Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee Minutes

19 June 2018

Our Vision

A City which values its heritage, cultural diversity, sense of place and natural environment.

A progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.
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VENUE       Meeting Room 3 (Upper Level), Norwood Town Hall

HOUR        10.00am

PRESENT

Committee Members       Cr Kevin Duke (Presiding Member)
                        Cr Kevin Shepherdson
                        Cr Garry Knoblauch
                        Mr Shane Foley

Staff        Claude Malak (Manager, City Projects)
                        Paul Mercorella (Acting Manager, City Assets)
                        Marina Fischetti (Executive Assistant, Urban Services)

APOLOGIES    Sergeant Bruce Hartley, Mr Nick Meredith

ABSENT       Nil

TERMS OF REFERENCE:
The Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee is established to fulfil the following functions:

- To make a final determination on traffic management issues which are referred to the Committee in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Local Area Traffic Management Policy ("the Policy"); and
- To endorse proposals and recommendations which seek to enhance and improve road safety throughout the City.

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT & ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2017

Cr Knoblauch moved that the minutes of the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee meeting held on 17 October 2017 be taken as read and confirmed. Seconded by Mr Shane Foley and carried.

2. PRESIDING MEMBER’S COMMUNICATION

Nil

3. STAFF REPORTS
3.1 STEPNEY MAYLANDS EVANDALE LOCAL AREA TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (LATM) STUDY – DRAFT LATM REPORT

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, City Projects
GENERAL MANAGER: Chief Executive Officer
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: S/04883
ATTACHMENTS: A - B

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to provide for the Committee’s consideration, the key findings of the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study (“the LATM Study”).

BACKGROUND

The Council has allocated funding in its 2017-2018 Budget to undertake the LATM Study.

The primary objective of the LATM Study is to identify the key traffic management and road safety issues which exist within the local area that is bound by Portrush Road, Payneham Road and Magill Road (“the Study Area”) and outline to the Council for its consideration, the possible treatments to address these key issues.

Tonkin Consulting (“the Council’s Consultant”) has been engaged to undertake the LATM Study, which is to be delivered in three (3) key stages.

Stage 1 involves the collation and analysis of traffic data (i.e. traffic volumes, speeds and crashes) and to seek input from citizens and the wider community regarding what they consider to be issues which they believe should be addressed. Stage 2 comprises the development of draft recommendations which are aimed at addressing the issues which have been identified and undertaking community consultation on these draft recommendations. Stage 3 involves the assessment of the comments which are received on the draft recommendations and the development of a final LATM Plan for the Council’s consideration and adoption.

The Council’s Consultant has submitted a report titled Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report (“the Draft LATM Report”), which sets out the investigations which have been undertaken to date and the draft recommendations aimed at addressing the issues which have been identified.

A copy of the Draft LATM Report is contained in Attachment A.

One of the key objectives for the establishment of the Committee is to consider and endorse proposals and recommendations which seek to enhance and improve road safety throughout the City. In this respect, this report is being presented to the Committee for its consideration and advice to the Council, as part of its consideration of the endorsement of the Draft LATM Report for the purpose of undertaking the next community consultation phase.
RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Outcomes and Objectives of the Council’s *City Plan 2030, Shaping Our Future* are provided below:

**Outcome 1: Social Equity**
**A connected, accessible and pedestrian-friendly community.**

**Objectives:**

The key traffic management and road safety which exist within the Study Area have been identified by the Council’s Consultant and strategies on how to address these are outlined in the Draft LATM Report. The Committee is required to consider the draft recommendations which have been made and provide advice accordingly to the Council.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

All figures quoted herein are excluding GST.

The Council has allocated $60,000 in its 2017-2018 Budget for this Project and at this time, it is envisaged that the LATM Study will be completed within budget.

HDS Australia Pty Ltd have been engaged to undertake the collection and collation of the necessary and required traffic data (i.e. volumes and speeds) along all roads which are located within the Study Area. A total of 85 counts were undertaken at a cost of $15,480.

The cost of engaging the Council’s Consultant to undertake the LATM Study, inclusive of analysis of the traffic data collated, both community consultation phases and the drafting the Draft LATM and Final LATM Reports, is $43,070.

