Campbell Rd as it is designed to do
26	we have no access to our streets from Campbell heading west. Only access is via May then Campbell eastbound
27	exactly?? Why are people allergic to using May St?!
28	Jardine you can't turn right into Hutchinson St from Campbell (median strip installed under Westconnex), and you can't enter the Hutchinson-Lackey-Applebee triangle from May St because it's one way.
29	The removal of the right turns at May Street & Mitchell Rd is only being done to funnel traffic towards Westconex, no other reason what ever TransportNSW say in their glossy presentation. Pushing traffic towards wcx is the main objective. This will cut off vehicle access to Hutchinson, Lackey Applebee Goodsell & Council Streets. No only will it increase rat running and extra driving time but residents and businesses will suffer due to visitors, deliveries, taxis and even emergency services getting lost. Its bad enough trying to get taxis to find St Peters triangle as it is now, don't let TransportNSW make it worse. Allow local traffic to turn right at May and Mitchell rds. I support the proposed pedestrianisation alfresco dining and cycle infrastructure but sad that its being used as a TransportNSW Greenwashing exercise. Keep the right turns Council dont let TransportNSW steel our local roads
30	the right hand turn from May should be retained but limited to light vehicles
31	you can't police it, everyone will just come up!
32	theres nothing stopping traffic traveling up May street. Please study the proposal
33	I know. But less will come up without the right turn they will go wcx and main road that has been purpose built!
34	EXACTLY!! So because we live in a world of lemmings... right turn to be taken away completely for decision to be taken away completely. Quite simple how it works
35	I don't really understand your point of "pushing traffic to the interchange" being a problem. I understand they will make money with the tolls, but isn't the whole point of westconnex to divert cars away from local areas and onto the highway? Isn't that it's whole purpose? I was against them building that thing, but now that they have, ppl might as well use it .
36	we allllllll have our own agenda... don't we? What suits you... doesn't suit others.... Like me... ON May street. So.... Think bigger picture buddy!
37	My street (May street) is now being used as the rat run. We have been put through the ringer over the past few years with all the road work and trucks using May street. It has broken marriages and caused serious disruption. So to add 3mins to someone's commuted time "sometimes" is a small price to pay for a life of serenity! Let's use the roads that have been build and designed for the traffic. No more May street as the rat run!
38	Rat run???May Street was built and designed for traffic. Its a duel laned light industrial road. The whole of st Peters has been through it with this. Im sorry the disruption has ended

No	Facebook comments
	relationships but choosing to live on a main road and expecting serenity is daft. What many of us are asking for is the right turn to be limited to cars only.
39	But what's wrong with Campbell? Modern main road?
40	can't turn right into Hutchinson street from Campbell.
41	that's ok. That's a good thing, less traffic in your street which is what you want... right?
42	no i want an equatable solution where residents of St. Peter's are not shafted again for the sake of wcx. Don't believe for one second that TransportNSW are doing this for your benefit because they ain't it's a green washing con job that is going to stitch us up again.
43	no, y it just want what's best for you not everyone... everyone has their own agenda when it comes to things like this. No one is whiling to compromise. You don't like it because it doesn't suit you 100% but what your suggesting doesn't suit me 100% but you don't care about that do you? So .... I reckon the council will do what they want... and for me... I'm happy with it. Suits me! We're all in it for ourselves really.. aren't we? You're protecting your street and in protecting mine. End of the day, I think this it great that wcx are doing things to redirect the traffic to the main roads they built and they are ultimately giving back to the area! I'm ok with Driving an extra block every now and then for fresh start, can't wait. So exciting!!
44	so your not even happy for the right turn to remain for small vehicles? Which would stop the trucks you speak of?
45	how do you police it? What's "small vehicles" still get the pollution, dust, trucks.. just drop it completely. Unless you want to stand at the bottom of the street 24/7 policing it. Which I doubt.. so.... Bring on the "rat run"
46	heavy goods vehicle drivers that ignore size and weight limitations don't keep their licenses for long. Should a right hand turn have a restriction placed on it a professional driver will obey that restriction and you would get less traffic. You could also restrict traffic turning left into May in the same way which would result in no trucks going down May. The proposal as it is does not remove traffic. People will still have to drive down May street to get access, just left from HWY. pretty pointless
47	As someone who lives overlooking what is now the (ugly concrete playground) st Peter's precinct & start of the princes highway, this proposal is 100% better than what it is now! Very glad & welcoming of this new development to reduce excessive traffic, adding bike lanes & making this whole area more user friendly for pedestrians long term.
48	So you make every other road a 40km zone, except the road Parents of St Peters Public school actually wants to be a 40km zone (Campbell) because of child safety. What the reasoning behind this so we can use this excuse too.

