

Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee Agenda & Reports

15 August 2023

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

10 August 2023

To all Members of the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee

Committee Members

- Cr Kevin Duke (Presiding Member)
- Cr Garry Knoblauch
- Cr Hugh Holfeld
- Mr Shane Foley (Specialist Independent Member)
- Mr Nick Meredith (Specialist Independent Member)
- Mr Charles Mountain (Specialist Independent Member)

Staff

- Carlos Buzzetti (General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment)
- Gayle Buckby (Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport)
- Rebecca van der Pennen (Engineer, Traffic & Integrated Transport)

NOTICE OF MEETING

I wish to advise that pursuant to Sections 87 and 88 of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the next Ordinary Meeting of the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee, will be held in the Mayors Parlour, Norwood Town Hall, 175 The Parade, Norwood, on:

Tuesday 15 August 2023, commencing at 10.00am

Please advise Gayle Buckby on 83664542 or email gbuckby@npsp.sa.gov.au, if you are unable to attend this meeting or will be late.

Yours faithfully



Mario Barone
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

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**

Page No.

1.	APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER	1
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT & ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 20 JUNE 2023	1
3.	DEPUTATIONS	1
3.1	DEPUTATION – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ISSUES – RICHMOND STREET, HACKNEY	2
3.2	DEPUTATION – PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNS – PERCIVAL STREET, NORWOOD.....	3
4.	PRESIDING MEMBER’S COMMUNICATION.....	4
5.	STAFF REPORTS	4
5.1	PETITION – RICHMOND STREET, HACKNEY – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	5
5.2	PERCIVAL STREET, NORWOOD – PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNS	11
6.	OTHER BUSINESS	16
7.	NEXT MEETING	16
8.	CLOSURE.....	16

3.1 DEPUTATION – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ISSUES – RICHMOND STREET, HACKNEY

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA1041
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

SPEAKER/S

Ms Marysia Marchant

ORGANISATION/GROUP REPRESENTED BY SPEAKER/S

Not Applicable.

COMMENTS

Ms Marysia Marchant has written to the Committee requesting that she be permitted to address the Committee in relation to traffic management issues in Richmond Street, Hackney.

In accordance with the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, Ms Marysia Marchant has been given approval to address the Committee.

3.2 DEPUTATION – PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNS – PERCIVAL STREET, NORWOOD

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA1041
ATTACHMENTS: Nil

SPEAKER/S

Mr Nick Nash

ORGANISATION/GROUP REPRESENTED BY SPEAKER/S

Not Applicable.

COMMENTS

Mr Nick Nash has written to the Committee requesting that he be permitted to address the Committee in relation to pedestrian warning signs in Percival Street, Norwood.

In accordance with the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013*, Mr Nick Nash has been given approval to address the Committee.

4. PRESIDING MEMBER'S COMMUNICATION

5. STAFF REPORTS

5.1 PETITION – RICHMOND STREET, HACKNEY – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA126030
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee (“the committee”) of a Petition that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 3 July, 2023, regarding traffic Management concerns on Richmond Street, Hackney.

BACKGROUND

The petitioners are requesting that the Council consider measures to address their concerns regarding speeding and dangerous driving in Richmond Street, Hackney, between Torrens Street and Hatswell Street, which in their opinion, endangers children, pedestrians, cyclists and residents.

A copy of the Petition is contained in **Attachment A**.

The Petition has been signed by a total of 180 citizens, which includes approximately 46 signatories who reside outside of this City. In accordance with the Council’s *Privacy Policy*, the personal information (street addresses) of the petitioners have been redacted from the Petition.

The petitioners have listed the following matters of concern:

- Speeding/dangerous driving between Torrens Street and Hatswell Street, Hackney endangering children, pedestrians, cyclists and residents;
- this issue has been recognised for years by SA Police, St Peters College and local residents with no action forthcoming; and
- proposed 40km/h speed limit will not address the dangerous driving.

The petitioners request that the Council undertake the following:

- position speed humps / road narrowing / bike path before the completion of the Botaniq development (‘re-development of the Hackney Hotel site on the corner of Hackney Road and Richmond Street’) which will further exacerbate the current hazards even further.

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

To progress the recommendations in contained in this report, further investigations and design work will be required and will be funded from the *2023-2024 Integrated Transport and Traffic Operating Budget*.

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 the recommendations made in this report will be undertaken by Council Officers, which may impact other traffic management projects that are already planned.

RISK MANAGEMENT

When vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists share a limited road space, there will be inherent risks. Pedestrians and cyclists are vulnerable road users and a collision between a vehicle and a pedestrian can result in a catastrophic impact. If safe infrastructure is provided and traffic speeds are moderate the residual risk can be reduced.

TABLE 1: RISK CATEGORY

Risk Event	Risk Event	Impact Category	Risk Rating	Primary Mitigation	Impact Category	Residual Rating
1	A pedestrian or cyclist injury or fatality	People	Extreme 3	Safe road crossings, dedicated space for all road users and slow traffic speed.	People	Substantial 13

CONSULTATION

- **Committee Members**
 Crs Duke, Knoblauch and Holfeld are aware of the petition as it was tabled to the Council at its meeting held on 3 July, 2023.
- **Staff**
 General Manager, Governance & Civic Affairs
 General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
- **Community**
 Not Applicable.
- **Other**
 The South Australian Police (SAPOL)
 St Peters College.

DISCUSSION

Richmond Street provides access between the suburbs of Hackney, College Park and St Peters, with the arterial road network at Hackney Road. The River Torrens forms a barrier to the north and St Peters College takes up a large parcel of land along the Hackney Road frontage. As such, Richmond Street is the only access road to Hackney Road for these suburbs.

Richmond Street forms part of the City’s cycling network as well as the State Government *Bikedirect* route and provides an important link between the City and the Adelaide CBD for people who ride a bicycle. Cyclists can either cross Hackney Road into the Adelaide Park Lands via a pedestrian refuge in the centre of Hackney Road, or exit Richmond Street to enter the River Torrens Linear Park via the Old Mill Reserve, to access the grade-separated underpass of Hackney Road. There was an average of 170 cyclists per day riding along Richmond Street, counted in 2023.