The Council has allocated $100,000 in its draft 2018-2019 Budget for the purpose of implementing the recommendations which it adopts for the Study Area. This amount may need to be adjusted through Budget Reviews, as required, once the Council has adopted the recommendations of the Final LATM Report and determined an implementation strategy.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

The LATM Study is being conducted in various stages as outlined in the Background Section of this report. This includes providing citizens and the wider community an opportunity to provide input into identifying the issues which are of concern to them and in providing comments on the draft recommendations proposed.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

The Council’s Consultant is delivering the LATM Study whilst Council staff are undertaking the project management responsibilities associated with the Project.
RISK MANAGEMENT

A number of safety issues have been identified at various locations within the Study Area. The Council has a duty of care to consider how to address these issues and the Council’s Consultant has recommended a range of treatments to address these issues.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**

  At its meeting held on 20 September 2016, the Committee considered a report regarding this matter and resolved to recommend to the Council to endorse the undertaking of the LATM Study, subject to allocating funding in the 2017-2018 Budget. At its meeting held on 4 October 2016, the Council endorsed the Minutes from the Committee’s meeting with respect to this matter and subsequently allocated funding in its 2017-2018 Budget for the undertaking of the Project.

  On 13 November 2017, an Information Session was held with Elected Members at which the Council’s Consultant outlined the proposed methodology for the LATM Study, the consultation phases and Project timeframes.

  On 14 May 2018, an Information Session was held with Elected Members at which the Council’s Consultant outlined the results of the traffic data which had been collated, a summary of the comments which had been received during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, the key issues identified and the proposed measures contained in the Draft LATM Report.

  At its meeting to be held on 2 July 2018, a report will be presented to the Council for its consideration (including the Committee’s advice), seeking its endorsement of the Draft LATM Report for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase.

- **Community**

  All citizens located within the Study Area as well as the wider community, have been invited to submit their comments to assist the Council’s Consultant to identify the key issues which need to be considered as part of the LATM Study. The Stage 1 community consultation phase was undertaken throughout November 2017 and December 2017.

  Comments were invited to be submitted to the Council’s Consultant via the following:

  - a letterbox drop of all properties which are located within the Study Area (approximately 3,500 letters were sent) which included a cover letter outlining the background to the LATM Study, a map of the Study Area and a Feedback Form (with supplied reply paid envelopes) inviting comments on a number of issues;
  
  - an online survey which consisted of the information that was provided in the letterbox drop package including the Feedback Form which was mailed to all citizens and property owners of the Study Area;
  
  - advertisements placed in the Messenger Newspapers which are circulated throughout the City which provided background information regarding the LATM Study and details on how to submit comments; and
  
  - copies of all relevant documentation were provided at the Norwood Council Offices and the Council’s three (3) Libraries, including Feedback Forms.

  In response to the invitation for comments for the Stage 1 community consultation phase, a total of 420 written submissions have been received.
The 420 written submissions have been provided in the following formats:

- completed Feedback Forms returned via reply paid envelopes (370);
- completed Feedback Forms via the online survey (40); and
- emails sent directly to the Council’s Consultant (10).

The proposed Stage 2 community consultation phase will utilise the same methodology as that which was used to undertake the Stage 1 community consultation phase. In this respect, every citizen and property owner within the Study Area will receive a copy of the information and will be invited to submit their comments. The wider community will also be invited to provide comments through the Messenger Newspaper advertisements and displays which will be provided at the Council Offices at the Norwood Town Hall and Libraries.

- **Staff**

  Chief Executive Officer  
  General Manager, Urban Services  
  Manager, Economic Development & Strategic Projects  
  Manager, Urban Planning & Sustainability  
  Team Leader, Customer & Regulatory Services  
  Project Manager, Urban Design & Special Projects  
  Sustainability Officer

- **Other Agencies**

  Various issues have been raised regarding the arterial road network on the perimeter of the Study Area. The Council’s Consultant will be raising and discussing these issues with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) and all comments provided by DPTI will be included in the Final LATM Report.

  The South Australia Police (“SAPOL”) will be requested to provide comment with respect to one of the key recommendations made by the Council’s Consultant (i.e. a Study Area wide 40 kph speed limit).

**DISCUSSION**

The Draft LATM Report is comprehensive and outlines in detail the various investigations which have been undertaken to date by the Council’s Consultant, the issues which have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, the various options which have been considered to address these issues and the draft recommendations.

