



**KU-RING-GAI TRAFFIC COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD ON MONDAY, 2 MARCH 2020 AT 9.00AM
ANTE ROOM - LEVEL 3**

A G E N D A

**** ** * ** * ** ***

NOTE: For Full Details, See Council's Website –
www.kmc.nsw.gov.au under the link to business papers

APOLOGIES

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee

File: CY00022/12
Meeting held 10 February 2020
Minutes numbered KTC01 to KTC03

GENERAL BUSINESS

GB.1 Traffic & Transport Policy

File: S02527

Ward: None
Electorate: None

To update Council's *Traffic & Transport Policy*, which was last updated in 2015.

Recommendation:

That the updated *Traffic & Transport Policy* be adopted by Council.

GB.2 **St Johns Avenue and Henry Street Gordon - alterations to parking restrictions**

File: TM4/12

Ward: Gordon
Electorate: Ku-ring-gai

To seek approval for proposed changes to parking restrictions in St Johns Avenue and Henry Street following the adoption by Council of the final concept design for the St Johns Avenue Upgrade project.

Recommendation:

That the following changes to parking and traffic conditions be approved, to support the concept design for St Johns Avenue Streetscape Upgrade:

- Removal of existing 1P restrictions in St Johns Avenue;
- Modification of the existing 3 spaces in Henry Street to No Parking ("Kiss and Ride") in peak hours, and P15 minute parking at all other times;
- Marking of cycle logos in Churchill Lane.

GB.3 **Yarrabung Road, St Ives**

File: TM9/12

Ward: St Ives
Electorate: Davidson

To consider the construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Yarrabung Road at Stanley Street, St Ives.

Recommendation:

That a pedestrian refuge island be constructed on Yarrabung Road, and a new median island and changes to line marking be implemented on Stanley Street, St Ives.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

**** ** ***

TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT POLICY

Ward: None
Electorate: None

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT:	To update Council's <i>Traffic & Transport Policy</i> , which was last updated in 2015.
BACKGROUND:	Council has engaged consultants to carry out an independent review of its <i>Traffic & Transport Policy</i> . The amended Policy was put on public exhibition from 16 December 2019 until 3 February 2020.
COMMENTS:	There were 11 submissions received while the Policy was on public exhibition, with only 2 objections to any of the proposed changes.
RECOMMENDATION:	That the updated <i>Traffic & Transport Policy</i> be adopted by Council.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update Council's *Traffic & Transport Policy*, which was last updated in 2015.

BACKGROUND

In March 2015, Council released its most recent update of its *Traffic & Transport Policy*. Regular updates to the policy are made approximately every 3 years in order to keep up with changes to practice, and any new strategies adopted by Council during that time.

An update of the policy was considered by the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee at its Meeting on 28 February 2019, with the following recommendations;

- A. Review the Traffic and Transport Policy acknowledging and referencing the Greater Sydney and Planning Commission District Plans, specifically the Active transport Plans.*
- B. Council to conduct an in depth community consultation regarding the Traffic and Transport Policy.*
- C. Council consult with local members regarding the Traffic and Transport Policy.*
- D. Council report back to the Traffic Committee once the review of the Traffic & Transport Policy is complete.*

These recommendations were adopted by Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 26 March 2019.

In July 2019 Council enlisted Traffic Consultants GTA to carry out an independent review of the Ku-ring-gai Traffic & Transport Policy. GTA recommended several changes to the Policy, with the major changes being;

- Council may consider the installation of speed cushions at certain locations
- Raised thresholds may be considered at intersections with streets with high pedestrian activity
- A new section has been added relating to Council's Draft Car Share Policy
- Recommending a requirement for provision of an on-site loading area for delivery vehicles in the access driveway of multi-unit dwellings with 12 or more units
- New developments with 4 or more dwellings which has its driveway on a road that carries over 2,000 vehicles per day should provide 'No Parking' restrictions for 6 metres on either side of the driveway

The Policy was also broken up into 2 separate documents. The first document is the Guidelines, which has all of the background information relating to the policy statements, as well as the policy statements for each section. The 2nd document is the Policy Statement, which only contains the policy statements for each section.

The amended Traffic & Transport Policy was considered by the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee at its Meeting on 21 November 2019, with the following recommendations;

That the updated Traffic & Transport Policy be put on Public Exhibition, with a final review of the policy to be considered by the Traffic Committee in early 2020.

On 16 December 2019 the updated *Traffic & Transport Policy* was put on public exhibition until 3 February 2020.

COMMENTS

During the public exhibition stage, there were 11 submissions regarding the *Traffic & Transport Policy*.

The following is a summary of the 11 submissions;

1. Supports the use of speed cushions, and specifically asks that they be installed on Stanley Street between Mona Vale Road and Horace Street.
2. Supports the use of speed cushions, provided they don't add to intrusive noise levels. Would like to see traffic calming on Rosedale Road. Would like to see paid parking implemented around Gordon Station.
3. Supports the proposals.
4. Highlighted the difficulty entering/exiting side streets off Ryde Road. The need for more 4P parking around Gordon station.
5. Concerned about phasing of traffic signals at Kissing Point Road and The Comenarra Parkway.
6. Wants to know why the Policy was split into 2 documents. Why don't streets in Ku-ring-gai meet eligibility criteria for resident parking permits? Concerned about non-local traffic parking near stations. Poor visibility due to overhanging vegetation & vehicles parked too close to corners. Traffic issues around schools at peak drop-off & pick-up times. Lack of pedestrian crossings on Pacific Highway between Livingstone Avenue & Park Avenue. Speed limits not being effectively policed.
7. Need for right turn arrows on Cowan Road at Mona Vale Road.
8. Need to urgently address road maintenance.
9. Supports No Parking within 6m of driveway to multi-dwelling unit complexes, & loading zones in unit complexes over a certain size. Would like to see full time Clearways on arterial roads.
10. Bus stop on Memorial Road restricts visibility when exiting Village Green Parade. A bus interchange is needed. Concerns about signals phasing when exiting Memorial Avenue at Mona Vale Road. Safety concerns at the intersection of Rosedale Road & Shinfield Avenue, which is used as a rat run.
11. Agree with the proposed changes to the Policy. Would suggest a reduction in the speed limit on Mona Vale Road to 50km/h through St Ives.

Only submission 6 raised any objections about the updated *Traffic & Transport Policy*, in particular about Council's position on resident permit parking schemes. Several of the submissions raised specific traffic issues that didn't relate to the Policy. There were no objections to the major changes being proposed in the Policy.

Item GB.1

S02527

Council also received a submission from the representative for the Member for Davidson, who is a voting member on the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee. He made the following 3 points;

- Car share providers should be charged for the use of parking spaces.
- The 6 metre 'No Parking' restrictions beside driveways to multi-unit complexes should be more flexible in order to minimise loss of on-street parking spaces. It should be noted that Council does on occasion reduce the 6 metres down to 5 or 5.5 metres, in instances where it will prevent the loss of a parking space on-street.
- Objected to the use of speed cushions and rumble bars.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no direct financial implications in adopting the proposed policy changes. The policy gives strategic direction to the organisation and the community in relation to traffic and transport issues.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

As noted previously in this report, the updated Traffic & Transport Policy was put on public exhibition from December 2019 until 3 February 2020.

SUMMARY

The updated Traffic & Transport Policy was put on public exhibition from 16 December 2019 until 3 February 2020. A total of 12 submissions were received, with only 2 submissions raising any objection to the changes being proposed in the updated Policy. Given the relative lack of opposition to the proposed changes to the *Traffic & Transport Policy*, it is recommended that it be considered for approval by Council.



RECOMMENDATION:

That the updated *Traffic & Transport Policy* be adopted by Council.

Michael Foskett
Team Leader Traffic

Deva Thevaraja
Manager Traffic & Transport

Attachments:

A1		Traffic and Transport Policy - Guidelines	2020/046006
A2		Traffic and Transport Policy - Statement	2020/046007

Ku-ring-gai Council

Draft

Traffic & Transport Guidelines

Version Number 2

Adopted: TBC

Effective: TBC



Traffic & Transport Guidelines

Table of Contents

Controlled Document Information	3
Authorisation Details	3
Related Document Information, Standards & References	3
Guidelines	5
Purpose and Objectives	5
Scope	5
Responsibilities	6
Guideline Statement	8
A. ROAD HIERARCHY	8
B. ROAD SAFETY (INFRASTRUCTURE)	8
C. DRIVER VISIBILITY	10
D. SPEED LIMITS	11
E. TRAFFIC CALMING	11
F. TRAFFIC FACILITIES (SIGNS AND LINES)	12
G. ON-STREET PARKING	14
H. COUNCIL CONTROLLED CAR PARKS	16
I. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES	17
J. CAR SHARE	18
K. PEDESTRIANS	19
L. SCHOOL SAFETY	20
M. ROAD SAFETY PROMOTION	22
N. PUBLIC TRANSPORT	22
O. HEAVY VEHICLES	23
P. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	24
Q. ROADSIDE FENCING	25
R. SPECIAL EVENTS / PLANNED DISRUPTIONS TO TRAFFIC	26
S. STATE ROADS AND OTHER STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	27
T. CYCLING	28
U. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	29
V. FUNDING	30
W. ROADSIDE MEMORIALS	32
Definitions	33

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Controlled Document Information

Authorisation Details

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.			
Controlled Document Number:	66	Record Number:	2015/187854
Controlled Document Type:	Guideline		
Controlled Document Name:	Traffic & Transport Guidelines		
Version Number:	2		
Department:	Operations		
Distribution:	Internal and External		
Review Period: Max < 4 years	3 years	Next Review Date:	TBC
Document Status:	Draft		
Approval Type:	Adopted by Council		
Version Start Date:	TBC	Version End Date:	TBC

Related Document Information, Standards & References

Related Legislation:	Local Government Act 1993 Roads Act 1993 Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 Heavy Vehicle National Law (HVNL) 2014 Disability Discrimination Act 1992	Section 88 of Roads Act 1993 Development Proposals Heavy Vehicles Public Transport
Related Policies (Council & Internal)	Ku-ring-gai LEP (Local Centres) 2012 Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 Council's Car Parking Code Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (DCP) 2016 Traffic & Transport Policy Ku-ring-gai Traffic & Transport Policy Statement	On-street parking Resident Parking Schemes Development Proposals
Related Documents - Procedures, Guidelines, Forms, WHS Modules/PCD's, Risk Assessments, Work Method Statements, etc	RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002 RMS Permit Parking Guidelines A Guide to the delegation to Councils for the regulation of traffic RMS Guide to Traffic and Transport Management for Special Events	RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002 Table 5.1 Resident Parking Schemes State Roads and other State Responsibilities Special Events
Other References	Future Transport 2056 Greater Sydney Region Plan, A Metropolis of Three Cities	

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Version History

Version Number	Version Start Date	Version End Date	Author	Details and Comments
1	October 2002	TBC	George Koolik	
2	September 2019	TBC	Anthony Leung, GTA Consultants	Review and update of Guidelines.
3	October 2019	TBC	Deva Thevaraja	Review and update of Guidelines.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Guidelines

Purpose and Objectives

The Ku-ring-gai local government area is located in Sydney's northern suburbs – about 16 kilometres from Sydney's GPO. It extends from the M1 Pacific Motorway in Wahroonga to Boundary Street, Roseville and has an estimated resident population of approximately 126,000 (2018).

Traffic and transport are areas of interest and concern to most residents of Ku-ring-gai. It impacts on many activities each of us are involved in almost daily.

Seeking solutions to traffic and transport issues by developing a strategic framework has been an identified objective of Council. Whilst traffic and transport problems in Ku-ring-gai cannot be solved by Council alone, a whole-of-Council approach to the issues concerned, could result in improvements for this community. Traffic and transport issues form an important part of Council's Delivery Program and Operational Plan.

Scope

Intrusion of through traffic into residential streets, is perhaps the cause of most concerns, and occurs when the number of vehicles on the arterial road system is so great, that delays occur. The problem is clearly worst during weekday, commuter peak periods.

If more commuters and school children used public transport, walked, cycled or pooled vehicles, the numbers of cars on our roads and therefore traffic delays, could be expected to decrease. It must be said, that there is some debate as to whether providing more capacity on motorways and main roads solves traffic congestion in the long term.

Increasing urban developments and residential densities result in increasing traffic generation and volumes. This is because there are more people to drive (through Ku-ring-gai and other Council areas) to get to work and to carry out their activities, even though increasingly, people are walking and cycling.

The M1 Pacific Motorway for example, currently terminates at the northern extremity of Ku-ring-gai. This motorway carries traffic volumes of 88,955 vehicles per day (2019) and this traffic currently has no option, but to use either Pacific Highway which takes them into Ku-ring-gai, or Pennant Hills Road to travel westerly. The NorthConnex Motorway is a tunnel that will provide a connection between the M1 and M2 Motorways. Tunnelling works were completed in late 2018, and the NorthConnex is due to open to traffic in 2020. The NorthConnex will be able to divert some of this traffic away from the Pacific Highway through Ku-ring-gai as it allows motorists to avoid up to 40 traffic lights on the Pacific Highway. However, NorthConnex's indirectness from Wahroonga to the Sydney CBD via the M2 motorway means that traffic diversion benefits will be limited and Ku-Ring-Gai will continue to see high traffic volumes along the Pacific Highway.

Motorway traffic, together with additional non-motorway traffic which also uses Pacific Highway, results in motorists using alternative routes. The diverting traffic might use roads which pass through otherwise quiet residential streets, past shops, parks and schools. Many drivers are prepared to drive longer distances, as long as they perceive that their travelling times will be reduced. It is often these drivers, some travelling at excessive speeds, who are of concern to residents and other road users.

Not all short-cutting or "rat-running" drivers are from outside Ku-ring-gai. Although the numbers or percentages of through vehicles vary on different streets, many through drivers would be residents of Ku-ring-gai.

