

City East Local Area Traffic Study Draft Report
Prepared by Transport & Urban Planning
Ref 27072r

**Formal Response from East Sydney
Neighbourhood Association (ESNA)**

January 2008

1. INTRODUCTION

East Sydney is the area bound by College, William, Oxford and Forbes streets and is home to approximately 3,500 people the majority of whom live at street level in terraced housing. The East Sydney Neighbourhood Association (ESNA) is the body representing all local residents. For further information on our organisation and to view our community Strategic Plan visit our web site <http://www.esna.org.au/>.

2. OVERVIEW

This draft Traffic Study reports that many of East Sydney streets, all of which are zoned as 'local', currently carry well over double the RTA recommended capacity of traffic volumes for local roads. In some cases these volumes are triple the recommended levels involving thousands of unnecessary through-traffic vehicles on a daily basis. The study considers this fact not only acceptable but unworthy of examination and serious response. There are no serious discussions about this issue and no genuine attempt to recommend measures to reduce volumes to acceptable and recommended levels suitable for local roads. This is of serious concern to ESNA. ESNA wishes to draw attention to the numbers of East Sydney residents experiencing the deleterious impact that high volumes of traffic have on their environmental amenity, on their safety and on their health.

The draft Study also fails to distinguish the unique characteristics of East Sydney with its high density 2B Residential Zoned heritage housing as opposed to other urban villages with different zoning and with greater numbers of high-rise apartments where most residents are removed from street level traffic impacts. The draft study has clumped East Sydney in with other City East 'villages' on the assumption that all inner-city precincts experience the same circumstances and that these can be resolved by the introduction of improvements such as pedestrian crossings and difficult to enforce speed limits. This has been done in an *ad hoc* manner without a cohesive strategy. It does not provide a big picture analysis which addresses the fundamental problems and it does not produce a strategy which can take East Sydney into the twenty-first century with new objectives for urban living. It has totally ignored the unique heritage identity of East Sydney and it leaves us the residents with a serious and continuing environmental problem.

It is stated in the Study that the subject area is located on the fringe of Sydney CBD and the land uses include commercial (retail, business and office) and entertainment areas and precincts mixed with residential uses. This may be true for City East as a whole but it is not an accurate description of East Sydney which is not on the fringe but on the very edge of the CBD and is predominantly residential with a limited number of commercial or retail uses and only one small 'eat street'. This demonstrated lack of detailed knowledge is a direct result of the agglomeration of villages into an anonymous City East, a kind of 'one size fits all' ersatz approach to traffic planning. As a result there is no appreciation or value of a unique heritage precinct with hundreds of

terrace homes at street level. It also reveals a complete misunderstanding of local precinct/village conditions and culture.

It is ironic that this Council, with its 'Villages Policy' has with this Traffic Study completely failed to address the fundamental and unique characteristics of the oldest and closest residential urban village to the largest CBD in Australia. It does not address the traffic and transport issues of a heritage village facing a unique set of circumstances.

3. TRAFFIC STUDY AND AREA

On the very first page of this Traffic Study it is stated that:

'A Council resolution was passed on 27 June 2005 to develop a revised traffic plan for East Sydney in consultation with the Roads and Traffic Authority and to investigate the impacts of the Cross City Tunnel on the study'.

It is ESNA's firm belief that this resolution was intended to be an LATM (Local Area Traffic Management plan) for the village of East Sydney. This is not what we have in this report. This draft 'Traffic Study' is not a Local Area Traffic Management Plan and neither is it for East Sydney. It is a Traffic Study for the whole of City East and as such it falls very far short of the focus required by residents in East Sydney. A fundamental flaw of this study is the sheer size and heterogeneity of the study area covering at least five different villages that differ greatly in terms of demography, zoning and built form.

4. LATM, ROAD HIERARCHY and THROUGH TRAFFIC

*"A Local Area Traffic Management plan (LATM) uses physical road network changes such as roundabouts, speed humps, **road closures etc** to control the movement of vehicles into and through a local area to create more liveable and safer residential streets. A LATM is intended to address traffic issues on a precinct-wide basis, with each precinct bounded by the main traffic routes, which are usually arterial or sub-arterial roads. Tackling issues on a precinct wide basis ensures traffic problems **are resolved and not merely relocated to another street in the precinct.**"*

Council of the City of Sydney Records; Local Area Inner South Community Forum - 11 April 2006

On the basis of this statement Council clearly considers that a comprehensive LATM is precinct based and designed to facilitate the movement of local traffic into and out of the precinct while restricting unnecessary through traffic from entering.