For the purpose of this report, only the recommendations which have been made by the Council’s Consultant to address the issues which have been identified and as outlined in the Draft LATM Report are summarised below.

1. **40 kph Speed Limit**

   1.1 Background

   By way of background information, Committee Members are advised that the current speed limit within the part of the Study Area which is bound by Nelson Street, Magill Road, Portrush Road and Payneham Road (except for the arterial roads) is 50 kph. However, the speed limit within the part of the Study Area known as the *Stepney Triangle*, which is bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road and Nelson Street (except for the arterial roads), is 40 kph.

   Traffic counts were undertaken along all roads which are located within the Study Area (except for the arterial roads) with a total of 85 counts being undertaken. The Council’s Consultant has advised that in respect to travel speeds, the traffic count data which has been collated reflects what would be typically expected of a residential area with average speeds generally being less than 45 kph. However, several streets located in the eastern part of the Study Area (i.e. between Portrush Road and Frederick Street), have recorded average speeds of more than 40 kph.
1.2 Concerns Raised During Stage 1 Community Consultation Phase

The Council’s Consultant has advised that during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, of the approximately 3,500 letters sent to citizens and property owners seeking comments, a total of only 36 written submissions received raised concerns regarding speeding within the Study Area and suggested reducing the speed limit to 40 kph.

The Council’s Consultant has acknowledged that based on the analysis of the traffic data which has been collated there is no warrant for the reduction in the current speed limit in the part of the Study Area which is currently a 50 kph speed limit. However, the Council’s Consultant is recommending that the Council, as part of the Stage 2 community consultation phase, seek to establish the “level of support” for the implementation of a 40 kph speed limit to determine whether this should be pursued.

1.3 Previous Consideration of a City-Wide 40 kph Speed Limit

Committee Members may recall that in 2015, the Council undertook a City-wide community consultation survey regarding the possibility of introducing a blanket 40 kph speed limit across the City along roads under its care, control and management.

At that time, approximately 24,000 Survey Forms were distributed to all citizens and property owners across the City. Approximately 6,000 (or 25%) completed Survey Forms were returned. Of those, approximately 4,000 (or 67%) indicated that they were satisfied with the current speed limits which applied across the City, approximately 840 (or 21%) were dissatisfied and approximately 480 (or 12%) were neutral meaning they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the current speed limit.

The information gathered at the time the survey was undertaken could not be collated based on locations in order to comply with relevant standards for statistical collation of surveys and in this respect, it is unknown what comments were received from citizens and property owners of the Study Area in 2015. On the basis of the results of this survey and given that a two-thirds majority support was not evident, as required under the DPTI 40 kph Guidelines at the time, the Council resolved not to proceed with this initiative.

The Council’s Consultant has considered the Council’s survey which was conducted in 2015, as part of the LATM Study, but has recommended to undertake community consultation for the introduction of a 40 kph speed limit within the Study Area.

The recommendation has been made for three (3) reasons, namely:

- that concerns regarding speeding within the Study Area (albeit it is acknowledged by the Council’s Consultant that this is not supported by the traffic data which has been collated) was the number one issue raised in the Stage 1 community consultation phase and in this respect, the Council’s Consultant feels that the question at least needs to be asked;

- that the DPTI 40 kph Speed Limit Guidelines have changed since 2015, with one key change being that there is no requirement for a minimum two-thirds majority level of community support; and

- that a 40 kph speed limit would seek to reinforce the local environment within the Study Area and would be more appropriate than the current 50 kph speed limit.

1.4 Benefits of a 40 kph Speed Limit in Study Area

The potential benefits of a 40 kph speed limit within the Study Area, as outlined by the Council’s Consultant in the draft LATM Report, are summarised below:

- an expectation that average speeds along those streets with average speeds currently greater than 40 kph would reduce, but unlikely to reduce speeds along those streets with average speeds already lower than 40 kph;

- expected road safety benefits to all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists;

- serve to reinforce the local residential precinct and improve the “residential amenity”; and

- serve to complement existing traffic controls currently in place rather than replace them, including roundabouts and speed humps which are considered to be functioning appropriately and their removal would be considered retrograde.
1.5 Establishing Community Support

One obvious question for the Committee and in turn the Council, in respect to this recommendation, is that whilst the DPTI 40 kph Speed Limit Guidelines now do not require a minimum level of community support, how does the Council determine what is an appropriate level of community support.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended to use a two-thirds majority as an indication of an appropriate level of community support and that this should be based on a representative sample of responses of between 10% and 15%. In this respect, out of the approximately 3,500 letters which are to be sent to citizens and property owners located within the Study Area, as part of the Stage 2 community consultation phase, a minimum of between approximately 350 and 525 written responses would need to be received of which, a minimum of approximately between 230 and 350 would need to support the proposed introduction of a 40 kph speed limit.

