

Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee Minutes

19 October 2021

Our Vision

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

*A progressive City which is prosperous, sustainable
and socially cohesive, with a strong community spirit.*

City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067

Telephone 8366 4555
Facsimile 8332 6338
Email townhall@npsp.sa.gov.au
Website www.npsp.sa.gov.au



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT & ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10 AUGUST 2021 | 1 |
| 2. | PRESIDING MEMBER'S COMMUNICATION..... | 1 |
| 3. | STAFF REPORTS | 1 |
| 3.1 | WEBBE STREET AND HARRIS STREET, NORWOOD – TRAFFIC FLOW REVERSAL | 2 |
| 3.2 | PETITION – AVENUE ROAD, PAYNEHAM AND GLYNDE | 6 |
| 4. | OTHER BUSINESS | 12 |
| 5. | NEXT MEETNG | 12 |
| 6. | CLOSURE..... | 12 |

VENUE Meeting Room 3 (upper level), Norwood Town Hall

HOUR 10.00am

PRESENT

Committee Members Cr Kevin Duke (Presiding Member)
Cr Carlo Dottore
Cr Fay Patterson
Mr Shane Foley (Specialist Independent Member)
Mr Nick Meredith (Specialist Independent Member)

Staff Gayle Buckby (Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport)
Kate Talbot (Executive Assistant, Urban Planning & Environment)

APOLOGIES Senior Sergeant Kev Carroll (SAPOL)

ABSENT Nil

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

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

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

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT & ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10 AUGUST 2021

Cr Patterson moved that the minutes of the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee meeting held on 10 August 2021 be taken as read and confirmed. Seconded by Mr Nick Meredith and carried.

2. PRESIDING MEMBER'S COMMUNICATION

The Presiding Member advised that the Council will have to seriously budget for future traffic management expenditure in order to address safety issues and the expectations of the community, as evidenced in recent petitions and requests to Elected Members.

3. STAFF REPORTS

3.1 WEBBE STREET AND HARRIS STREET, NORWOOD – TRAFFIC FLOW REVERSAL

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA80868
ATTACHMENTS: A - C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee (“the Committee”) the findings of a review that has been undertaken to assess the feasibility of reversing the traffic flows in Webbe Street and Harris Street, Norwood.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 6 September 2021, the Council endorsed a motion that, ‘*Staff prepare a report to the Council’s Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee regarding the traffic movements in and around Webbe Street, Edward Street, George Street and Harris Street, Norwood*’.

In the reasons provided in support of the Notice of Motion, it was stated that, “*with the proposed new lights arrangement at the intersection of George Street and The Parade, it may be advantageous to have left turn form George Street into Webbe Street to assist with the movement of vehicles and to help with congestion*”.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Goals contained in *CityPlan 2030* are:

Outcome 1: Social Equity

An inclusive, connected, accessible and friendly community

Objective 1.1:

Convenient and accessible services, information and facilities.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable.

COVID-19 IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Elected Members**
The Council considered the Notice of Motion at its meeting held on 6 September 2021, and as such Crs Duke, Dottore and Patterson are aware of this issue.
- **Staff**
General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

The Council regularly receives correspondence from users of the car parks accessed off Webbe Street, who are concerned about traffic congestion and delays in exiting Webbe Street onto George Street.

Webbe Street is a single lane road with eastbound traffic flow and Harris Street is a single lane road with westbound traffic flow. These two streets run between George Street and Edward Street and form a one-way around the Webbe Street car park in Norwood.

Site observations indicate that at times, there are traffic delays in Webbe Street resulting from the high vehicle and pedestrian activity in Webbe Street. This activity is concentrated in a short mid-block area which includes:

- a two-way ramp to the upper floors of the Webbe Street car park (north side);
- a two-way crossover to the ground floor Webbe Street car park (north side);
- a two-way ramp to the underground Norwood Place car park (south side);
- a service area facilitating small commercial vehicle for the Norwood Place specialty shops (south side);
- a service area facilitating commercial vehicles up to 11 metres long for Foodland (south side); and
- a pedestrian crossing (Wombat Crossing).