The Traffic Study acknowledges this when it states the following as one of its aims:

'to prevent use of local roads by 'through traffic' and re-direct through traffic to State and Regional Roads'.

However despite the above this is not what it does and it is certainly not what it achieves. The aim is no more than meaningless rhetoric. If the study was to achieve the stated aim then a principal objective must be the identification of the excessive use of local roads by through traffic coming from outside the precinct and the development of a scheme which successfully redirects this traffic to arterial roads before it enters the precinct.

The report lists the following daily (7 day average) traffic volumes on local designated East Sydney roads:-

- Crown Street- south of Stanley St..... 9,218 vpd
- Liverpool Street- east of Forbes St..... 7,737 vpd
- Liverpool Street- east of Yurong St..... 3,644 vpd
- Burton Street- east of Forbes St..... 5,637 vpd

These volumes greatly exceed the recommended 2,000 vpd threshold in for local roads in residential areas as quoted in the Study in point 3.5.1. These volumes are not desirable in a residential area and they should not be maintained or aspired to. Double and quadruple figures is quite unacceptable.

Nowhere in the report are these volumes acknowledged as a problem to be addressed. Instead the aim is to ensure that accessibility of drivers into the precinct by those living outside is maintained. The study suggests that since through traffic uses local streets it is acceptable for local streets to continue to carry it. It accepts large volumes of through traffic in residential East Sydney as a given, even when such volumes greatly exceed the RTA recommended and quoted levels for local roads. This thesis is totally flawed – through traffic should be placed on to the arterial roads of William and Oxford to the greatest and earliest extent possible and certainly before it enters the local street network of East Sydney.

It is not correct to refer to William Street and College Street in Section 3.1 as 'major local (city) roads' There is no such category. The RTA Road Design Guide provides information on road hierarchy including desirable traffic volume thresholds for the various classifications. The categories given are: Arterial Road, Sub-Arterial Road, Collector Road and Local Roads. There is no category of 'major local road' and its use for William, College Crown, Liverpool, and Burton east of Crown is totally misleading. William, College and Oxford Streets are clearly Arterial Roads and having nothing like the much smaller dimensions and local status of roads in East Sydney.

There also seems to be considerable confusion about the role of a collector road. The definition of a collector road is: ***"a roadway linking traffic on local roads to the arterial road network"*** In other words it **collects** traffic from

local roads and puts it on to arterial or sub-arterial roads. It does NOT collect traffic from external areas and put it on local roads in a residential precinct. However, this is what is currently happening with Liverpool, Bourke and Burton Streets.

ESNA is concerned that this study seems to regard these streets as unofficial collector roads while at the same time it applies an incorrect role for a collector road. These local roads are NOT collector roads and never should be. Even if they were collector roads the role they are currently playing by bringing external traffic into the precinct rather than diverting it out is quite inappropriate for a collector road.

It is erroneous to refer to or even suggest that Liverpool Street, Bourke Street and Burton Street are 'collector roads'. They are local roads and have always been local roads. Just because they have been allowed over time to carry excessive through traffic this does not make them collector roads. It simply reflects the negligence of years of negligent traffic planning in East Sydney where vehicle volumes have been allowed to increase despite the protests of residents. Neither is it acceptable that local roads are quietly transformed into a higher category of classification simply because it is easier and more convenient for the traffic planners to do so rather than to develop a scheme which protects the precinct. If any moves are made to re-classify Liverpool, Bourke or Burton Streets to 'collector' status ESNA's objections will be very vocal and broadcast widely.

The streets in East Sydney which carry these high volumes are narrow, street level residential and are clearly not designed for this arterial strategic purpose. The solution is to introduce strategic management measures through a properly undertaken LATM which significantly reduce the volumes of traffic entering East Sydney and returns local roads to their proper local function. The report instead recommends such things as traffic lights on local roads (cnr. Bourke and Liverpool Sts.) and road re-openings (remove right-hand turn ban cnr Forbes and Burton Sts) to facilitate better through traffic flows instead of recommending measures to decrease it.

It is a very poor and unimaginative response.

5. ROAD CLOSURES

In section 12.3 of the Study under the Item 'Issues Raised in Public Consultation Process' it says that;

'in general pedestrian issues tended to be the single issue most raised with other issues including inappropriate speed, rat running traffic and requests for specific devices were noted'.