It is important to note that the Council’s Consultant is of the opinion that respondents to the next round of community consultation who do not have a strong opinion either way would be included as being ‘supportive’ of the recommendations. This practice has not been used by the Council previously as the basis for this assumption is flawed.

It is also important to also note that given all citizens and property owners as well as the wider community will all be provided an opportunity to provide comments regarding the lower speed limit, the Council’s Consultant is not recommending any further community consultation on the matter and in this respect, the Council should determine its position on the basis of the results of the Stage 2 community consultation phase.

A copy of the draft Feedback Form which will be used to invite comments, as part of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase, is contained in Attachment B.

1.6 Consultation with SAPOL and Local Member of Parliament

In addition to ascertaining the level of community support (or otherwise) for this initiative, the Council’s Consultant has also recommended that the Council seek comments from SAPOL with respect to this matter and given the need to enforce the lower speed limit should this be introduced. As such, it is recommended that consultation with SAPOL also be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 community consultation phase.

The previous DPTI 40 kph Speed Limit Guidelines required support from the relevant Local Member of Parliament, in order for the Minister to approve any requests. The current Guidelines have changed and do not require this as part of the approval process. However, Council staff are of the opinion that the Local Member of Parliament should at least be consulted, as part of the Stage 2 community consultation process.

Once the Council has ascertained the level of community support (or otherwise), the comments received from SAPOL and the Local Member of Parliament regarding a 40 kph speed limit, it would be better placed to determine whether or not it will pursue this matter. Should the Council decide to pursue the matter, it is required to seek and obtain approval from the Minister prior to implementation.

2. Ann Street

2.1 Trial One-Way Movement (Preferred Option)

Concerns have been raised as part of the Stage 1 community consultation phase, regarding difficulties being experienced by motorists when navigating, through the street due to the narrow carriageway width of Ann Street and on-street parking results in congestion.

Ann Street has a carriageway width of approximately 7.0 metres to 7.5 metres and was found to be carrying approximately 1,500 (two-way) vehicle movements per weekday. On-street parking is provided via defined parking bays which are staggered on both sides of the street with No Parking yellow edge lines in some locations. Time-limit parking restrictions in the form of 2-hours apply 7:00am to 7:00pm, Monday to Friday and 7:00am to 12-midday, Saturday thereby allowing for only one (1) vehicle movement through at a time.
The Council’s Consultant has recommended (as a preferred option) that the Council undertake consultation to ascertain level of support, regarding the introduction of a one-way traffic movement along Ann Street, which would apply in a north westerly direction (i.e. from Magill Road to Payneham Road). The Council’s Consultant has recommended that this be implemented on a trial basis for a period of six (6) months, following which an assessment of traffic condition (i.e. a before and after assessment) be undertaken to establish what impact this has had on Ann Street and surrounding streets. Based on the results of this review, the Council would then determine if it would seek to maintain the one-way restriction on a permanent basis.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended the one-way traffic restriction trial be implemented if the Council receives a minimum level of support of 50% from residents of Ann Street during the Stage 2 community consultation phase.

2.2 On-Street Parking Restrictions (Alternative Option)

The Council’s Consultant has recommended (as an alternative option) that in the event the minimum level of support as recommended is not received for the trail one-way movement along Ann Street, then the Council introduce on-street parking restrictions on the northern side of Ann Street and staggered parking on the southern side of the street. In this respect, the Council is being asked to establish the support or otherwise for the traffic movement restriction and if this is not palatable then consider parking restrictions as an alternative.

By way of background information, Committee Members are advised that in 2001, the Council commissioned an LATM Study in this Study Area. At that time, a one-way traffic movement trial was recommended for Ann Street, albeit the direction in which it would or should apply was not specified. The Council endorsed the recommendation “in principle” and for the purpose of community consultation but given that a consensus was not reached through the consultation process, the Council resolved not to pursue the implementation of the trial. In this respect, this is different to the 2001 LATM Study recommendation in that the one-way movement is stipulated as a north-westerly direction, as recommended by the Council’s Consultant in the Draft LATM Report.

