

Attachment

| General Feedback on Your Say Yarra – Park Street | |
|---|---|
| Respondent | Comment |
| 1 | <p>Hi Team Yarra, Just wanted to express my appreciation and admiration for all your fantastic work. With plans like these I reckon you've been responsive, creative, and informative. A real vision for our community, thanks!! I'm most interested in the Park Street bi-directional bike lanes project - such a brilliant idea - and the plans for the St George's Rd and Park St intersection (if any). The obvious solution would seem to be to begin the bidirectional popup from Park St and Taplin St. But I think it's still worth exploring how those walking and bike riding can be separated in that area around the Inner Circle Trail either side of St George's Rd, and riders protected at the southerly intersection of the Inner City Rail Trail and St George's Rd (at tram stop no. 23, really dangerous to cross, in the mornings especially). Those are serious conflict points, I think. Could a future bi-directional path include a proper crossing with lights at the Inner City Trail/St George's Rd (maybe I'm dreaming)? Or could a new sealed path run from the Park St cul-de-sac (near the old Metro Fire Brigade building) to the next segment of Park St (near Taplin St)? A newly widened traffic light crossing on St George's Rd/Park St/Capital City Trail could be timed so riders could be thoroughly separated from non-riders (now I'm really dreaming). These are probably overly ambitious/poorly explained ideas! I mainly want to thank you for all your work, it's great, keep it up :) Looking forward to seeing how it goes.</p> |
| 2 | <p>I'm very excited about the installation of the Park Street contraflow lane. I will use this almost daily. I encourage the council to consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing traffic speed on Park St to 30km/h - Ensuring the installed lane connects safely with Nicholson St and St Georges Rd (it is a great concern to me that the section of St Georges Rd the bike lane connects to is 60km/h and I encourage the council to continue to advocate for lower speeds (ideally 40km/h max) as per the Scotchmer LAPM plan <p>Longer term the I urge the council to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How Park Street can be enhanced to permanently relieve congestion on the Capital City trail (and how Park st connects to the Capital City Trail); - How the installation of priority crossings on Brunswick St North and Rae Street can be fast tracked; - How either Brunswick St North and Rae Street could be closed between Park St and the Capital City trail to extend the park area and reduce the number of conflict zones between the CCT and cut through traffic. <p>I really appreciate the work the council is doing in this space and am cognizant of</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>the many restraints you are working within and against. Please keep fighting the good fight for safer streets and prioritising both active and low emission transport.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Pop up bike lane in Park St Fitzroy North, I have a few questions/concerns.</p> <p>As Park St is one way in 2 different directions, am I correct in assuming that the bike lane will see the bikes going against the traffic for part of it?</p> <p>Are you expecting bikes to go off the Capital City Trail, go onto Park St then go back onto the trail? I can't see this happening.</p> <p>The Piedmontes semi-trailer goes down Park St 2-3 times a day, generally between 6am - 3pm, it takes up all the road and I see this as a potential safety hazard for the cyclists. Can you please explain why the truck is allowed in the first place as it is over the designated street weight limit?</p> <p>As I am now working from home, I see numerous cars drive along Park St at speed in the wrong direction, this could also be a potential hazard for the cyclists.</p> <p>Did council consider widening the trail path and if so, why was it rejected?</p> <p>Will there be parking spaces lost on Park St due to the temporary bike lane?</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p> |
| 4 | <p>I live on Park St, Fitzroy North. I'm not oppose to the idea of the bike lane but i think it could be dangerous for cyclist to be riding on a narrow one way road.</p> <p>Perhaps it's worth closing Park st to all thoroughfare traffic and only allow residents to access the street.</p> |
| 5 | <p>With the pop up bi directional bike lane on Park St, will you consider pedestrian usage and covid safety too? Many riders sweat as they ride by VERY close to me when i am walking.</p> |