As well as being a main connector route for vehicles and cyclists travelling *through* Richmond Street, there are a number of destinations that generate vehicle, foot and cycle traffic *to or close to*, Richmond Road, as set out below.

- Twelftree Reserve which includes play equipment, a bar-b-que and a basketball ring;
- Fix Specialty Coffee (café);
- Old Mill Reserve;
- Access point to River Torrens Linear Park shared path;
- Adelaide Caravan Park;
- St Peters College; and
- Bus stops on Hackney Road.

Traffic data for Richmond Street, between Hatswell Street and Torrens Street, was collected in July 2023 and is contained in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2: TRAFFIC DATA – RICHMOND STREET, HACKNEY (AVERAGE WEEK DAY)

2023 DATA	TWO-WAY	ONE-WAY
Bicycle volume (cyclists per day)	163	Not available
Traffic speed (85 th percentile)	47km/h	48km/h eastbound 45km/h westbound
Traffic volume (vehicles per day)	3,769	2,290 eastbound 1,479 westbound
Traffic volume (AM peak)	485	160 (7%) eastbound 325 (22%) westbound
Traffic volume (PM peak)	373	279 (12.2%) eastbound 128 (8.6%) westbound
2004 DATA (prior to O-Bahn extension on Hackney Road)		
Traffic speed (85 th percentile)	50km/h	Not available
Traffic volume (vehicles per day)	5,300	Not available

During the data collection period, there were some traffic diversions that were associated with the redevelopment of the Hackney Hotel property (the Botaniq development). To minimise potential errors in the data as a result of the diversions, the time/day schedule of detours was obtained from the Project Manager of the Botaniq development, the length of the survey period was extended, and the traffic data was analysed to ensure that the data quoted in this report did not include periods when the diversions occurred. In addition, the data was cross-referenced with data that was collected in 2020, which given its similarity, concluded that the data was accurate.

In summary, the 85th percentile traffic speed is 45km/h in a westbound direction and 48km/h in an eastbound direction, which are both below the default urban speed limit of 50km/h and as such, does not point to a technical deficiency in the operating speed of Richmond Street. For clarification, the 85th percentile speed is the speed that 85% of motorists travel at or below, and is used by traffic engineers universally to determine whether any traffic management interventions are required. However, a more in-depth assessment was undertaken to identify if there were instances of high-speed or hoon driving. This assessment found that the 95th percentile speed was recorded at 50.7km/h, which is still within the legal framework of the street.

The traffic volume is 3,769 vehicles per day which is high for a residential street, but is an outcome of the surrounding street network and lack of alternative streets that provide access to and from Hackney Road. The Council's *Local Area Traffic Management Policy* states that is acceptable for a *main collector street* to carry up to 6,000 vehicles per day. The eastbound traffic volume is higher across an entire day, but the westbound AM peak carries 22% of the daily traffic which is a high concentration of traffic between 8am and 9am.

Historical traffic data was also reviewed and it was identified that traffic volumes and speeds were considerably higher prior to the O-Bahn busway extension on Hackney Road, which included the removal of the right turn out onto Hackney Road. In 2004, Richmond Street carried an additional 1,650 vehicles per day and the 85th percentile speed was 3km/h faster, than in 2023.

Crash data was obtained from the Department for Infrastructure & Transport for the five (5) year period from 2017 to 2021. There were three (3) recorded crashes on Richmond Street, between Hackney Road and Torrens Street, as set out below:

- two (2) crashes, one resulting in an injury to a bicyclist and one hitting a fixed object, at the intersection of Richmond Street and Torrens Street; and
- one (1) crash as a result of hitting a fixed object, at the junction of Richmond Street and Eton Lane.

The Council has endorsed the implementation of a 40km/h speed limit in the residential streets in the suburbs of Hackney (including Richmond Street), College Park, St Peters, Joslin, Royston Park and Marden, if supported by the majority of residents. Community consultation for this new speed limit commenced on Friday 28 July 2023 and is currently underway at the time of writing this report. Evaluation of 40km/h speed limits throughout metropolitan Adelaide has identified that the speed limit reduction can improve road safety by reducing speeds by 3 to 4 km/h in some streets. If supported by the community, it is anticipated that a 40km/h speed limit would be implemented in the 2024-2025 financial year, subject to funding by the Council.

The width of Richmond Street varies and is predominantly 8.9 metres wide except for localised widening at Torrens Street. On-street car parking is permitted on the south side between Torrens Street and Regent Street. The footpaths are 1.5 metres wide (north side), and 1.8 metres wide, (south side) measured from property boundary to the kerb. This is considered narrow, particularly given that there is no buffer (i.e., verge), between the footpath and the moving traffic.

Kerb ramps are provided at each street junction to facilitate walking *along the length* of Richmond Street, but the narrow footpaths restrict the ability to provide compliant kerb ramp with landings to facilitate the *crossing* of Richmond Street. As such, there are no kerb ramp road crossings on Richmond Street, between Torrens Street and Hackney Road and the kerb ramps at Hackney Road do not meet the requirements of the Australian Standards. In addition, the ramps across the driveway access to the Old Mill Reserve car park, do not comply with the Australian Standards.

Although Richmond Street is a key cycling connection and carries approximately 170 cyclists a day, there is insufficient width for a bicycle lane, and as such, cyclists are required to either share the road with the traffic or ride on the footpaths which are too narrow for a cyclist to comfortably pass a pedestrian.

The Petition contained a comment that the traffic issues have '*been recognised for years by SA Police, St Peters College and local residents*'. A previous email from the Convenor of the Petition stated that a Senior Sergeant from SAPOL informed her that, '*a design fault of the road makes it almost impossible to police and that the MP/council need to be contacted to address this ongoing issue*'.