2.3 Olive Road Intersection

Concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, regarding driver sightlines at the Ann Street and Olive Road intersection.

Drivers who are exiting Olive Road have reduced sightlines due to vehicles being parked on Ann Street. The Council’s Consultant has recommended that should a one-way trial or parking restrictions be implemented along Ann Street, then no changes are to be made to current conditions at the intersection as traffic congestion will be reduced and this will assist with navigating the intersection and improving driver sightlines.

However, the Council’s Consultant has recommended that in the event that no changes are made to the current conditions along Ann Street, either by way of a one-way trial or the introduction of on-street parking restrictions, then the issue of driver sightlines would need to be addressed and the Council should reassess the need to install a Stop sign at the intersection to address this issue.

2.4 Flora Street Intersection

Concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase regarding driver sightlines at the Ann Street and Flora Street intersection.

Drivers who are exiting Flora Street have reduced sightlines due to vehicles being parked on Ann Street. The Council’s Consultant has recommended that should a one-way trial or parking restrictions be implemented along Ann Street, then no changes are to be made to current conditions at the intersection as traffic congestion will be reduced and this will assist with navigating the intersection and improving driver sightlines.
However, the Council’s Consultant has recommended that in the event that no changes are made to the current conditions along Ann Street, either by way of a one-way trial or the introduction of on-street parking restrictions, then the issue of driver sightlines would need to be addressed and the Council should reassess the need to install a Stop sign at the intersection to address this issue.

3. Lindas Lane

Traffic management and safety along Lindas Lane has been the subject of detailed investigations which were undertaken by the Council in 2012. The Council implemented various recommendations which it received to address the issues which were determined at the time. Given the LATM Study involves an holistic review of all traffic management matters within the Study Area, the Council’s Consultant was requested to review traffic conditions along the Lane, as part of its consideration of the Study Area as a whole.

In short, following consideration of all the relevant data the Council’s Consultant is not supportive of a one-way restriction along Lindas Lane given that this could have various negative impacts including an increase in travel speeds, impact on rear property access and shifting vehicle movements to adjoining streets.

However, the Council’s Consultant has recommended the installation of a ‘No Entry’ sign at the Morcomb Street intersection, to restrict entrance into the Lane at that point given the ‘blind corner’ nature of the intersection but still maintain two-way movement along the Lane itself.

4. Laura Street and Frederick Street Intersection

Concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase regarding motorists “cutting the corner” when entering Laura Street from Frederick Street. Site observations undertaken by the Council’s Consultant have confirmed this to be of concern.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended the installation of raised pavement bar median (i.e. rumble bar strip) along Laura Street, at its intersection with Frederick Street to prevent corner cutting. The proposed rumble bar strip is expected to result in the loss of approximately three (3) on-street parking spaces along Laura Street.

5. Henry Street

5.1 Stepney Street Intersection

Concerns have been raised regarding safety at the Henry Street and Stepney Street intersection, where there have been four (4) reported right angle crashes between 2012 and 2016. Currently, there are Stop signs installed along both sides of Henry Street requiring drivers to give way to traffic travelling along Stepney Street. This is somewhat unusual as Stepney Street is considered to be the “main” traffic movement at this intersection.

In attempting to reduce the rate of crashes at this intersection, the Council’s Consultant has considered various traffic management options, namely; a roundabout, a raised plateau along the carriageway of Henry Street, a raised plateau along all four (4) approaches to the intersection and re-prioritising traffic movements to require drivers travelling along Stepney Street to give way to drivers travelling along Henry Street (i.e. reversing the Stop sign control).

In respect to the introduction of physical devices, the geometry and layout of the intersection would make the installation of these options very challenging and cost prohibitive. In this respect, the option of re-prioritising traffic flow is the preferred option and is the one which has been recommended to the Council in order to address safety at this intersection.
5.2 Ann Street Intersection

Concerns have been raised regarding safety at the Henry Street and Ann Street intersection where there have been four (4) reported right angle crashes between 2012 and 2016. Currently, there are Stop signs along both sides of Ann Street requiring drivers to give way to traffic traveling along Henry Street.