The street layout and activity generators described above are depicted in **Attachment A**.

Prior to undertaking a traffic study of the street network to assess the impacts of reversing the traffic flows in Webbe Street and Harris Streets, the operation of the Norwood Place service areas were reviewed. The service areas were designed in 2003 as part of the Norwood Place redevelopment. They were designed to enable eastbound commercial vehicles to enter the service area in a forward direction, reverse within the service area to the loading platform, unload from the rear of the vehicle and exit to Webbe Street in a forward direction. This movement is depicted in **Attachment B**.

The traffic report for the redevelopment identified that the manoeuvre was tight for an eleven (11) metre truck and as such, a condition was included as part of the Development Approval, to limit the size of vehicles able to use the service area to eleven (11) metres in length and requiring that all vehicles to enter and leave the service area in a forward direction.

In February 2007, despite opposition from the Council, the State Development Assessment Commission approved a Development Application to vary the original approval granted with respect to the Norwood Place development, including the loading dock arrangements. The approval removed the restriction that delivery trucks for Foodland should not exceed eleven (11) metres and this enabled the operators of Foodland to use 13.7 metre long articulated trucks, as this formed part of an agreement between Foodland and its suppliers.

To ascertain whether a 13.7 metre truck travelling west could enter and exit the service bay in a forward direction, a vehicle turn path simulation has been undertaken using a similar size truck (12.5 metre long). It was identified that the manoeuvre is not possible within the constraints of the existing street width and service bay arrangement, as depicted in **Attachment C**.

If the direction of traffic in Webbe Street was changed from eastbound to westbound, a 13.7 metre long vehicle would be required to reverse into the service area from Webbe Street, which is not a safe or practical manoeuvre.

The only options available to facilitate the forward-in and forward out manoeuvre for a 13.7 metre vehicle would be to either modify the Webbe Street car park structure or the Norwood Place service areas. These options are not feasible or practical given the cost and impacts of such significant infrastructure modifications.

OPTIONS

Option 1

The Committee can recommend to the Council that in light of the outcomes of the investigations set out in this report, there is no justification to undertake further traffic investigations with regard to reversing the direction of traffic flow in Webbe Street and Harris Street.

This approach is recommended.

Option 2

The Committee can recommend to the Council that further investigations be undertaken to understand the extent of works and costs associated with modifying the existing infrastructure of either the Webbe Street car park or the Norwood Place service areas to facilitate westbound traffic to enter and exit the service areas in a forward direction.

This approach is not recommended because it is not feasible or practical to modify the existing infrastructure given the significant changes that would be required.

CONCLUSION

The Norwood Place service bay areas have been specifically designed for eastbound traffic flow in Webbe Street and cannot safely accommodate 13.7 metre long commercial vehicles travelling in a westbound direction. Given the anticipated high cost involved to modify the Norwood Place service areas or the Webbe Street car park infrastructure, it is not considered feasible or practical to reverse the direction of travel in Webbe Street.

COMMENTS

Given the investigations herein that identify the constraints associated with reversing the direction of vehicular traffic in Webbe Street, it is considered impractical to undertake further traffic investigations with regard to the wider street network. However, it is noted that the proposed upgrade of George Street will result in the removal of parallel parking on George Street, just south of Webbe Street. This is likely to improve sight distance for vehicles exiting Webbe Street, resulting in less traffic delays.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Traffic Management and Road Safety Committee recommends to the Council that in light of the investigations detailed in this report, there is no justification to undertake further traffic investigations with regard to reversing the direction of vehicular traffic flow in Webbe Street and Harris Street.

Cr Dottore moved:

That the Traffic Management and Road Safety Committee recommends to the Council that in light of the investigations detailed in this report, there is no justification to undertake further traffic investigations with regard to reversing the direction of vehicular traffic flow in Webbe Street and Harris Street.

