**LOCAL ROUTE 7 (ST PETERS TO TEMPE) DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN: CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

The Local Route 7 (LR7) draft concept plan was placed on public exhibition from 13 July to 13 August 2017. Following public exhibition, issues raised in submissions were considered, and where feasible have informed modifications to the proposal.

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

**PUBLIC EXHIBITION OF THE DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN**

During the public exhibition period:

* Approximately 1,500 letters were sent to residents, businesses and property owners along the proposed route with a further 4,500 letters distributed to residents in the surrounding area
* Public exhibition of the draft concept plan was advertised to the wider community in the Inner West Courier, on Council’s website and via Council’s social media
* Information about the proposal was accessed 1,500 times from Council’s website
* 71 community submissions were received by Council

**68% of all respondents stated “support” (31%) or “support with changes” (37%) for the proposal. 32% of respondents stated they did “not support” the proposal**

**Of the 71 submissions received, 40 (63% of all submissions) were from residents in St Peters, Sydenham and Tempe. Of these, 77% indicated either “support” (32%) or “support with changes” (45%) for the draft concept plan. 23% of respondents from the local area indicated they did “not support” the changes.**

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

31% of submissions by community members during the public exhibition period indicated support for the draft concept plan. The issues most frequently raised in other submissions by community members were:

* The route is too indirect and slow to meet the needs of commuting bicycle riders (21% of submissions)
* More separated bicycle paths should be provided on the route (7% of submissions)
* Provide a shared path along the Princes Highway instead of using Henry Street (7% of submissions)
* The proposed shared path on Edwin Street will be unsafe for pedestrians (7% of submissions)
* Provide clear directional signage and markings along the route (6% of submissions)