| 6 | <p>After 3 years of Scotchmer LAPM3 reviews, data collection, public consultation, controversy etc it staggers me that money is proposed to be diverted to this "out of nowhere" project. It is creating a bike lane on Park St approx 15m from an established bike lane over a total distance of maybe 500m. It proposes to put this duplicate bike lane on a road that directionally has traffic travelling both west and east and creates another dangerous intersection of bikes meeting cars on one of the busiest residential streets in the Scotchmer precinct ie Brunswick St North.</p> <p>This will just create a second safety hazard for cyclists on this street as these cyclists will now intersect with an average of 3169 vehcles per day (2018 CoY</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>data). It is also disappointing to see that Council has already spend ratepayer money removing a traffic calming island in Park St which beggers belief given that the local residents have been crying out for more traffic calming measures which Council will not act upon.</p> <p>My question for Council is... why is the CoY proposing to waste ratepayer money on this project when a bike path already exists 15 metres from Park St and at the same time there is a significant and well documented problem of excessive traffic volume on Brunswick St North that needs addressing and funding with urgency.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Ive attempted to get information on the bidirectional bike lane on Park St. When I click on the interactive map all that comes up is the name of the project.</p> <p>I find it annoying that never when any project is proposed by this council is information about the cost, the pollution arising from the construction etc given to stackholders. It seems that just running up the flag for some noble cause is seen to be good enough. It isn't.</p> <p>I am assuming that this project will be on the roadway. My question is why when there is a bike lane which has been widened at least once since its initial construction.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Hello Sir - I refer to your flyer advising of a bike lane along Park St Nth fitzroy.</p> <p>It would be greatly appreciated if you would consult with the residents prior to such decisions being taken.</p> <p>The proposal has a number of problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The road is not that wide and having bikes travelling in the opposite direction to the normal direction of travel just creates a dangerous situation and a possible lawyers picnic - the solution is to widen the existing bike path that exists in Linear Park. 2. The direction of travel is an interesting one given that cars travel in a westerly direction along Park St between Brunswick St Nth and Nicholson St but in an easterly direction from Brunswick St Nth to St Georges road. The result being all bicycles will converge at Brunswick St Nth intersection under the current proposal. 3. The Capital City Trail is not that busy nor congested - why at 8am today it was nearly empty - everybody is working at home. 4. I agree it's a bit busy on the weekend but this has the added result of slowing bike riders that normally travel at break neck speeds; I went for a ride last Sunday morning and it was quite civilised. |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p>5. Your flyer says you're keen to hear what we have to say but I suspect that not actually the case.</p> |
| <p>9</p> | <p>I write regarding the imminent establishment of the Pop-up Bike lane in Park St Fitzroy North. There has been no consultation with residents and I believe we would have been able to voice some significant concerns to take into consideration before implementing this project.</p> <p>Please note, I am in favour of enhancing the capacity for cyclists. But I am concerned this proposal will put lives at risk if several concerns are not addressed. They are as follows:</p> <p>Park St is one way in 2 different directions. This will mean cyclists will be turning into the lanes and using them against the traffic.</p> <p>Cyclists will require clear messaging about entry into the Pop-up Bike Lane from Birkenhead or risk colliding with oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Cyclists will require clear messaging about alternating between the Capital City Trail and this Pop-up Bike Path, for their own safety and that of pedestrians and cars in Park Street.</p> <p>Piedmonts' delivery trucks use the section of Park St between Birkenhead and Brunswick Street North several times a day. They take up the entire street and will be turning into oncoming cyclists because you are allowing the cyclists to travel against the traffic in this section. I have never understood why it is the Piedmonts' delivery trucks are permitted in this section of Park St since they are over the designated weight for our street. Will you issue infringements to avoid deaths on this road?</p> <p>I work from home, have done since I arrived in 2013. Cars, cyclists, pedestrians, skateboarders continuously contradict the one way signage for this section of Park Street. And the sign itself is utterly inadequate.</p> <p>Perhaps it would be a better option to widen the Capital city Trail rather than putting people's lives at risk with this ill-considered project.</p> |