The SAPOL Traffic Investigations Unit has been contacted to seek clarification on this comment and the response from SAPOL is that, it is not suitable to deploy a mobile traffic camera because Richmond Street is too narrow and includes a horizontal bend. In addition, SAPOL has a site selection criterion when determining locations for speed cameras that include four (4) weighted criteria that are; a history of casualty crashes, reports by the public, expiations exceeding the speed limit of 30km/h or more and other offences relating to road safety. Therefore, given that the recorded traffic speeds are below the current speed limit of 50km/h and that there are no recorded crashes, it would be unlikely that SAPOL would allocate resources to monitoring Richmond Street.

St Peters College was contacted to seek clarification on the schools understanding of road safety issues in Richmond Street, however no response had been received at the time of writing this report.

CONCLUSION

The investigations as set out in this report, have identified that the 85th percentile traffic speeds on Richmond Street are operating at a speed less than the current default speed limit of 50km/h. As such, the speeding and dangerous driving concern that is raised in the petition is not verified by evidence-based data.

However, the street has high levels of pedestrian activity, high cyclist volumes, high traffic volumes, three (3) crashes in a 5-year period, narrow footpaths, a lack of kerb ramps and a lack of dedicated space for cyclists. As such, the safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists that were raised in the petition are acknowledged.

There is justification for traffic management measures to be investigated further with view to improving amenity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists travelling along and across Richmond Street, within the constraints of the width of the existing road reserve. Further investigations may identify a number of possible improvements for pedestrians and cyclists that could include new kerb ramps, a zebra crossing, road narrowing and footpath widening. These measures may include low-cost items that could be implemented in the short term and high-cost road reconstruction measures that would be longer-term measures incorporated into a future Capital Works Program. Any traffic management measures would also need to be prioritised taking into consideration the existing traffic management works program across the City.

COMMENTS

At the time of writing this report, community consultation is underway to ascertain if citizens support a speed limit of 40km/h in the residential streets of Hackney (including Richmond Street), College Park, St Peters, Joslin, Royston Park and Marden. If supported, it is anticipated that a 40km/h speed limit would be implemented in the 2024-2025 financial year, subject to funding by the Council.

OPTIONS

The Council has the following options in respect to addressing the concerns of the petitioners.

Option 1

Do nothing. The Committee can decide that given that a 40km/h speed limit is pending, there is no justification for the Council to undertake further road safety improvements in Richmond Street, Hackney.

This Option is not recommended on the basis of the traffic investigations identified in this report.

Option 2

The Committee can recommend to the Council that given the combination of high traffic volumes, narrow footpaths, lack of kerb ramps, lack of space for cyclists, and high level of pedestrian and cyclist activity, that traffic management improvements are warranted to improve the amenity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and that future investigations be undertaken to determine the most appropriate measures.

This option is recommended on the basis of the traffic investigations identified in this report

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Petition (as contained in **Attachment A**), that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 3 July, 2023, be received and noted.
2. That the Committee notes that the Council is currently consulting with citizens regarding the implementation of a 40km/h speed limit in the suburbs of Hackney (including Richmond Street), College Park, St Peters, Joslin, Royston Park and Marden, and that if supported, it is anticipated that a 40km/h speed limit would be implemented in the 2024-2025 financial year, subject to the allocation of funding by the Council.
3. That the Committee notes that Council staff will engage a traffic engineering consultant to undertake detailed investigations and concept designs with the objective of improving road safety for all road users in Richmond Street, Hackney, and in particular the amenity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
4. That the Committee notes that the funding for the investigations and the preparation of concept design will be funded from the 2023-2024 *Traffic and Integrated Transport Operating Budget*.
5. That the Council notes that the traffic management outcomes from the investigations may include low-cost items that could be implemented in the short term and high-cost measures that may need to be longer-term measures incorporated into the future Capital Works Program. The timing of the implementation of the recommended works would be dependent on the complexity and cost of each measure, the potential to integrate these works with the future Capital Works Program priorities and taking into consideration other traffic management works that are currently planned.
6. That the Petitioners be thanked for bringing their concerns to the Committee's attention and be advised of the outcomes of the investigations which have been undertaken by staff.

Attachment A

Petition Richmond Street, Hackney Traffic Management

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

PETITION

To the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters

175 The Parade, Norwood SA 5067
PO BOX 204, Kent Town SA 5071

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

ABN 11 390 194 824



City of
Norwood
Payneham
& St Peters

PETITION CONTACT DETAILS (Convenor of Petition)

Name: Marysia Marchant

Address:

Phone:

Mobile:

Email:



Part 1: The petition of: (identify the individuals or group – eg: the residents of The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters)

The concerned residents and users of Richmond Street, Hackney, on behalf of children, pedestrians and cyclists.

Part 2: Matter of concern to petitioners: (outline the circumstances of the matter)

Speeding/dangerous driving between Torrens Street and Hatswell Street, Hackney endangering children, pedestrians, cyclists and residents.

This issue has been recognised for years by SA Police, St Peter's College and local residents, with no action forthcoming.

Proposed 40 kph restrictions will not address the dangerous driving.

Part 3: The petitioners request / submission is that the Council: (outline the action that the petitioners are requesting Council should or should not take)

Please position speed humps/road narrowing/bike path before the completion of the Botanic development which will further exacerbate the current hazards even further.

RECEIVED
FRONT COUNTER

27 JUN 2023

CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

Sunday
10-11.30 am.

