

## **Attachment B**

**Community Feedback December 2020 -  
Shared Path Improvements and Changes to  
Parking and Traffic on Park Street,  
Erskineville**

# Shared path improvements and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street

Respondents were asked: *Please provide your feedback on the proposed shared paths in Alexandria and Erskineville and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street*

This section contains comments received in response to this question, relating specifically to the proposed shared path improvements and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street.

Overall 77 comments

Below is a summary of points made by respondents about the proposed shared path improvements and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street, based on their overall sentiment towards the proposal.

## **Supportive comments**

- There was slightly more support for the proposed changes than there was objection.
- Support was on the basis of safety and the perception that the intervention would have minimal disruption to traffic and roads.

## **Unsupportive comments**

- Just over a quarter of comments on the proposal for shared paths in Alexandria and Erskineville and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street were not supportive.
- The most frequently given reason for objecting to this was that it would create traffic and parking issues.

## **Mixed or qualified support**

- Approximately the same number of respondents who supported the proposal, provided a comment showing mixed support, or qualified their support with some caveats.

## **MIXED OR QUALIFIED SUPPORT**

**29 COMMENTS**

The most frequently offered comment for the proposed changes for shared paths in Alexandria and Erskineville and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street were mixed. Respondents frequently supported the proposals but took issue with some aspect of its implementation.

A main issue for those with mixed views on the proposed changes was traffic volume and safety for active transport users in Park Street. Several respondents questioned whether or not pedestrian safety is adequately addressed in the plans. Comments included:

*Park Street really needs the traffic calmed as people now use it to skip through to Henderson Road. Given that the end of Park Street on Swanson Street is a busy crossing due to its proximity to the park, I would welcome a solution that slowed that traffic and gave priority to pedestrians.*

*If Park Street remains the only option for local traffic, there ABSOLUTELY needs to be a pedestrian crossing placed at the intersection of Park and Copeland.*

Due to the variety of specific suggestions, remaining comments are included verbatim in Appendix 7.

## SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS

26 COMMENTS

Support for the proposal for shared paths in Alexandria and Erskineville and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street was most frequently given in general terms. The proposals were variously described as "all good", and "a great idea". Similar phrases were used by several respondents, and in a few cases greater description was provided, as in the comment below:

*Any changes to promote walking and cycling are welcomed. Separate paths are usually best but if this is not possible a shared path is better than no path.*

Secondary to general comments, support was expressed about perceived safety improvements. One-fifth of the comments in support of this proposal cited safety in their responses. The proposal was deemed likely to result in the following:

*Safer zones for kids and parents walking to school.*

*Totally support the idea of improving the area and making it more convenient and safe for pedestrians and bikes.*

*Safe paths to every school in (the) area.*

One respondent went further to state that:

*I think the reduction in parking is worth the safety gains for commuters (walking and riding).*

A small number of respondents specifically noted support for a pedestrian crossing on Park Street, as the comments below show:

*A pedestrian crossing is an absolute must now due to the increased volume of traffic! Especially as it is heavy vehicle traffic.*

*The installation of a pedestrian crossing on Park Street is absolutely crucial. It should have been installed at the same time as the "pop-up" cycle lanes.*

## UNSUPPORTIVE COMMENTS

22 COMMENTS

Objections to the proposed changes to shared paths and Park Street were most commonly due to the changes that this would bring to Park Street. It was anticipated that parking would be made more difficult by the changes, and that traffic, which was viewed as worsening already, would further become problematic.

*Parking changes to Park street would also ruin the street character and are a poor outcome for residents here.*

*With parking at limited already a reduction is not a thought-out idea.*

There was the perception that the changes would be dangerous generally, and for pedestrians. Safety issues included both shared path users and road users. The latter was in part due to increased traffic use of Park Street, and additionally, that heavy vehicles continue to use the street in spite of restrictions. Examples of safety comments are included below:

*Shared paths sound great until someone gets injured. It's just too dangerous.*

*You are proposing for bikes to take over footpaths, so where do the kids go. It's not going to be kids on bikes because that's already allowed use of the paths. It's not unlikely my kid will end up run down by one of these idiots you create even more space for.*

*Park Street is restricted heavy vehicle zone with a three tonne heavy vehicle limit however this is being ignored. Residents vehicles are being side swiped including my neighbours.*

There were several impassioned comments about the use of Park Street by increasing volumes of traffic, and the proportion of this that is heavy traffic. Comments conveyed a sense of extreme displeasure that this was occurring, citing pollution and noise (alongside safety) in their comments, as well as frustration that heavy vehicle limits were not being adhered to.