Although it is reported that road closures and road narrowings polarised opinions at the Community Consultation meetings nonetheless the split is equally 50/50 between those who supported them or were undecided, and

those who opposed them. If this was the lowest approval rating for any traffic control device as stated then it is not surprising. The numbers should be put into context and consideration given as to where the 50% opposition comes from and why it is being expressed. It is unrealistic to consider that the views on traffic of residents living in high rise precincts in Potts Point, Kings Cross, Elizabeth Bay, Rushcutters Bay and Darlinghurst will be the same as those of residents in street-fronted terrace houses in East Sydney and Woollahooloo.

A person living in a high-rise apartment will not accede to giving up a convenient rat run through a residential neighbourhood simply to improve the environment, health and safety of others living at ground level. Drivers are generally unwilling to give up rat-running opportunities for the environmental benefit of others. This is a measure that has to be enforced for the greater good and the Council should have the courage to ensure that it is. Currently unnecessary rat-running traffic on our local roads is accepted and being accommodated. If this study is implemented in its present form this situation will continue.

It is not surprising therefore that at a meeting where East Sydney residents are considerably outnumbered by residents from elsewhere in City East, by people who benefit by driving through residential local roads rather than on the arterial roads that opposition to road closures will be high. In fact it is remarkable that those who oppose road closures represent only 50% of respondents. Based on the numerical representation of the rest of City East it could have been much higher. Numerical strength in this context does not confer ethical correctness. The figures quoted in this report as reflecting community attitudes are meaningless in this context and should be completely disregarded.

Contemporary traffic management here in Australia and internationally is moving towards local residential areas which promote improvements strong on providing pedestrian focus with traffic free areas and shared zones and with an emphasis on safety, on a reduction in noise and fuel pollution and a generally improved environmental amenity for the local inhabitants. These factors encourage better living conditions generally and provide opportunities for further environmental improvements. They should always come before the needs of unnecessary traffic and rat-running drivers who should be diverted on to arterial roads where they belong.

6. LIVERPOOL STREET

Liverpool Street is a local road in a residential area with a corresponding recommendation threshold volume of 2,000 vpd. However the study considers that over double and up to almost four times that volume is acceptable. It is not a collector road it merely carries a comparable traffic volume through years of traffic management neglect.

ESNA's Strategic Plan recommends two closures of Liverpool Street with clearly stated advantages which are detailed below.

Liverpool Street at Whitlam Square

The study's assumptions regarding traffic levels entering East Sydney via Liverpool Street at Whitlam Square are completely flawed. In its 'Origin and Destination' survey, the study states that of traffic entering Liverpool Street at Oxford Street:-

- Between 64% and 67% of this traffic is no longer on Liverpool Street east of Forbes Street.

The report concludes that this (approximately 65%) traffic has its destination between College Street and Forbes Street. This assumption is not borne out by the facts. Most of this traffic has destinations outside East Sydney. The significant reasons for traffic entering Liverpool Street at Whitlam Square are as follows:

- Traffic turning left off Liverpool Street to gain access to the toll free Eastern Distributor and Harbour Bridge crossing
- Traffic turning right off Liverpool Street to cross Oxford Street since right hand turns are not permitted off Oxford Street between Whitlam and Taylor Squares
- Commuters using East Sydney streets to park illegally all day – particularly noticeable between College and Bourke streets.
- Through traffic heading to Darlinghurst and Paddington

These are all inappropriate vehicle uses of local residential roads and measures should be taken to prevent these options. All traffic should be redirected onto the arterial roads of Oxford, College and William Streets.

The 2001 RTA funded study by Arup and Partners recommended four options to avoid through traffic from using Liverpool Street to enter East Sydney. These options were widely discussed in a workshop and by survey of residents in East Sydney. There was overwhelming support for Option 4 but Council lacked the moral courage to stand up to unreasonable opposition and implement it, This opposition came mainly from residents in adjoining suburbs who wanted the convenience of driving through the middle of East Sydney on local residential roads. It is also necessary to state that much of this opposition was driven by an overt political agenda aimed at undermining the current administration of Council.

ESNA has already made known its support for Option 4. This option is the option supported by the community and it is one which does not lead to the risk of increasing traffic movements on other local roads.

The ESNA proposed closure of Liverpool Street at Whitlam Square as recommended in Option 4 has the following advantages:

- Removing conflict for thousands of pedestrians crossing at Liverpool Street and Oxford Street with much improved pedestrian flow
- Improved traffic flow for buses across Whitlam Square and into Oxford street as they no longer need to stop for traffic turning into Liverpool Street held up by pedestrians using the crossing.
- Improved safety for cyclists on Oxford Street as traffic turning conflict removed if Liverpool Street remains open as an alternative for cyclists as it could.
- Allows the creation of additional green space at the closure
- Removes through traffic from Liverpool and Francis Streets and beyond.
- Improves residential amenity by improved streetscapes with potential for greater public and business use.