No	Facebook comments
50	its a new road. All hail the new road
51	Filtering traffic into Trans Urban's toll road. Stuffing up access for locals. Inserting more bike lanes for bike riders at no cost to them. How about introducing a tax on bike riders so they can fund this? And have TransUrban fund the road works, as they are the ones that will benefit. Plus pay restitution to the triangle residents that will have yet another inconvenience placed on them? I don't live in the triangle, but support them getting some form of compensation
52	Appeldoorn income tax pays for roads not car registration so I guess with your logic unemployed or low income people should not use the roads.
53	want access not compensation
54	This project and IWC needs to consider impact to local street. Both the lord/Darley st are narrow and 3T limited, however there no traffic calming or monitoring fitted. Local residents get their cars hit constantly and the IWC does nothing to discharge its duty of care, EXCEPT hand out tickets to local residents. Given the narrowness of the streets, IWC needs to consider and implement alternatives such kerb mounting (in line with the trees) and/or targeted traffic calming fixtures including truck monitoring CCTV.
55	Lord Street will end up having to bear the load of the residents and businesses of the St.Peters triangle who need the right hand turn at May to access the streets of Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee.
56	yup, no nimby here..I'm ok with the development and the area needs ped focused attention.. However IWC council needs to consider traffic flow and actually do something abt residents that live and park in these narrow streets
57	I never go down Lord as it scares me at how close the cars are and because I drive slowly I get anxious about the cars behind me. St.Peters residents will have to do big loop arounds to access their homes which just creates more traffic issues.
58	People in the St Peter's triangle have not been consulted or considered in this proposal. We lose access from King and May St plus Sydney Park Road. We will have to do a rat run through local streets including Lord, Angel, Florence and Concord Streets. It also pushes heavy vehicles into two school zones. There are no local traffic studies regarding these impacted streets in the proposal. This is a shocking outcome for the St Peters Triangle and South Newtown!
59	The main issue is that it causes the residents of the St.Peters triangle of Hutchinson, Lackey and Applebee Street to lose access to their homes and businesses. Residents need to turn right from the Princes Highway to go down May Street to turn left into Campbell and then left into the one way system of Hutchinson which is the only entrance to the triangle. Westconnex has cut off access to Hutchinson from Campbell with a median strip so there is only one entry point. Residents deserve better.
60	agree
61	totally, thanks for bringing it up
62	also Goodsell & Council
63	You guys will survive. May street has been abused.
64	So this is the 'look we destroyed your suburb for Westconnex so we're going to do some window dressing' bit right?
65	you're deluded if you think it looks better now or before Westconnex