RECEIVED
FRONT COUNTER
27 JUN 2023

		CITY OF NORWOOD
Name (print)	Address	PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS Signature
JULIA PHILLIS	[Redacted]	St Peter
James Nugent	[Redacted]	st peter
JACQUELINE	[Redacted]	HACKNEY
Van Harry	[Redacted]	Gilbert
Amanda Carril	[Redacted]	Gilb
Lisa Neronoff	[Redacted]	SH
Nicholas Parry	[Redacted]	, Co
Jacqui Herington	[Redacted]	
Buson Pierre	[Redacted]	Poll
Nicola White	[Redacted]	st Pe
D. Murray	[Redacted]	
D. Cooper	[Redacted]	
Maniah Anzil	[Redacted]	
Wesley Trowse	[Redacted]	Mayland
Simone Austin	[Redacted]	Klemzig
Rosie kavanagh	[Redacted]	Peters
Oscar Rudman	[Redacted]	"
Henry Shillby	[Redacted]	Parteside
Dan Gilbert	[Redacted]	Wetherville
ADAM HARRIS	[Redacted]	
Jonathan Harris	[Redacted]	
Ines Sedano	[Redacted]	-SIPER
ALISON BOTHA	[Redacted]	T WAKE
HENRY BOTHA	[Redacted]	"
Suzanne DONALDSON	[Redacted]	.ST. PETER
Jack Williams	[Redacted]	Wetherville
Sarah Hyland	[Redacted]	
Tangie Hoffard	[Redacted]	
Effie Adams	[Redacted]	
S Goonasekera	[Redacted]	
Sharon Wilson	[Redacted]	
Melene FERBAM	[Redacted]	

32

RECEIVED

FRONT COUNTER

27 JUN 2023

CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

Name (print)	Address	Signature
Vic Cantini	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Lyn Hurd	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Jess Underdorn	[Redacted] Mile End	[Redacted]
Keliana Usman	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Amy Short	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Nicole B	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Andrea B	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Michelle Smith	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Kate Hawtin	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
JOEY COZZI	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Rae	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Alan CAMPBELL	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Dellmay / Julie	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Lorraine Clayton	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Andrew Under Shys	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
DAVID ALSON	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
annabel mardon	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Erin Phillips	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Jish Sahe	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Nick Pope	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Maire Tenoughty	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Sarah Peake	Marden	[Redacted]
Miah Sherry	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Lauren Mellett	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Jack Tong	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Elliot Baker	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Anita Oehler	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Julia Lim	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Laura Fountain	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Chris Fry	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Andrew Wilson	[Redacted]	[Redacted]

32

27 JUN 2023

CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

Part 4: List of signatories to the petition:

Please note: when this petition is placed on the public agenda for a Council meeting, it will be a public document and will appear on the Council website. Your address will be redacted, but your name and signature will appear in the public document.

Name (print)	Address	Signature
Emily Hunt	[Redacted] Tonbridge	[Redacted]
Rachael Walker	[Redacted] St Agnes	[Redacted]
Amanda Kay	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Emmy Pagac	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Vanessa Saccardo	[Redacted] Malden	[Redacted]
Esther Chew	[Redacted] Woodville Garden	[Redacted]
Pam Duffell	[Redacted] St. PETERS	[Redacted]
Shruti Tiwari	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Leigh Vickers	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Makayla Hillman	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Julie Wiltshire	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Sarah Telle	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
BAGHDAD Cagare	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
[Redacted]	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Jessie Symonds	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
RICHARD VABLI	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Carl Spender	[Redacted] Helston	[Redacted]
Bruno Cardoso	[Redacted] Lissos	[Redacted]
RORY MARCHANT	[Redacted] Mile End	[Redacted]
Cleo Wilson	[Redacted] Stepney	[Redacted]
Denee Johnstone	[Redacted] Hanley	[Redacted]
Matthew Frith	[Redacted] Fullerton	[Redacted]
Sarah Tolley	[Redacted] Fullerton	[Redacted]
Pousin Sharma	[Redacted] Lockers	[Redacted]
Caitlin McClarty	[Redacted] CAMPPELLTON	[Redacted]
Jeremy Talbot	[Redacted] CAMPPELLTON	[Redacted]
Xijie Wang	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Diana Elgic	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Monica Manc	[Redacted] Ingle farm	[Redacted]

Issue with footpath near old church which requires attention. unsafe for prams & pedestrians. (spare crop)
- Flipped our pram!

Saturday
9am -

RECEIVED
FRONT COUNTER

A5

27 JUN 2023

CITY OF NORWOOD
PAYNEHAM & ST PETERS

Name (print)	Address	Signature
MAYAL MASOK	[REDACTED] CATHERINE ST	[REDACTED]
Kate Turner	[REDACTED] Seabridge	[REDACTED]
Olivia Buckley	[REDACTED] Walkerville	[REDACTED]
B. Huyunh	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
T. Pither	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Andy Branson	[REDACTED] Pithers	[REDACTED]
GUY SHIELD	[REDACTED] Evansdale	[REDACTED]
Veronica Corallo	[REDACTED] Payneham	[REDACTED]
Scott William	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Vanessa Mann	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Ilijana Laganin	Bridgewater	[REDACTED]
Conny Menda	Aldgate	[REDACTED]
GREG OATES	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
MELANIE BOOTH	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
ROBERT BOOTH	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Bec May	[REDACTED] Royston Park	[REDACTED]
John NABAS	[REDACTED] College Pl	[REDACTED]
Adriane xaxaxax	[REDACTED] College Pl	[REDACTED]
Simon Casson	[REDACTED] St Peter	[REDACTED]
Richard Lamb	[REDACTED] St Peter	[REDACTED]
Ala Branch	[REDACTED] St Peter	[REDACTED]
Hogwell Carr	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Carmel Westbrook	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Melinda Westbrook	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
ZOE PHILLPOT	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Jack MINTZ	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Jack McLarron	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
DES BURY	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
MARIE BURY	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Alana Lannazzo	[REDACTED] Peter's	[REDACTED]
Tony Hatzis	[REDACTED] St Peter's	[REDACTED]
Joe Adamo	[REDACTED] Payneham	[REDACTED]

32

RECEIVED
 FRONT COUNTER
 27 JUN 2023
 CITY OF NORWOOD
 PAYMENT OFFICERS



Part 4: List of signatories to the petition:

Please note: when this petition is placed on the public agenda for a Council meeting, it will be a public document and will appear on the Council website. Your address will be redacted, but your name and signature will appear in the public document.