General displeasure at the proposed changes included the following two final comments:

*None of these footpaths are wide enough to accommodate.*

*You are just creating a traffic and parking nightmare.*

## Appendix 7

This appendix contains verbatim comments from respondents who offered qualified support for the proposed shared path improvements and changes to parking and traffic on Park Street, alongside suggestions for how the proposal could be improved. The comments below have been included in this appendix due to their specific and detailed nature which makes them more useful for CoS use as whole statements. Note that the key points made in each of these comments have also been synthesised into the body of the report, above.

### QUALIFIED SUPPORT FOR SHARED PATH IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES TO PARKING AND TRAFFIC ON PARK STREET – SUGGESTIONS

- *This is an add on to my earlier submission on the Henderson Road Cycleway. Copeland Street is experiencing hugely increased traffic volumes. It becoming very noisy, polluted and increasingly dangerous, with speeding cars, trucks and motorcycles at all hours of the day and night. Wider shared paths, or even a cycle lane along the northern side of Copeland Street from the Kurrajong Hotel down to Mitchell Road, combined with traffic calming measures might address this. Don't stop these measures on Swanson Street, please bring them all the way down Copeland Street to Mitchell Road to discourage the use of this as a thoroughfare. People wanted to travel by car between Newtown and Randwick should be encouraged to use Sydney Park Road or Cleveland Street, rather than tearing through the quiet community of Erskineville and Alexandria.*
- *A raised footpath at the south end of Park Street is positive but insufficient to have any impact on the problems created by the closure of the left hand turn from Erskineville Road to Railway Parade. 90 degree parking is not supported as a traffic calming measure if it is to run the whole street. Parking at this angle would be supported only at the entrance to Park Street close to the cafe/pub and up to the park. Some of the streets width and charm should be retained in line with heritage conservation zones across the city and the desire to maintain the history and charm of terrace lined streets.*
- *I've often felt footpaths have been underutilised. Park Street is relatively quiet and wide.*
- *Hello: I am Sydney trains Site manager for Operational Technology Center 126-128 Railway PDE Erskineville. I have concern for the main entry Gate 2, at my depot which is set back behind parked cars. I would like to propose that the two car spaces either side of the gate is removed. Vehicles entering the depot do not have a clear view for pedestrians or cyclist. we are currently having interruptions with deliveries and waste disposal garbage trucks not able to gain a swing turn into our driveway without causing damage to the parked cars. Traffic build up due to vehicles turning into our drive way causes*

*issues to traffic flow and causing tension and sounding of horns and abuse at us. Resident have complained and abusing my staff. I fell the community and residents are being affected with noise heavy traffic flow from Park St to Railway Parade. This also impacts the State Emergency center across from our driveway. Trying to maneuver around cars parked opposite their roller doors. Help remove the Hazard of two parked car spaces either side of our main entry gate would be benefit to all.*

- *If we have cycleways can we ensure cyclists use then as I always see cyclists on the road down Henderson Road rather than on the cycleway.*
- *Park Street really needs the traffic calmed as people now use it to skip through to Henderson Road. Given that the end of Park Street on Swanson Street is a busy crossing due to its proximity to the park, I would welcome a solution that slowed that traffic and gave priority to pedestrians.*
- *Traffic must again be directed down Railway Pde. Park St should NOT be a thoroughfare*
- *Something needs to be done to slow the traffic and address the rat run that Park Street has become due to no left turn onto Henderson Road from Erskineville Railway bridge. A left turn only from North end of Park Street would mean no loss of amenity for the residents in that area. But everyone else should have to go to Mitchell Road to turn left.*
- *As a regular rider and resident of Buckland Street I am concerned with these shared paths based on the amount of traffic and speed as to which cars/trucks travel along Buckland and Mitchell. I have many experiences of aggressive drivers and have been concerned for my safety. To encourage and place children in this situation could be very dangerous unless council address the speed of cars first. Also, the amount of cars illegally turning from Mitchell Road (coming from south) turning right into Buckland Street is always concerning and as a local you must be aware to watch for this, I would hate to put children in harms way, without council addressing this issue first.*
- *The crossing at park is a good initiative. However should not result in the loss of large London plane trees on Swanson between Newton and Park. Removal of these mature trees wouldn't be accepted for any other public works undertaken in a development. Why should council remove them instead of working around them like every other private infrastructure upgrade has to. Parking changes to Park street would also ruin the street character and are a poor outcome for residents here*
- *Regarding Park Street. It needs 2 chicanes along it rather than those speed bumps.*