In attempting to reduce the rate of crashes at this intersection, the Council’s Consultant has considered various traffic management options, namely; a mini roundabout, a raised plateau along the carriageway of Henry Street and a raised plateau along all four approached of the intersection.

With respect to the mini roundabout option, it is considered that this could be implemented with minimal difficulties, albeit several infrastructure design parameters need to be confirmed. However, the raised plateau options are likely to pose significant stormwater management challenges which are not easily overcome and as such, the mini roundabout is the preferred option.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended that the Council undertake an engineering design feasibility, in order to establish whether it is possible to install the mini roundabout.

5.3 Blind Bend

Concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, regarding safety at the “blind bend” located in Henry Street, between Frederick Street and Morcomb Street.

The carriageway varies in width along this section of Henry Street and is approximately 5.3 metres wide at its narrowest which does not allow two-way traffic and parking on both sides of the street. In this respect, the Council’s Consultant has recommended the installation of a solid white dividing line to provide lane separation. The recommended linemarking will result in the removal of approximately four (4) on-street parking spaces.

6. Morris Street and Bakewell Road Intersection

Concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase regarding motorists cutting the corner when entering Morris Street from Bakewell Road. Site observations undertaken by the Council’s Consultant have confirmed this to be of concern.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended the installation of raised pavement bar median (i.e. rumble bar strip) along Morris Street, at its intersection with Bakewell Road to prevent corner cutting. The proposed rumble bar strip is expected to result in the loss of approximately two (2) to four (4) on-street parking spaces along Laura Street.

7. Adelaide Street and Dover Street Intersection

There have been four (4) reported right angle crashes at the Adelaide Street and Dover Street intersection. It is unclear why these crashes have occurred but suffice to say, the intersection is quite ‘opened’ and the carriageway width a very generous.

The Council’s Consultant has recommended that the Council undertake an engineering design feasibility, in order to establish whether it is possible to install a roundabout.

8. Narrow Streets

There are a number of narrow streets which exist within the Study Area, where on-street parking on both sides of these streets, does not allow for the convenient two-way traffic. In this respect, concerns have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, regarding the narrowness of such streets throughout the Study Area and the associated difficulties such as congestion being experienced.

Whilst the Council has guidelines for the marking of solid yellow edge lines adjacent driveways, there is currently no formal Council policy or procedure for the purpose of managing on-street parking versus traffic congestion along narrow streets.
In this respect, the Council’s Consultant has recommended that the Council consider the development of a policy or procedure to manage this situation. This would ensure a consistent and holistic way by which the Council would consider and address this matter not only within the Study Area but throughout the City.

These aspects are summarised below:

- establish the minimum required carriageway width within a residential street in order to permit on-street parking on both sides of the street and allow for two-way traffic movements at a time;

- develop and adopt a standard procedure for implementing ‘no stopping’ on-street parking restrictions and how these would apply which could include such matters as complaints received, residents’ support for removal of on-street parking provisions, etc; and

- determine an appropriate review process for considering further change to on-street parking controls within a street.

On-street parking is not part of the scope of the LATM Study, given that the Council will undertake a City-Wide Parking Review as a separate Project. However, given the concerns which have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, the Council’s Consultant has recommended that the Council consider the development of a policy or procedure, to manage on-street parking versus traffic in narrow streets as outlined above.

9. Arterial Roads

One of the key concerns which have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, has been the extent of ‘cut-through’ traffic which may be using the Study Area to avoid the arterial road network on the perimeter of the Study Area (in particular Portrush Road and Magill Road).

The Council’s Consultant has considered a number of options insofar as reducing the extent of “cut-through” traffic within the Study Area, including roads closures, the installation of traffic control devices and prohibiting turning movements during the AM and PM peak periods (refer to Draft LATM Report for details). The introduction of these measures could be effective but have not been recommended by the Council’s Consultant as these restrictions are considered to impact negatively on local residents and their access to the Study Area.

Notwithstanding this, it is difficult for the Council to address congestion and the inefficiencies of the arterial road network adjacent the Study Area, as these roads are under the care, control and management of DPTI. However, the Council’s Consultant has collated the various issues raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase, regarding the arterial roads and will refer to DPTI as part of the Stage 2 community consultation phase and seek comments from DPTI on these matters. This is to include a request of DPTI to undertake a formal review of the capacity and efficiency of the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection. The information to be received from DPTI will be included in the Final LATM Report which is to be considered by the Council.