Liverpool Street at Bourke Street

The report identifies the Liverpool Street / Bourke Street intersection with 25 accidents in a 5.5 year period but there is no analysis in the report of any change in the accident rate in this 5.5 year period. It responds by recommending the introduction of traffic lights.

ESNA opposes the introduction of traffic lights at the intersection of Liverpool and Bourke streets. These are both local roads where traffic lights are inappropriate. We believe that an analysis of dates when accidents took place would reveal a significant decrease over recent times as traffic has adjusted to the current conditions. Given that the worst three intersections in the study area all have traffic lights, there is no guarantee about any degree of accident reduction. In addition, traffic lights are pedestrian unfriendly, expensive for Council to install and run and raise the status of what are local roads and ought to be treated as such. We support instead the introduction of other means of reducing accidents at this junction foremost of which is the removal of unnecessary through traffic by implementing a road closure on the eastern side of Bourke Street, followed by the introduction of traffic calming measures on Liverpool Street west including cycle path, street narrowing, landscaped pedestrian crossings and blisters with greening.

The draft Traffic Study bases its calculations on peak hour figures for its traffic counts on Liverpool Street east of Forbes Street. It seems completely unaware that most of this peak hour traffic which occurs is generated by parents dropping children at SCEGGS. This traffic turns right from Liverpool Street into Forbes Street and returns by turning left from Forbes into Liverpool. It never reaches the Liverpool/Bourke Streets intersection where the traffic lights are proposed. The roundabout at Liverpool and Forbes Streets proposed by Transport and Urban Planning would force east-bound traffic on Liverpool Street in the morning peak to stop on a steep hill because access to the roundabout would be denied by a continuous stream of turning SCEGGS traffic.

ESNA recommends that this junction be closed on the eastern side of Bourke Street. This will provide the following advantages:

- Improved pedestrian and traffic safety at the Bourke Street/ Liverpool intersection by creating a T intersection with good sight lines for Liverpool Street traffic turning right or left into western Bourke Street.
- Removal of the need for traffic lights at this intersection
- Improving the flow of SCEGGS local traffic
- Removing the need for a roundabout at Forbes/Liverpool St

Any genuine LATM aimed at improving the local environment for residents would recommend the implementation of Option 4 and the proposal for a road closure at the Bourke Street/ Liverpool Street junction.

It must be stated however that should Council lack the courage to stand up to unreasonable opposition and take these sensible traffic management initiatives that accord with the principles of an LATM to remove through traffic, then the whole length of Liverpool Street needs a comprehensive and fully landscaped traffic calming design undertaken by landscape architects working in conjunction with traffic engineers.

7. BURTON STREET

The study states its intention to seek solutions to:

'maintain and enhance safety, connectivity, accessibility and permeability for cyclists and pedestrians'.

'maintain local area liveability while maintaining access for residents to local activity generators through traffic management means'.

Although the study recommends cycle routes on certain roads in East Sydney including Burton Street wherever there is a potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles it is solved in this study by giving preference to the motor vehicle. The proposed abandonment of the shared zone on Burton Street is a glaring example of this.

Burton Street is a local residential street with a recommended threshold volume of 2,000 vpd, yet the study considers that almost three times that volume (5,637 vpd) is acceptable despite a proposed bicycle route along its length. There is no need for non-local traffic to use Burton Street between Bourke Street and Crown Street. Only local access traffic requires the use of it.

A proposal for a shared zone on Burton Street linking the Tabernacle Building to the Albert Sloss Reserve opposite (once Heffron Hall has been relocated)

was presented to the City East Traffic community consultation meeting on 13 December 2008. This proposal was enthusiastically endorsed by all those at the meeting but is now referred to in this study in the section dealing with Transport and Planning responses with the curt statement that this section between Burton and Crown Street ***performs a local access road function and that other measures are proposed between Bourke and Crown Street to calm traffic and provide pedestrian improvements.*** In other words the 'shared zone has been abandoned. Since when does local access prevent the establishment of a shared zone? It is the volume of through traffic that is the problem. This is a very inadequate and unacceptable response again favouring through traffic at the expense of a vastly improved pedestrian environment. We do not want 'pedestrian improvements' and the continuation of high traffic volumes. We want a shared zone which safely connects the proposed components of the development proposal. Surely an issue like this is exactly what a good and proper LATM should be capable and desirous of solving?