| <p>10</p> | <p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>I write regarding the establishment of the Pop-up Bike lane in Park St Fitzroy North. I am a new resident at 198 Park Street. There are a few questions about this project I hope to be answered, below.</p> <p>I am a bike rider, and use the Capital Trail to commute to work. The track is now crowded with walkers and cyclists, true.</p> <p>But in my view the risks of a series of preventable problems are high, through attention to both process and content.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Process: Council has off-sided residents through lack of any consultation to date. Could you explain why this rush is perceived as essential, and why a simple and rapid consultation process was not undertaken? This is important to safety, as below, and to community moral. In the current environment of having unprecedented federal and state restrictions upon us, the local 'people's' government might pay more attention than ever to acting differently when seeking to bring about changes for the greater good. 2. Content: Will pedestrians be excluded from this bike lane? If not, you will simply replicate the mayhem that now occurs on the Capital Trail, and create yet another risky situation. The problem on the trail is the mixing of walkers, prams, dogs, and little kids on scooters moving together with fast moving commuter bikes. The problem is not too many bikes. Further, I cannot see how a one-way system for bikes can work in a 2-way traffic flow up and down |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Park St. I wonder if you are aware that we have many cars going the wrong way on our street and major trucks (garbage, Piedemonte's) use this section weekly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The future: What assurance can you give that this is indeed temporary? I have heard you are treating it as a trial, that is likely to become permanent. Our ability to object or offer another way forward is all but gone in that light. For example, I would have preferred a widening of the existing path to include a devoted pedestrian zone. Why is the rail trail area to the north of our section of the path not being considered for this use instead? 4. On balance: as a resident who bought into Park St last year at great cost, <i>specifically for its peaceful aspect</i>, this announcement made my heart sink. If the individual experience might be considered for a moment: I am being asked by Council for instant acceptance and tolerance for the construction of this project, plus what is likely to be a long standing flow of noisy traffic right outside my door. Conversely, there is nothing rapid about Council's response to my needs as a Park St resident. I inherited from the previous owner and unknown to me until settlement an overlooking planning problem that sat unactioned by Yarra council for 17 years, yet which Council informed I must as the new owner immediately correct at my own cost. I have waited months for Council building approval for these works to commence (still pending). My collective experience as a Park St Resident of the Yarra Council is certainly mixed. 5. Your replies to the above will be appreciated. 6. Above all - PLEASE - given you are clearly going to forge ahead with this bike path - ensure it does not simply replicate the safety risks of the existing path by mixing bikes and pedestrians, and factor in the real traffic risks already evident on our street. |
| 11 | <p>Project 1 appears very sensible; the bike path parallel to Park St can get very crowded.</p> <p>Closure of Trenerry Crescent is more problematic as TC is a regular route for locals. Could the closure be limited to rush hour, say 8-9 and 4:30-5:30? There would have to be a barrier come down at those hours or else any closure would not work. Mere signage would require policing and council rarely polices these restrictions: see for example the NO LEFT TURN from Heidelberg Rd into FENWICK St which is habitually ignored.</p> |
| 12 | <p>Hi Team Yarra, Just wanted to express my appreciation and admiration for all your fantastic work. With plans like these I reckon you've been responsive, creative, and informative. A real vision for our community, thanks!! I'm most interested in the Park Street bi-directional bike lanes project - such a brilliant idea - and the plans for the St George's Rd and Park St intersection (if any). The obvious solution would seem to be to begin the bidirectional popup from Park St and Taplin St. But I think it's still worth exploring how those walking and bike riding can be separated in that area around the Inner Circle Trail either side of St George's Rd, and riders protected at the southerly intersection of the Inner City Rail Trail and St George's Rd (at tram stop no. 23, really dangerous to cross, in the mornings especially). Those are serious conflict points, I think. Could a future bi-directional path include a proper crossing with lights at the Inner City Trail/St George's Rd (maybe I'm dreaming)? Or could a new sealed path run from the Park St cul-de-sac (near the old Metro Fire Brigade building) to the next segment of Park St (near Taplin St)? A newly widened traffic light crossing on St George's Rd/Park St/Capital City Trail could be timed so riders could be thoroughly separated from non-riders (now I'm really dreaming). These are probably overly ambitious/poorly explained ideas! I</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p>mainly want to thank you for all your work, it's great, keep it up :) Looking forward to seeing how it goes.</p> |