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

| **COMMUNITY FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC EXHIBITION** |
| --- |
| **Topic** | **Community comments** | **Council officer response** |
| **Route options** | The route is too indirect and slow to meet the needs of commuting bicycle ridersThe route appears to prioritise the convenience of motorists over bicycle ridersThe route is only a secondary route for the local areaThe proposed route won’t encourage more bicycle ridingCommuter bicycle riders will continue to use Unwins Bridge Road as it is a more direct routeThe route will cater for less confident riders and children | RMS has advised it would not support the development of a bicycle route on Unwins Road Bridge due to insufficient road width and likely impacts to regional road traffic associated with providing appropriate bicycle infrastructure. As a result, alternative route options were considered.Consistent with Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy, the proposed improvements are intended not only for those already riding, but also for new riders of all ages and abilities. The route aims to encourage more people to travel by bicycle for short trips to local destinations in St Peters, Sydenham and Tempe (such as parks, schools, shops and train stations). Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy acknowledges that in instances confident or experienced riders will prefer to use normal street infrastructure. |
|  | Provide a route along Unwins Bridge RoadProvide a separated bicycle path on Unwins Bridge Road between May Street and Belmore StreetRestrict traffic on Unwins Bridge Road in Tempe e.g. make this section one-way for cars, to provide space for a separated bicycle pathIt is unclear why RMS considers Unwins Bridge Road to not be wide enough | RMS has advised it would not support the development of a bicycle route on Unwins Road Bridge due to insufficient road width and likely impacts to regional road traffic associated with providing appropriate bicycle infrastructure. As a result, alternative route options were considered. |
|  | Provide a route along the rail corridor | At the time of investigating route options, Transport for NSW advised it did not consider a rail corridor option to be feasible given ongoing uncertainty about impacts of Sydney Metro changes near Sydenham. |
|  | Continue the proposed shared path along the Princes Highway instead of using Henry StreetUse Foreman Street instead of Brooklyn Street to bypass a section of the proposed Princes Highway shared pathUse the laneway between Union and Foreman Streets to bypass part of the proposed Princes Highway shared path | Henry Street is preferred as it would offer a more pleasant riding environment than the Princes Highway given low traffic volumes. The shared path section along the western side of the Princes Highway between Brooklyn Street and Lymerston Street has only been proposed as no other suitable local street option is available.The proposed route would not preclude the use of other local street options by riders as desired.  |
|  | Build a separated bicycle path on the Princes Highway and divert traffic to WestConnex | The Princes Highway is a State road and thus does not fall under the jurisdiction of Council. |
|  | Incorporate a bicycle route into the Sydney Metro projectProvide a route on the northern side of the rail corridor as per the initial assessment of optionsA route on the northern side of the rail corridor would not serve residents of Tempe and St Peters | Council continues to work with Sydney Metro and WestConnex to integrate improvements to cycling infrastructure into their projects, such as the Sydenham to Bankstown Active Transport Corridor (Sydney Metro) and the Campbell Street/Campbell Road cycleway (WestConnex). |
|  | Connect to the western side of Tempe station via the existing bicycle path at Kendrick Park Connect to the western side of Tempe station via Richardsons Crescent | The concept plan proposes connecting to the western side of Tempe station via the existing bicycle path at Kendrick Park.The RMS has advised it would not support a bicycle crossing of the Unwins Bridge Road and Richardson Crescent intersection due to intersection impacts, thus impacting bicycle route connectivity via Richardsons Crescent to the western side of Tempe station. |
|  | The route does not connect to local destinations such as Precinct 75 and St Peters Fruit World | Noted. The proposed route would connect to a number of local destinations along the route, including train stations, parks, schools and local shops.  |
|  | The new Decathlon store near Ikea will encourage more local trips by bicycles | Noted. The proposed route would improve the connectivity of the existing shared path on the eastern side of the Princes Highway between Smith Street and Bellevue Street. |
|  | It is unclear whether the route includes provision for future improvements and expansion | The proposed local route would link to existing regional bicycle routes, such as the Cooks River shared path, and planned regional routes such as the Campbell Street cycleway and the Sydenham to Bankstown active transport corridor. |
|  | Connectivity of the route to Sydenham station is importantConnecting the route to local train station is importantSt Peters station is inaccessible for bikesTempe station is inaccessible for bikes | Noted. The proposed route would improve local connections to train stations. Bike parking at the train stations would be investigated at the detailed design stage to encourage people to ride to the stations when planning to travel by train.Measures to improve wayfinding to/from Sydenham Station via Sydenham Green would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