Through traffic is of concern to residents and other local road users, including motorists, pedestrians and cyclists because of the loss of amenity and road safety concerns on local roads. This loss of amenity and road safety concerns results from increased noise levels generated by the traffic, excessive traffic speeds or, in other cases, delays and congestion because of the volumes and also difficulties in exiting driveways and for pedestrians crossing roads.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

This loss of amenity to residents and road safety concerns results in some residents requesting intervention by the use of traffic calming treatments. Such treatments can range from:

- various signs and lines on the road,
- 'rumble bar medians' at intersections and on curves to encourage appropriate and slower turning movements,
- treatments which deflect vehicles, such as roundabouts,
- turn or one-way restrictions,
- road closures.

Council has used a range of traffic calming treatments to address known safety issues to reduce the impact of through traffic, and to reduce the attraction of otherwise quiet residential streets to through motorists. A ranking system, using transparent criteria, to score traffic management projects allows projects to be prioritised. This ranking system is intended to eliminate the provision of facilities at locations of lower needs.

Increasing the capacities of main roads or motorways may have environmental and community impacts, but would reduce through traffic on local parallel routes, particularly in the short to medium term. Currently the RMS is proposing to improve capacity of the Pacific Highway and Mona Vale Road through its Pinch Points and Clearways Programs.

The Town Centres Parking Management Plan provides guidance on the future parking provision and management around the six town centres of Ku-ring-gai. Other policies recently adopted by Council include Council's Integrated Transport Strategy and the Ku-ring-gai Bike Plan. Council has a Traffic and Transport 10 Year Plan which prioritises traffic management projects, based on set criteria.

The NSW Government has recently released details of its long-term transport strategy in the *Future Transport 2056* Plan which will have impacts on Ku-ring-gai. In particular, its movement and Place Framework aims to allocate road space in a way that balances the liveability of places and the movement of people, vehicles and goods. The framework will seek to distinguish roads that are intended as movement corridors between streets that are for local community access and places for people. The Framework is expected to be further developed into guidelines and toolkits for implementation and will be of significance to existing movement corridors in Ku-ring-gai such as the Pacific Highway.

Future Transport 2056 also recognises the Greater Sydney Commission's Greater Sydney Region Plan, *A Metropolis of Three Cities*, which is centred on a vision of three cities where most residents live within 30 minutes of their jobs, education and health facilities, services and places. Ku-ring-gai is located within the Eastern Harbour City under this plan. The plan recognises nearby suburbs outside the local government area such as Macquarie Park and Chatswood as major jobs growth centres within an 'Eastern Economic Corridor' stretching to the Sydney CBD and Randwick. While Ku-ring-gai sits outside of this corridor, existing movement corridors through Ku-ring-gai such as the Pacific Highway and the T1 train line are recognised as a 'strategic road corridor' and a 'city shaping corridor' under *Future Transport 2056* respectively that transport people and goods towards the 'Eastern Economic Corridor'.

Furthermore, *Future Transport 2056* also recognises infrastructure upgrades to address capacity issues on the Pacific Highway as a 'visionary initiative' for investigation in the 20+ year timeframe.

Responsibilities

This document is linked to Council's Delivery Program and Operational Plan and is therefore integrated to other areas of Council's activities which seek to improve transport options and safety of residents. Other Council and State documents which relate to this document include: Traffic and Transport 10 Year Plan, Council's Integrated Transport Strategy, Car Parks Plan of Management, Ku-ring-gai Bike Plan, and Council's other policies (refer to Council's website). State documents include the Future Transport Strategy 2056, *A Metropolis of Three Cities* and the Infrastructure NSW/State Infrastructure Strategy. Council's policy also has to be consistent with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and other guidelines/standards as well as with what is considered to be 'good practice' in other parts of Sydney. In that sense, this document should be considered to be a flexible, living document, to be further amended to reflect future Council decisions and changing community expectations.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

According to the RMS document "Delegation to Councils for the Regulation of Traffic";

Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) is legislated as the organisation responsible for the control of traffic on all roads in NSW. Traffic is controlled by the installation of prescribed traffic control devices, such as regulatory signs, or traffic control facilities, such as medians.

The RMS has delegated certain aspects of the control of traffic on regional and local roads to the Councils of Local Government areas.

It should be acknowledged, that a solution for one individual, may not be a solution, and could create a problem, for another. It often depends on the perspective of the individuals concerned; whether they are residents of a particular street, pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, motorists or a combination of the above.

Council's obligations to its own residents may be considered to be higher than its obligations to meeting the needs of road users from outside the area. An underlying consideration in the decision making process, however, should be the safety of all road users.

Design guidelines, such as those developed by RMS, Austroads and Australian Standards should be used to guide Council in undertaking new work.

Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census of Population and Housing 2011 and 2016 indicates lower percentages in Ku-ring-gai (than for NSW) for residents in the 0-4 and 18-34 age groups, and higher percentages in the 5-17 and over 35 age groups. Census data also indicates that Ku-ring-gai households have higher vehicle ownership rates than average for New South Wales.

The Local Government Act, 1993 requires Council to apply principles of ecologically sustainable development to its activities, including:

- precautionary principle – relates to facilitating safety around sustainable transport options as a priority, including cycling and pedestrian infrastructure availability and design
- inter-generational equity – transport options need to be accessible, that is public transport needs to facilitate movement for a cross section of age groups
- Intra-generational equity – Ku-ring-gai residents have their quality of life degraded (noise, air, water pollution and safety issues) by regional traffic avoiding congested arterial roads. Measures need to be implemented by all levels of government to encourage commuters to remain on arterial roads or use alternative means of transport
- bio-diversity conservation – wildlife killed on local roads is of concern (refer to *Section 4.F*)
- true evaluation and pricing of environmental goods and services – requires that developments and activities, such as vehicle use, adopt a user pay approach for damage incurred by their activities

Guideline Statement

A. ROAD HIERARCHY

A road hierarchy classifies roads by usage. A hierarchy classification assists in planning for the future by clearly showing appropriate through routes and those roads for which some protection from traffic intrusion could be appropriate.

Classification can be based on road function, environmental capacity or funding considerations.

Ku-ring-gai has had a functional road hierarchy classification since 1983. This hierarchy is based on traffic use (road function).

State (arterial) roads are major inter-regional links, regional (sub-arterial) roads are secondary inter-regional links and collector roads are links between local roads. In Ku-ring-gai, all roads provide access to individual properties.

As a guide, regional roads in Ku-ring-gai have daily volumes of up to 25,000, collector roads up to 10,000 and local roads approximately 5,000 vehicles.

There are several collector roads or routes which could be considered to be approaching regional road in function. These include Rosedale Road, Park Avenue, Werona Avenue, Lindfield Avenue, Strickland Avenue, Pentecost Avenue, Boomerang Street, Clanville Road, Hill Street, Fiddens Wharf Road and Telegraph Road.

Residents should be aware of the classification of their road and the function that their road is expected to play.

Environmental classifications are based on environmental standards. Under this classification, used largely when considering new developments, resident amenity is considered. The traffic impacts of new developments are considered at the application stage (refer to Section P).

Guideline

Plan and implement Council's Traffic & Transport infrastructure in accordance with the road hierarchy classification.

B. ROAD SAFETY (INFRASTRUCTURE)

Ku-ring-gai is an established urban area, with a road network which has operated satisfactorily for many years. Although minor changes are considered and approved as necessary the road network is generally appropriate and safe. Unsafe roads are demonstrated by adverse crash data or road safety audits.

A scoring system for prioritising traffic management related projects is used by Council (refer to Section V). This systematic approach results in consistency in allocating funds/ resources and dealing with resident concerns.

When planning road safety infrastructure the needs of all users, including pedestrians and cyclists, should be considered. A whole-of-Council approach should be taken to road safety. Council, however, has no direct control over road user behaviour (refer to Section M).

Safety can be considered by reviewing the facilities on or adjacent to the road surface. Facilities, including islands, various roadside barriers, fencing, furniture, pavement markings or signs should be appropriately maintained in good condition and be visible. They should not be obstructed by vegetation and preferably be well lit. Visibility can be enhanced by painting structures on the road, although painting requires regular maintenance.

Relevant authorities should be encouraged to relocate or remove kerbside poles as opportunities arise.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

RMS and other relevant organisations have developed standards and guidelines which assist in designing and proposing appropriate treatments (refer to Section 4.E). Standards and guidelines should be generally adhered to, to maintain consistency in the use of treatments and therefore, to have recognisable and safer conditions on urban roads.

To assist staff investigating safety issues, traffic speed and volume data can be obtained using physical equipment left on-site. 'Recorded' crash data supplied by RMS, is useful in considering what collisions have been reported. This data includes information on collisions involving fatalities, injuries or vehicles having to be towed away. Information about the characteristics of crashes, time of day, weather conditions and other relevant data provided can be used to consider whether particular crash patterns are evident. This data is useful to compare locations and variations at specific locations over time.

Minor (self-reported) accidents are not included in Council's crash database. There will therefore be crashes that residents are aware of that have not been formally recorded.

Road geometry is an important factor when considering the provision of facilities.

Refer to Section Q for a discussion on roadside fences and guardrails.

Council does not object to not-for-profit community groups marking property numbers on kerbs for residents.

Guideline

- i. That all roads are considered to be safe adverse crash data or road safety audits can prove otherwise.
- ii. That balanced risk benefits that reflect current practices and the community's values and expectations, be considered when investigating or recommending new facilities.
- iii. That road safety factors including:
 - a) the appropriateness of facilities (based on relevant guidelines or good practice principles),
 - b) condition of the existing road/facilities,
 - c) driver visibility,
 - d) lighting levels/ location of poles,
 - e) traffic speed and volume count data,
 - f) Council's criteria for ranking traffic management projects,
 - g) recorded crash history,
 - h) road geometry/ topography, and
 - i) previous Council resolutionsbe considered when investigating traffic issues.
- iv. That adequate funding be provided in Council's budgets to allow:
 - a) necessary tree trimming around traffic facilities, public lighting and at intersections to ensure adequate visibility for all road users,
 - b) the approach faces of traffic islands to be marked/painted to improve their visibility to drivers,
 - c) installation and maintenance of approved minor traffic facilities that do not receive funding from the Roads and Maritime Services,
 - d) maintenance of existing street name and directional signs,
 - e) adequate/ appropriate levels of public lighting be provided on roads.
- v. That the Director Operations have delegated authority to approve roadside furniture, including seats and bins on footpath areas.
- vi. That as opportunities arise, relevant authorities be encouraged to remove or relocate poles closer to property boundaries.
- vii. That Council continue to work with Local Area Commands for higher levels of traffic law enforcement within Ku-ring-gai.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

C. DRIVER VISIBILITY

Safe road conditions rely on road users having adequate visibility. Obstructions to visibility can create hazards for pedestrians and other road users as well as to drivers.

Topography and existing road geometry do not always allow adequate vehicle stopping distances. Appropriate warning signs should be provided when sight distances are inadequate. In the longer term, roadworks or other actions may be required to improve visibility.

An impact of Ku-ring-gai's green environment is that trees and other roadside vegetation can reduce driver visibility at critical locations, including intersections. Although trees are desirable, it is considered that road safety considerations should be paramount as far as planting, trimming or, if necessary, removing some trees. Significant resources are currently required to trim trees at intersections and where signs are obstructed. Trees can also restrict visibility when exiting driveways.

The Roads Act 1993 (S 88) allows a road authority to remove any tree for the purpose of removing a traffic hazard. Removing a hazard is considered to be adequate reason to trim, or if necessary, to remove a tree or trees, notwithstanding Council's Urban Forest Policy.

Roadside landscaping including the landscaping of roundabouts, should not result in obstructions which could impact on road safety. It is suggested that roundabout planting be groundcover type, but if alternative planting is used, it is restricted to 0.9 m in height above the road pavement. Plantings should be frangible and of a height and density that vehicles' indicators can be seen.

Public lighting, including street lighting is provided to assist motorists and pedestrians and to provide general security.

One area of concern for many residents is visibility when they are exiting their driveways due to on-street parked vehicles. This is particularly the case with low level driveways where properties are below street level and when larger vehicles obstruct visibility.

Council does not signpost individual residential driveways with *No Parking* or *No Stopping* restrictions, nor does it paint lines on the pavement at driveways. However, Council accepts that some residents may like to mark such lines to discourage vehicles from parking too close to their driveways. Such lines encourage motorists to be considerate, but have no legal standing.

Council has received requests for convex mirrors on roads where visibility is limited, often opposite driveways. Convex mirrors distort images and are unsafe in high speed locations.

Guideline

- i. That roadside landscaping does not obstruct the visibility of road users at intersections, driveways or pedestrian crossings.
- ii. That roundabout planting be limited to ground cover and not have dense growth which exceeds 0.9 m in height above the road pavement and ensure vehicle indicators are visible. Single trunked trees of suitable frangible species, may be used in non-mountable roundabout areas.
- iii. That public lighting be provided to the approved standard.
- iv. That appropriate levels of lighting be provided over traffic calming or other devices that could constitute a hazard to motorists.
- v. That appropriate levels of lighting be provided over pedestrian crossings for traffic and pedestrian safety.
- vi. That Council not provide painted lines on road pavements at driveways nor maintain existing lines, but accept that some residents will mark such lines in accordance with a standard design.
- vii. That convex mirrors not be used on roads with measured or estimated traffic speeds of 50 km/hr or greater. Other requests to be referred to the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee for consideration and recommendation

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

D. SPEED LIMITS

A number of differing speed limits apply within Ku-ring-gai. Road classification, adjacent land use and road geometry (safety) are considerations in setting speed limits. Speed limits are set by RMS.

State and many regional roads other than near schools, are restricted to speeds of not less than 60 km/hr. Higher speeds are permitted where lanes are wider and the road geometry is conducive to higher speeds.

A general urban speed limit of 50 km/hr applies throughout NSW, unless signposted otherwise.

A 40 km/hr speed limit applies in school zones, during peak school times. School zones are clearly defined with signs and yellow 40 markings on the road pavement.

A 40 km/hr speed limit also applies at any bus stop when school children alight from buses. Flashing lights at the rear of buses inform motorists of their obligation to slow down.

A 10 km/hr speed limit may be imposed by RMS, where there are high pedestrian concentrations and the road environment has been altered to encourage slow traffic speeds. These areas are called 'Shared Zones'.