Seconded by Mr Shane Foley and carried unanimously.

3.2 PETITION – AVENUE ROAD, PAYNEHAM AND GLYNDE

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA76306
ATTACHMENTS: A - C

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee (“the Committee”) of a Petition which has been received regarding traffic management issues associated with Avenue Road, Payneham.

BACKGROUND

The petitioners are requesting that the Council consider the following matters in relation to Avenue Road, Payneham:

- reduce the speed limit from 50kph to 40kph to decrease the risk of a vehicle collision and pedestrian accident;
- increase speed limit signage;
- implement speed humps and or slow points to physically reduce motorist speed (as seen on Devitt Road);
- implement a safe pedestrian crossing/walkway; and
- reduce/restrict entry/exit into Avenue Road via Payneham Road and/or Marian Road.

A petition was provided to signatories in hard copy and this has been signed by a total of ten (10) people, including the convenors of the petition. A copy of this petition is contained in **Attachment A**.

The petition was also provided as an electronic online petition which, as at 6 September 2021, had been “signed” by 99 people (including one anonymous person). This online petition is still active and as such, the number of signatories may increase. A copy of the online petition is contained in **Attachment B**.

In accordance with the Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013, a petition to the Council must:

- be legibly written, typed or printed;
- clearly set out the request or submission of the petitioners;
- include the name, address and signature of each person who signed or endorsed the petition; and
- be addressed to the Council and delivered to the Principal Office of the Council.

On this basis, the online petition as contained in **Attachment B**, is not a valid petition.

The Council’s website clearly set outs the process associated with petitions and includes a template which citizens can use when wanting to present a petition to the Council. In respect to the petition which has been submitted to the Council, the template which is provided on the website is the template which the convenors of the petition have provided to the Council. The petition contained in **Attachment A** constitutes a valid petition to the Council.

In addition to the petition, the convenors of the petition have provided a document containing various photographs highlighting the issues. A copy of the photographs is contained in **Attachment C**.

In accordance with the Council’s *Privacy Policy*, the personal information of the petitioners, (ie the street addresses) have been redacted from the petition. The names of the signatories and the suburb which have been included on the petition have not been redacted.

RELEVANT STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS & POLICIES

The relevant Goals contained in *CityPlan 2030* are:

Outcome 1: Social Equity

Objective 1.2: A people friendly, integrated and sustainable transport network.

Strategy:

1.2.4 Provide appropriate traffic management to enhance residential amenity.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

EXTERNAL ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Excessive traffic volumes, speed and noise can reduce community liveability and safety of residential streets.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

The work required to undertake further investigations can be integrated with the '*Traffic Study – Glynde, Payneham, Payneham South, Trinity Gardens & St Morris*' which is already planned to be undertaken in 2021-2022.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Not Applicable

COVID-19 IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Committee Members**
Crs Duke, Dottore and Patterson are aware of the petition as it was considered by the Council at its meeting held on 6 September 2021.
- **Staff**
General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment

- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Other Agencies**
Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

Traffic data collected in August 2020, identified that Avenue Road carries in the order of 3,400 vehicles per day. Therefore, according to the Council's *Local Area Traffic Management Policy*, the function of Avenue Road is a *Main Collector Road*. The road function hierarchy contained in the Policy is set out below:

- Local Road – up to 2,000 vehicles per day;
- Collector Road – 2,000 to 3,000 vehicles per day;
- Main Collector Road – 3,000 to 6,000 vehicles per day;
- Sub-arterial road – 6,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day.

The 85th percentile traffic speed of traffic on Avenue Road is 53 km/h, which is marginally above the speed limit of 50km/h.