| **Route design and treatments** | Provide more separated bicycle paths along the routeVulnerable bicycle riders prefer separated bicycle paths to mixed traffic streetsPavement markings can be adequate on quiet streets but provide little security or guidance to bicycle ridersProvide a separated bicycle path on Goodsell Street and Council StreetProvide a separated bicycle path on Roberts Lane | Consistent with Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy, the proposed route aims to encourage more people to travel by bicycle for short trips by catering for riders of all ages and abilities, particularly more vulnerable, inexperienced and less confident riders. This includes encouraging riders to travel in mixed traffic conditions where traffic volumes are suitably low in accordance with national guidelines for appropriate bicycle infrastructure. |
|  | Shared paths slow bicycle riders downShared paths are safer for riders than using traffic lanesImprove shared path surfaces so they are safer for users | The concept plan seeks to provide a local connection to local destinations in St Peters, Sydenham and Tempe, such as schools, parks, shops and train stations. Consistent with Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy, the proposed route aims to encourage more people to travel by bicycle for local trips by catering for riders of all ages and abilities, particularly more vulnerable, inexperienced and less confident riders, by utilising low volume streets and shared paths where suitable. |
|  | May Street is not wide enough to accommodate a bicycle path Widen the shared path on May Street | A bicycle path is not proposed on May Street. The concept plan proposes utilising the existing shared path on the northern side of May Street from Campbell Street to the Camdenville Park pathway.Council will investigate providing a shared path connection through Camdenville Park as part of future improvements to the park, to provide an alternative to the proposed shared path on May Street. |
|  | The pedestrian crossing at Gannon Street is dangerous and a gap in the in the bicycle route | Bicycle riders would be required to dismount when crossing the pedestrian crossing at Gannon Street. |
|  | Provide a fence on the Princes Highway shared path to protect shared path users from traffic | Specific measures to improve safety along the route will be considered at the detailed design stage. |
|  | The route does not appear to take the WestConnex changes on Campbell Street and May Street into account | Council continues to liaise with WestConnex to ensure the bicycle route concept plan addresses changes related to WestConnex and ensures good connectivity to/from the planned WestConnex cycleway on Campbell Street. |
|  | Provide clear directional signage/markings along the routeProvide clear signage to/from the route e.g. to link to Sydenham station | Opportunities for improved wayfinding would be considered during the development of detailed designs for the route. |
|  | Provide bike parking at destinations along the route | Opportunities for bike parking would be considered during the development of detailed designs for the route. |
| **Pedestrians** | Shared paths are not supported by Transport for NSWBicycle paths should be on roads and parks, not on residential footpaths | Shared paths are proposed where alternatives are not feasible without significant traffic or parking impacts or would deter less experienced bicycle riders from using the route.  |
|  | Cyclists do not like sharing shared paths with pedestriansCyclists travel too fast on shared pathsCyclists do not give way to pedestrians on shared pathsThere will be increased public liability claims due to pedestrian injuries caused by bicyclesShared paths can be made safe with the right education and signage | Appropriate shared path markings and signage would be used to increase awareness for bike riders and pedestrians when sharing the path. |
|  | The proposed shared path on Edwin Street would be unsafe for pedestriansEdwin Street has high pedestrian volumes including school studentsThere is poor visibility for motorists exiting driveways on Edwin Street which would affect bicycle rider safetyBicycle riders on Edwin Street could travel on the road as vehicle volumes are relatively low | The shared path is preferred as it would contribute to a continuous off-road link between Griffiths Street and Tempe Public School, and utilises the verge space available. Signage and markings to improve user safety will be considered as part of the development of detailed designs for the route.While Edwin Street could support a mixed traffic treatment, this would require removal of on-street parking where riders transition between the pedestrian crossing at Gannon Street and the traffic lanes on Edwin Street. A mixed traffic option would less adequately cater for vulnerable or inexperienced riders. |
|  | The proposed shared path on Gannon Street would be unsafe for pedestrians | Shared paths are proposed where alternatives are not feasible without significant traffic or parking impacts or would deter less experienced bicycle riders from using the route. Given traffic volumes on Gannon Street, alternative route treatments would likely require the removal of on-street parking to ensure appropriate separation of bicycles and motor vehicles.Appropriate shared path markings and signage would be used to increase awareness for bicycle riders and pedestrians when using the path. |
|  | The proposed shared path on Union Street is unsafe for pedestrians | No shared path is proposed on Union Street. |
|  | Skateboarders will also likely use the shared paths, causing added congestion and risks | Skateboarders may use footpaths and shared paths. |