Speed limits are enforceable only by the NSW Police Force. The level of enforcement may not be sufficient to meet the expectation of the community. Council staff receive frequent complaints regarding excessive vehicle speeds. The management of speed cameras is not a responsibility of Council.

Guideline

- i. That Council continues to explore methods of encouraging improved traffic rule compliance.

E. TRAFFIC CALMING

Intrusion of through traffic into local roads and high traffic speeds result in loss of amenity for residents. Although motorists may consider that they should have rights to travel uninhibited on any road, residents object to high traffic speeds and the impact of through traffic because of increased levels of noise, congestion, loss of access to their properties and impacts on safety.

Council provides traffic management treatments, generally consisting of rumble bars at intersections and raised devices, although chicanes and narrowed traffic lanes have also been used. Rumble bar medians at intersections encourage appropriate turn movements. Council would also consider the installation of speed cushions at the approaches to intersections, including roundabouts to slow traffic. They may also be considered at mid-block locations where there are no adjacent residential properties. Raised thresholds would also be considered at intersections with streets with high pedestrian activity to improve safety and amenity for pedestrians. The use of rumble bars at intersections may be in future replaced with median islands as they can potentially cause damage to vehicles and in certain instances could be hazardous to motorcyclists.

Rather than provide an area wide treatment, Council now uses criteria to allocate scores for individual locations and funding for its traffic management works.

Treatment selection is based on factors such as:

- road geometry, such as road widths and visibility,
- traffic volumes and speed,
- pedestrian and cycling volumes,
- crash history,
- costs and available funding levels, and
- resident feedback

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Traffic management treatments are not undertaken without consultation with residents who would be directly affected and other affected bodies, including emergency services and bus operators. Action is not normally taken without overall resident support, as gauged by resident responses to advertising. A basis for treatment has generally been a desire that treatments do not result in traffic diverting into adjacent or parallel streets/ routes. Council has therefore generally not closed roads to traffic.

Council receives requests from new residents to the area to alter current traffic conditions that have previously been installed in response to a traffic matter. Ongoing investigations and correspondence has significant implications on staff resources. The resident should be advised that of the history and Councils current position on the matter. Council would not undertake any further action if not required.

Narrow road pavement widths would result in slower traffic speeds. Their use is likely to result in resident objection, particularly if on-street parking is lost. Future likely community and traffic requirements should be considered when investigating narrowing road pavements.

Raised wombat crossings are encouraged near schools and these involve pedestrian crossings on raised platforms at schools to encourage slower traffic speeds and to make it safer for children to cross the street.

Guideline

- i. Traffic calming treatments consisting of linemarking, signs, rumble bars, at-grade narrowings, median or blister islands, roundabouts, wombat crossings near schools, raised thresholds or speed cushions are available for use depending on local traffic factors, resident feedback, cost and available funding.
- ii. That speed cushions be considered at approaches to intersections including roundabouts to reduce speeds and mid-block locations where there are no adjacent residential properties.
- iii. That narrowed pavement widths be used in local and minor collector roads with daily volumes of up to 3,000 vehicles, subject to adequate parking being provided and residents agreeing to the proposal.
- iv. That design of traffic management devices should consider safety of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists and be consistent with relevant guidelines.
- v. That residents who have recently moved into an area and are persistent in demanding altered traffic facilities, and whose requests have been investigated and requested facilities are not highly ranked, be invited to show the need for requested changes in traffic facilities, by demonstrating how traffic or parking conditions have altered since they moved into the area. In cases where traffic facilities are not considered to have substantially altered, the rank is not high and safety concerns have not been confirmed, further follow-up investigations, requiring additional Council resources, not be undertaken.

F. TRAFFIC FACILITIES (SIGNS AND LINES)

Signs unique to Ku-ring-gai (such as street name, signs to local destinations and suburb signs) are wholly the responsibility of Council. Councils will have a standard design for their unique signs. Council's street name signs have black lettering on a reflective white background. Commencing in 2019, Council will be gradually replacing the existing street name and community signs.

Signs and pavement markings such as Stop/Give Way at intersections, various parking signs and lines which are not unique to Ku-ring-gai, are approved by Council, subject to the approval of the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee (refer to Section S). Their use should be consistent with practice in other areas. RMS issues guidelines and technical directions to encourage consistency between local government areas.

For environmental reasons, the use of new signs is carefully considered. Generally statutory restrictions and warning signs are not signposted. For example, repeater speed limit signs and the 10m restriction

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

on parking from intersections are not normally signposted. Similarly, driveways to individual properties are not signposted and 'Driveways Ahead' signs are not usually used.

In some specific situations, Council may permit the installation of *No Parking* restrictions at driveways to multi-residential developments of at least four apartments on busy roads with traffic volumes of at least 2,000 vehicles per day. Individual requests, which must be endorsed by the Body Corporate, are considered on their merits. Council's fees and charges for referral to the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee and installation of signs, apply. Restrictions may apply for up to six metres in length.

There is a concern that too many directional signs at intersections may constitute a traffic safety hazard. Directional signs to local commercial facilities, including preschools, retirement villages and sporting venues can be perceived to be a form of advertising. Most clients would be aware of their destinations or can use applications to find their way. Directional signs are therefore used sparingly and mainly for significant public facilities.

Directional signs to suburbs and other important community destinations (e.g. Sydney Adventist Hospital and Bicentennial Park), located on Council controlled roads are Council's responsibility.

'Wildlife' signs are used on high speed rural roads to warn motorists of hazards from large animals (including kangaroos). It is considered to be inappropriate for environmental and safety reasons to use 'Wildlife' signs to warn motorists on lower speed urban roads. These signs would be difficult to see at night and their proliferation in Ku-ring-gai would reduce the impact of regulatory and warning signs. Their effectiveness has not been demonstrated. RMS advice is that to protect animals from becoming roadkill, they would need to be removed from the road environment.

Guideline

- i. That statutory restrictions and warning signs not be used unless a particular safety case can be demonstrated to the Director Operations, such as hazardous and unique road geometry.
- ii. That statutory restrictions such as 'No Stopping' signs within 10 m of intersections, new 50 km/hr speed limit signs and 'No Parking' across driveways to individual properties not be signposted.
- iii. That *No Parking* restrictions at individual driveways extending up to six metres in length, particularly on the approach side, may be approved, subject to the following strict criteria:
 1. Multi-residential developments of at least four apartments,
 2. Developments with their driveways being on roads with daily traffic volumes of at least 2,000 vehicles per day, and
 3. Individual requests from the public being considered on their merit but requiring Body Corporate endorsement.
- iv. That new directional signs to local commercial facilities not be installed.
- v. That signs to significant public facilities with genuine wide public use be permitted. Funding for these signs would be at the expense of the applicant.
- vi. That directional signs for significant Council operated facilities be installed by Council at Council's expense.
- vii. That 'Wildlife' type signs not be used in Ku-ring-gai.

G. ON-STREET PARKING

Most residents, shoppers, local employees and commuters expect to find convenient on-street parking.

Residents generally expect to find parking close to or in front of their homes. However residents of major and narrow roads and those close to shops/stations or of higher density development areas usually accept that convenient on-street parking is not necessarily available to them. Higher density development areas which have had to comply with relevant plans, such as the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan (Local Centres) 2012 or Council's Car Parking Code, are assumed to adequately provide for their residents (refer to *Sections I and P*). Residents should therefore not expect that they will necessarily be able to find parking on-street immediately outside or even near their property.

Shoppers will take their business elsewhere if convenient parking is not available to them. In many shopping centres, Council provides free, but time restricted, off-street parking for a significant numbers of vehicles (refer to *Section 4.H*).

Commuters and business owners/employees in some centres, who choose to drive, generally accept that they may have to walk further distances to their transport connections, than shoppers. Local employees should not expect that Council will provide them with day parking concessions (permits).

Areas close to public transport nodes and shopping centres have greater competition for parking spaces between residents, commuters, employees/business operators who do not provide sufficient on-site parking for their own and their customer's needs. Generally, short-term parking restrictions are provided closer to shops and train stations with restrictions of longer duration further away. Residents, commuters and visitors compete for parking beyond these restricted areas, potentially resulting in shortages of on-street parking availability.

There is some community debate as to whether convenient on-street parking should be made available to commuters because of the impact of this parking on residents and their visitors. This impact can include inconvenience and congestion.

There is a view that reducing parking provision would result in a reduction in the reliance on vehicles and an increase in the use of public transport. A number of State and Council policies seek to reduce car reliance (refer to *Section P*). *Future Transport 2056* and *A Metropolis of Three Cities* states that it seeks to deliver integrated and connected centres where residents are within 30 minutes' travel of their jobs and key destinations and services.

The Ku-ring-gai Town Centres Parking Management Plan considers strategies in each of the six town centres. The Plan focuses on land uses, short and long term parking as well as parking for other modes of transport. This plan is supplemented by Ku-ring-gai Parking Management Strategy (incorporated Paid Parking) that addresses the locations at which, and the conditions under which paid parking may be appropriate to encourage visitor parking turnover and improve parking availability.

Parking restrictions are required on some narrow roads with moderate traffic volumes. Typically, roads narrower than 10 metres allow parking only on one side, although individual locations need to be considered separately. Topography and traffic volumes will influence when parking will need to be restricted.

Council's Regulatory Services has the authority to enforce on-street parking restrictions, by issuing infringement notices. Effective enforcement options are available and are being implemented.

Some inner metropolitan areas provide resident parking schemes for residents (refer to *Section 4.I*) and in some areas, are conducive to the operation of car share schemes. The street parking schemes have parking restrictions of 2-hour duration but exempt residents. There are advantages and disadvantages with such schemes.

Car share schemes in areas of higher density, possibly involving a number of sites, could be operated from dedicated on-site car share parking or kerbside space currently occupied by general parking spaces (refer to *Section 4.J*).

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

On-street 'Disabled' parking spaces are not normally provided for safety reasons and because those spaces would be unoccupied much of the time. Motorists with permits under the Mobility Parking Scheme can usually park for longer periods than shown on the applicable restrictions.

Requests are received for exemptions from timed parking restrictions by various operators. Non-commercial community services, such as health vans, are given exemptions at the discretion of the Director Operations.

Some metropolitan locations with high demands for on-street parking such as busy shopping centres, have pay-parking arrangements. Whilst no such scheme operates in Ku-ring-gai at present (other than the off-street Culworth Avenue car park, in Killara), the use of paid parking could be considered under Ku-ring-gai Parking Management Strategy.

Paid parking will result in parking spaces being available because of higher turnover of spaces in areas of consistent high demand for public parking and would encourage shoppers to access such areas because of the increased parking convenience. Paid parking would also have the added benefit of assisting in meeting the costs of providing and maintaining parking and transport related infrastructure, but this should not be the primary reason for implementing paid parking.

Council's practice is that parking restriction signs are not installed across driveways to individual properties. This practice may be contended by some residents, but it is consistent with the practice of RMS and other local governments. *Section 4.C* refers to lines on road pavements at driveways and *Section 4.F* to signs.

RMS has advised Council that they are reviewing road network efficiencies and has implemented clearways along sections of Pacific Highway and Mona Vale Road. RMS requests Council's Town Centre Parking Management Plan to remove all parking on State roads.

Guideline

- i. That Council continues to provide on-street parking for residents, shoppers and commuters where conditions permit, but notes that increasing competition for road space will continue to result in decreasing opportunities to park on-street at some locations. This will require Council's management of on-street parking through a mixture of time restrictions and paid parking schemes.
- ii. That high density developments which include on-site parking for their residents, in accordance with Council's plans and codes, are assumed to provide adequate onsite residential parking.
- iii. That the Director Operations be delegated powers to exempt non-commercial, community service vehicles to exceed parking restrictions when offering services to the community.
- iv. That authorised staff continue to enforce on-street parking restrictions by issuing infringement notices as appropriate.

H. COUNCIL CONTROLLED CAR PARKS

Council controls over 50 off-street car parks across the LGA. Most are at shopping centres, or near train stations. Most car parks located at shopping centres are intended to be used by shoppers/customers, rather than by commuters or employees. All, except for one (at Culworth Avenue, Killara) are free, although time restrictions apply to many.

Car parks at shopping centres generally have time restrictions imposed. The most common time restriction is 2 hours. This is considered to be adequate for most shoppers, whilst being short enough to discourage parkers who have business in the city or other remote locations. Changes to the 2-hour restrictions have been made at the request of some local business communities.

To discourage misuse of car parks, one condition of use can be that vehicles can only park in one area for one period per day. This would prevent local business people and employees using car parks at the expense of customers. Improved enforcement technologies would also assist in improving vehicle turnover.

Providing car parking and managing the parking in a manner that increases vehicle turnover encourages patronage of local businesses.

Current mobility parking scheme permits, issued by RMS, enable a vehicle displaying the permit to park for a longer time than allowed by the signposting.

Council endeavours to provide a minimum of one dedicated disabled space in its car parks in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards.

Commuter car parks are provided for all day parking. Most are on railway property and encourage commuter use.

Car parks should be adequately lit to improve security. Where appropriate, secure bicycle parking should be provided in accordance with Austroads guidelines.

The use of car parks is controlled by Council's Regulatory Services by issuing infringement notices for use in contravention to signposted conditions, including overstaying, and not parking within one parking space.

Congestion and parking problems can exist on streets adjacent to sporting fields. Council accepts that these facilities may not have ample parking to cater for all users.

Council will be carrying out a safety review of its parking at small shopping centres where cars park at 90 degrees to the adjacent footpath in front of the shops. Concerns have been raised about cars mounting the footpath and hitting pedestrians.