| <p>13</p> | <p>Project 1 – New pop-up bike lane on Park Street, Fitzroy North. Yes, the Capital City Trail does get busy but this so called "pop-up" solution in response to COVID-19 does not make sense and is poorly planned. The proposed section of Park St (between Nicholson St and St George's Rd) is a narrow one way street which runs alongside the Capital City Trail (approx 10m from the shared path) and crosses Rae St and Brunswick St Nth (BSN). Park St also changes directions - vehicles can only travel in a westerly direction between BSN and Nicholson St and in an easterly direction between BSN and St George's Rd. How does Council propose to install a bidirectional bike lane on this narrow street without causing confusion and increasing the risk of accidents? Is Park St really wide enough to accommodate parking, one vehicle travelling through and a bidirectional bike lane? In addition, Park St crosses, and changes direction, at BSN, which has a high volume of traffic (greater than the recommended levels for a local street) and includes trucks. It is metres from the Capital City Trail? Will vehicles understand cyclists are crossing at at these neighbouring points? Who will have right of way, vehicles on BSN or cyclists on Park St? Will cyclists be aware they need to give way to vehicles or will a stop sign be installed at the BSN intersection similar to the one on Rae St? There is no explanation on the online map. This does not appear to be a good, safe and well planned response to COVID that will benefit the wider community. What consideration is given to pedestrians (including families) or joggers? Many locals already do not use the Capital City Trail due to the manner and speed many cyclists navigate this shared path. This problem is a safety risk and existed before COVID-19. It appears you are creating more space for cyclists but not pedestrians. It is unlikely that cyclists will stop using the Capital City Trail. Why not build a simple gravel path (similar to the one around Princes Park) beside the Capital City Trail that is dedicated for pedestrians? This parkland is wide enough. This would create space, be of long term benefit and take into consideration other members of the community, not just cyclists. The most frustrating thing is that this has distracted Council and taken funding away from the approved LAPM 3 plan which included traffic calming measures in this area which would benefit all, particularly cyclists. They include a raised priority crossing on the Capital City Trail (at Rae St and BSN), a zebra crossing at the BSN roundabout (including bike sharrows) and</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>narrowing BSN (including bike sharrows). The irony is that the priority crossing at BSN would have been of greater benefit to cyclists (ie a safer strategy) than a bi-directional path on Park St. Why weren't local residents notified about this "pop-up" bike lane? Particularly given the controversy that has surrounded the LAPM 3. This 'have your say' is once again tokenism on CoY part. Particularly as CoY plan to install it next week.</p> |
| 14 | <p>Project 1 – New pop-up bike lane on Park Street, Fitzroy North. Yes, the Capital City Trail does get busy but this so called "pop-up" solution in response to COVID-19 does not make sense and is poorly planned. The proposed section of Park St (between Nicholson St and St George's Rd) is a narrow one way street which runs alongside the Capital City Trail (approx 10m from the shared path) and crosses Rae St and Brunswick St Nth (BSN). Park St also changes directions - vehicles can only travel in a westerly direction between BSN and Nicholson St and in an easterly direction between BSN and St George's Rd. How does Council propose to install a bidirectional bike lane on this narrow street without causing confusion and increasing the risk of accidents? Is Park St really wide enough to accommodate parking, one vehicle travelling through and a bidirectional bike lane? In addition, Park St crosses, and changes direction, at BSN, which has a high volume of traffic (greater than the recommended levels for a local street) and includes trucks. It is metres from the Capital City Trail? Will vehicles understand cyclists are crossing at at these neighbouring points? Who will have right of way, vehicles on BSN or cyclists on Park St? Will cyclists be aware they need to give way to vehicles or will a stop sign