Name (print)	Address	Signature
CRAIG Hooper	[Redacted] Adelaide	[Redacted]
Trudy Hooper	[Redacted] Adelaide	
Rebecca Hooper	[Redacted] BAKENEY	
Cheryl Butcher	[Redacted] Auburn SA	

Name (print)	Address	Signature
Greg Whaley	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Monika Nitschke		
Nicole Meulding		
Matthew Woodward		
Dina Hilde		

Name (print)	Address	Signature
Lukey Cee	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Annabelle Pitt		
JULIAN SPANOS		
JIM SPANOS		
Miriam Posse		
Carly Underwood		
Nicole Hambilke		
Lauren Morgan		

17+3
 = 20
 180

Name (print)	Address	Signature
David Cree	[Redacted] SPEKERS	[Redacted]
Kerline Cree	[Redacted] St Belas	
Olivia Cree	[Redacted] Highbury	

RECEIVED
FRONT COUNTER
27 JUN 2023
CITY OF BROADBENT
NEWYAM & ST PETERS

Part 4: List of signatories to the petition:

Please note: when this petition is placed on the public agenda for a Council meeting, it will be a public document and will appear on the Council website. Your address will be redacted, but your name and signature will appear in the public document.

Name (print)	Address	Signature
PAULINE FOX	[Redacted] Fitzroy	[Redacted Signature Column]
Alice Webb	[Redacted] Adelaide	
RAMIYA PALANI	[Redacted] Rydalmere	
SUSILA PALANI	[Redacted]	
Philippa Dillon	[Redacted]	
Milly Tanith	[Redacted]	
Jen Hoban	[Redacted]	
Martina Townsend	[Redacted] Collins	
CARL TOWNEND	[Redacted] NSWOLB	
KATE CARTER	[Redacted] ST PETERS	
TERRY GRENVILLE	[Redacted] EVANDALE	
ADAE FEARLES	[Redacted] Hackney	
CHRISTINE VanderSluis	[Redacted]	
Madeleine Kay	[Redacted]	
GARY BERTAL	[Redacted] HACKNEY	
VISA BEATON	[Redacted] Paisley	
Michele Heinrich	[Redacted] Salisbury	
Michelle Gonsiorak	[Redacted] Berrimong	
Emily Huddle	[Redacted] Rydalmere	
Alice Hawkes	[Redacted] Park Prospect	
Lauren Trowse	[Redacted] Maryland	
Deaf Finch	[Redacted]	
Helen Noman	[Redacted] Durradale	
Elizabeth Nelligan	[Redacted] King	
CLAIRE DWYER	MURTLBANK	
MARGARET GREGORY	[Redacted]	
Genevieve Lewis	[Redacted] Seaton	
JANICE BEARE	[Redacted] Marden	
VANESSA JAMESON	[Redacted] Belair	

52

5.2 PERCIVAL STREET, NORWOOD – PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNS

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA95218
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee (“the Committee”) of the final recommendations regarding the removal or retention of *pedestrian* warning signs which are located at each end of Percival Street, Norwood.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 20 June, 2023, the Committee considered a staff report regarding a Petition submitted by residents of Percival Street, that requested the removal of two *pedestrian* warning signs. A copy of the report and Minutes is contained in **Attachment A**.

The Committee considered the investigations which were undertaken regarding this issue, but were unable to agree on a final determination. As such, The Committee unanimously agreed that determination of the matter should be deferred to allow staff to undertake a pedestrian survey and present the results to the Committee.

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

Not Applicable

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Pedestrians are vulnerable road users and a collision between a vehicle and a pedestrian can result in a catastrophic impact. Older pedestrians can be particularly vulnerable because a higher proportion of older people are frail which can result in a higher crash severity, or they may have mobility, vision or hearing impairments that make crossing a road more difficult.

The traffic speed and volume in Percival Street is low, there are clear sight lines and the street is narrow to cross, which in combination, provides a low-risk environment. As such, the likelihood of a *catastrophic* event occurring is unlikely, which classifies the risk rating as *high* (6), refer to Table 1.

The installation of the pedestrian warning signs may raise awareness to motorists that there is a high proportion of vulnerable pedestrians in the street and hence result in more considerate driver behaviour than if the signs were not installed. However, this impact is not measurable and the risk rating would not change as a result of the signs.

TABLE 1: RISK RATING

RISK EVENT	RISK EVENT	IMPACT CATEGORY	RISK RATING	PRIMARY MITIGATION	IMPACT CATEGORY	RESIDUAL RATING
1	A pedestrian injury	People	High 6	Installation of Pedestrian Warning sign	People	High 6

CONSULTATION

- **Committee Members**
Crs Duke, Knoblauch and Holfield are aware of the petition as it was tabled to the Council at its meeting held on 1 May, 2023.
- **Staff**
General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
- **Community**
Not Applicable
- **Other Agencies**
Clayton Church Homes

DISCUSSION

Percival Street, Norwood, is a residential east-west street, located between Portrush Road and Queen Street, just south of Beulah Road. It carries low traffic volumes of 337 vehicles per day, low traffic speed of 40km/h, and there have been no recorded crashes in the last five (5) years. The majority of dwellings that have direct access onto Percival Street are retirement living dwellings, owned by Clayton Church Homes.

The pedestrian warning signs were originally installed in Percival Street prior to 2007 and have been removed and reinstalled several times in the last three years at the request of residents or the administration of Clayton Church Homes. One group of Clayton Church Homes residents would like the signs to remain and another group of Clayton Church Homes residents would like the signs removed.

The pedestrian signs are not *regulatory* signs that inform motorists of a *legal requirement*, but are simply a warning to motorists to be aware of a special condition on the street. Percival Street does not have any specific *physical* street conditions however there is a high percentage of older people who reside in the street from the Clayton Church Homes Retirement Village.

The reasons why the signs could be removed are set out below:

- this type of sign is typically used to warn of the presence of pedestrians on, or crossing the road where such activity might be unexpected;
- the sign is generally not installed at each end of a residential street because pedestrians can cross anywhere along the roadway, or alternatively use the designated crossing points (kerb ramps), at each end of the street;
- all of the Clayton Church Homes dwellings are separate and there is not a pedestrian “desire-line” at any point along the street where residents cross to access a community facility;
- traffic signs should only be installed where absolutely required, otherwise signs tend to lose their effectiveness if used unnecessarily or too frequently; and
- traffic data shows that there are no traffic-related safety concerns in terms of vehicular speeds and volumes.