Guideline

- i. That it is accepted that car parks are provided for shoppers/customers (rather than for commuters or local employees) and that therefore, the usual time restriction imposed in a shopping centre car park is 2 hours in duration. Any alterations to this limit are determined in consultation with the local business communities.
- ii. That Council car parks provide disabled parking in accordance with the current Local Environmental Plan/ Council's Car Parking Code.
- iii. That the General Manager delegates to Council's Director of Operations for approving disabled parking spaces within Council controlled car parks, in accordance with the provisions of Australian Standards and to approve other layout alterations.
- iv. That, where appropriate, adequate lighting be provided in car parks to improve the safety of users.
- v. That, where appropriate, secure bicycle parking be provided in or at car parks.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

- vi. That Council continue to recognise permits under the Mobility Parking Scheme and relax parking restrictions in its car parks for holders.
- vii. That authorised staff continue to enforce conditions applicable to Council-controlled car parks.
- viii. That users of Council's facilities satisfy Council before new leases are entered into, that the facility sought will adequately accommodate the traffic and parking needs of the user organisation.
- ix. That Council consider the introduction of paid parking in local centre car parks so as to encourage a higher turnover in available parking spaces, with funds raised to be used for maintenance and improvement of parking and transport related infrastructure.
- x. That Council carry out a safety review of 90 degree angle parking adjacent to footpaths in its car parks.

I. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES

Council is requested from time to time to introduce resident parking schemes on local roads, particularly near rail stations.

Resident parking schemes are a form of permit parking used by some inner metropolitan Councils with older dense development, including North Sydney, City of Sydney, Inner West and Woollahra. On-street parking can be in high demand and properties are too small to accommodate vehicles on-site. In such areas, residents do not have access to any off-street parking.

It is important to note that the schemes in these Council areas have been implemented in accordance with the RMS Permit Parking guidelines.

RMS guidelines for resident parking schemes allow for a maximum of two resident parking permits per household reducing by one permit for each available off-street parking space. Most single dwelling properties in Ku-ring-gai have sufficient space on-site to provide for parking for more than one vehicle.

Multi-unit developments developed in or after 2012 including residential developments, must comply with the requirements of the Ku-ring-gai LEP (Local Centres) 2012 or Council's *Car Parking Code* to provide for on-site resident and visitor parking requirements. These developments are assumed by Council to provide adequately for the needs of their residents. Council is therefore not obliged to provide additional off-site parking for residents of those developments (refer to *Sections G and P*) and will not issue parking permits to such residents.

Residents have also requested the implementation of a preferential parking scheme, to enable Ku-ring-gai residents to park in commuter car parks or on-street near railway stations over other users.

It is unlikely that Transport for NSW would implement a Ku-ring-gai resident preferential parking scheme for its commuter car parks in Ku-ring-gai, although Transport for NSW is currently trialling Opal card access to car parks, to maximise the parking opportunities for people who drive to stations to make train trips.

Guideline

- i. An overwhelming majority of the streets within Ku-ring-gai Council that would not meet the current RMS' eligibility criteria for Resident Permit Parking Schemes.

J. CAR SHARE

Car share schemes are now established in the Sydney metropolitan area. Residents or businesses can join a privately operated car share scheme to use a car when they need one, without the cost and hassle of car ownership. Cars are parked in dedicated parking areas, either on-street or in public car parks and can be booked for periods as short as an hour or as long as a few days.

Car share schemes generally reduce car ownership, usage and can contribute to a reduction in the amount of parking required in new developments (hence improving affordability). The scheme results in lower car usage because participants generally use cars more efficiently by carefully planning trips and combining multiple trips and encourage the use of public transport or active transport. The availability of car share schemes can also allow households to defer the purchase of second or third cars. Some owners/renters of residential units choose not to own a car and do not want the cost of one or more car spaces included in their purchase or rental cost.

An added benefit of car share is it provides another transport option for the residents and workers it serves, which will broaden travel choice to complement existing travel options. It can fill a gap in the transport network which conventional public transport cannot fill (e.g. times of the day where public transport service may be of a lower quality such as the late hours), without the substantial cost to own a car. In this sense, car share is an equitable transport option because it provides people with relatively affordable access to the benefits of a car for trips where driving is necessary. Hence, on-site and on-street car share parking would contribute to a diverse range of transport modes more affordable and equitable to Ku-ring-gai's residents and workers.

Car share schemes generally require the support of local councils. Ku-ring-gai Council can support such a measure by working with car share providers to allocate car share spaces in key local centres and other strategic locations in kerbside space or in Council-managed car parks.

Guideline

- i. That Council actively works with car share providers to establish car share spaces in areas of high demand throughout the local government area such as near employment centres, medium to high density residential areas and train stations.
- ii. That Council reserves the right to charge for the establishment and on-going provision of on-street or off-street car share parking spaces.
- iii. That Council requires car share operators to regularly report back to Council on, but not limited to, the uptake, utilisation, and membership in each area that car share parking spaces are installed, including the travel and car ownership habits of the car share members
- iv. That Council prioritises car share organisations that use electric vehicles, provided their costs are not significantly more than standard car sharing schemes and they can provide the same level of coverage/capacity (e.g. provide a service that is just as attractive and convenient).
- v. Should a car share be an electric vehicle, then charging points should be provided and maintained by the car share provider. The car share provider will be required to cover the costs of electricity necessary to charge vehicles.

K. PEDESTRIANS

Pedestrians should have safe access on footpath areas where topography allows access. This access could be on paved or unpaved surfaces. Paved footpaths should be smooth and not have trip obstacles such as displaced concrete slabs, footpath landscaping or exposed tree roots. Footpaths also should have adequate clear head room for pedestrian safety and convenience. A maintained clearance height of 2.5 metres is desirable to allow joggers and pedestrians with umbrellas to pass without interference. Roadside furniture, such as seats and bins are provided for the convenience of pedestrians and other road users, but should be strategically located.

Road crossing opportunities at locations with a demonstrated need, such as schools, public transport nodes and shopping centres should be provided. RMS has developed guidelines for consistency across the State, in the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities.

In accordance with RMS guidelines zebra foot crossings require a minimum number of vehicles and pedestrians to ensure that crossings are not placed in inappropriate locations where motorists would not be expecting them. Similarly, marked foot crossings are not appropriate on major roads, where traffic speed (85th percentile) exceeds 75 km/hr, because pedestrians could be at increased risk. It is considered that marked foot crossings are not appropriate on Regional roads because of the heavy traffic volumes.

Facilitated pedestrian crossings should be provided where possible and necessary to create a safe pedestrian environment throughout Ku-ring-gai. At the same time, pedestrians, motorists and all other road users should be conscious of other road users when moving through any traffic environment, recognising the potential for conflicts around them.

The orange coloured flags associated with children's crossings should only be displayed when the crossings are in use so that their impact on motorists is not diminished. School Principals are encouraged to remove these flags when the crossings are not in use, such as in non-peak school times. Consideration could be given to Council staff removing flags left displayed outside of peak school times, and offending school/s being required to pay a fee for the return or replacement of flags.

RMS has developed guidelines to assist in the preparation of pedestrian access and mobility plans (PAMP). A PAMP is a comprehensive strategic and action plan to develop pedestrian policies and build pedestrian facilities. PAMPs aim to co-ordinate safe, convenient and connected pedestrian routes. PAMPs may attract 50% funding from RMS.

Council's Road Safety Program (refer to *Section 4.L*) includes educational programs to encourage safety around schools.

The Disability Discrimination Act makes it unlawful to discriminate against a person with a disability in the provision of access to public transport facilities. There is an obligation on Council to provide an increasing percentage of Council's bus stops and other transport facilities to be accessible (refer to *Section 4.M*).

Appropriate access should be provided for disabled pedestrians and their motorised mobility scooters.

Council has adopted Asset Management Policy and procedure for assessing footpath repair and maintenance work.

Guideline

- i. That Council adheres to Roads and Maritime Services guidelines, where these exist, regarding the provision of pedestrian facilities, which would result in crossings at locations which are safe, and where there is a demonstrated need.
- ii. That marked (zebra) foot crossings not be installed on Regional roads.
- iii. That pedestrian safety be accepted as an important consideration relating to footpath access.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

- iv. That footpath landscaping materials not be permitted to restrict effective footpath widths for pedestrians to less than 2.0 m.
- v. That Council encourages school Principals to remove children's crossing flags when these crossings are not in use.
- vi. That appropriate access for all, including disabled, be a priority for new and existing works.

L. SCHOOL SAFETY

Safety for school children and other road users near school environments is a significant issue because of the concentration and ages of those concerned. During school peak times when children are being dropped off or collected, there are large numbers of school-related vehicles, passing traffic and children, which can potentially conflict. At schools where on-site parking and/or set-down/pick-up facilities are not provided, parents and carers seek parking close to school access points, which is usually where the greatest concentration of children cross roads and access buses. School communities should be encouraged to use the road space near the schools during school peak times so that children are dropped off/picked up safely and efficiently. Some schools have a management strategy or practice to speed up the process, particularly when picking children up in the afternoon.

Council staff carry out a limited number of audits of on-street facilities near schools in consultation with schools concerned. Audits are intended to assist schools by maximising the use of available kerb side areas. One area of discussion and agreement is what action the schools concerned will take to manage school related parking to minimise impacts on their local communities.

Providing appropriate and safe facilities at schools for pedestrians, vehicles and buses is a priority. Some of the initiatives that have been undertaken at schools in consultation with school communities include the provision of:

- Children's crossings,
- Raised wombat crossings,
- Appropriate kerbside restrictions (*No Stopping/No Parking* etc),
- Bus zones close to school gates; and
- School zones (40 km/hr speed limit during peak school times).

RMS has installed flashing light technology and electronic alert systems at school zones, with at least one per school. RMS has installed 'dragon teeth' warning markings within school zones.

Development Applications are not required to be submitted, but are encouraged, for alterations or extensions to public schools. Development approvals by Council would allow Council, in the case of public schools, to request or require the provision of necessary on-site facilities. As a consequence, a number of public schools do not have adequate on-site set-down/pick-up facilities, particularly accessible facilities and staff/student parking. These schools, therefore, impose congestion and other safety hazards upon their students and the wider local community.

On 7 February 2000, Council resolved that all future development consents for schools include conditions requiring adequate parking and pick-up/set-down facilities be provided on-site.

On 1 April 2003, Council resolved that the Department of Education and Training be informed that Council expects that in future the Department/schools adequately provide on-site for all disabled needs of schools, including set-down/pick-up of children.

The increased use of public transport and active, including buses, walking and cycling, would reduce congestion at most schools. It is therefore considered that convenient and safe bus zones and footpaths should be provided at schools and that schools be encouraged to promote the use of public transport, walking or cycling as much as possible.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Council has a program of providing road safety educational material to schools (refer to *Section M*). These materials include leaflets, signs, banners and relevant data, which can be used in school newsletters or school websites. Close contact with school Principals has been developed to raise awareness of road safety issues at schools and to provide advice on such issues.

Guideline

- i. That Council support, provide or seek funding, as opportunities arise, for safe and appropriate facilities at schools, including raised wombat crossings.
- ii. That school communities be encouraged to increase their use of public transport, walking and cycling. Schools are also encouraged to use the road space near schools, particularly during peak school times, so that children are dropped off/picked up safely and without inconveniencing others.
- iii. That schools be encouraged to develop plans to better manage student/ staff parking, and on-street pick-up and set-down at schools.
- iv. That requests for peak school period on-street restrictions to assist schools with set-down/pick-up activities at schools, be considered as short term measures only. Preferably the installation of those signs should be funded by the schools concerned.
- v. That inadequate or unsafe set-down/pick-up or parking facilities on-street near public schools, which come to Council's attention, be referred to the Department of Education or other appropriate body, particularly in the case of non-government schools, requesting that, in those cases, they provide the necessary facilities on-site, rather than imposing safety hazards on school children and the local community.
- vi. That the NSW Police Force be requested to enforce 40 km/hr school zones and other traffic offences, during school peak periods.
- vii. That safety in school zones continues to be enforced by appropriate Council staff.
- viii. That all future Development Consents for schools in Ku-ring-gai include conditions requiring on-site parking and pick-up/set-down facilities.

M. ROAD SAFETY PROMOTION

Council provides a road safety educational program to the community which promotes and endeavours to raise the community's awareness of road safety issues. This program promotes, at the local level, RMS' wider educational and media initiatives.

Under Council's program operated through an annual Road Safety Action Plan, vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, motorists, cyclists and school children are targeted. Behavioural programs and educational materials are developed and delivered to raise awareness of relevant road safety issues and to encourage safe behaviour. This is undertaken in a positive way to develop and maintain interest in this issue. This program has received considerable interest from school communities and other interest groups and is understood to be viewed positively by the general community. Some programs are undertaken across several Council areas on a regional level, to improve outcomes.

Initiatives undertaken include highlighting road safety issues through media, community events and schools.

The Road Safety Program is partially funded by RMS, with additional project grants received from a number of external road safety stakeholders.

Guideline

- i. That Council support the initiatives of Council's Road Safety Officer and the Roads and Maritime Services regarding various road safety behavioural issues.
- ii. That Council maintain and develop an educational road safety program that aims to:
 - a) promote road safety awareness and maintain an active behavioural road safety profile within the community,
 - b) encourage community involvement and ownership of road safety issues, and
 - c) incorporate road safety into other areas of Council's business.

N. PUBLIC TRANSPORT

In 2018, the NSW Government released Future Transport 2056, setting a direction for transport in NSW for the next 30 to 40 years. The Plan brings together all modes of transport, including public transport to develop 30-minute cities in line with the three cities model under A Metropolis of Three Cities.

Transport for NSW has implemented a number of strategic bus corridors throughout Ku-ring-gai. Routes that use these corridors are the Hornsby to Macquarie route (via Turramurra station), operated as route 575 by Transdev, St Ives to the City operated as route 194, North Turramurra to the City via St Ives operated as 594 and Mona Vale to Macquarie (via Gordon) as route 197 by Forest. In some cases the services have been implemented without adequate passenger facilities.

The Federal Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (DDA) provides protection for everyone against discrimination based on disability. Under this Act, transport providers are required to provide facilities which are disability friendly. As a road authority, Council is responsible for providing complying bus stops and bus terminals. Council has prepared a prioritised list of the nearly 700 bus stops in Ku-ring-gai and will be progressively upgrading these to required disability standards.

Ku-ring-gai is well served by the North Shore rail line which runs along the main ridge through the area.

Pacific Highway, which is the main road link between the northern suburbs of Sydney and the City, runs parallel and close to the rail line. This road link is heavily congested during peak periods, resulting in slow average traffic speeds.