be installed at the BSN intersection similar to the one on Rae St? There is no explanation on the online map. This does not appear to be a good, safe and well planned response to COVID that will benefit the wider community. What consideration is given to pedestrians (including families) or joggers? Many locals already do not use the Capital City Trail due to the manner and speed many cyclists navigate this shared path. This problem is a safety risk and existed before COVID-19. It appears you are creating more space for cyclists but not pedestrians. It is unlikely that cyclists will stop using the Capital City Trail. Why not build a simple gravel path (similar to the one around Princes Park) beside the Capital City Trail that is dedicated for pedestrians? This parkland is wide enough. This would create space, be of long term benefit and take into consideration other members of the community, not just cyclists. The most frustrating thing is that this has distracted Council and taken funding away from the approved LAPM 3 plan which included traffic calming measures in this area which would benefit all, particularly cyclists. They include a raised priority crossing on the Capital City Trail (at Rae St and BSN), a zebra crossing at the BSN roundabout (including bike sharrows) and narrowing BSN (including bike sharrows). The irony is that the priority crossing at BSN would have been of greater benefit to cyclists (ie a safer strategy) than a bi-directional path on Park St. Why weren't local residents notified about this "pop-up" bike lane? Particularly given the controversy that has surrounded the LAPM 3. This 'have your say' is once again tokenism on CoY part. Particularly as CoY plan to install it next week.</p> |
| 15 | <p>I live in Park Street where most residents park in Park Street outside their houses. I also watch the Reserve from my living room windows. Apart from mornings and afternoons there are not a great many bikes going through.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>I have looked at the markings that have been done in Park Street for a pop-up bike lane.</p> <p>Most cars barely fit in the zones marked for parking and the opportunity for accidents with bikers going the other way, as people try to park, will be a real issue.</p> <p>In the section between St Georges Road and Brunswick Street North there is a large open space in the Reserve running parallel with the bike track, recently used for as a pop up village of work-huts. This includes sections of the old circular railway. We walk there to avoid the bikes all the time.</p> <p>This area needs new planting and could be extended into a lovely informal walking track or tan to allow walkers the safety of not constantly watching out for bikers. This could be permanent and would not be expensive - thus saving the Council from squandering money on pop - up facilities.</p> <p>I know there are strong voices for facilities for bikers in the Yarra Council. However I object strongly to the interests of Yarra Ratepayers and the people who actually live in these places always being regarded as secondary.</p> <p>There is a better solution to this.</p> |
| 16 | <p>Hi, I think the Park St pop up bike lane is a good idea for many reasons. I would like to point out however that the garden alongside Park St adjacent to where the bike lane is going (the garden starts at the end of Taplin St and heads west) needs planting out. It is in some disrepair with large bare and weed sections, some blocks out of place and in general not of the standard of these formal garden beds around the area.</p> |
| 17 | <p>The Park St contraflow is a good initiative. Safety for all, particularly vulnerable users, will improve.</p> <p>Its a great pity though, that your project doesn't extend all the way to Bowen Crescent.</p> <p>The section of the path where the speed of sporting type bike riders is actually beyond the Nicholson St cessation of your project. Probably because there's fewer deviations and crossing points that necessitate riders slowing down.</p> <p>Please work to extend the initiative.</p> |
| 18 | <p>I support more Open Space being reallocated for people walking and cycling and do hope generally that this initiative will enable the trials to remain beyond the immediate crisis to address the even bigger crisis of the climate emergency.</p> <p>Regarding the Park St contra flow lane. This has been a long identified need and I'm delighted to see it trialled. I will observe it in operation and provide feedback if I see an opportunity to improve. I do think there is an even greater need to address the section between Nicholson St and Bowen Crescent. I see many</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>uncomfortable situations in this section due to the large number of people and the large relative difference in speeds. The straight and wide open design of the path in this section supports those large speed differences. The school in Brunswick South adds many small and more vulnerable people into the mix along there.