A shared zone on this residential street is an essential component of the proposed public developments for a theatre in the Tabernacle and a redesign of the park. It will provide a highly desirable, safe and aesthetic space which is very badly needed in East Sydney. If it is there to provide the best outcome for residents as part of this very expensive community development on both sides of Burton Street then it is absolutely imperative that Council does not back down on the proposal for a shared zone in this location. Did the authors of the study have any idea of the nature and significance of what Council is proposing for this location? It would appear not. Some vision and a 'can do' attitude from Council are necessary here.

The whole area between Crown Street and Bourke Street should be designed and properly landscaped as a shared zone and this should include measures for slowing local traffic access. Whatever traffic measures are required to reduce through traffic volumes should be put in place. If necessary Burton Street should be closed at Bourke Street an outcome which is strongly favoured by ESNA as it will also create a much safer environment for cyclists on the proposed cycle route, provide angled parking for use by the Tabernacle and prevent a considerable volume of unnecessary traffic entering East Sydney in the first place.

Instead of preventing this shared zone from going ahead because of excessive and inappropriate traffic volumes on a local road, the report should be suggesting ways in which the intended outcome can be achieved. However, as with much of this report and many of its recommendations, there is a clear lack of vision and no attempt to seriously improve the amenity of the local environment. It is a blinkered knee jerk response providing the standard answer of putting traffic before people. It is a lazy response and a completely unacceptable recommendation which should be ignored.

8. SPEED LIMITS

ESNA confirms that stretches of our local streets experience traffic travelling at speeds far greater than the current legal limit. ESNA supports a speed limit of 40kph but is very concerned that there are unlikely to be effective ways to enforce it on a consistent and regular basis. It is anticipated that the majority of drivers will simply ignore the limit. This will require careful monitoring. It is also recommended that Heavy Vehicles (Austroad Class 3) with an exception for the 389 bus are banned from entry into the narrow streets of East Sydney. Exemptions can be sought for heavy vehicles legitimately involved in local construction projects but large delivery vehicles should be banned.

9. PARKING

There is no discussion of parking in East Sydney. For several years when the question of parking has been raised as an issue and a significant problem for residents we have been told by Council officers and political representatives that a parking study would be necessary and this must wait for a comprehensive LATM. Although ESNA acknowledges that this is not a comprehensive LATM but a limited Traffic Study, this is all that we have and the parking investigations and recommendations don't exist within it.

ESNA has since been advised that no work has progressed at all on the issue of parking at Council and that we can expect nothing for at least eighteen months at the barest minimum. This is unacceptable taken the time we have already been waiting for the improvement of a deteriorating situation.

East Sydney especially during the day but also into the early evening is used as a commuter car park. It is sufficiently close for city workers to drive in from other areas, park the car and then walk into the CBD. They do this with alacrity safe in the knowledge that a parking ticket is extremely unlikely. Despite 30 minute and 1 hour parking restrictions with resident exemptions on most roads in East Sydney enforcement is absolutely minimal. The only time it seems that an illegally parked car is booked especially in the most easterly streets of the precinct is when a resident rings the rangers and asks for some action. Even then a response is not always guaranteed.

Requests for parking meters to provide easier means of enforcement and a clear signal that parking infringement is being taken seriously are met with deaf ears. No-one in Council seems to be interested. The loss of potential earnings is astonishing. This means that residents who pay for an annual parking permit cannot park close to their homes and are forced into parks hundreds of metres from their residence or worse still into other parking areas where they run the risk of a fine. Meanwhile non-residents get to park during the day scot-free and for the most part without penalty.

This lack of enforcement of parking regulations is a disgrace. It leads to an additional volume of traffic entering the local residential streets of East Sydney with no legitimate right to be there, Vehicles parking illegally in our residential streets should be penalized financially every time it happens. Illegal parking is deleterious to both residents and local businesses. High

parking turnover would encourage shoppers to use local businesses more readily.

The situation is impossible but yet again an opportunity with this Traffic Study to investigate and address the situation has disappeared.