To reduce congestion on State and Regional roads, Council has supported and encourages the use of alternative transport. Council's policies, such as the Integrated Transport Strategy call for the promotion and support of public transport. This encouragement is demonstrated by the bus network which operates through Ku-ring-gai and the bus and taxi facilities provided on this network, including bus

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

interchanges at several rail stations. Facilities include seats and shelters for passengers. A number of shelters have been funded by advertising within some shelters. Council is also committed to expanding its cycling network (refer to *Section 7*).

Council should support and encourage sustainable and innovative forms of public transport that may be developed in the future, including initiatives in Future Transport 2056.

Guideline

- i. That bus services within, and through Ku-ring-gai be supported and encouraged by reviewing facilities and identification of improvement opportunities.
- ii. That Council support and encourage innovative forms of public transport that may be developed in future.

O. HEAVY VEHICLES

Many roads are not suitable for large numbers of heavy vehicles due to the topography of Ku-ring-gai. Heavy vehicles impact on residential amenity and cause damage to the local road infrastructure.

Council has imposed a 3-tonne gross vehicle mass (GVM) restriction, on many local and regional roads under its control. This limit prohibits the use of such streets by heavy vehicles, which do not have an origin or destination within the area.

The restrictions do not impact on local deliveries, bus services or garbage collection because the vehicles concerned have origins/destinations within the area.

Under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (HVNL) introduced in February 2014, Council is the Road Manager for roads under its control, provide access permits for vehicles larger than general access.

The restrictions are enforced by Council's Regulatory Services.

Guideline

- i. That load limits continue to be enforced by the appropriate Council staff.

P. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Ku-ring-gai Local Environment Plan (Local Centres) 2012, which guides the development and management of land in six local centres, took effect in February 2013.

Developments in local centres and other areas result in traffic and parking impacts during both construction and after completion. Proposals should therefore include consideration of the impacts of development on the existing road network and planning for future works to ameliorate these impacts.

Applications for developments of a larger scale, such as, residential flat buildings, childcare centres, new commercial developments, or where a parking shortfall is proposed, are to be accompanied by a traffic assessment report. These reports identify likely impacts and consider alternative proposals. Usually, developments provide for their own parking needs on site, including for employees, as well as for their own loading/unloading needs (refer to *Sections 4.G and 4.I*).

Assessment of development applications and ensuring compliance with conditions of consent is the responsibility of the Director Development and Regulation, although internal compliance of a development may become the responsibility of a Private Certifier, as permitted by the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Expected development related impacts on the community are minimised by the imposition of appropriate consent conditions.

The Arup 2007 Parking Management Background study suggests that:

...the basis of the future car parking strategy should be to retain the current general availability of public car parking and for the future developers of large consolidated retail, commercial and residential development sites to accommodate all future car parking demand on site, including visitor car parking.

Developments with a significant effect on the wider road network are referred to RMS for assessment under SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007.

Likely construction-stage impacts may include at least some of: delays to traffic, traffic conflicts, heavy vehicle routes, delivery management and parking demand management.

Larger scale developments such as residential flat buildings or commercial developments, as well as developments on arterial roads, will require a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted to and approved by Council prior to commencement of any works, to minimise the effects on public safety and amenity.

Works Zones are mandatory for larger developments unless expressly vetoed by RMS. Temporary parking restrictions may be required to maintain two-way traffic in surrounding streets or to facilitate the entry and exit of large construction vehicles to and from the site.

The provision of dedicated on-site spaces, within larger developments, for shared vehicles is encouraged. The demand for shared cars is increasing in denser living areas as a more sustainable alternative to private vehicle ownership (refer to *Section G*).

With the large number of multi-dwelling developments recently being constructed, Council has begun to receive requests for on-street loading zones. Any new multi-dwelling developments comprising 12 or more dwellings should provide an on-site loading area; a separate hardstand area is not permitted. The position of the loading area must not prevent access to and from the basement level car park, with at least one travel lane to be maintained at all times while loading/unloading takes place on the driveway. At least one on-site loading space is to be provided to cater for a minimum 6.7 m long service vehicle. The loading space/s should be line marked and/or signposted as a designated loading area. The on-site loading area requirements will be included in the next review of the Ku-ring-gai DCP. Developments constructed in or after 2012 will not be eligible for consideration of on-street loading zones. Developments constructed prior to 2012 are to utilise existing driveways and basements with Body Corporate providing information to tenants on the use of small removal/delivery vans, or can apply to Council for an on-street loading zone for a fee. Council will consider applications on a case by case basis and retains the discretion to decline or approve applications.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Council has also received many requests from residents of new multi-dwelling complexes for parking restrictions on either side of the driveway, in order to provide better visibility to approaching traffic. Any new developments with 4 or more dwellings constructed in or after 2012 which has its driveway on a road that carries over 2,000 vehicles per day should provide 'No Parking' restrictions for 6 metres on either side of the driveway (Refer to F).

Guideline

- i. That rezoning and development proposals consider the impacts of development on the existing road network and planning for future works to ameliorate these impacts.
- ii. That traffic and parking related impacts of development applications continue to be assessed under Council's DCP, RMS guidelines and Australian Standards.
- iii. That Council is not obligated to provide on-street parking, loading/unloading, or other facilities for the benefit of residents or other users of recent developments which have demonstrated adequate provision in their applications.
- iv. That development consents for multi-dwelling developments and those on arterial roads include a requirement for a construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted and approved by Council prior to commencement of any works.
- v. That development consents for larger developments require a mandatory Works Zone of adequate length unless expressly vetoed by Roads and Maritime Services.
- vi. Any new multi-dwelling developments comprising 12 or more dwellings should provide an on-site loading area, a separate hardstand area is not permitted. The position of the loading area must not prevent access to and from the basement level car park, with at least one travel lane to be maintained at all times while loading/unloading takes place on the driveway. At least one on-site loading space is to be provided to cater for a minimum 6.7 m long service vehicle. The loading space/s should be line marked and/or signposted as a designated loading area. The on-site loading requirements will be included in the next version of the DCP. Developments constructed in or after 2012 are not eligible for consideration for on-street loading zones. Developments constructed prior to 2012 are to utilise existing driveways and basements with Body Corporate providing information to tenants on the use of small removal/delivery vans, or can apply to Council for an on-street loading zone for a fee. Council will consider applications on a case by case basis and retains the discretion to decline or approve applications.
- vii. Any new developments with 4 or more dwellings constructed in or after 2012 which has its driveway on a road that carries over 2,000 vehicles per day should provide 'No Parking' restrictions for 6 metres on either side of the driveway (Refer to 4F).

Q. ROADSIDE FENCING

Roadside fencing can be used to prevent pedestrians crossing roads, while other barrier fencing can protect occupants of vehicles which have gone out of control.

Pedestrian fencing, located behind kerbs or on median islands, can be used at locations of high pedestrian concentrations including near schools and school bus stops to control pedestrian movement. Fencing behind kerbs is used to direct pedestrians to traffic signals as well as to discourage inappropriate parking of vehicles. The fence height and type should minimise the impact on driver visibility at intersections. Pedestrian footpath fencing should not be used alongside kerbs where parking is permitted because of the difficulty that vehicle occupants would have in moving from vehicles to the footpath. This fencing does not normally withstand impact from vehicles therefore there may be safety implications to pedestrians who may be close to a fence hit by a vehicle. Pedestrian fencing should be safe for pedestrians and vehicle occupants and should therefore not have horizontal rails which could spear vehicles in a collision.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Median pedestrian fencing is used on medians of multi-lane roads where there are large concentrations of pedestrians to discourage pedestrians from crossing. Median fencing can impact on access by emergency vehicles during periods of heavy traffic by restricting such vehicles from crossing medians. Objections could be expected from some shop-owners/businesses where an adverse economic impact may be perceived from the fencing. Objections based on economic concerns should be considered against social benefits of preventing accidents.

Vehicle barriers, such as steel guard rail are used on curves and embankments, to reduce the risk of vehicles leaving the road. Guardrail ends should be safe for oncoming vehicles. Median concrete barriers and wire rope type fences are alternatives. Fencing adjacent to cycleways should be safe for cyclists.

RMS has suggested, in effect, that to protect wildlife from being injured by traffic, that their open space habitats be fenced to remove wildlife from the road environment (refer to *Section F*).

Guideline

- i. That kerbside pedestrian fencing continue to be used at locations of high pedestrian concentrations including around schools, school bus stops and where stopping of vehicles is not permitted. The height and type of fencing used is to consider safety and minimise the impact on driver visibility, particularly at intersections.
- ii. That appropriate median pedestrian fencing be supported at locations of high pedestrian concentrations and funding be sought, where:
 - there is a demonstrated crash history involving pedestrians,
 - there are adequate crossing locations provided,
 - there are no objections from emergency service providers.In such cases, pedestrian safety (including social and cost savings to the community) will be considered above perceived economic impacts on business.
- iii. That hazardous vehicle barriers, including guard rail ends and other fencing that uses horizontal railing beside kerbs, continue to be reviewed and funds sought in a progressive funding program, to ensure that they are made safe for oncoming vehicles.

R. SPECIAL EVENTS / PLANNED DISRUPTIONS TO TRAFFIC

Temporary road closures may be requested by community groups which wish to hold special events such as fairs or street parties. Temporary road / lane / footpath closures may also be requested by users wishing to use the road / footpath space to undertake works or construction activities within the road reserve.

RMS' guide to Traffic and Transport Management for Special Events, has categorised special events, depending on the impact on road users of the proposed road closure/s. Under the RMS classification, there are four classes of special events.

For any planned disruption to normal traffic, pedestrian flows or other road users, a Transport Management Plan (TMP) identifying the disruption to be caused and ameliorative measures to be taken, must be prepared and submitted to Council for consideration. Special events must be integrated into other demands for the road space. A Traffic Control Plan (TCP) must be prepared when road user disruption is expected at work sites. TMP's and TCP's are normally prepared and certified by qualified practitioners in the field. Consultation with stakeholders and Police approval are required. Council will consider the TMP/TCP, stakeholder consultation and Police comments provided. Applications must be made in time for the necessary consultation and consideration of the proposal by Council. Fees and charges are applicable.

For disruptions on a State Road, Regional Road or local road (where the activity may impact on a State or Regional road) or within 50m of a traffic facility, applicants must apply to RMS for approval to occupy the road.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Applicants need to check whether a development application is required for their proposed event. Under the LEP 2012 (Local Centres), LEP 2015 or DCP 46 for the deferred areas, for Exempt and Complying Development, an application (DA) may be required if numbers exceed the threshold.

Council allows filming to take place on local streets in accordance with Local Government Filming Protocol 2009 which requires applicants to identify and address impacts of their activities on road users by preparing and implementing appropriate traffic control or traffic management plans which have been certified by a qualified practitioner.

Guideline

- i That certified Transport Management Plans (TMP's) and Traffic Control Plans (TCP's) be submitted for appraisal, in sufficient time and in accordance with Roads and Maritime Services guidelines, before any Special Events or activities are held involving any disruption to traffic or other road users.
- ii. That applicants for filming activities comply with Local Government Filming Protocol 2009 which requires them to identify and address impacts of their activities on road users by preparing and implementing appropriate traffic control and traffic management plans, and submitting them to Council for consideration.

S. STATE ROADS AND OTHER STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

Council's powers to provide facilities on roads are limited by State legislation. Many of these powers are given to RMS, as road authority, which itself has conditionally delegated some of its powers to Councils. Exercising Council's delegated powers must be undertaken in accordance with the conditions that are attached to the delegations. In addition, RMS issues guidelines and technical directions to encourage safety and consistency between Councils.

Approval of facilities on roads under its control, requires Council to consult, through a structured process, with RMS, Police LAC and Local Member of State Parliament. This consultation is undertaken through the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee. This Committee makes recommendations to Council that Council may either accept or reject.

Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee consideration can be through either consideration at a formal Committee meeting, or by a delegated process, whereby items are distributed to Committee members and Ward Councillors for approval after consultation with stakeholders. Larger matters and items to which Committee members or Ward Councillors do not agree, are referred to formal meetings. Consultation is undertaken with directly affected residents prior to matters being referred to the Committee, to inform them of the action proposed and to seek resident agreement to recommendations.

Most traffic matters are considered under the delegated process. Only matters regarding traffic management, those to which objections have been registered by a Committee member or a Ward Councillor under the delegated process, or those, which in the opinion of the Director Operations, are particularly contentious are referred to formal meetings (refer to *Section 4.7*).

Control over State roads and facilities on those roads remains the responsibility of RMS. RMS also has full control over the provision of traffic signals on any road, the setting of speed limits and it must approve one-way restrictions and road closures (in accordance with a transport management plan or TMP, which considers ameliorative measures). RMS also retains full responsibility for the provision of clearways, bus lanes and transit lanes.

Because of its responsibility to provide an efficient State road system, RMS's principal interest in traffic is considered to be to ensure that traffic flow on its roads is maximised. RMS does this by means such as parking restrictions (including clearways), S lanes and setting traffic signals to favour through-traffic on State roads. This bias towards traffic on State roads can result in delays for motorists on side streets and complaints, particularly from older pedestrians, of inadequate time in which to cross State roads at signals.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Before making changes to facilities on State roads, RMS usually informs, or consults with Council. Council can make representations to RMS on any issue under its control, but the final decision is not Council's.

As an agent for the Commonwealth, RMS is working on providing a link between the M1 Motorway at Pearce's Corner and the M2 Motorway, otherwise known as NorthConnex. The NorthConnex tunnel is due for completion in 2020.

From time to time, RMS proposes actions on its road, which would impact on roads under Council's control. The impacts on Council-controlled roads are not always clear. It is suggested that, in those cases, RMS, or any organisation proposing to do any work which may impact on a Council-controlled road, be required to produce a traffic impact statement. The impact statement should identify all impacts of the proposed work, in detail, and should propose ameliorative measures to reduce or minimise the impact of the proposed work. The proponent of the proposed work should be prepared to be responsible for undertaking the ameliorative work considered by Council to be necessary.

The Australian Road Rules were adopted in 1999 to provide consistency between States. State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP's) impact on planning and development activities and therefore on Council's traffic and public transport outcomes. These State policies are imposed on Council and the community.