The reasons why the signs could remain in place are set out below:

- older pedestrians can be particularly vulnerable because a higher proportion of older people are frail which can result in a higher crash severity, or they may have mobility, vision or hearing impairments that make crossing a road more difficult; and
- the installation of the pedestrian warning signs may raise awareness to motorists that there is a high proportion of vulnerable pedestrians in the street and hence result in more considerate driver behaviour than if the signs were not installed.

At its meeting held on June 20, 2023, the Committee resolved that the reasons that the signs could be removed (as listed above), justified the removal of the signs. However, the Committee noted that there was a considerable volume of older pedestrians living in Percival Street and that if there was a high volume of older pedestrians crossing Percival Street on a regular basis, that there could be justification for the signs to remain.

Observations were undertaken in July and August 2023, over a number of days and are listed in Table 2. The observations were undertaken on fine days when weather conditions would not restrict the presence of pedestrians and at various times of the day to include the peak AM and PM periods when traffic volumes are at their highest, at also at mid-morning, midday and mid-afternoon. The aim of the observations was to count the number of pedestrians that crossed Percival Street mid-block. It did not count pedestrians who crossed at the kerb ramps at Queen Street or Portrush Road.

In summary, the pedestrians who crossed Percival Street, mid-block were predominantly either:

- people who parked their car on the north side of the street and crossed Percival Street as part of their journey to or from the direction of The Parade; or
- people entering or leaving a dwelling on Percival Street before walking toward Queen Street or Portrush Road.

Several pedestrians were observed to walk along the centre of Percival Street for a distance before crossing to the footpath which demonstrated their lack of concern with regard to traffic in Percival Street. There were no road safety issues observed and traffic volumes and speeds were suitable for the street environment.

TABLE 2: PEDESTRIAN OBSERVATIONS

DATE (2023)	TIME OF DAY	NO. OF VEHICLES	NO. OF PEDESTRIANS	COMMENTS
Tuesday 27 July	2:55pm to 3:25pm	15 cars 1 cyclist	4	
Wednesday 26 July	12:20pm to 12:50pm	15 cars	10	Included a group of four (4) Percival Street residents who crossed together.
	8:30am to 9:00am	13 cars	3	
Tuesday 1 August	10:40am to 11:10am	11 cars	2	Both movements were Percival Street residents.
	5:00pm to 5:30pm	18 cars 1 cyclist	4	Included two (2) Percival Street residents.
Thursday 3 August	12:45pm to 1:15pm	7 cars	5	None appeared to be Percival Street residents. One pedestrian was on a skateboard in the centre of the street.
Tuesday 8 August	12:45pm to 1:15pm	13 cars	4	Three (3) of these movements were the same pedestrian walking from his car to a dwelling to undertake gardening services.

CONCLUSION

Pedestrian warning signs were installed in Percival Street prior to 2007 and have been removed and reinstalled several times in the last three years at the request of residents or the administration of Clayton Church Homes. One group of Clayton Church Homes residents would like the signs to remain and another group of Clayton Church Homes residents would like the signs removed.

Site observations have been undertaken to determine whether there is justification for the pedestrian warning signs to remain or be removed. There was very little pedestrian activity observed.

COMMENTS

It is important to note that the determination by the Committee will bring this matter to a close and it will not be re-considered unless circumstances regarding the road and road user environment significantly change and or new evidence is provided that, in the opinion of the Council's Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport, warrants a review of the need or otherwise for pedestrian warning signs on Percival Street.

OPTIONS

Option 1: Do nothing

The Committee could decide that the signs be left in place because there is a relatively high proportion of older residents living in Percival Street and the signs may improve road safety for these vulnerable pedestrians.

This option is not recommended because of the reasons set out below:

- pedestrian warning signs are typically used to warn of the presence of pedestrians on, or crossing the road where such activity might be unexpected;
- the sign is generally not installed at each end of a residential street because pedestrians can cross anywhere along the roadway, or alternatively use the designated crossing points (kerb ramps), at each end of the street;
- all of the Clayton Church Homes dwellings are separate and there is not a pedestrian desire-line at any point along the street where residents cross to access a community facility;
- traffic signs should only be installed where absolutely required, otherwise signs tend to lose their effectiveness if used unnecessarily or too frequently;
- traffic data shows that there are no traffic-related safety concerns in terms of vehicular speeds and volumes; and
- site observations did not identify that pedestrian activity is high.

Option 2: Remove the pedestrian warning signs

The Committee could decide to remove the signs because the signs are not used for their intended purpose and they are not required because traffic data and site observations do not identify that there is a road safety concern in Percival Street that warrants pedestrian warning signs.

This option is recommended on the basis of the traffic investigations identified and set out in this report.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That based upon the results of the outcomes of the investigations that have been undertaken and as set out in this report, which included a pedestrian survey, the *pedestrian* signs at each end of Percival Street be removed.
2. That the Petitioners be advised of the outcome and thanked for bring their concerns to the Council's attention.

Attachment A

Percival Street, Norwood Pedestrian Warning Signs

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**

4.1 PETITION – PERCIVAL STREET, NORWOOD – PEDESTRIAN WARNING SIGNS

REPORT AUTHOR: Manager, Traffic & Integrated Transport
GENERAL MANAGER: General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
CONTACT NUMBER: 8366 4542
FILE REFERENCE: qA95218
ATTACHMENTS: A

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise the Traffic Management & Road Safety Committee (“the Committee”) of a Petition which has been received and considered by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May, 2023, requesting the removal of the *pedestrian* warning signs which are located at each end of Percival Street, Norwood.

BACKGROUND

The Petitioners are requesting the removal of the pedestrian warning signs located at each end of Percival Street because in their opinion, *“the sign makes the residents of Percival Street feel unsafe and more vulnerable, as it draws attention to the fact the residents are elderly. Our view is that it makes you more likely to suffer harm from offenders, as they will likely view the residents as easy targets”*.

A copy of the petition is contained in **Attachment A**.

The petition has been signed by a total of twenty-eight (28) people, including the convenor of the petition.