10. SCEGGS and SYDNEY GRAMMAR

Given that on school days these two schools create enormous volumes of local traffic twice a day it is reasonable to expect that an LATM would examine these traffic movements in a strategic manner and put in place measures to ensure that these movements are as smoothly executed as possible and with minimised impact on residents or other stakeholders in East Sydney. Nowhere is this addressed in the report. In fact, it is likely that unbroken school traffic on the proposed roundabout at the Forbes/ Liverpool Streets intersection will adversely affect other traffic, especially traffic east-bound on Liverpool Street. While unable to enter the roundabout, it is probable that traffic will bank up on a fairly steep hill and further disrupt residents. This solution needs careful re-evaluation

11. CONCLUSION

East Sydney is a small residential village which is seriously affected in traffic terms by its proximity to the city. It needs a strategic approach to traffic management which is at the same time particular and careful if it is to remain a residential village where local environmental amenity and safety are paramount and where pedestrians and cyclists are favoured over large volumes of through traffic. This is not a radical idea or an unrealistic aspiration. Communities across Australia are claiming back their streets from vehicles and the City of Sydney has triumphantly embraced this philosophy with urban planning advice from the Danish expert Jan Gehl who intelligently champions the cause. Too bad however that what is seen as good for the city centre does not seem to be the case for the heritage residential village on its immediate edge. At a time when the developed world is implementing schemes to reduce cars and promote pedestrians and cyclists it is extremely disappointing to see a premier global city, the City of Sydney, deny the opportunity to its closest and oldest urban village the opportunity to reclaim its streets for the people who live, work and play in East Sydney.

The thesis that residential local streets in East Sydney currently carry between 2 and 4 times the recommended threshold vehicle numbers and that this is acceptable in such a dense urban area made up of hundreds of street level houses is a purely traffic-centred response. Through traffic needs to be diverted onto adjacent arterial roads at the earliest opportunity and to the greatest extent possible – this is the purpose of arterial roads and it should be a key aim of the study. The report even goes to the extent of inventing a new category of road with a fictitious classification of 'major local road'

This draft Study is totally lacking in vision. It fails to draw on any elements of current innovative best practice in international people/traffic management

thinking and is one of the most uninspiring and unimaginative reports to have ever been produced by any Council in ESNA's thirty plus years of activity. It fails to address the real needs of people, residents and small businesses. It tinkers with small improvements treating each individual issue on an *ad hoc* basis without ever seeing the big picture and grappling with it. There is no contextual or strategic plan which improvements can fit into in an appropriate and contributory manner. It is seriously deficient as an integrated precinct based traffic vision.

Although there are some recommendations which are welcome such as improvements to pedestrian safety and the introduction of cycle ways ESNA is very disappointed that the study makes no strategic attempt to decrease excessive through traffic on local roads.

ESNA regards that what has been produced in this study is deficient and far from acceptable. It fails to achieve what we as residents have spent years clamouring for – a significant and marked reduction of unnecessary traffic in our streets replaced by a very strong focus and emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists. The motor vehicle and its ease of access is still the dominant philosophy underpinning this study and this is very disappointing.

It cannot be emphasised enough that people come second in this study.

In conclusion this Traffic Study is regarded as a regressive and ultimately short sighted document. It solves very little for us as residents and small businesses and takes us backwards rather than forwards.

ESNA is very willing to work with the City of Sydney to achieve a traffic plan which works for East Sydney but to do so we must be treated seriously and our views properly listened and responded to.

Council should carry out a genuine LATM for East Sydney as promised and do so in the short term, we have been waiting long enough.

DETAILED PAGE COMMENTS ON THE TRAFFIC STUDY

Page 2

Section 6: Community comment relates to current projects and not this LATM.
Section 7: not available for download.

Page 3

ESNA has already written raising concerns with the 20 June Workshop process.

Page 5

Para 3 - Reference is made in to a whole range of roads; it must be clarified that some of these are arterial roads (mention of Oxford Street is omitted) and also included are residential local roads within East Sydney. To our knowledge, there is no such classification as a 'major local road'.

Para 4 – we point out that East Sydney is a residential area mixed with other uses – and **not** the other way round!

Para 5 – note this site is not TAFE NSW Sydney Institute and has been the National Art School for some years.

Page 7

ESNA supports bike routes – however notes that this does not preclude other traffic calming devices including blisters.

Page 17

The shared zone/closure of Burton Street to link the two community facilities of the Tabernacle and Heffron Hall and the Albert Sloss Reserve will lead to a decrease in the accidents cited at Burton and Palmer streets (again we believe it is likely these have declined over time as traffic has adjusted).

Page 18

Para 1: Council did not agree with the RTA to the amended changes which had previously been developed with local East Sydney community consultation and which were overturned by State Government but certainly not with the collusion of Council.

Page 20

Paras 3 and 4: the risible reductions in traffic movements are hardly worth a mention.