|  | Bicycle riders should not use the King Street footpaths | Noted. At St Peters station, the route would link to existing bicycle routes on Sydney Park Road and Concord Street. |
| **Residential amenity/safety** | Security issues and potential increased crime due to people roaming on shared paths | Encouraging use of paths by widening and allowing use by bicycle riders would be expected to increase the passive surveillance of these streets.  |
|  | Loss of residential amenity on Edwin Street associated due to the proposed shared path:* Caused by increased pedestrian and bicycle volumes
* The shared path may be used by organised group riders early in the morning
* Bicycle riders will bring loud talking, bell ringing and other noise metres from bedrooms
* Widening the footpath will reduce green space
* Widening the footpath would reduce the length of existing driveways, for which residents pay rates
* Property values will be affected
 | Public paths are for the use of the wider community.  |
| **Trees** | Do not support the removal of any trees along the routeObject to the potential loss of trees on Edwin Street | The draft concept plan does not propose removing any trees along the route. Council’s Tree Management Officer has raised no objection to the proposed path widening to 2.5m on Edwin Street. |
| **Consultation** | The original plan proposed a route along Unwins Bridge Road, for which community feedback was sought in February 2017, however it is unclear why the route has now changedOnly 74 submissions were received during the February 2017 consultation, indicating little interest or support for this proposal | No route was proposed in the February 2017 consultations. At the time, Council wrote to community members with three “suggested route options” as shown in the Marrickville Bicycle Strategy, and requested “your views about bike riding in the local area, including these or any other route options”: Council’s letter to residents also advised that “your comments will inform the development of a concept plan for bicycle route improvements between St Peters and Tempe. The concept plan will then be placed on public exhibition for further feedback”.  |
|  | There is no local or elected representation on the Local Traffic Committee | Council’s Local Traffic Committee is primarily a technical review and advisory committee and ensures that current technical guidelines are considered. The Local Traffic Committee has not decision-making powers; it provides recommendations to Council.Local Traffic Committee membership comprises a Council representative, a NSW Police representative, an RMS representative, and a representative of the local State Government Member of Parliament. |
|  | There does not appear to have been sufficient community consultation on the design of the route | In January/February 2017, Council wrote to approximately 6,000 residents, businesses and property owners in St Peters, Sydenham, Tempe and surrounding neighbourhoods seeking input into the development of route options between St Peters and Tempe.The draft concept plan for the route was then development and placed on public exhibition for 31 days in July/August 2017. During this time, Council again wrote to approximately 6,000 residents, businesses and property owners in the study area to advise about the draft concept plan and seek feedback. |
| **Parking** | Object to the removal of two parking spaces on Griffiths StreetA resident parking scheme for streets near Tempe station should be considered | Council has sought to minimise impacts to parking along the route. The proposal removal of two spaces on Griffiths Street will enable the provision of a protected right turn bay for bicycle riders to safely cross to the proposed shared path on Gannon Street. |
|  | The bicycle route proposal doesn’t appear to be integrated with the St Peters / Sydenham parking study | The bicycle route concept plan has been developed with consideration of the ongoing parking study. |
|  | The Edwin Street shared path will remove the ability for residents to park cars on the driveway between the street and the footpath | It is an offence to park across the driveway between the street and the footpath, and thus these are not technically parking spaces. |
| **Traffic** | Provide statutory 10m no stopping at intersections along the route to improve visibility of riders by motorists | Formalisation of statutory 10m no stopping areas have been proposed on parts of the route, and would be considered further in the detailed design stage as needed. |
|  | Traffic may encroach on the path of bicycle riders at the intersection of Roberts Street and Roberts Lane | This would be considered further during the development of detailed designs for the route. |
|  | The crossing of Mary Street would be unsafe given two traffic lanes merge at this point | Bicycle riders crossing Mary Street to/from Bakers Lane would be required to give way to vehicles on Mary Street. |
|  | Changing priority at the intersection of Terry Street and Henry Street will be dangerousChanging priority at Yelverton Street and George Street is supported, as it will reduce the speed of through traffic. Suggest adding speed humps or similar treatments too. | Given concerns that the changed priority would reduce intersection safety, as the intersecting streets at these locations carry substantially higher volumes of traffic than Henry Street, the proposed changes to intersection priority have been deleted from the revised concept plan. |
|  | Give way or stop signs should be added to the intersection of Samuel Street and Henry Street | Stop signs are already in place on Henry Street at the intersection of Samuel Street. |