No	Facebook comments
66	Definitely before Westconnex.
67	Ridiculous...why does everyone think cycleways are the solution. Really...we need to accept cycling isn't for everyone in fact it's only physically possible and enjoyed by a very small minority in the grand scheme of things.
68	I'm originally from Belgium and used to cycle everywhere. I never do here and that's because of the lack of infrastructure in Australia. It's quite frankly terrifying here. It's all about that threshold when more and more ppl will see cycling as an attractive option. And once people do that, there will be much less cars on the streets and less traffic jams for people who can't (or don't want to) cycle. It'll benefit everyone eventually. Just look at countries like the Netherlands, Denmark etc
69	mate if I wanted to be like the Netherlands and Denmark I would live there! I love driving my car and personally and like many other Australians have no interest riding a bicycle. 60% of our population in Sydney would or could not ride around Sydney, which is our aging population, physically disabled or geographically unjustified cannot even ride so that leaves 40% that can in and around the inner suburbs of Sydney. How many of the 40% will justify the cost and use the cycleways? Also you are comparing heavily populated cities with huge density in comparison to Sydney's sprawled geographic populus. It's not a fair comparison.
70	nobody is forcing anyone to cycle. But why should people who prefer driving their car get all the infrastructure, and people who prefer to cycle close to none? And again, more ppl cycling benefits everyone in the end. (less traffic jams, accidents, noise, pollution, co2,...).
71	ridiculous...why does everyone think roads are the solution. Really...we need to accept driving isn't for everyone in fact it's only financially possible for a portion of our community in the grand scheme of things. See - it works both ways. You still get your precious roads and sharing the space might even make life easier, as more people like me can cycle to our destinations rather than creating more congestion for drivers like you.
72	was just about to tag you in this
73	Sick of you making narrow streets narrower, adding to the traffic problems. And increasing pollution and stress.
74	I see a problem with closing the right turn into May Street in that it could force extra traffic in to Lord Street in order to access Unwins Bridge Road
75	Agree with including lights at barwon park road because the other end is no entry 2. Don't agree with reducing right hand turn lanes from 2 to 1 going north from princes highway onto Sydney park road towards Alexandria. That right turn already gets banked up severely - reducing to 1 lane is untenable
76	I support proposal, widening of footpaths and landscaping will make the street area much more appealing and better for people walking around using the area, hopefully "feel" less like a major busy road as vehicles travel a bit slower. Has to be better t... See more
77	More congestion, bike lanes with a few bikes every 24 hours. Not everyone can use public transport if and when it shows up, people need to travel through suburbs to get to destinations, clogging up suburban roads to keep a few locals

No	Facebook comments
	happy is extortion.
78	The bike lane is very exciting!! I often have to take very indirect (read: slow) routes to stay safe on my bike
79	well why don't you contact your council and suggest a highway being build through your suburb, if you love through traffic that much
80	Helen Elizabeth Jane Hooper highly doubt it. This isn't an area known to vote Liberal, which is why they had no qualms destroying it with a spaghetti junction. Not to mention poisoning residents with fumes from the site, taking people's homes and exposing us to years of noise and pollution.
81	because it's always been such a picturesque part of Sydney. Especially the big hole in the ground where the interchange now is. It's called progress.
82	A reduction in traffic lanes is a terrible idea. More and more units and high density developments are being built and we need wider untolled roads not a reduction in lanes and 40km zoning..... That part of this proposal is terrible. Our city is getting busier and more densely populated. We need room to commute by vehicle and not just by walking or riding. On the other hand, the greenery is nice.
83	I'm all for reducing the number of lanes, but businesses along that stretch need more parking, especially for the post office. Would want to see the left lanes on each side of the Princes Highway dedicated to street parking at all times.
84	you clearly dont catch the bus home lol
85	nothing a bus zone at the bus stops won't fix.
86	Such a great project. Can't wait for it to begin. Hopefully it doesn't get watered down to favour cars. Local active transport is the future for this area.
87	I hope the new red lights at Barwon Park Rd will provide entry and exit to the Sydney Park car park for cars coming from both north and south of Princes Highway.
88	Please not another building project. St Peters has had enough and this will not improve my life or the lives of many residents who need these right turns to get home. Enough is enough
89	Looks like a big improvement to me, I've worked in St Peter's for 12 years, Princes Highway is really quite a horrible road, this can only improve it
90	When?
91	Love it! Please plant native plants that support appropriate native species.
92	tress are for parks not hwys designed for heavy traffic ....
93	just so much to say here. Plants aren't always trees. Also, trees exist outside parks and in fact they existed even before highways
94	When?
95	BRING IT ON! This looks AMAZING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
96	I understand the concerns for "rat running" local residence... and I am a local resident and I'm all for this change. Because I rather the "rat running" once or twice a day than 24/7 traffic, trucks, car beeping because everyone is impatient, traffic jams, air pollution, dust and having to wash down my front door every week, cars speeding.... I might actually be able to open my front door for fresh air and enjoy the serenity of the area. I love it... well done IWC. Approved by locals here So give me the rat run all day over the constant noise and traffic we get. One suggestion though; Making May Street 40km zone as well. All the