</p> <p>Recently Council installed a new pedestrian crossing at an exit point of the CCT in Princes Hill (at Mcilwraith St) that made it illegal to depart the CCT riding you bicycle. This prevents people riding from moving off the CCT and onto Park Street as this project desires people to do further East. I find this inconsistent treatment by Council confusing. Council is building infrastructure further east to have people riding leave the CCT to preferably use Park St and yet at Mcilwraith St Council has removed a previously available exit point for people on bikes to move onto the road. I ask as part of this project a formal, legal exit/entry point be reestablished for people on bikes at the CCT/Park St and Mcilwraith location.</p> <p>Please consider in this initiative addressing the same and even more apparent social distancing difficulties and conflict issues in the Nicholson to Bowen Crescent section of the CCT/Park Street section as outlined above.</p> |
| 19 | <p>This would help alleviate congestion on shared user path and reduce Covid risk to users.</p> |
| 20 | <p>Hi , I have noticed the proposed bidirectional bike lane markings on park street, Fitzroy North between St Georges Road and Nicholson Street. Which I think will be dangerous as cars parked east of Brunswick street north will not be able to see oncoming bicycles until the car pulled out over the bike lane. I don't think it's required as there is great off road bike path just a few metres away. Also this path will not meet the new bike path regulations that's been adopted in other Australian states of having one metre clearance between a cyclist and motor vehicles . Also I have noticed late in the afternoon and it will apply to the mornings that some cyclists wear dark clothes and don't have bike lights.</p> |
| 21 | <p>Great to see Yarra aiming to provide more space for walkers and young bike riders on the shared path. this is probably a worthwhile objective but needs some tuning.</p> <p>Park St seems to have low enough volumes and speeds to be a safe environment for bike riders of all ages at this time.</p> <p>Tried riding the Park Street Pop up bike lanes on Sunday</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Issues include:</p> <p>Lack of signage to direct people on bikes onto Park St</p> <p>Lack of signage to let drivers know that bikes will be travelling in contraflow direction</p> <p>Being deflected south including being away from the signalised crossing at St George's Road</p> <p>Unclear if the lanes are intended to be one-way or bidirectional</p> <p>No separation from traffic - asked to share the traffic lane in some sections, otherwise a painted line in contra-flow direction</p> <p>As a result the vast majority of bike riders were using the shared path rather than Park Street.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Really looking forward to the Park St bike lane as it's between my home and my office in North Fitzroy. I will really appreciate the chance not to crowd pedestrians on the capital city trail when I'm cycling, or be constantly having to move aside for cyclists when I walk along it.</p> |
| 23 | <p>As a regular user of the capital city trail and Park Street (both as a pedestrian and erstwhile cyclist) and resident of Park Street, I believe there are a number of factors relating to the use of those spaces which council should take into account. I have been walking these paths and streets daily for the last four years since retiring, so believe I have some useful input.</p> <p>Clash of faster cyclists with slower cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>At the outset, it is clear that the capital city trail cannot safely accommodate slower bike riders and pedestrians (often with dogs and children) and those speedier cyclists at the same time.</p> <p>Most bike riders do not obey the current requirement (as far as I understand it) or demonstrate common courtesy, by ringing a bell to alert you to their oncoming presence when approaching from behind. They also pass very close by pedestrians, and not having indicated their presence, create a real risk of hitting those pedestrians from the rear. As a regular user of this path, I now more frequently elect to use the footpath as it does not feel safe to have fast cyclists approaching from behind who do not appear to have regard for the shared nature of the path. An education program is urgently required to ensure cyclists modify this behaviour. In my view, a bike path of this nature is no place for someone cycling at high speeds, and there are many such users.</p> <p>The clash of these types of users has presumably led to the current proposal, if the idea is to move the faster cyclists to another location. I certainly agree that faster cyclists should use bike lanes on roads, rather than shared bike paths where they come into conflict with slow riders and pedestrians, dogs and children.</p> <p>Specific issues with Park Street</p> |