|  | Bicycle riders should dismount when crossing busy roads such as the Princes Highway | The concept plan proposes installing bicycle lanterns at the intersection of Holbeach Avenue and the Princes Highway to enable bicycle riders to cycle across. |
|  | Florence Street is unsuitable for a bicycle route as it is too narrow and will require bicycle riders to give way to cars | Bicycle riders may already travel along all streets, including Florence Street. The concept plan proposes placing bicycle symbols on Florence Street to remind all road users of the presence of bicycles on the road. All road users are expected to exercise courtesy and give way to approaching vehicles as required. |
|  | The route goes against traffic in one-way street, which is against Council, Police and RMS policy | RMS technical direction TTD2014/002 specifically permits two-way bicycle movements on roads that are one-way for other vehicles, subject to assessment of individual circumstances. Consistent with this direction, Council has enabled two-way movements for bicycles on a number of one-way streets. |
|  | The proposed right hand turn at Griffiths Street is dangerous given traffic speed and volume | The proposed protected right turn bay on Griffiths Street would enable bicycle riders to wait in the centre of the road until it is safe to cross the southbound traffic lane onto the proposed shared path on Gannon Street. |
| **Other** | The proposed bicycle route improvements are a waste of money | Council has committed to encouraging bicycle riding and improving bicycle paths and networks.  |
| **OTHER STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN** |
| **RMS** | Traffic counts and RMS approval are required for proposed shared environment intersection treatments on the route | Noted. Traffic counts have been provided to RMS for review. |
|  | RMS approval is required for proposed bike lanterns on the route | Noted. Approval will be sought at the detailed design stage of the project. |
| **Sydney Metro** | Consideration should be made to provide a link to Sydenham station and the planned active transport corridor between Sydenham and Bankstown stations | Measures to improve wayfinding to/from Sydenham Station via Sydenham Green would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
| **WestConnex** | The concept design is consistent with the proposed RMS works to connect this intersection to the Princes Highway via a 2.5m shared path along the north side of Mary Street.This connection will allow cyclists heading towards Sydney Park and beyond to Alexandria / Mascot to travel via the separated cycleway within the St Peters Interchange (SPI) parallel with Princes Highway and into Sydney Park via the Campbell Road Land-bridge. | Noted. |
|  | The concept design is consistent with the proposed RMS works to connect Florence Street to the separated cycleway on the north side of Campbell Street via a new shared path on the south side of Campbell Street. Cyclists will be able to cross Campbell Street via cyclist crossings at Unwins Bridge Road, St Peters Street or Princes Highway.This connection will allow cyclists either continuing along the proposed LR7 route to St Peters Station or travelling east to Mascot, to access the Campbell Street / Road separated cycleway. | Noted. |
|  | The concept design is consistent with the proposed RMS works to connect the new separated cycleway along the north side of Campbell Street with a new separated cycleway on the north side of May Street.  Cyclists will be able to cross Campbell Street and May Street via cyclist crossings at this intersection.This connection will allow cyclists either continuing along the proposed LR7 route to St Peters Station or travelling west to Marrickville, to access the Campbell Street / Road separated cycleway.RMS has also proposed a separated cycleway along the north side of Bedwin Road and north side of May Street between the Bedwin Road / Darley Street intersection and the future entrance to Camdenville Park immediately to the west of the terraces in May Street. | Noted. |
| **Bike Marrickville** | Bike Marrickville has a strong preference for a route on the West side of the railway line. | Noted. Counc il continues to work with Sydney Metro to facilitate the development of the planned active transport corridor between Sydenham and Bankstown. |
|  | The ride along the Princes Highway footpath is very unpleasant. | Henry Street is preferred as it would offer a more pleasant riding environment than the Princes Highway given low traffic volumes. The shared path section along the western side of the Princes Highway between Brooklyn Street and Lymerston Street has only been proposed as no other suitable local street option is available. |
|  | The route fails to address the lack of access to Sydenham Station  | Measures to improve wayfinding to/from Sydenham Station via Sydenham Green would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |
|  | The route fails to address the major interruption to RR5 caused by Sydenham Rd | Noted. |
|  | The shared path on the Edwin St footpath is unacceptable as it is riding past the front gate of a series of closely spaced residential houses. Instead make this section of of road 40 km/hr zone | The shared path is preferred as it would contribute to a continuous off-road link between Griffiths Street and Tempe Public School, and utilises the verge space available. Signage and markings to improve user safety will be considered as part of the development of detailed designs for the route. |
|  | The on-road pavement markings are not effective for marking the route for the rider. The route must be clearly marked at each corner with the blue route markers. | Measures to improve wayfinding along the route would be considered in the detailed design phase of the project or as part of a wider Council scheme for bicycle route wayfinding. |