No	Facebook comments
	parks, cafe and residential, it should also be 40km going into a 40km zone. Therefore, you wants quicker way to get around... continue along the westconnex thanks
97	no it doesn't just heavier traffic , locals doing rat runs to get home and more unnecessary cafes
98	thats your opinion, and mine as a local is... BRING IT ON !!!!
99	Pretty wild hey. Might have to get a bike.
100	Benefit the pedestrians and cyclists but not improving overall traffic
101	it will if more people start feeling safe enough to cycle more and stop using their cars. I'm one of those people who prefers not to drive and has a bike - the safer it is the more likely myself and others will ditch the car completely
102	Would be nice if there was more cycleways in Inner West LGA... dreadful bicycle infrastructure for a supposedly progressive area
103	Great to revitalise this strip, but please note that preventing the right turn from Princes Highway to May Street will severely impede access to the St Peters triangle.
104	Pedestrianising is always a good thing. Time to reduce car supremacy.
105	Please. More trees.
106	Bill Faulkner it's a Hwy it's meant for traffic , would you rather us rat run through your street !!
107	I'd rather you use your car as little as possible.
108	I don't even have one ....but most around here seem to have 2 vehicles
109	Hey council ...not all of us in Tempe are happy that you just gave 2 streets \$25000 for some signs to hang on gates protesting Bunnings ...are you serious \$25000 could be well better spent .alot of us in Tempe are happy about Bunnings...I may not pay my rates next year if this is how you spend it
110	Which one of you far left green morons thought this up.
111	Going to look more like a concert jungle with no style
112	this is it

### Submissions (3)

No	Submission
1	<p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN</p> <p>Re: Proposed changes to Princes Highway between Campbell Street and May Street. St Peter' s,2044.</p> <p>It is with concern that we read of the proposed changes to the Princes Highway, St Peter's as this will have a major impact on our established business of over 30 years. We provide a specialist Land Rover parts retail and repair service at 99 Princes Highway, situated between Campbell Street and Short Street.</p> <p>We rely on roadside parking for customers and freight deliveries as well as the ability for tow trucks to reverse into the yard to drop off and pick</p>

No	Submission
	<p>up vehicles. We also have trucks coming in to collect tyres, metal, waste oil, general waste and recycling materials. The proposed changes of removal of parking spaces and general access will have a detrimental effect on our business which employs 11 people while at the same time has safety implications as it will be more difficult for trucks to access our yard. It will also potentially lead to traffic stoppages as trucks will have less space for manoeuvring into the yard.</p> <p>We have now had several years of disruptions and unkept promises from council/government. We were told parking that was removed due to west connex etc was only temporary only to have it removed completely. Also it is worth noting that although parking may be provided for contractors working on this development past experience tells us that in reality they use the available roadside parking rather than the allocated parking for them.</p> <p>We feel very much that for the last few years businesses such as ours who provide employment, a niche service and input many dollars into the economy are being deliberately driven out by local government planning decisions. It is not just our immediate business this affects but all the local retailers that our customers then visit while waiting such as the coffee shops, post office, Newtown shops etc.</p> <p>We would ask that you reconsider and adapt the proposed plans to allow businesses such as ours to continue to provide the valuable niche service which is in high demand.</p>
2	<p>Dear Mr Banfield,</p> <p>RE: Sydney Park Junction</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for Sydney Park Junction. Bicycle NSW has been the peak bicycle advocacy group now in NSW for over forty-five years, and has over 30 affiliated local Bicycle User Groups.</p> <p>Our mission is to make cycling better for everyone in NSW, and we support improvements to facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. We advocate for new cycling routes that incorporate dedicated paths within both green corridors and the road environment, to provide connections to jobs, schools and services for daily transport and recreation trips. Cycling provides a healthy, congestion-reducing, low-carbon form of travel that is quiet, efficient and attractive for all ages with the correct infrastructure design.</p> <p>Opportunities:</p> <p>It has been a pleasure to review the plans for Sydney Park Junction and the Review of Environmental Factorsi document. We commend Transport for NSW, City of Sydney and Inner West Council for such a</p>