Guideline

- i. That Council make representations to Roads and Maritime Services, or other relevant Government body, in relation to matters under their control, that are of interest to residents of Ku-ring-gai.
- ii. That pursuant to powers delegated to Council by Roads and Maritime Services and subject to the limitations set out in the Instrument of Delegation, Council sub-delegate its functions to the Director Operations in respect of all traffic facilities, other than those regarding traffic management schemes, those to which objections have been received from a member/ Ward Councillor or that the Director Operations considers are contentious or do not have overall resident concurrence.
- iii. That Roads and Maritime Services, or any organisation proposing to do any work which may impact on a Council-controlled road, be requested to produce a traffic impact statement. The impact statement should identify all impacts of the proposed work in detail, and should propose ameliorative measures to reduce or minimise the impact of the proposed work. The proponent of the proposed work should be prepared to undertake the ameliorative work considered necessary by Council or the General Manager.

T. CYCLING

There is an increasing demand for the provision of on-street cycling facilities for both recreational and commuter use. This increase in demand is for cycleways to schools, shops, sporting facilities and train stations.

Unfortunately, the topography of Ku-ring-gai with its steep grades makes the provision of a first class cycling system on Council-controlled roads difficult. The most appropriate locations for cycleways are some of the State/Regional roads and the North Shore rail route. Provision of user-friendly and safe cycleways on either has not been possible to date. However, with the increasing popularity of electric bicycles, barriers previously imposed by steep grades will increasingly become less of an issue.

Council has developed a Cycleways Map, showing the best way to get around Ku-ring-gai to encourage this form of alternative transport. This map shows formal routes and less formal, including routes using relatively quiet streets. Council's website contains other useful cycling tips and information. New routes should be developed accounting for the benefits of electric bicycles in terms of overcoming steep grades.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Transport for NSW has developed a Principal Bicycle Network in Future Transport 2056, which shows the bicycle masterplan for the Greater Sydney Region, including routes on the North Shore. Within Ku-ring-gai, a principal bicycle network route is identified between Hornsby and Chatswood via Gordon and Pymble.

The provision of auxiliary facilities such as bicycle racks and lockers needs to be considered when providing cycleways. Such facilities could be provided at train stations, car parks, sporting facilities and shopping centres.

Provision of safe cycling facilities near schools would encourage some school children to ride and would reduce traffic congestion at those locations (refer also to *Section L*).

Council has developed ranking criteria for prioritising various types of capital works projects. In the case of cycle projects, the criteria consider whether the project is consistent with Council's Bike Plan, whether it joins an existing cycleway and whether it is likely to attract funding from external sources.

The needs of motorcyclists should also be acknowledged. These include adequate skid resistance on linemarking, commuter parking, temporary work and crack sealing.

Guideline

- i. That Council seek funding, as opportunities arise, for the provision of cycling facilities, which have been prioritised, including cycleways, bicycle racks and lockers. Cycleways in the Ku-ring-gai Bike Plan that align with Future Transport 2056's Principal Bicycle Network should be prioritised.
- ii. That future works on footpaths and roads consider provision for cyclists and motor cyclists.

U. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Council has a commitment to consult with residents and community groups and has adopted a Community Consultation Policy.

Consultation is undertaken with directly impacted residents and community groups to obtain their feedback regarding the proposals. This consultation is normally undertaken in the form of writing directly to residents and groups, or by letterboxing. It is intended to consult affected residents regarding significant proposals, before referring them to the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee or Council. Letters inform residents of the request made to Council, provide background information on the request or proposal and seek residents' input prior to any decision being made. Overall resident consensus is sought to proposals for changes before referring proposals to Council for a decision. If necessary, compromise solutions are sought in cases that do not impact on road safety.

Writing directly to residents with information on proposals allows each household to express its point of view and for the feedback received to be collated and considered equally with other responses. Responses are normally collated by street, if more than one street is involved. Multiple responses from any single household, expressing the same view, are normally not considered because they are considered to distort the feedback received.

An alternate consultative process involves direct feedback from residents at public meetings, workshops, resident committees or through online channels. This process allows participating residents to express themselves more fully, but may not result in representative feedback, because a small number of residents can dominate this process.

Resident feedback forms a significant component of investigations undertaken when considering facilities. This feedback is referred to, with technical considerations forming investigations, when issues are reported on. These reports are themselves the subject of consultation with technical representatives of relevant State Government bodies and Local Members of Parliament. These representatives form the basis of the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee which Council must consult and whose recommendations are considered by Council. (Refer to *Section S*).

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

There are instances, when safety or strong overall community interests, may be considered to be paramount. It may be necessary in those instances, to approve appropriate traffic facilities, even though support by directly affected residents has not been obtained.

Guideline

- i. That consultation with residents and community groups who are considered to be directly affected by proposed traffic facility installations, be undertaken, seeking resident consensus to proposals. Consultation be undertaken before referral to the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee. Responses be collated, by street, one per household (unless conflicting responses are received), and reported to Council.
- ii. That, in instances where safety or overall community interests are considered paramount, appropriate traffic facilities be approved and installed, without necessarily seeking or obtaining the support of directly affected residents.
- iii. That residents who have recently moved into an area and are persistent in demanding altered traffic facilities, and whose requests have been investigated and requested facilities are not highly ranked, be invited to show the need for requested changes in traffic facilities, by demonstrating how traffic or parking conditions have altered since they moved into the area. In cases where traffic facilities are not considered to have substantially altered, the rank is not high and safety concerns have not been confirmed, further follow-up investigations, requiring additional Council resources, not be undertaken.

V. FUNDING

It is self-evident that policies and a desire to provide facilities are insufficient in themselves for improvements to materialise.

Whilst there are numerous desirable projects in a range of areas that Council would like to fund, Council's ability to provide funding for traffic and transport initiatives is, by necessity, limited.

Council's Capital Works Program forms part of its Delivery Program and Operational Plan.

Council's criteria for prioritising traffic management works has been reviewed. The review considered current best practice in identification of hazardous locations by assigning crash costs based on road user movements. Generally, locations with higher crash costs over the most recent 5 year period for which data is available, would be those that require the most immediate attention. Crash cost data is updated periodically by RMS.

Under this method, the cost of a treatment can be directly compared to the cost savings (benefits) achieved by the accident reductions resulting from the treatment. RMS uses treatment benefit over the life of the project verses crash costs as the basis for awarding funding for blackspot treatments. Higher emphasis will therefore be placed on the crash costs (accident history) in Council's criteria to reflect a focus on safety, although factors to account for local issues, such as proximity to schools and pedestrian/cycle usage, will still be retained.

Council's 10 Year Traffic and Transport Plan scores individual locations, listing them in priority, based on scores obtained under these criteria. It proposes and priorities traffic managements works for a 10 year period, feeding prioritised proposals into Council's Delivery Programs. Prioritised lists of proposed traffic management works are updated periodically to reflect changing collision and other data.

Ranking criteria is also used for other project types. Clearly, a higher ranking will not necessarily ensure that a project can be funded.

There are opportunities to receive funding assistance for some projects from outside sources. RMS, for example, provides 50% of funding for a limited number of projects that it considers worthwhile. Some projects, such as initiatives to treat black spots, need justification in terms of benefit/cost ratios before

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

funding is provided. Projects with significant crash records and therefore with higher scores are more likely to be funded from external Black spot sources.

RMS is responsible for meeting the costs associated with the installation and maintenance of approved traffic facilities (signs and lines). RMS expends the allocation on Council's behalf but is encouraging Councils to take on this role. RMS allocation is considered to be insufficient to bring the sign/linemarking stock condition to a satisfactory level and to maintain it at its current condition. In recent years, Council has considerably overspent its RMS administered allocations. Some Councils who have taken over the installation and maintenance of sign and linemarking facilities, supplement RMS funds. Consideration should be given to allowing residents and community groups to provide funding for desired works which are not associated with developments (refer to *Section 4.O*). Such works ought to be beneficial to the wider community, and to have received Council's approval.

Council charges fees for various services. Fees are set by Council annually, in its Delivery Program and Operational Plan, and these must be paid when application is made for the services requested.

Council now owes a legal duty of care to road users for the condition of facilities provided and assets, even if damage or hazards are the result of others' activities. Legal liability in undertaking improvements for the community is clearly a concern to Council.

Guideline Statement

- i. That Council's criteria for ranking traffic facility projects, is:

CATEGORY	EXTENT OF ACTIVITY	SCORE	WEIGHT	MAX TOTAL
Accident costs over the last 5 years (based on crash costs by type from RTA Economic Analysis Manual)	High range	3	16	48
	Medium range	2		
	Low range	1		
	Nil accidents	0		
85 th percentile speeds above posted speed limit	> 15 kph	3	4	12
	10 to 15kph	2		
	5 to 10 kph	1		
	< 5kph	0		
Change in traffic volumes per year	> +10%	3	4	12
	+5% to +10%	2		
	0 to +5%	1		
	< 0	0		
Level of community concern	High (written concern from a number of sections in the community on precinct related traffic issues)	4	3	12
	Medium (high number of residents on localised traffic issues)	3		
	Low (several residents)	2		
	Very Low (one resident)	1		
Pedestrian/cycling usage	High (adjacent to pedestrian/cycle generators, including shopping centres, cycleways)	3	4	12
	Medium	2		
	Low	1		
Proximity to schools	Within 100 metres	3	4	12
	Within 200 metres	2		
	Within 300 metres	1		
	Beyond 300 metres	0		
TOTAL			108*	
(*adjust to a percentage)				

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

- ii. That Council make provision in its Capital Works budgets for funding of projects submitted to Roads and Maritime Service for shared funding under various Roads and Maritime Service's various programs.
- iii. That Council review the possible acceptance of traffic facility installation and maintenance in future.

W. ROADSIDE MEMORIALS

Where a roadside fatality has occurred, relatives of the deceased may wish to erect a roadside memorial at the site of the fatal accident.

Under the Roads Act 1993, Council has care and control of the road reserve and unless authorised by Council, the erection of any memorial is not covered under the Roads Act.

Given the sensitive nature of roadside memorials within the community, Council may permit the erection of such memorials:

- Where a roadside memorial is erected and the responsible person or persons can be identified, they can be contacted to advise that Council will permit a modest roadside memorial for a period of three (3) months, subject to the concurrence of any adjoining property owners. After three months, the person or persons concerned, will be responsible for removal of the memorial and can arrange for a plaque up to 100mm x 100mm, to be installed at the site at their own cost. Alternatively, the plaque can be installed on a Council facility such as a seat in a Council park.
- Where a roadside memorial is erected and the responsible person or persons cannot be identified, then the roadside memorial will be removed by Council's maintenance staff after a three (3) month period and stored for a further one (1) month. After such time, the memorial will be disposed of.

While roadside memorials have purpose for the aggrieved person(s) they can also detract from the appearance of the roadside, can impact on adjoining residents and the community, and in some cases can be considered to be a road safety issue.

Guideline

- i. Where a roadside memorial is erected and the responsible person or persons can be identified, they can be contacted to advise that Council will permit a modest roadside memorial for a period of three (3) months, subject to the concurrence of any adjoining property owners. After three months, the person or persons concerned, will be responsible for removal of the memorial and can arrange for a plaque up to 100mm x 100mm, to be installed at the site at their cost. Alternatively, the plaque can be installed on a Council facility such as a seat in a Council park.
- ii. Where a roadside memorial is erected on a Council roadside and the responsible person or persons cannot be identified, then the roadside memorial will be removed by Council's maintenance staff after a three (3) month period and stored for a further one (1) month. After such time, the memorial will be disposed of.

Definitions

Term / Abbreviation	Definition
DCP	Development Control Plan
GVM	Gross Vehicle Mass
HVNL	Heavy Vehicle National Law 2014
LAC	Local Area Command
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
LGA	Local Government Area
PAMP	Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan
RMS	Roads and Maritime Services
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
TMP	Traffic Management Plan
TCP	Traffic Control Plan
Through Traffic	Anyone who has not taken a direct route to/from a major road.
Rumble Bars	A series of raised bumps along the shoulder or centre line of a road.
Speed Cushions	A short, raised device that is wide enough to require a car to drive over it, but narrow enough to allow a bus to straddle the device.
Car Share Scheme	A commercial operation where a share car can be booked for short periods by members of the public.

Ku-ring-gai Council

Draft

Traffic & Transport Policy Statement

Version Number 2

Adopted: TBC

Effective: TBC



Traffic & Transport Policy Statement

Table of Contents

Controlled Document Information	3
Authorisation Details	3
Related Document Information, Standards & References	3
Policy	5
Purpose and Objectives	5
Scope	5
Responsibilities	5
Policy Statement	6
A. ROAD HIERARCHY	6
B. ROAD SAFETY (INFRASTRUCTURE)	6
C. DRIVER VISIBILITY	6
D. SPEED LIMITS	6
E. TRAFFIC CALMING	6
F. TRAFFIC FACILITIES (SIGNS AND LINES)	6
G. ON-STREET PARKING	6
H. COUNCIL CONTROLLED CAR PARKS	7
I. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES	7
J. CAR SHARE	7
K. PEDESTRIANS	7
L. SCHOOL SAFETY	7
M. ROAD SAFETY PROMOTION	7
N. PUBLIC TRANSPORT	8
O. HEAVY VEHICLES	8
P. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	8
Q. ROADSIDE FENCING	8
R. SPECIAL EVENTS / PLANNED DISRUPTIONS TO TRAFFIC	8
S. STATE ROADS AND OTHER STATE RESPONSIBILITIES	8
T. CYCLING	9
U. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	9
V. FUNDING	9
W. ROADSIDE MEMORIALS	9
Definitions	10

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Controlled Document Information

Authorisation Details

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.			
Controlled Document Number:	66	Record Number:	2019/344069
Controlled Document Type:	Policy Statement		
Controlled Document Name:	Traffic & Transport Policy Statement		
Version Number:	2		
Department:	Operations		
Distribution:	Internal and External		
Review Period: Max < 4 years	3 years	Next Review Date:	TBC
Document Status:	Draft		
Approval Type:	Adopted by Council		
Version Start Date:	TBC	Version End Date:	TBC

Related Document Information, Standards & References

Related Legislation:	Local Government Act 1993 Roads Act 1993 Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 Heavy Vehicle National Law (HVNL) 2014 Disability Discrimination Act 1992	Section 88 of Roads Act 1993 Development Proposals Heavy Vehicles Public Transport
Related Policies (Council & Internal)	Ku-ring-gai LEP (Local Centres) 2012 Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 Council's Car Parking Code Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (DCP) 2016	On-street parking Resident Parking Schemes Development Proposals
Related Documents - Procedures, Guidelines, Forms, WHS Modules/PCD's, Risk Assessments, Work Method Statements, etc	RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002 RMS Permit Parking Guidelines A Guide to the delegation to Councils for the regulation of traffic RMS Guide to Traffic and Transport Management for Special Events Ku-ring-gai Traffic & Transport Guidelines	RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002 Table 5.1 Resident Parking Schemes State Roads and other State Responsibilities Special Events
Other References	Future Transport 2056 Greater Sydney Region Plan, A Metropolis of Three Cities	

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Version History

Version Number	Version Start Date	Version End Date	Author	Details and Comments
1	October 2002	TBC	George Koolik	
2	August 2019	TBC	Anthony Leung, GTA Consultants	Review and update of policy.
3	October 2019	TBC	Deva Thevaraja	Review and update of policy.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

Policy

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this statement is to provide a framework to produce a consistent approach to resolving traffic and transport issues throughout the Ku-ring-gai LGA. Whilst traffic and transport problems in Ku-ring-gai cannot be solved by Council alone, a whole-of-Council approach to the issues concerned could result in improvements for this community.