Of the twenty-eight (28) signatories, twenty-three (23) are in support of the removal of the pedestrian warning signs, and five (5) signatories are against the removal of the signs.

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

Not Applicable.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RESOURCE ISSUES

Not Applicable.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Pedestrians are vulnerable road users and a collision between a vehicle and a pedestrian can result in a catastrophic impact. Older pedestrians can be particularly vulnerable because a higher proportion of older people are frail which can result in a higher crash severity, or they may have mobility, vision or hearing impairments that make crossing a road more difficult.

The traffic speed and volume in Percival Street is low, there are clear sight lines and the street is narrow to cross, which in combination, provides a low-risk environment. As such, the likelihood of a *catastrophic* event occurring is unlikely, which classifies the risk rating as *high* (6).

The installation of the pedestrian warning signs may raise awareness to motorists that there is a high proportion of vulnerable pedestrians in the street and hence result in more considerate driver behaviour than if the signs were not installed. However, this impact is not measurable and the risk rating would not change as a result of the signs.

Risk Event	Risk Event	Impact Category	Risk Rating	Primary Mitigation	Impact Category	Residual Rating
1	A pedestrian injury	People	High 6	Installation of Pedestrian Warning sign	People	High 6

COVID-19 IMPLICATIONS

Not Applicable.

CONSULTATION

- **Committee Members**
Councillors Duke, Knoblauch and Holfeld are aware of the petition as it was tabled to the Council at its meeting held on 1 May, 2023.
- **Staff**
General Manager, Governance & Community Affairs
General Manager, Urban Planning & Environment
- **Community**
Not Applicable.
- **Other Agencies**
Clayton Church Homes.

DISCUSSION

Percival Street is 180 metres long and x 7.5 metres wide, with on-street parking on both sides of the road. Traffic data collected in 2020 is set out below and indicates that there is no road safety concern in Percival Street.

- The traffic volume is 337 vehicles per day;
- The 85th percentile speed is 40km/h;
- the average speed at 30.5km/h; and
- there were no recorded collisions in the last five (5) years.

Sixty-three (63) dwellings have direct car park and pedestrian access onto Percival Street, including twenty-seven (27) units that face onto Beulah Road and one dwelling that faces onto Portrush Road. Of these sixty three (63) dwellings, fifty (50), are owned by Clayton Church Homes, and twelve (12) are privately owned dwellings.

Clayton Church Homes has advised the Council that their dwellings are all *retirement living* and most are fully independent, however it is anticipated that eventually most residents will require home care assistance as they age.

The signs in contention are the '*Pedestrian*' warning signs with '*Aged*' supplementary plates, located at each end of Percival Street, as shown in *Photos 1 and 2*.



Photo 1: The pedestrian warning signs in Percival Street for eastbound traffic, near Queen Street



Photo 2: the pedestrian warning signs in Percival Street for westbound traffic, near Portrush Road

The break-down of the of the petition signatories is set out below.

- a total of twenty-eight (28) residents who have access directly onto Percival Street signed the petition;
- seventeen (17) of the signatories reside in Clayton Church Homes and eleven (11) reside in privately-owned dwellings;
- Twenty-three (23) of the signatories supported the removal of the pedestrian warning signs;
- of the residents who supported the removal of the signs, twelve (12) reside in Clayton Church Homes and eleven (11) reside in privately-owned dwellings;
- five (5) signatories are opposed to the removal of the pedestrian warning signs and all were residents of Clayton Church Homes.

Warning signs are a diamond shape sign with a black symbol and are installed to raise motorist awareness of a potential hazard, obstacle or condition requiring special attention. Warning signs may or may not include a rectangular supplementary plate under the sign, that indicates specificities, such as advisory traffic *speed*, *distance* to a hazard, or a type of vulnerable pedestrian present (*aged or blind*). Warning signs are not a regulatory sign, as such, do not indicate or reinforce a traffic law or regulation.

The relevant extract from Australian Standard (AS1742.2) defines the purpose for the installation of pedestrian warning signs and is set out below.

- *The W6-1 pedestrian warning sign is used to warn of the presence of pedestrians on or crossing the road where such activity might be unexpected.*
- *A supplementary legend sign describing particular classes of pedestrians such as Aged or Blind may be used in conjunction with this sign.*
- *The use of Regulatory and Warning signs should be restricted to the minimum consistent with their particular requirement, as signs tend to lose their effectiveness if used unnecessarily or too frequently.*

Although the pedestrian warning signs were originally installed prior to 2007, Clayton Church Homes residents have expressed conflicting views to the Council in recent years about whether the sign should or should not be in place. The approximate timeline of events that have taken place is set out below.

- **April 2020:** The Council received a request from a resident to remove the pedestrian warning signs, stating that they were redundant because they were installed for a nursing home that was located in Percival Street that has been demolished. The request added that the nursing home had been replaced by *independent living units* which housed residents who were not elderly and did not require the signs.

The pedestrian warning signs were removed following an investigation of:

- Traffic data which identified that road safety was not a concern in Percival Street; and
- the Australian Standards could be interpreted that the pedestrian warning signs were not applicable, because pedestrian activity *is expected* in Percival Street, similar to any other street and this did not constitute a *hazard, obstacle, or condition requiring special attention*.
- **May 2020:** The Council received correspondence from several residents of Clayton Church Homes, listing a comprehensive list of traffic and parking concerns, including a request to reinstall the pedestrian warning signs.

The Council met with the group of residents to discuss their issues and an email was forwarded to the residents that responded to each of their concerns. This included details of the Australian Standard extract that explained the reason why the pedestrian signs were removed.

- **November 2020:** to assist with an agreeable solution, Clayton Church Homes administration undertook a survey of their residents, which identified that the majority of residents preferred that the pedestrian warning be reinstated.

Council staff identified that given that there is no legal requirement for or against the installation of the pedestrian warning signs, the Australian Standard could be interpreted that a high proportion of residents residing in retirement homes along the street, justified the installation of the pedestrian warning signs to raise motorist awareness of the possible presence of vulnerable road users.