OPTIONS

The issues which have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation process and those which been identified by the Council’s Consultant based on their investigations, have been outlined in the Draft LATM Report. The recommendations which have been made to the Council in the Draft LATM Report have been summarised in this report.

The Committee is now required to consider the issues and provide advice to the Council. In this respect, the Committee is not required to endorse the Draft LATM Report but merely provide advice to the Council.

It is recommended that the Committee endorse the draft recommendations which have been made by the Council’s Consultant and advise the Council to endorse these draft recommendations for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase, but then consider in detail the results of that process prior to making any decisions with respect to which recommendations it will adopt for implementation within the Study Area.
CONCLUSION

The relevant issues which have been outlined in this staff report enable the Committee to consider the relevant issues and provide advice to the Council as part of its considerations of endorsing the Draft LATM Study for the undertaking of the Stage 2 consultation phase.

COMMENTS

Council staff support the majority of the draft recommendations which have been made by the Council’s Consultant, given the issues which have been identified by citizens and property owners and the data which has been collated.

However, in the opinion of Council staff, the draft recommendations which have been made by the Council’s Consultant regarding the 40 kph speed limit and the Ann Street one-way trial, are somewhat “theoretical” and are based on a “belief” that the concerns which have been raised during the Stage 1 community consultation phase should be addressed rather than having established an actual problem or issue which needs to be addressed. In other words, there appears to be no traffic management or road safety “warrant” for putting forward these particular draft recommendations.

Experience has shown that traffic management matters are often emotive and difficult to address and hence, a need for the Council to be very clear not only regarding the problem/issue which it is seeking to address but equally the manner in which it is seeking to address it. A very good example of this has been the very successful Schools Review which was recently undertaken by the Council and which has been implemented in a very structured and effective manner. The key to its success was the ability to clearly demonstrate and articulate the issues and the possible solutions which made implementation of the recommendations easier to achieve.

Notwithstanding this, Council staff support these draft recommendations (i.e. the Study Area wide 40 kph speed limit and Ann Street one-way trial), only by way of the Council endorsing them as part of the Draft LATM Report for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase. This will enable the Council to establish the support or otherwise for these particular recommendations and the Council can then make an informed decision as to what action (if any) it will take regarding these matters.

A staff report outlining the results of the Stage 2 community consultation phase will be presented to the Council. At that time, the Council can consider the issues, taking into account the comments which are received from the community and make informed decisions regarding what recommendations it will pursue.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee notes that a report will be considered by the Council at its meeting to be 2 July 2018, regarding the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report which has been submitted by Tonkin Consulting and as contained in Attachment A to this report.

2. The Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee recommends that the Council endorses the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report, for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase inviting comments on the draft recommendations.

3. That a further report be considered by the Council outlining the results of the Stage 2 community consultation phase which is to be undertaken regarding the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report, prior to the Council making any final determinations with respect to the implementation of any of the draft recommendations which are contained in the Draft Report.
Cr Shepherdson moved:

1. That the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee notes that a report will be considered by the Council at its meeting to be 2 July 2018, regarding the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report which has been submitted by Tonkin Consulting and as contained in Attachment A to this report.

2. The Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee recommends that the Council endorses the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report, for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase inviting comments on the draft recommendations.

3. The Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee recommends to the Council that in respect to Ann Street, a third option of ‘No Entry’ into Ann Street from Payneham Road whilst retaining two-way traffic along Ann Street be included as an option, for the purpose of undertaking the Stage 2 community consultation phase inviting comments regarding this as an option.

4. That a further report be considered by the Council outlining the results of the Stage 2 community consultation phase which is to be undertaken regarding the Stepney Maylands Evandale Local Area Traffic Management Study Draft Report, prior to the Council making any final determinations with respect to the implementation of any of the draft recommendations which are contained in the Draft Report.

Seconded by Cr Knoblauch and carried unanimously.
4. OTHER BUSINESS
   Nil

5. CLOSURE
   There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 11.32am.

____________________________________
Cr Kevin Duke
PRESIDING MEMBER

Minutes Confirmed on ________________
(date)