Park Street, with its change of direction at Brunswick Street North, narrow road space and regular heavy vehicle traffic is not a good choice from a safety perspective for cyclists riding against the direction of traffic. (I note that the Council flyer which announced that this proposal was proceeding does not make clear that cyclists would be permitted to ride contra the traffic in BOTH directions. The diagram on the flyer also appears to show a proposed bike lane on the northern side of Park street, which is not where the lane has been uniformly drawn.

1. Piedimonte's semi-trailers

Council is presumably aware that Piedimontes semi-trailers make multiple trips per day from Brunswick Street North, turning into Park Street, then turning into Birkenhead Street. Many residents have been complaining about this use of these local roads for years and there has never been a good explanation for this apparently council-sanctioned use contrary to weight restrictions.

These semi-trailers take up a large amount of road space. How they will occupy the same narrow space with cyclists heading in the OPPOSITE direction is alarming to contemplate. I would love to see council prevent heavy vehicles from using these local roads as the weight restriction requires, perhaps now is the ideal time?

Further, at the intersection of Park Street and Brunswick Street North, several new layers of complexity will be introduced by cyclists travelling across this intersection in both directions, together with entering heavy vehicles. Presumably cyclists will have to stop at this intersection, or they will risk their lives. As council is aware from its recent consideration of an island restricting entry to Brunswick Street North, this street has become a busy thoroughfare.

Having to stop at Brunswick Street North detracts from any suggestion that the Park Street route will suit faster riders. What is contemplated at this intersection?

There is already a great deal of confusion at the intersection of the capital city trail and Brunswick Street North already. I have observed many potential conflicts at this intersection, along with cyclists and pedestrians who seemingly expect the motor vehicles to stop for them, which they are not currently obliged to do.

1. Motor vehicles travelling the wrong way from Birkenhead Street along Park Street

It is very common for drivers to turn left from Birkenhead Street into Park Street travelling in a westerly direction contrary to signage and restrictions. I have previously asked council to consider some sort of built out garden at this intersection to further discourage drivers from turning left in this location. I am not sure that I received a response to this proposal.

These drivers accelerate to the intersection of Brunswick Street North to quickly clear the area, knowing they are doing the wrong thing, but also seeking to avoid oncoming vehicles. If they meet oncoming cars, they usually do not change their mind, but continue on. On occasion, these drivers do not even stop at Brunswick Street North. I stress that this is a regular occurrence, particularly if there are any road closures in the area.

Encouraging cyclists to now travel in a bike lane in a westerly direction and others to travel easterly, in the context of the illegal road use by drivers creates a major safety risk.