The Council met a Clayton Church Homes representative and several of their residents on site to agree on the preferred locations of the signs. A plan was prepared that depicted these locations and sent to Clayton Church Homes for approval prior to installation. The locations were subsequently approved and the signs were installed.

- **January 2021:** A newly appointed Property Manager at Clayton Church Homes requested that the Council remove the pedestrian warning signs, on behalf of their residents.

The Council removed the 'aged' supplementary plate but left the diamond-shaped pedestrian warning sign and post in place.

As a result, Clayton Church Homes contacted the Council again, noting that the Council had made "an error" and requested that the entire signs and posts be removed. The signs were removed and the Council informed Clayton Church Homes that the signs would not be reinstated in the future.

- **May 2022:** A newly appointed staff member of Clayton Church Homes, on the resident's behalf, requested to the Council that the pedestrian signs be reinstated. A history of the sign removal and installation was forwarded to the Clayton Church Homes staff member and it was stated that given this history, the pedestrian warning signs would not be reinstated. Clayton Church Homes provided absolute assurance to the Council that the reinstatement of the signs was agreed by all parties, and that there would be no further requests for installation or removal of the signs.

The Council reinstated the pedestrian warning signs and reiterated to Clayton Church Homes that they would not be removed at any time in the future.

- **September 2022:** The Council received a request from a newly appointed staff member of Clayton Church Homes to remove the pedestrian warning signs in Percival Street, on behalf of a resident. The new staff member was provided with the history of the signs and they were advised that the signs would not be removed.
- **November 2022:** The Council received an email from the newly appointed staff member of Clayton Church Homes requesting that the pedestrian signs be removed, because residents had provided a survey that identified that the majority of residents wanted the sign removed.

The new staff member was informed of the history of the sign and advised that the signs would not be removed.

- **May 2023:** The Council received the petition that is the subject of this report, to remove the pedestrian warning signs.
- **May 2023:** The Council received an email from Clayton Church Homes advising that their preference is for the pedestrian signs to remain.

CONCLUSION

The pedestrian warning signs were originally installed prior to 2007 and as set out above, have been removed and reinstalled several times in the last three (3) years at the request of residents or the administration of Clayton Church Homes.

A number of Clayton Church Homes residents would like the pedestrian warning signs installed because in their opinion, there are road safety concerns for elderly and vulnerable pedestrians. Other residents of Percival Street would prefer that the signs are not installed because in their opinion, the signs cause the residents to feel unsafe and vulnerable by indicating that the residents in the area are elderly. There has been a high turnover of staff at Clayton Church Homes and as turnover has occurred, the Council has received conflicting requests from new staff to either remove or reinstate the signs.

COMMENTS

There is no research available that confirms or contradicts the reasons set out in the petition for the removal of the sign, which as stated by the Convenor of the petition is that, *"the sign makes the residents of Percival Street feel unsafe and more vulnerable, as it draws attention to the fact the residents are elderly. Our view is that it makes us more likely to suffer harm from offenders, as they will likely view the residents as easy targets"*.

The pedestrian signs are not regulatory signs that inform motorists of a *legal requirement*, but are simply a warning to motorists to be aware of a special condition on the street. Percival Street does not have any specific *physical* street conditions however there is a high percentage of older people who reside in the street from the Clayton Church Homes Retirement Village.

Older pedestrians are included in the group of vulnerable road users, along with young children and people who ride bicycles. Older pedestrians are included in this group because they are more likely to be frail which can result in a higher crash severity, and some may find the crossing of roads difficult because of reduced mobility, vision or hearing.

OPTIONS

Option 1: Do nothing.

The Committee could decide to leave the signs in place because there is a relatively high proportion of older residents living in Percival Street and a survey undertaken in 2020 identified that the majority of residents preferred that the sign be installed and Clayton Church Homes has advised the Council that it is their preference that the signs remain in place.

This option is recommended because the pedestrian warning signs may raise motorist awareness that there is a high proportion of vulnerable pedestrians in the street and hence result in a safer environment for pedestrians than if the signs were not installed

Option 2: Remove the pedestrian warning signs and Aged supplementary plates.

The Committee could decide to remove the signs due to twenty-three (23) residents of Percival Street signing the petition stating that in their opinion, the signs are not required and that the traffic data does not indicate that there is a road safety concern in Percival Street that warrants pedestrian warning signs.

This option is not recommended because pedestrian safety is paramount, particularly in an environment with a significant proportion of older pedestrians, albeit, that the removal of the pedestrian warning signs and Aged supplementary plates could also be considered a reasonable action to take given the data shows there is no traffic related safety concerns in terms of vehicular speeds and volumes

Option 3: Remove the Aged supplementary plates, but leave the pedestrian warning signs in place.

The Committee could decide that as a compromise the Aged supplementary be removed only.

This is not recommended because the pedestrian warning sign by itself would not provide sufficient information to motorists with regard to the reason of the warning, and could therefore be more likely to be ignored that if the *aged* plate was in place.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Petition (as contained in Attachment A), that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May, 2023, be received and noted.
 2. That based upon the results of the outcomes from the investigations set out in this report, the *pedestrian* warning signs and *aged* supplementary plates, are to remain in their current positions at each end of Percival Street.
 3. That the Petitioners be advised of the outcome and thanked for bring their concerns to the Councils attention.
-

Mr Nick Meredith moved:

1. *That the Petition (as contained in Attachment A), that was received by the Council at its meeting held on 1 May, 2023, be received and noted.*
2. *That based upon the results of the outcomes from the investigations set out in this report, the pedestrian warning signs and aged supplementary plates, are to remain in their current positions at each end of Percival Street.*
3. *That the Petitioners be advised of the outcome and thanked for bring their concerns to the Councils attention.*

The motion lapsed for want of a seconder.

Mr Charles Mountain moved:

That the determination of this matter be deferred to allow staff to undertake a pedestrian survey and present the results to the Committee.

Seconded by Mr Nick Meredith and carried unanimously.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**
(Of an urgent nature only)

7. **NEXT MEETING**
Tuesday 17 October 2023

8. **CLOSURE**