No	Submission
	<p>well-conceived proposal. The project will be of enormous benefit to the community, enhancing the pedestrian and cycling connectivity to Sydney Park and improving the place environment of King Street, Princes Highway and Sydney Park Road ii.</p> <p>The Princes Highway and Sydney Park Road currently experience high traffic speeds, heavy freight volumes, narrow footpaths and limited safe crossings for pedestrians and cyclists. This creates a poor street environment for all, discouraging community activities and business investment.</p> <p>Key features of the transformation of Sydney Park Junction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lowering speeds from 60km/h to 40km/h to create a safer environment</li> <li>• Reducing traffic lanes from 6 to 4 with an estimated decrease in traffic volumes of 50%</li> <li>• A new multi-modal St Peters Square with links to St Peters Station, bus stops, dynamic community spaces, Sydney Park's green space and the King Street precinct.</li> <li>• New landscaping and street trees to create vibrancy and community, extending the King St restaurant and shopping precinct south from Newtown.</li> <li>• Replacing traffic lanes with new cycle paths and pedestrian links.</li> <li>• New shared cycle and pedestrian priority raised mid-block crossings at May Street, Goodsell Street and Short Street.</li> </ul> <p>P 2/7</p> <p>(02) 9704 0800   <a href="mailto:info@bicyclensw.org.au">info@bicyclensw.org.au</a>   <a href="http://www.bicyclensw.org.au">www.bicyclensw.org.au</a>  Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230  ABN 26 511 801 801</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing access to side streets, including the removal of the right turn onto May St, reinforcing the guiding philosophy of "local roads for local traffic".</li> <li>• Removing dangerous slip lanes at Barwon Park Road and Sydney Park Road/King Street.</li> <li>• Upgraded bus stops with direct access to the station to support multi-modal journeys.</li> </ul> <p>Dramatically improved pedestrian amenity, safe crossing points, new tree canopy, reduced noise and pollution and lowered speeds will attract people to stay and play. The plan in Figure 1 summarises the proposed changes.</p> <p>Figure 1: Plan showing the proposed changes to Sydney Park Road, King Street and Princes Highway (Source: Transport for NSW)</p>

No	Submission
	<p>It is fantastic that Transport for NSW is demonstrating real intent to meet the aspirations set out in the recently-published Movement and Place Framework<sup>iii</sup>. Movement is a key enabler of place but needs to be considered very carefully to create places where people want to be. Movement can no longer be considered as the only criteria for success of a street. Achieving the right balance of movement and place is critical for the future of Sydney's main roads. Applying movement priorities to bike riding, rather than just to motor vehicles, will further improve environmental amenity and encourage mode-shift.</p> <p>The proposals for Sydney Park Junction provide exciting evidence that Transport for NSW now recognises that vehicle traffic will expand to fill whatever space is created for it. When the available asphalt is reduced, demand will decrease and space can be allocated to walking, cycling and public transport. By considering the whole street, from building line to building line, and all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, delivery workers and transit users, whether travelling through or lingering, and allocating the space accordingly, the city can move forward from decades of car domination.</p> <p>P 3/7</p> <p>(02) 9704 0800   <a href="mailto:info@bicyclensw.org.au">info@bicyclensw.org.au</a>   <a href="http://www.bicyclensw.org.au">www.bicyclensw.org.au</a>  Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230  ABN 26 511 801 801</p> <p>The provision of safe walking and cycling infrastructure at Sydney Park Junction is fully supported by the NSW Government's new Road User Space Allocation Policy CP21000<sup>iv</sup> which establishes a road user hierarchy that considers pedestrians first and private cars last. Multiple environmental and health benefits will flow from increased walking, cycling and public transport use. The streets will be more equitable for Sydney-siders of all ages, incomes and abilities.</p> <p>The Sydney Park Junction plans are supported by a several other important strategies:</p> <p>Future Transport 2056 Plan<sup>v</sup> outlines an overarching vision for transport in NSW guided by community desire for better places. Future Transport 2056 commits to providing a regional cycle network in Greater Sydney, known as the Principal Bicycle Network (PBN). A coordinated delivery of bike lanes across Greater Sydney will ensure that routes across council boundaries align and create the most direct path of travel.</p> <p>Greater Sydney Commission's Eastern City District Plan (2018)<sup>vi</sup> set outs how integrated land use and transport planning can help achieve the 30-minute city through increasing development density near public transit corridors in Planning Priority E10. The need for better accessibility,</p>