The peak periods carry approximately 330 vehicles per hour, which represents approximately three (3) vehicles per minute. North-south and east-west traffic volumes are similar in both peaks with marginally more traffic travelling in a northbound direction. The data is provided in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1: TRAFFIC DATA – AVENUE ROAD, PAYNEHAM & GLYNDE

| | Total | Northbound | Southbound |
|-----------------------------------|---------|------------|------------|
| Vehicles per day (average) | 3,416 | 1,799 | 1,617 |
| AM peak (8:00am to 9:00am) | 326 | 179 | 147 |
| PM peak (5:00pm to 6:00pm) | 329 | 171 | 159 |
| 85 th percentile speed | 53 km/h | 53 km/h | 53 km/h |

It is likely that the traffic on Avenue Road is a combination of local residents, employees of businesses located within the Glynde Employment Zone and commuter traffic seeking to avoid delays on the arterial road network.

As a comparison, the north-south roads either side of Avenue were also reviewed. It was identified that Barnes Road also functions as a *Main Collector Road* with 3400 vehicles per day and Ashbrook Avenue functions as a Local Road with 1133 vehicles per day.

Similarly, some east-west routes in the vicinity of Avenue Road function as Main Collector Roads, with Marian Road carrying 3,903 vehicles per day and Luhrs Road carrying 3,464 vehicles per day.

The suburbs of Payneham, Payneham South, Glynde, Firle, St Morris and Trinity Gardens, are bound by the arterial roads of Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road. The distance between these arterial roads is more than 1.5 kilometres without any mid-block Collector Roads. This results in motorists cutting through residential streets to avoid the delays on the arterial. In addition, there is a mix of land-uses within the precinct such as schools, commercial and light-industrial premises that generate employee, customer and servicing traffic through the residential street network. This is likely to be exacerbated in the future if foreshadowed large scale developments including a Bunnings Hardware Store and Aldi Supermarket are approved and commence operating on Glynburn Road, Glynde.

The Council regularly receives correspondence from residents of Payneham, Payneham South, Glynde and Firle regarding to high traffic volumes and speeds which in their view adversely impacts on neighbourhood liveability.

The Council is aware that traffic issues can impact on the daily lives of residents and as such, has allocated \$15,000 in its 2021-2022 Budget to commence a traffic study of the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road (*the 2021-2022 Traffic Study*). The aim of *the 2021-2022 traffic study* is to qualitatively and quantitatively identify traffic-related issues throughout the area, rather than addressing isolated locations as they arise. Traffic data collected in 2020 and 2021, at a strategic level, will be analysed to provide an evidence-based framework that together with community consultation will provide a robust basis for the development of traffic management solutions.

The Petitioners have specifically requested a number of traffic management solutions, albeit that the cause of the issues have not been identified. These are listed below followed by a response.

1. *Reduce the speed limit from 50km/h to 40km/h.*

The Council is currently investigating the introduction of a 40km/h speed limit in residential streets citywide. This is being undertaken in a staged approach, on a precinct by precinct basis and would be included in any strategic traffic study as a matter of course. Therefore, *the 2021-2022 traffic study* will include investigations into the introduction of a 40km/h area speed limit.

2. *Increase speed limit signage.*

The Council installs speed limit signage in accordance with the Department for Infrastructure & Transport Guidelines. The default speed limit for urban areas is 50km/h and speed limit signs are not required unless the speed limit is not 50km/h. If the 40km/h area wide speed limit is adopted, additional signs will be installed as required. 'Remember 50' signs at locations complying with the DIT Guidelines could be considered if the 40km/h speed limit was not adopted.

3. *Implement speed humps and or slow points to physically reduce motorist speed.*

The 2021-2022 traffic study will form the framework for the development of any traffic management solutions as required. The area as a whole must be considered strategically so that traffic management solutions taken in one street do not simply shift a problem to another street. This will be addressed in *the 2021-2022 traffic study*.

4. *Implement safe pedestrian crossings.*

The safety of pedestrians and cyclists, particularly at busy road crossings will be also considered as part of *the 2021-2022 traffic study*.