Scope

The scope of this policy is to develop a consistent approach to addressing local traffic matters.

The Policy Statement is to be utilised in conjunction with the Ku-ring-gai Traffic & Transport Guidelines when determining the appropriate outcome for traffic matters.

Responsibilities

This statement is the responsibility of the Manager Traffic & Transport – Operations, in consultation with the Local Traffic Committee.

Implementation of the statement is the responsibility of the General Manager, all Directors, Managers and Council officers

Policy Statement

A. ROAD HIERARCHY

Plan and implement Council's Traffic & Transport infrastructure in accordance with the road hierarchy classification.

B. ROAD SAFETY (INFRASTRUCTURE)

Ensure that all Council road network and traffic facilities are planned and maintained to a high safety standard for all road users.

C. DRIVER VISIBILITY

Ensure any landscaping or planting on the roadside or in roundabouts does not obstruct visibility or present a safety hazard for road users.

Ensure that appropriate levels of lighting are provided to the approved standard on Council's road network, including traffic calming devices, pedestrian crossings and any other devices that could constitute a hazard to motorists.

D. SPEED LIMITS

That Council continues to explore methods of encouraging improved traffic rule compliance.

E. TRAFFIC CALMING

That traffic calming treatments be considered for implementation depending on local traffic factors, resident feedback and available funding. The design of traffic management devices should consider safety of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists and be consistent with relevant guidelines.

F. TRAFFIC FACILITIES (SIGNS AND LINES)

That statutory restrictions and warning signs not be used unless a particular safety case can be demonstrated to the Director Operations, such as hazardous and unique road geometry.

That signs to significant public facilities with genuine, wide public use, be permitted. New directional signs to local commercial facilities should not be installed.

'Wildlife' type signs should not be used in Ku-ring-gai because their effectiveness has not been demonstrated and their widespread use would reduce the impact of regulatory and other safety signs.

G. ON-STREET PARKING

That Council continues to provide on-street parking for residents, shoppers and commuters with the increasing demand for on-street parking to be managed through a mixture of time restrictions and paid parking schemes.

H. COUNCIL CONTROLLED CAR PARKS

Time restrictions in Council controlled car parks are provided primarily to cater for the needs of shoppers/customers (rather than for commuters or local employees). Adequate disabled parking and bicycle parking is to be provided in accordance with the current standards. Adequate lighting, and where appropriate, secure bike parking is to be provided in the car parks.

Council will continue to review the use of local centre car parks and implement the Parking Management Strategy where changes are required to encourage higher turnover.

I. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES

An overwhelming majority of the streets within Ku-ring-gai that would not meet the current RMS eligibility criteria for Resident Permit Parking Schemes.

J. CAR SHARE

That Council actively works with car share providers to establish car share spaces in areas of high demand throughout the local government area such as near employment centres, medium to high density residential areas and train stations.

That Council reserves the right to charge for the establishment and on-going provision of on-street or off-street car share parking spaces.

K. PEDESTRIANS

That Council adheres to Roads and Maritime Services guidelines, regarding the provision of pedestrian facilities, which would result in crossings at locations which are safe, and where there is a demonstrated need.

L. SCHOOL SAFETY

That Council support and provide or seek funding, as opportunities arise, for safe and appropriate facilities at schools, including raised wombat crossings.

Encourage school communities to use public transport, walk and cycle. Also encourage schools to develop plans to better manage student/ staff parking, and on-street pick-up and set-down at schools, so as not to impact adversely on others in their community.

Any school related parking or traffic issues to be referred to the Department of Education or other appropriate body, requesting that they provide the necessary facilities on-site. Requests for peak school period on-street restrictions be considered as being short term measures only. Preferably the installation of those signs should be funded by the schools concerned. That all future Development Consents for schools in Ku-ring-gai include conditions requiring adequate parking and pick-up/set-down facilities be provided on-site.

M. ROAD SAFETY PROMOTION

That Council support the initiatives of Council's Road Safety Officer and the Roads and Maritime Services regarding various road safety behavioural issues. That Council maintain and develop an educational road safety program that aims to promote road safety awareness within the community, and encourage community involvement and incorporate road safety into other areas of Council's business.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

N. PUBLIC TRANSPORT

That bus services within, and through, Ku-ring-gai be supported and encouraged through a review of facilities and identification of improvement opportunities. Also encourage innovative forms of public transport that may be developed in future.

O. HEAVY VEHICLES

That load limits continue to be enforced by the appropriate Council staff.

P. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

That rezoning and development proposals consider the impacts of development on the existing road network and planning for future works to ameliorate these impacts.

That Council not accept responsibility for providing on-street parking, loading/ unloading, or other facilities for the benefit of residents or other users of recent developments which have demonstrated adequate provision in their applications. Developments constructed in or after 2012 are not eligible for consideration for on-street loading zones.

That development consents for multi-dwelling developments and those on arterial roads include a requirement for a construction Traffic Management Plan, to be submitted and approved by Council prior to commencement of any works. Development consents for larger developments also require a mandatory Works Zone of adequate length, unless expressly vetoed by Roads and Maritime Services.

Any new developments with 4 or more dwellings constructed in or after 2012 which has its driveway on a road that carries over 2,000 vehicles per day should provide 'No Parking' restrictions up to 6 metres on either side of the driveway.

Q. ROADSIDE FENCING

That kerbside pedestrian fencing continue to be used at locations of high pedestrian concentrations including around schools, school bus stops, and where stopping of vehicles is not permitted. The height and type of fencing used is to consider safety and minimise the impact on driver visibility, particularly at intersections.

R. SPECIAL EVENTS / PLANNED DISRUPTIONS TO TRAFFIC

That certified Transport Management Plans (TMP's) and Traffic Control Plans (TCP's) be submitted for appraisal, in sufficient time and in accordance with Roads and Maritime Services guidelines, before any Special Events or activities are held involving any disruption to traffic or other road users.

Council allows filming to take place on local streets in accordance with Local Government Filming Protocol 2009 which requires them to identify and address impacts of their activities on road users by preparing and implementing appropriate traffic control and traffic management plans, and submitting them to Council for consideration.

S. STATE ROADS AND OTHER STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

That Council make representations to Roads and Maritime Services, or other relevant Government body, in relation to matters under their control, that are of interest to residents of Ku-ring-gai.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

T. CYCLING

That Council seek funding for the provision of cycling facilities, which have been prioritised, including cycleways, bicycle racks and lockers. Cycleways in the Ku-ring-gai Bike Plan that align with Future Transport 2056's Principle Bicycle Network should be prioritised.

U. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Consultation with residents and community groups who are considered to be directly affected by proposed traffic facility installations, is to be undertaken, seeking resident consensus to proposals. Consultation be undertaken before referral to the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee

In instances where safety or overall community interests are considered paramount, appropriate traffic facilities be approved and installed, without necessarily seeking or obtaining the support of directly affected residents.

V. FUNDING

The implementation of traffic facility projects is prioritised using Council's ranking criteria. Projects are prioritised based on accident history, traffic speeds and volumes, level of community concern, pedestrian/cycling usage and proximity to schools.

W. ROADSIDE MEMORIALS

Roadside memorials may be erected for up to 3 months, subject to the concurrence of any adjoining property owners. After this time, the memorial will be removed, and the person or persons concerned may arrange for a plaque of up to 100x100mm to be installed at their own cost.

Definitions

Term / Abbreviation	Definition
DCP	Development Control Plan
GVM	Gross Vehicle Mass
HVNL	Heavy Vehicle National Law 2014
LAC	Local Area Command
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
LGA	Local Government Area
PAMP	Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan
RMS	Roads and Maritime Services
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
TMP	Traffic Management Plan
TCP	Traffic Control Plan
Through Traffic	Anyone who has not taken a direct route to/from a major road.
Rumble Bars	A series of raised bumps along the shoulder or centre line of a road.
Speed Cushions	A short, raised device that is wide enough to require a car to drive over it, but narrow enough to allow a bus to straddle the device.
Car Share Scheme	A commercial operation where a share car can be booked for short periods by members of the public.

This is a Controlled Document. Before using this document check it is the latest version by referring to Council's Controlled Document Register. Unless otherwise indicated, printed or downloaded versions of this document are uncontrolled.

ST JOHNS AVENUE AND HENRY STREET GORDON - ALTERATIONS TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT:	To seek approval for proposed changes to parking restrictions in St Johns Avenue and Henry Street following the adoption by Council of the final concept design for the St Johns Avenue Upgrade project.
BACKGROUND:	<p>St Johns Avenue is one of the key streets in the Gordon local centre. It has a high level of pedestrian activity and a number of eateries. It is establishing itself as an "Eat Street".</p> <p>The final concept design for the upgrade aims to address issues identified through site analysis and during community consultation. The proposed design includes the widening of footpaths of St Johns Avenue.</p>
COMMENTS:	<p>To support the St Johns Avenue Upgrade project, proposed changes to existing parking and traffic arrangements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Removal of existing 1P restrictions in St Johns Avenue, to enable footpath widening;• The existing 3 spaces in Henry Street with P15 parking restrictions to be modified to No Parking ("Kiss and Ride") in peak hours, and P15 minute parking at all other times;• Marking of cycle logos in Churchill Lane, to indicate an on-road/mixed traffic cycle route. <p>There is spare capacity in the Wade Lane car park to absorb the removal of the kerbside parking spaces in St Johns Avenue.</p>
RECOMMENDATION:	<p>That the following changes to parking and traffic conditions be approved, to support the concept design for St Johns Avenue Streetscape Upgrade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Removal of existing 1P restrictions in St Johns Avenue;• Modification of the existing 3 spaces in Henry Street to No Parking ("Kiss and Ride") in peak hours, and P15 minute parking at all other times;• Marking of cycle logos in Churchill Lane.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval for proposed changes to parking restrictions in St Johns Avenue and Henry Street following the adoption by Council of the final concept design for the St Johns Avenue Upgrade project.

BACKGROUND

St Johns Avenue is one of the key streets in the Gordon local centre. It has a high level of pedestrian activity and a number of eateries. It is establishing itself as an "Eat Street" for Gordon. Some eateries provide outdoor dining options under Council's current outdoor dining policy. However given the nature of existing conditions, the outdoor dining is restricted to a one metre wide zone, usually adjacent the kerb and on sloping, uneven pavement making furniture placement difficult and uncomfortable. The footpath pavements are a patchwork of bitumen, have steep cross falls and are uneven in a number of locations. There are a number of pedestrian desire lines between Pacific Highway and Wade Lane.



There is kerbside parking for approximately 16 vehicles in the highlighted section of St Johns Avenue, with a one hour time limit from 8am-6pm weekdays, 8am-12.30pm Saturdays, and "No Parking" between 7:00am and 8:30am Monday to Friday on the southern side.

Henry Street is mostly residential with apartments. The street has two traffic lanes, one in each direction and on-street parking with two hour parking limits on both sides of the street. There are concrete footpaths and street tree planting in grassed verges along both sides of the street. There is an informal kiss and ride (drop-off and pick-up) on the western side of Henry Street near Churchill Lane that has a 15 minute time limit.

Gordon bus interchange and commuter car park is on the eastern side of Henry Street. Access for buses particularly from the bus interchange needs to be maintained through St Johns Avenue due to the inability for buses to make a left hand turn from the interchange into Henry Street.

Item GB.2

TM4/12

Wade Lane provides rear lane access to many retail and commercial properties that front Pacific Highway. It is also an entry and exit point for the Wade Lane Car Park. During peak periods, it is heavily used by vehicles and pedestrians and is a potential conflict zone for all users. A drop-off/pick-up area is located just north of the pedestrian crossing from St Johns Avenue to the station, and near the exit of the upper level car park. This causes delays and sometimes confusion for drivers and pedestrians in the area. Access to Wade Lane needs to be maintained.

Clipsham Lane provides access to the rear of some properties that front the north side of St Johns Avenue. It is also used as a short cut for drivers dropping passengers at the station or leaving the Wade Lane car park and returning to the Pacific Highway. It has little in the way of safe pedestrian access/facilities, and is not an attractive laneway.

The St Johns Avenue precinct has been selected for an upgrade and to be a “showcase” for the Gordon local centre. The upgrade may trigger renewed interest in Gordon and provide a community space which does not currently exist in Gordon.