Page 26

- ESNA has already made known its support for Option 4.

Page 31

ESNA absolutely opposes the introduction of traffic lights at the intersection of Liverpool and Bourke streets.

Page 32

ESNA considers that a roundabout at the intersection of Liverpool and Forbes streets is unnecessary if Liverpool Street is closed east of Bourke Street.

Pages 40 - 47

ESNA covers the area of East Sydney, ie the area contained within Oxford, William, Oxford and west Forbes streets, forming a section of the southern part of this report. Therefore the majority of our comments relate to this area.

N5 40 km/h speed limit – supported with enforcement measures taken into consideration

N24 – Bourke Street onto William Street 2 lanes: should the local residents of these streets wish to have 2 lanes then ESNA does not oppose that wish. However, we suspect that this proposal has come from out of the immediate area and we oppose these external suggestions which provide more space for cars and less for people.

S6 shared zone Little Burton Street – supported (note ESNA proposes all laneways in East Sydney zoned shared zone)

S7 traffic lights at Liverpool and Bourke streets – ESNA totally opposes. Supports alternative traffic calming measures at this intersection but prefers above all else a road closure.

S8 roundabout and MFC treatment at Liverpool and Forbes street – supported but is unnecessary if Liverpool Street is closed east of Bourke Street

S9 – outside East Sydney

S10 – traffic treatments at Burton and Forbes streets:

S11 – traffic treatments at Burton and Bourke streets: supported but would prefer a closure

S12 – traffic treatments at Burton and Palmer streets: very strong support for a shared zone

S13 – signage at Liverpool and Yurong streets: supported. In addition, blisters, street narrowing and implementation of additional greening and public space at this intersection

S14 – traffic treatments at College and Stanley streets - supported

S15 - 40 km/h speed limit – supported

S16 – shared zoning for laneways – supported

S17 - investigate all lanes in East Sydney and Darlinghurst for shared zone treatment - supported

S18 – treatment for Yurong Lane onto Yurong Street – supported but also recommend unsightly power lines on this prominent corner are undergrounded as part of the project. The closure should be properly designed by a professional landscape architect as befits an important gateway into East Sydney.

S19 – introduction of shared zone - supported

S21 – closure of Palmer Street at Stanley Street. This will break existing kerb crawling circuits as well as provide a new green area in East Sydney and an opportunity for angled parking on the northern section to serve and upgraded Stanley Street. Very strong support.

Appendix 1 – matters raised

We comment as follows on the matters raised, with the principle that we support issues raised by the residents of that locality for improvement and oppose any measures which provide additional space for cars and less space for people. ESNA supports a 40 km/hr speed limit.

Matters raised at meetings

10 – Bourke/William streets: any changes should include reinstatement of full closure of Bourke Street to the south of William Street.

12 – Bourke and Liverpool streets: ESNA totally opposes traffic lights. Supports alternative traffic calming measures at this intersection but prefers a road closure for reasons already provided in the main body of the text.

15 – right turn from Bourke into William: absolutely not. Any changes should include reinstatement of full closure of Bourke Street to the south of William Street

19 – note SCEGGS not 'SKEGGS': traffic management and local community consultation considered satisfactory by ESNA.

20 – re-open Bourke at William streets: absolutely not. Any changes should include reinstatement of full closure of Bourke Street to the south of William Street

21 – street closure Bourke south of William street – supported.

52 – remove right hand ban turn from Crown to Oxford street – absolutely not – would induce more traffic onto Crown and other East Sydney local streets

85 – Liverpool Street: either close or narrow street/calm traffic. Support Option 4 for closure.

86 – Liverpool Street: improved signage at Liverpool and Yurong streets: supported. If not closed then blisters, street narrowing and implementation of additional greening and public space at this intersection.

87 - Liverpool and Forbes street: roundabout and MFC treatment unnecessary with closure of Liverpool Street east of Bourke Street.

166 – Yurong Lane/Stream Street: improved public domain treatments

180 – Rat run on Burton Street – report comment absolutely indicative of whole pro-car and anti-traffic calming attitude. This is not a collector road it is a local residential street with a recommended threshold volume of 2,000 vpd, yet the authors consider that almost three times that volume (5,637 vpd) is acceptable! All traffic should as early as possible be diverted to arterial roads, in this case Oxford Street.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Averaging the issues on through traffic raised at the first Community Workshop by only 61 participants representing some 25,000 residents in the whole of Eastern Sydney are largely meaningless.