No	Submission
	<p>connectivity and amenity for pedestrian and cyclists is also emphasised in Planning Priorities E4, E17, E18 and E19. An important objective is a “city in its landscape” which has 2 relevant indicators – to create increased urban tree canopy and expand the Sydney Green Grid.</p> <p>Sydney Green Gridvii, developed by the NSW Government Architect in 2017 and reflected in the district and region plans, proposes an interconnecting network of open spaces that support walking and cycling. The Principal Bicycle Network will integrate the Sydney Green Grid to create important links between activity centres and support active recreation. The improved access to Sydney Park forms part of the long-term vision for green infrastructure that can be enjoyed by everyone.</p> <p>We applaud the plans for segregated cycleways on Sydney Park Road and King Street, and we are certain that the level of usage from private riders and food delivery workers amply justifies their provision. The pop-up lane on Sydney Park Road has been successful in trials and it is excellent that it will be formalised as part of this project. It links the Mitchell Road cycleway path with St Peters Station, enhancing possibilities for multi-modal journeys. The King Street path connects with Goodsell Street where an important strategic route heads west. The inclusion of safe, rideable crossings at intersections and at two mid-block location on Sydney Park Road is also welcomed so riders are not forced to improvise, stop riding, or break the law.</p> <p>Bicycle NSW does not support a ‘do nothing’ option being included in the REF. Thankfully this was dismissed due to crashes with cars hitting pedestrians and cyclists, and the fact that doing nothing will not encourage mode shift to active transportviii.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <p>Despite overall support for the proposals, Bicycle NSW would like to raise several issues that still need to be resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The separated bike lane on King Street is very short and misses opportunities to connect with the existing cycling network, particularly to the north and west.</li> <li>2. Changes to access and parking may create strong opposition within the community and derail a very beneficial project. There are particular concerns about losing the right turn into May St from Princes Highway and from Mitchell Road to Sydney Park Road.</li> </ol> <p>P 4/7</p> <p>(02) 9704 0800   <a href="mailto:info@bicyclensw.org.au">info@bicyclensw.org.au</a>   <a href="http://www.bicyclensw.org.au">www.bicyclensw.org.au</a>  Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230  ABN 26 511 801 801</p>

No	Submission
	<p>3. Vehicles may be pushed onto neighbouring streets without careful traffic management, causing increased noise and pollution and a reduction in residential amenity.</p> <p>4. The Traffic and Transport Assessment (Appendix C) includes modelling of motor vehicle level of service/delay at intersections, but no modelling of pedestrian and bicycle service/delay. This is an unprofessional omission, given the objective of the project is to improve walking and cycling movement and connectivity. Unfortunately, prioritising movement for bicycles is neglected in Movement and Place Framework. However, it must be considered at Sydney Park Junction.</p> <p>5. The 20-month project timeline will be hard to swallow for a community very weary from many years of disruption related to Westconnex. Night noise, diversions, temporary cycle routes and worker parking need to be resolved before construction commences.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>1. Extend the separated cycleway north to Lord Street</p> <p>The short section of separated cycleway proposed for King Street must extend north to allow people to cycle safely across the new St Peters Square and connect with important and well-used cycle routes heading west along Lord St to Marrickville Metro shopping area, north-west to the Enmore Road and north-east to Erskinvile and Newtown, Sydney University and the CBD.</p> <p>2. Maintain a clear focus on the vision for the place outcomes.</p> <p>Bicycle NSW wholeheartedly supports Transport for NSW's shift from 'predict and provide' to 'vision and validate' when planning neighbourhood centres. We urge you not to relent to community pressure and maintain the plan to prevent right hand turns from King Street to May Street and from Mitchell Road to Sydney Park Road. These changes are very important to restrict through traffic from local streets and eliminate rat runs. We recommend that inner West Council explores partnerships with organisations like Cycling without Age who could provide electric rickshaws to help elderly residents affected by road closures to access the shops.</p> <p>There is a net loss of just 15 on-street parking spaces over the 1.2km renewal corridor. Studies show that parking spaces are less significant for customers than many businesses expect, with owners overestimating the proportion of customers arriving by car by a factor of 3x. Visitors themselves overwhelmingly prefer widened footpaths, even if it means sacrificing some parking spaces. Cyclists and pedestrians are better customers, spending over twice as much time in the area and 40% more money per month than people driving. A report</p>