1. Other intersections

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Another regular occurrence is drivers failing to stop at stop signs at the intersection of Park and Rae Street, when travelling North/South or vice versa. I have also witnessed near misses at this intersection. Including cyclists travelling in dual directions into this mix is another major safety risk.</p> <p>Whilst council might make its plans expecting people to obey the road rules, this is simply not the case in reality. Adherence to the local speed limit is also often completely lacking.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1. Parking cars in Park Street</p> <p>As a resident of Park Street and owner of a car, I do not understand how drivers can safely park their cars on the southern side of the street without endangering cyclists travelling in the opposite direction close to that side of the street. Drivers will have to cross over the cycle lane, heading straight for the cyclists. When road volumes return to a more normal size, how can this be safely done? Similarly, pulling out into traffic with cyclists heading directly for the driver and other cars and cyclists heading up behind the driver create an incomprehensible level of potential conflict and risk. I find it hard to understand why council is entertaining such a risky proposal.</p> <p>We all understand that council encourages less cars and less car use, however, Park Street does not appear from any aspect to be a good location for this proposal.</p> |
| 24 | <p>I am writing to <i>strongly oppose the contra-lane on Park Street</i> as it stands. This <i>project should be stopped, and the road reverted back to its original state</i>. A detailed risk analysis needs to be conducted and feedback from Yarra City residents needs to be considered.</p> <p>Bi-directional bike lanes on Park Street have significantly increased the <i>risk to cyclists</i> with cars pulling out into fast moving oncoming bike traffic. If you have not been to this section of Park Street, car parking is on the right-hand side of the street (the driver is in the gutter) which means that visibility for oncoming traffic is limited. This parking practice was put in place many years ago as a risk mitigation strategy.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u> I am concerned that there is not a strategy around the Capital City Trail (CCT).</p> <p>The CCT should be a joint project between councils, looking at what the aim of the CCT is now and the role it will play in the future – this might, for example, include separating the CCT into 2 paths; pedestrians, and cyclists. However, this is simply a brainstorm idea from someone who is not a city planner. The combined minds of city planners, roads experts and residents across all the CCT councils would be able to develop a plan which builds for our future.</p> <p><u>Iterative Trials</u> In December 2019 the council approved a new approach to projects called '<i>iterative trials</i>', this is an entirely inappropriate approach and should be stopped immediately.</p> <p>'<i>Iterative Design</i>' is a valuable, researched and proven process which involves;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understanding desired outcomes, • suggestion of ideas by experts, • review and input by different stakeholder groups, • risk analysis, • cost analysis, and |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the best design being implemented. <p><i>'Iterative Trials' lack the most important steps of this proven methodology, lead to safety issues and will likely cost in the long term. I have not found any research which discusses, analyses or proves the success of 'Iterative Trials'.</i></p> <p>The way in which this process was approved was as a subsection to Elizabeth Street changes, which lacks transparency. This approach gives too much power to Council Officers, removing the scrutiny which is an important tenet of our democracy. Council has a responsibility to its residents and this type of consultation with residents is inappropriate. For example, Park Street residents still have not received communication from the council about works, and the project has been implemented.</p> <p><i>Iterative Trials should be stopped immediately.</i></p> <p><u>Appropriate decision making</u> This council is set to discuss a number of important matters on 15 September 2020 and will then enter 'care-taker' mode on 22 September. It would be <i>inappropriate</i> to enact new projects, particularly under 'iterative trials'.</p> <p>The Park Street bidirectional / contra-lane <i>project should be stopped, and the road reverted back to its original state.</i> A detailed risk analysis should be conducted and feedback from Yarra City residents should be considered.</p> |
| 25 | <p>write to you again out of a deep concern for the safety of cyclists on Park Street between St Georges Rd and Brunswick St North, now the contraflow lane has been painted.</p> <p>I have attached photos to demonstrate my concern, and invite you to come and see this before you discuss the project at next Tuesday's council meeting. I would be happy to let you sit in my 'sanitised' car so you can experience the problem for yourself.</p> <p>As you can see from the photos, I can not see oncoming cyclists when pulling out of my carpark. My vision of the lane, and any cyclist on it, is completely blocked by the car parked in front of me.</p> <p>This would be the same for the majority of cars in this section of Park St, because, the curve of the road into the gutter is appropriately deep to deal with water run off. This means drivers are lower than in roads that are more level, so our vision is impeded by the parked car in front of them.</p> <p>I understand council wants to encourage faster cyclists to use this contraflow lane at peak hour. I fear it will most certainly end in severe injury, or death of cyclists, and consequent involuntary manslaughter charges for residents attempting to move their cars.</p> <p>We are lucky at the moment because of Covid-19 restrictions, but once they lift peak hour cyclists will use a lane they believe is safe when it is not. AND the majority of motorists taking off for work in the morning will not see the fast, oncoming cyclist.</p> <p>Cyclists and motorists rely on their local councils to provide safe roads that will save their lives. In this instance it is clear cyclists lives are at risk. I hope you will come and</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p>see the road for yourself so we can find an elegant solution for both peak hour cyclists and residents leaving for work in the morning.</p> |
| <p>26</p> | <p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>We are writing to voice our opposition to the process taken to decide on a course of action and implementation of bicycle access in Park Street North Fitzroy.</p> <p>We are sympathetic and greatly concerned about the impact of the COVID pandemic.</p> <p>We do however have the right to be consulted and our views as residents of Park Street to be seriously taken into account.</p> <p>As consultants we know the limitations and benefits of consultation models.</p> <p>An <i>iterative</i> model in our opinion is highly inappropriate in these sensitive and complex times. It is exactly the wrong time to be excluding the lived experience and the voice of the people.</p> <p>In recent years Park Street has been subject to many changes to the street and bicycle paths including speed bumps.</p> <p>As residents we have had no communication about the recent changes that impact upon us as long term residents. That is distinctly disrespectful and frankly dangerous.</p> <p>The egress from cars is a delicate balance: to now allow bicycles to use a <u>narrow one-way street</u> in both directions puts the residents and bicycle users at high risk.</p> <p>As residents of Park Street and ratepayers we expect and demand to be consulted and the current bicycle paths to be urgently reconsidered.</p> |
| <p>27</p> | |