5. *Reduce / restrict access into Avenue Road via Payneham Road and/or Marian Road.*

Traffic control devices and the permeability of the road network will be considered as part of *the 2021-2022 traffic study*.

CONCLUSION

The Council is aware of the traffic concerns which have been raised in the petition and is also aware that these concerns are shared by other residents in Payneham, Payneham South, Glynde and Firle.

The area as a whole must be considered strategically so that traffic management undertaken in one street does not adversely impact another street. The Council has allocated funding in its 2021-2022 Budget to commence a traffic study in the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road, which includes Avenue Road. This study will form the framework for the strategic development and planning for traffic management solutions where warranted.

As such, the Petitioners will be advised that a Traffic Study for the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road will commence in the latter half of this financial year. The traffic issues raised in the petition will be included in the community consultation component of the Study. The residents will also have additional opportunities to raise their traffic concerns with the Council during the study.

COMMENTS

The Petitioners requested the following:

- *reduce the speed limit from 50km/h to 40km/h;*
- *increase speed limit signage;*
- *implement speed humps and or slow points to physically reduce motorist speed;*
- *implement safe pedestrian crossings; and*
- *reduce or restrict access into Avenue Road via Payneham Road and/or Marian Road.*

These requests have been documented for inclusion into the community consultation component of the 2021-2022 traffic study.

The Council has allocated \$15,000 in its 2021-2022 Budget to commence the traffic study. Additional funding will be required to develop traffic management solutions that respond to the findings of this initial study.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Petition (as contained in Attachment A), that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 6 September 2021, be received and noted.
 2. That the Committee notes that the Council has allocated funding in its 2021-2022 Budget to commence a traffic study of the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road and that this study will include the investigation of traffic issues on Avenue Road.
 3. That the Committee notes that in respect to the petitioners request for a 40 km/h Speed Limit, this will be investigated in the Traffic Study as part of the Council's investigations into the introduction of a City-wide 40 km/h speed limit.
 4. That the convenors of the petition be advised that:
 - the Council has allocated funding in its 2021-2022 Budget to undertake a traffic study of the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road and that this study will include the investigations of traffic issues on Avenue Road;
 - the proposed traffic study will consider the traffic issues which have been raised in the petition as part of the community consultation component of the study;
 - the petitioners will have additional opportunities to raise their specific traffic concerns with the Council during the study; and
 - the petitioners be thanked for bringing their concerns to the Council's attention.
-

Mr Nick Meredith moved:

That the Traffic Management and Road Safety Committee recommends to the Council, that in light of the investigations detailed in this report:

- 1. the Petition (as contained in Attachment A), that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 6 September 2021, be received and noted;*
- 2. the Committee notes that the Council has allocated funding in its 2021-2022 Budget to commence a traffic study of the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road and that this study will include the investigation of traffic issues on Avenue Road;*
- 3. the Committee notes that in respect to the petitioners request for a 40 km/h Speed Limit, this will be investigated in the Traffic Study as part of the Council's investigations into the introduction of a City-wide 40 km/h speed limit; and*
- 4. the convenors of the petition be advised that:*
 - the Council has allocated funding in its 2021-2022 Budget to undertake a traffic study of the area bound by Payneham Road, Magill Road, Glynburn Road and Portrush Road and that this study will include the investigations of traffic issues on Avenue Road;*
 - the proposed traffic study will consider the traffic issues which have been raised in the petition as part of the community consultation component of the study;*
 - the petitioners will have additional opportunities to raise their specific traffic concerns with the Council during the study; and*
 - the petitioners be thanked for bringing their concerns to the Council's attention.*

Seconded by Mr Shane Foley and carried unanimously.

4. OTHER BUSINESS
Nil

5. NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 21 December 2021

6. CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 10.56am.

Cr Kevin Duke
PRESIDING MEMBER

Minutes Confirmed on _____
(date)