Only six participants (10%) at the workshop came from East Sydney precinct, a Heritage Conservation Village that has the greatest problems with through traffic on local roads. East Sydney contains perhaps the only roads in the whole study area that could be, but have not yet been, already treated to

avoid through-traffic (due to the existence until the 1990s of an RTA traffic corridor for a surface, now a tunnel, Eastern Distributor), it is unsurprising that 28 (50%) of the participants do not want road closures. Where do most of these people live?

W2 – DRAG

The pro through-traffic, anti road closure stance adopted by DRAG a vocal pressure group in Darlinghurst may have been obscured at the Community Workshop but is very evident in its written submission - only four points out of fourteen in its written submission relate to matters within the Darlinghurst precinct. ESNA has repeatedly flagged the political nature of this small group who are committed to negative actions towards East Sydney which is perceived by them as a stronghold of their political opponent and as such worthy of their best efforts to undermine. ESNA holds monthly open public meetings and all residents of East Sydney are welcome to voice their opinions at these meetings. ESNA regularly letter box drops the entire neighbourhood of East Sydney, the area contained within Oxford, William, Oxford and west Forbes streets, with news, views and invitations for input. DRAG does not have a voice concerning the area of East Sydney. Of the 14 points mentioned as being raised by DRAG only 4 relate directly to what could possibly be considered their local area and the majority are concerned with the sad obsession of these few individuals to denigrate the urban village of East Sydney. This probably speaks for itself particularly when compared to the ESNA submission.

W22 – ESNA

The authors have reported accurately the community traffic management plan prepared by ESNA. All ESNA proposals are rigorously and extensively communicated to residents for input. As noted, some of ESNA's recommendations have already been implemented and others are under current planning.

To summarise, traffic management is part of the community developed ESNA Strategic Plan which is available for download from the ESNA website, and which the report authors have accurately reflected. Principal changes to traffic management matters in this plan since it was originally written include (a) removal of the concept of a shared zone on Crown Street (which dated from when a closure was proposed on Crown Street south of Oxford Street) and (b) the addition of shared zoning for all East Sydney laneways (widely supported throughout the community with grant application for funding). The concept of (c) a shared zone for Stanley Street is also not viewed as a priority for residents.

It should be noted that the preferred community option for the Whitlam Square scheme is option 4 since this option does not risk displacing traffic onto other local residential streets.

The authors' response to the ESNA proposal to create a shared zone or eliminate traffic on the section of Burton Street (not Bourke – typo?) between the community facilities of the Tabernacle, Heffron Hall and Albert Sloss

Reserve is beyond belief. (Conflicts with S19 under Council consideration?) As previously stated, Burton Street is a local residential street with a recommended threshold volume of 2,000 vpd, yet the authors consider that almost three times that volume (5,637 vpd) is acceptable!

Further, this local residential street is somehow re-categorised as an east-west collector to Paddington! **All traffic should as far as possible be diverted to arterial roads**, in this case Oxford Street.

We cannot possibly conceive of or endorse any future plans which would prevent consideration of a road closure to give more space to people and remove cars from a community recreational facility with a high volume of people movements. The authors seem to have absolutely no concept that people matter more than cars and this attitude has been perpetuated throughout the whole report.

Similarly, the authors state that 'Liverpool Street is a collector road and not suitable for a road closure.' This is not accurate since Liverpool Street is a local residential street with a recommended threshold volume of 2,000 vpd, yet the authors consider that over double and up to almost four times that volume is acceptable! **It is essential that Liverpool Street be made a lot less attractive to cars and a key disappointment of this report that it has failed to make any recommendations to that effect.**

ESNA supports bike routes and does not view their implementation as an excuse to dismiss additional traffic calming measures. There are multiple examples of innovation and creative schemes which provide ample space for both bikes and pedestrians. The report's tone in suggesting otherwise is of concern.

Draft Scheme

Most aspects of the draft scheme have been commented on as above. A few additional/confirming remarks as follows:

S7 - Bourke/Liverpool streets traffic lights – strongly oppose. Support alternative traffic calming measures at this intersection.

S19 – shared/closed zone on Burton between Crown and Palmer streets (community centre node) – welcomed (conflicts with W22, point 2?)

S21 – road closure at Palmer/Stanley Street - welcomed

ADDENDUM

The City's LATMP for East Sydney should aim to:

- improve safety and access for pedestrians and cyclists
- improve walking access to, and safety around local schools

- improve access to public transport
- preserve local amenity while maintaining local traffic access for residents
- re-direct through-traffic to appropriate roads.