- *All the continuous footpath treatments make perfect sense, especially at the extra wide crossing across Park Street on Swanson Street. I also strongly support traffic calming and angle parking on Park St in principle, as there is currently greatly increased volumes of traffic due to the pop-up cycleway, and parking is often completely full at night. However, I definitely want to see more details of how precisely this will be implemented before any work is approved. I do not think the footpaths on Park St and the north side of Swanson St should become shared paths, as they are already quite narrow.*
- *I am concerned about the impact these routes will have on existing amenities in the area. In particular, by funneling cyclists into the footpaths where there is currently outdoor dining venues, such as 'Kurrajong Hotel', 'Naked Brew' and 'Parkview Hotel'. The addition of cyclists on the footpath would be dangerous for what is a very populated footpath with residents, diners and pub-goers. A better option would be to direct cyclists to the foot path on the opposite side of the road where there are no businesses or residential premises.*
- *There is not enough room on these narrow paths for fast bike riders as you also have a highly popular with local cafe (Naked Brew) that utilise this space for their dining. So bikes could hurt these diners. PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE the outside dining option of this cafe as it gives the area a lovely community feel!*
- *If Park Street remains the only option for local traffic, there ABSOLUTELY needs to be a pedestrian crossing placed at the intersection of Park and Copeland.*
- *I don't think these changes are necessary as the flow of traffic down Park Street is not excessive in my opinion. I would be more in favour of amending the current cycleway on Henderson road and reopening railway terrace to bidirectional traffic which would in turn reduce the traffic burden on park street.*
- *Place the traffic calming measure at both ends of Park Street making it inaccessible to heavy vehicles.*
- *I think bike lanes are a great idea but the ones I am commenting on are not well placed and have a detrimental effect on people who rely on a car for transport*
- *Along this section of Swanson Street there is a lot of extra space from the road width. Could some of this be converted to a dedicated cycle path?*
- *I have not seen detailed plans on Councils plans for Park Street. Park Street is shown on the safe routes to school map only briefly and refers to calming measures and angled parking, but I haven't seen what this will actually look like. Council needs to urgently put out a more detailed look at what the plans*

for Park Street are. It probably needs to be closed off altogether or at a minimum, closed to traffic turning right from Park onto Henderson.

- I don't know these roads well but Swanston Street should have a cycleway down each side and perhaps shared path helps get us there. What changes do you have for Park Street? Temporary cycle lanes like in Dalmeny Avenue would seem very suitable.
- The changes to traffic on Park Street is not clear. Will traffic be able to travel from Swanson Street to Henderson Street via Park Street?
- Shared paths are a reasonable use of space so long as they don't reduce road way. Where are the plans for this proposal?
- The installation of a pedestrian crossing on Park Street is absolutely crucial. It should have been installed at the same time as the "pop-up" cycle lanes, given the predictable impact on traffic flows down Park Street, which has been horrible for a once quiet and safe street.
- Residents require access to Railway St from Swanson road via Park street due to the need to avoid further congestion on Mitchell Rd, which has gotten / will get much worse since Park Sydney complex opened.
- The ability to access Railway pd from Park Street is essential. The constant limiting of residents' access to houses in the Erskineville triangle from Swanson St ruining amenity in the area.
- Cycle ways are great and I am supportive BUT unfortunately the consequences have been significant for Park Street. Cars and trucks are racing down it constantly all times of day and night. I am so terrible worried that someone is going to be hit as the cross at the Swanson street end. I recommend that an island be put between the Kurrajong and Naked Brew Cafe. It would force cars to completely slow down as they enter the street. It is such a concern, it is such a heavily pedestrian focused end of the street with so many kids every day walking home from the two schools only a hundred metres away. A change needs to happen to our street to stop all the rat runners. It cannot stay as it is.
- Safe routes to school/shared path improvements (Buckland Street, Mitchell Road, Swanson Street)

Parts of the "existing user network" shown on the context map are not safe for children walking/riding to school. In particular, children going to/from Alexandria Park along Belmont Street must cross Fountain Street, which has high-speed/volume traffic. Measures are required to reduce crash risk here, e.g., Pedestrian/bicycle crossing; kerb extensions to reduce crossing distance; and narrow traffic lanes to reduce traffic speed.

A continuous footpath treatment is needed at Swanson St/Elliot Ave.



*The existing Swanson St pedestrian crossing should also have a bicycle crossing.*

To reduce traffic speeds and crash risk, Brown Street laneway should be 10 a km/h shared zone.