No	Submission
	<p>from London showed that improvements to the public realm to enable safer walking and cycling lead to a 30% increase in tradexi.</p> <p>We urge Inner West Council to help businesses understand the benefits of the transformed public spaces and new active travel infrastructure that will be delivered by the Sydney Park Junction proposals, and reduce the fear associated with change.</p> <p>3. Plan for no increase in traffic on local streets</p> <p>Transport for NSW will need to work closely with the relevant councils, in consultation with the community, to develop a local traffic management plan to ensure there will be no traffic volume increases on local streets. Additional traffic calming, modal filtering and one-way flows should all be considered to help reduce the</p> <p>P 5/7</p> <p>(02) 9704 0800   <a href="mailto:info@bicyclensw.org.au">info@bicyclensw.org.au</a>   <a href="http://www.bicyclensw.org.au">www.bicyclensw.org.au</a>  Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230  ABN 26 511 801 801</p> <p>capacity of local streets and discourage through traffic. In addition, making driving less convenient for short trips by residents will help generate the desired modal shift in the area.</p> <p>4. Upgrade all crossings to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>Measures to optimise pedestrian and bicycle level of service must be incorporated in the design of traffic signals and intersections. The following features should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Instant green on demand for pedestrians and bicycles at mid-block crossings, with induction loop detectors for bicycles/wheelchairs/mobility scooters and fully accessible push buttons.</li> <li>b. Longer crossing times so that pedestrians of all ages and abilities have time to cross safely and without stress.</li> <li>c. Automatic green for pedestrians/bicycles at all signalised intersections so there is no need to press a 'beg button'.</li> <li>d. A scramble crossing at Sydney Park Road/Mitchell Road intersection, so that people making a diagonal movement through the intersection do not have to wait for two successive signals on two arms of the intersection.</li> <li>e. Eliminate the proposed traffic signals at the Barwon Park Rd/King St intersection and instead create a left in/left out intersection with a priority pedestrian/cyclist raised crossing. Traffic lights at this junction will delay pedestrians which is inconsistent with project objectives to improve walking movement and connectivity.</li> </ul>

No	Submission
	<p>Again, any reduction in effective road capacity will decrease the convenience of driving and help achieve the desired project outcomes.</p> <p>5. Ensure that construction impacts are carefully mitigated</p> <p>TfNSW must adhere to its commitment to establish work compounds away from the project site in more industrial areas, to reduce the presence of construction vehicles on local roads, and should commit to the heavy vehicle safety standards used on the Sydney Metro project as a minimum. Bicycle NSW supports the community's advocacy for all construction to occur during standard daytime construction hours.</p> <p>Although night work is promised to be limited to 2 nights a week in each of 3 specific noise catchments, any night construction disturbs the sleep of nearby residents, affecting physical and mental health. Additional daytime traffic restrictions would reduce effective traffic capacity, resulting in a temporary reduction in traffic and associated impacts along the corridor. This outcome would be consistent with the project objectives, and state and local government priorities and strategies. It is also far easier to communicate to impacted residents as a benefit of the project.</p> <p>It is essential to maintain safe walking and cycling through the area during construction. The pop-up lane on Sydney Park Road has become an important part of many journeys and removing it from the network, even temporarily, would be a backward step for the mode shift to cycling. Please refer to Austroads Guide to Temporary Traffic Management<sup>xii</sup> and adhere to the principles of coherence, equivalence, directness and safety during construction.</p> <p>6. Don't lose sight of the all-important details.</p> <p>Great paving, high-quality, mature landscaping, attractive street furniture, drinking fountains and bike racks all need to be considered carefully to ensure a place is created where people will want to linger. The design speed of the roads and intersections needs to match the posted speed limits, and discourage travelling and turning too fast. Appropriate traffic calming with visual and physical cues are required to slow drivers down. Street art, murals and sculptures should be incorporated to emphasise the sense of place and reflect the character of the locality.</p> <p>P 6/7</p> <p>(02) 9704 0800   <a href="mailto:info@bicyclensw.org.au">info@bicyclensw.org.au</a>   <a href="http://www.bicyclensw.org.au">www.bicyclensw.org.au</a></p> <p>Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230</p> <p>ABN 26 511 801 801</p> <p>Secure bike parking and spaces for share bikes are needed at St Peters Station to facilitate multi-modal journeys. The DCP may need to be</p>