The proposed key design elements for the concept design of the St Johns Avenue Precinct include:

- removal of kerbside parking and widening of footpaths to both sides of St Johns Avenue;
- terraced pavements for outdoor dining areas to create flat areas for comfortable dining zones;
- new footpaths along the shop fronts to a minimum clear width of 2 metres;
- footpath re-grading to allow for entry into dining terraces and rest areas for mobility impaired users;
- selected public domain paving for footpaths;
- new LED street lighting for improved lighting levels with higher quality fittings;
- raised thresholds at marked pedestrian crossings;
- extended raised area at southern end of Wade Lane with a drop-off/pick-up area which would also function for accessible drop-off/pick-up, as well as control turning movements out of Wade Lane car park;
- upgrade to Heritage Square;
- extended raised area/continuous footpath to western arm of Clipsham Lane;
- infrastructure for community street events such as power and communications;
- possible digital display signs for transport and community information;
- improved way finding; and
- improved signage.

COMMENTS

Occupancy surveys conducted in the Wade Lane car park in early 2018 indicate that on weekdays, the peak occupancy (excluding leased spaces) was 81% (with 67 spaces available) at 11am. On Saturdays, the peak occupancy (excluding leased spaces) was 65% (with 121 spaces available), also at 11am. On Sundays, the peak occupancy was 65% (between 11am and 1pm), noting that leased spaces do not apply on Sundays.

The mid-level of the car park would be the most convenient parking destination as this level is accessed directly from Wade Lane via St Johns Avenue. Analysis of the peak occupancy of the mid-level shows:

- 85% utilisation (17 spaces available) at 2pm on weekdays;
- 69% utilisation (36 spaces available) at 2pm on Saturdays;

Item GB.2**TM4/12**

Peak parking times in St Johns Avenue (where all 16 spaces were occupied) on weekdays occurred at 8am, 12pm and 3pm. During these times, there were 90, 33 and 42 spaces available respectively on the mid-level of the Wade Lane car park.

Therefore, this indicates there is spare parking capacity in the Wade Lane car park to absorb the removal of 16 x 1P kerbside parking spaces in St Johns Avenue.

Key changes/upgrades to existing traffic and parking conditions**St Johns Avenue**

Parking lanes and the 1P kerbside parking will be removed from both sides of St Johns Avenue, within the project area. The carriageway will be narrowed to two lanes, one in each direction and no parking will be permitted (nor available).

New kerb ramps will be installed mid-block and the northern end of St Johns Avenue, for ease of pedestrian movement and also to control the location of these movements. The new terraces and fencing will restrict crossing opportunities throughout the street. Two approach lanes in St Johns Avenue at Pacific Highway will be retained.

A kerb adjustment is proposed to improve left turning movements for buses into St Johns Avenue from Pacific Highway.

Henry Street

The 15 minute parking restriction in Henry St is proposed to be changed to No Parking – “Kiss and Ride” on weekdays from 6.30am-9.30am and from 3.30pm-6.30pm, and 15 minute parking at other times.

The 2P parking restrictions in the remainder of Henry Street will remain unchanged.

Wade Lane

Wade Lane “Kiss and Ride” (No Parking) restrictions will remain the same. The marked pedestrian crossing will be upgraded to a raised crossing, with the raised area (including flush kerbs and bollards) extending for the length of the Kiss and Ride zone. This would allow accessible passenger drop off and collection at this point. The design of the raised zone would also assist in discouraging vehicles turning left from the car park exit ramp and travelling the wrong way in Wade Lane to access St Johns Avenue.

Churchill Lane

The Ku-ring-gai Bicycle Plan indicates a cycle route along the full length of St Johns Avenue and in Henry Street (between St Johns Avenue and the underpass road), also known as “Gordon 2”. During the development of the Concept Plan, it was considered that adequate cycling facilities could not be provided in St Johns Avenue due to the restricted road width and high pedestrian numbers using the footpaths. It was considered prudent to designate Church Hill Lane as the cycle route in this section of since it is located immediately parallel to St Johns Avenue and carries low traffic volumes (est. <200vpd).

An on road/mixed traffic cycle route is proposed for Churchill Lane and will be marked accordingly. Provision is also made in the Concept Plan for a short section of wide footpath on Pacific Highway (between St Johns Avenue and Church Hill Lane), which could be converted to a Shared User Path once the route is further developed in a westerly direction along St Johns Avenue. This route will ultimately provide cycle access to the Gordon local centre and Gordon railway station from the south-western part of Gordon. AS part of the upgrade project, bike rails are proposed to be installed in St Johns Avenue adjacent to Heritage Park. There are also bike rails in Wade Lane outside Gordon railway station.

There will also be a continuous footpath treatment along Henry Street at Churchill Lane.

Clipsham Lane

Conditions in Clipsham Lane are proposed to remain the same with the exception of a continuous footpath treatment along St Johns Avenue at Clipsham Lane.

An illustration of the design proposal is attached to this report.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This project is funded by developer contributions ("Section 94"), raised under the Ku-ring-gai Contributions Plan (2010).

Council has applied for funding assistance through Transport for NSW's High Pedestrian Activity Area program (for various elements of the project) as part of the proposed Gordon High Pedestrian Activity Area. This is still under consideration by Transport for NSW.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Council engaged with the community between 16 August and 13 September 2019. A range of engagement tools were employed which included a survey (online and paper) and a two-day pop-up park community drop-in event on St Johns Avenue. These approaches were supported using online tools as well as face-to-face discussions, and promoted via digital and traditional media.

The vast majority of the community supported the concept plan (over 80% on average). Those not supporting the concept expressed concerns about the loss of parking and potential impacts on business as well as the suitability of the plan for St Johns Avenue due to the gradient and issues associated with high traffic movements in the area.

Overall, the vast majority of the community (more than 80%) supported the project suggesting it would enliven the street and bring more life to Gordon, which is a key objective for the project.

Consultation with bus operators was also conducted.

INTERNAL CONSULTATION

The internal Project Reference Group (PRG) had a second meeting on 2 July, 2019 with representatives from a broad spectrum of Council Departments including Strategy and Environment, Community, Regulation and Operations Departments. The meeting was attended by the following Council officers:

- Public Domain Co-ordinator
- Public Domain Officer
- Team Leader Urban Design
- Community Development Officer - Disability Services
- Strategic Traffic Engineer
- Manager Technical Services – Operations
- Coordinator Design, Operations
- Civil Design Engineer
- Environmental Health Officers

Councillors were briefed on the project on 15 October 2019 and the report was tabled at the Ordinary Meeting Council on 22 October, 2019. The concept design was adopted unanimously for further development to proceed to tender.

For the preparation of this report, consultation was undertaken with Operations, Strategy & Environment and Regulatory Services.

SUMMARY

St Johns Avenue is one of the key streets in the Gordon local centre. It has a high level of pedestrian activity and a number of eateries. It is establishing itself as an “Eat Street”. Some eateries provide outdoor dining options, however, the nature of existing conditions restricts outdoor dining to a narrow zone adjacent the kerb and on sloping, uneven pavement making dining difficult.

The St Johns Avenue precinct has been selected for an upgrade and to be a “showcase” for the Gordon local centre. The final concept design aims to address issues identified through site analysis and during community consultation. The proposed design includes the widening of footpaths of St Johns Avenue.

To support the St Johns Avenue Upgrade project, proposed changes to existing parking and traffic arrangements include:

- Removal of existing 1P restrictions in St Johns Avenue, to enable footpath widening;
- The existing 3 spaces in Henry Street with P15 parking restrictions to be modified to No Parking (“Kiss and Ride”) in peak hours, and P15 minute parking at all other times;
- Marking of cycle logos in Churchill Lane, to indicate an on-road/mixed traffic cycle route.

Occupancy surveys conducted in the Wade Lane car park indicate there is spare capacity to absorb the removal of 16 x 1P kerbside parking spaces in St Johns Avenue.



RECOMMENDATION:

That the following changes to parking and traffic conditions be approved, to support the concept design for St Johns Avenue Streetscape Upgrade:


- A. Removal of existing 1P restrictions (and kerbside parking spaces) in St Johns Avenue between Pacific Highway and Wade Lane;
- B. Modification of the existing 3 spaces in Henry Street from P15 parking restrictions to No Parking ("Kiss and Ride") 6.30am-9.30am and from 3.30pm-6.30pm Mon-Fri, and P15 minute parking at all other times;
- C. Marking of cycle logos in Churchill Lane, to indicate an on-road/mixed traffic cycle route.

Joseph Piccoli
Strategic Traffic Engineer

Deva Thevaraja
Manager Traffic & Transport

Attachments: A1  St Johns Avenue Gordon - Concept Plan for Proposed Streetscape Upgrade


2020/047333



ST JOHNS AVENUE, GORDON - PROPOSED CONCEPT PLAN

YARRABUNG ROAD, ST IVES

Ward: St Ives
Electorate: Davidson

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF REPORT:	To consider the construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Yarrabung Road at Stanley Street, St Ives.
BACKGROUND:	A footpath has recently been completed along the eastern side of Yarrabung Road to complete the missing sections between Stanley Street and St Ives Primary and St Ives High Schools. The footpath currently ends just before the intersection with Stanley Street.
COMMENTS:	A pedestrian refuge is needed to provide a link between the newly constructed footpath on the eastern side of Yarrabung Road, and the existing footpath along the western side, to the north of Stanley Street.
RECOMMENDATION:	That a pedestrian refuge island be constructed on Yarrabung Road, and a new median island and changes to line marking be implemented on Stanley Street, St Ives.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider the construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Yarrabung Road at Stanley Street, St Ives.

BACKGROUND

Council has recently constructed a new footpath along the eastern side of Yarrabung Road to complete the missing sections between Stanley Street and St Ives Primary and St Ives High Schools. The footpath currently ends just before the intersection with Stanley Street.

It is proposed that the footpath extend just beyond the intersection with Stanley Street. At this point it is proposed that a pedestrian refuge be constructed to allow pedestrians to cross to the western side of Yarrabung Road to connect to the existing footpath.

Yarrabung Road is 9 metres wide at the site of the proposed pedestrian refuge. When the pedestrian refuge is constructed, it will leave a 3.75 metre wide travel lane in the northbound direction, and 3.35 metres wide in the southbound direction. The location of the pedestrian refuge will provide sufficient sight distance to approaching vehicles from both directions in Yarrabung Road, and to approaching vehicles from Stanley Street.

A **detailed** plan has been prepared showing the proposed works and is **attached**.

The main traffic route at this intersection is along Stanley Street and the northern leg of Yarrabung Road. Due to the wide entry angle into Yarrabung Road, some motorists approaching from Stanley Street do not slow down when turning left. This is even though they are required to give way to northbound traffic on Yarrabung Road.

In order to slow traffic entering Yarrabung Road from Stanley Street, it is proposed to straighten the angle at the intersection by marking an edge line with raised pavement markers (RRPM's) installed. The reduced entry speeds will improve safety for pedestrians using the pedestrian refuge. It is also proposed that a Give Way sign be installed, and a holding line be marked.

The existing concrete median on Stanley Street is to be replaced by a 600mm wide rubberised median, which will meet Yarrabung Road at a straighter angle.

Buses travel through this intersection, which is on the route for the 582 bus service. The pedestrian refuge has been designed to allow a 14.5 metre long bus to turn left into Yarrabung Road from Stanley Street, and to turn right into Stanley Street from Yarrabung Road.

In September 2019 this matter was considered by the voting members of the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee, as TDA 96/19. The Police and RMS agreed to the proposal, while the representative for the Member for Davidson disagreed.

COMMENTS

The representative for the Member for Davidson disagreed with the proposed pedestrian refuge for the following reasons;

1. People will not walk along Yarrabung Road because it is too steep in sections, and that most people would prefer to walk along Horace Street. The pedestrian refuge is not close to any bus stops.

Comments from Traffic & Transport Department:

This argument fails to address the fact that the footpath on the western side of Yarrabung Road ends at Stanley Street. Therefore there is a need for a safe crossing point at the intersection so pedestrians can cross to the footpath on the eastern side. People living in streets that connect with Yarrabung Road, such as Grevillea Avenue and Melaleuca Drive would not be prepared to detour to Horace Street to walk, and would still use the pedestrian refuge to get to the nearest bus stop on Yarrabung Road north of Catherine Street.

2. The sign at the splitter island in Stanley Street at the intersection is often damaged. Whether or not a rubberised splitter island in a slightly different location is the appropriate solution is not explained. –

Comments from Traffic & Transport Department:

The proposed changes will straighten the intersection, thereby reducing vehicle speeds at the intersection. This should reduce the likelihood of vehicles hitting the median island.

3. The only observed instance of speeding exiting Stanley Street onto Yarrabung Road in almost 35 years was by a cyclist. –

Comments from Traffic & Transport Department:

The purpose of the Give Way line and sign, and the straightening of the intersection, is to force motorists on Stanley Street to give way to through traffic on Yarrabung Road. At present, many motorists are turning left into Yarrabung Road without slowing down in case they need to give way to through traffic.

4. Rumble bars were previously installed on the corner of Stanley Street and Yarrabung Road. During this time many motorists turning left into Yarrabung Road ended up on the wrong side of the road. The proposed edge lines would force vehicles closer to the pedestrian refuge.

Comments from Traffic & Transport Department:

Swept turning paths were used for a 14.5 metre long bus for left turns into Yarrabung Road, and right turns into Stanley Street. Using the Autoturn program, it was found that a 14.5 metre long bus could negotiate the corner when the pedestrian refuge was constructed. Therefore any cars should be able to easily negotiate the bend.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Funding has been sourced and allocated for the project to be completed in the current financial year.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Council consulted with the resident of #60 Stanley Street about the proposed pedestrian refuge. The resident was initially concerned that it would impact driveway access. However, following further correspondence, they are satisfied that driveway access will not be affected.

SUMMARY

There is a need to provide a safe crossing point for pedestrians to link the existing footpath on the western side of Yarrabung Road, to the north of Stanley Street, with the footpath on the eastern side of Yarrabung Road, to the south of Stanley Street. This would encourage walking in the area, and improve access to public transport.

RECOMMENDATION:

That a pedestrian refuge island be constructed on Yarrabung Road, and a new median island and changes to line marking be implemented on Stanley Street, St Ives.

Michael Foscett
Team Leader Traffic

Deva Thevaraja
Manager Traffic & Transport

Attachments:



Yarrabung Road at Stanley Street St Ives - Pedestrian Refuge
Plan

2020/045832