No	Submission
	<p>reviewed to ensure that bike storage and end-of-trip facilities are provided in all new buildings.</p> <p>7. Keep an eye on the future.</p> <p>The transformation of Sydney Park Junction will have a ripple effect on the streets beyond the immediate area. Calls for more place and less vehicle dominance on Sydney's high streets will get louder and more vocal.</p> <p>The proposals need to consider longer-term possibilities such as King Street emerging as a public and active transport corridor all the way to Broadway, further speed reductions in line with the global 30Please movement, and the implementation of the full Principal Bike Network with fully segregated routes, increasingly delivered as uni-directional pairs on both sides of the street, crossing the city and providing the benefits of active travel to everyone in the community.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>This project sets an exciting precedent for better place outcomes throughout Sydney. Changing the dial on how we measure the success of a movement corridor will have huge implications for the reimagining of our arterial roads. The changes at Sydney Park Junction are being delivered as a condition of the hugely destructive and expensive Westconnex. But we are fast learning that we do not need new motorways to shift cars from the roads. There is a huge appetite for public and active mobility and if the correct infrastructure is provided, people will happily drive less. Projects to reallocate road space, calm traffic, add tree canopy and vegetation and create spaces for people and community life need to happen in every corner of the New South Wales.</p> <p>We look forward to contributing to the detailed design of the cycling infrastructure and eagerly await the renovation of Sydney Park Junction into a place valued by both local residents and the wider community.</p>
3	<p>WalkSydney is pleased to make a submission about the proposed Sydney Park Junction walking and cycling upgrade</p> <p>WalkSydney is a community group working to make it easier, safer and more pleasant to walk in Sydney.</p> <p>With a growing population we need to ensure people can easily walk to public transport, local shops and services, and shared transport options. The proposed Sydney Park Junction walking and cycling upgrade provides another opportunity to achieve those outcomes.</p>

No	Submission
	<p>More space for paths and cycles:  WalkSydney welcomes and supports the proposal which will improve Sydney Park by better integrating the Park with its surrounding environment. The repurposing of road space for wider and continuous paths especially at May Street and Goodsell Street as well as permanent cycleways along Princes Highway/King Street and Sydney Park Road are welcomed.</p> <p>Expanded areas of plantings:  The proposed increase in the tree canopy will complement the residential areas adjoining the park and provide for a more convivial landscape. A walking experience is enhanced by a green landscape. Although peripheral to the scope of the project, an upgrade of Camdenville Park with trees and street plantings between Camdenville Park and King Street would assist achievement of the objectives of the St Peter's Square upgrade.</p> <p>Intersections:  All the intersections with other road users need to be fair and not privilege vehicle drivers. A walker should not need to wait long to cross a road. Therefore all the raised pedestrian crossings as well as the proposed mid-block crossings along King Street and the Princes Highway are welcomed. Where there are traffic lights, these should be responsive to demand or automatic for pedestrians and cyclists. The lower speed limit is supported.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to removing signals at the Mitchell Road and Sydney Park Road intersection especially as the area is to be used for local traffic. The intersection should be reconfigured as a roundabout with pedestrian/bicycle priority on all arms (also known as a protected or 'Dutch-style roundabout' – see Figure 1). This would eliminate intersection delay for pedestrians and bicycles.</p> <p>The above improvements would have the added benefit of reducing the effective road capacity and therefore traffic volume and associated impacts – consistent with the project objectives to improve</p>



No	Submission
	<p>walking movement and connectivity, and state and local government priorities and strategies.</p> <p>WalkSydney thanks Transport for NSW, City of Sydney and Inner West Councils for the proposal which has been promoted with excellent explanatory material. Thank you for taking the time to read our comments.</p>