

## **Re: Park Terrace/ Fitzroy Terrace upgrade proposal**

The Bicycle Institute of South Australia would like to provide the following comments on the proposed plans to upgrade Park Terrace and Fitzroy Terrace.

First, we note that all levels of government (Federal, State and local) strongly support the development of infrastructure to encourage walking, cycling and public transport and increase their mode share relative to private cars, mainly for reasons of:

- **Transport:** these modes reduce congestion, are more space efficient, have lower associated transport costs and contribute to safer roads
- **Community wellbeing:** these modes are associated with better physical and mental health outcomes and more liveable communities
- **Environmental wellbeing:** walking and cycling have particularly low environmental impact.

Other associated factors are economic growth/ productivity (through the provision of efficient transport systems and more healthy employees) and social equity (through choice of transport mode).

Our comments are therefore made in the context of the following state government plans, all of which explicitly support the provision of facilities to encourage walking and cycling:

- South Australia's Strategic Plan
- South Australian Planning Strategy
- Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia
- Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan
- A Functional Hierarchy for South Australia's Land Transport Network
- Towards Zero Together
- Tackling Climate Change: South Australia's Greenhouse Strategy
- Safety in Numbers – A Cycling Strategy for South Australia 2006-2010
- The Eat Well Be Active Strategy for South Australia 2011–2016.

The Bicycle Institute has a number of major safety concerns, several concerns related to connectivity, comments regarding design details and suggestions for improvements. These are detailed in the following pages.

In the absence of marked widths or phasing proposals, and given the difficulty of measuring off electronic files, our comments regarding design details must be indicative only. Shared path signage and logos are required to enable legal use of paths throughout.

### Park Terrace (Sheet 1)

- The existing bicycle lane on the north-western side of Park Terrace currently terminates on the approach to the railway crossing (Outer Harbor Line) and recommences between Second Street and Third Street. The Bicycle Institute is concerned that as part of the upgrade, the existing extent of this bicycle lane is reduced in length rather than extended (as policy would seem to support), commencing between Third and Fourth Streets. Additionally, a protuberance at Second Street will force any cyclists who might be using the on-street car parking as a de facto cycling area to enter the vehicular travel lanes on Park Terrace. The overall impact of these changes would be to reduce cyclist safety on an arterial road and significant cyclist route. If a bicycle lane cannot be accommodated, then cyclists should at least be provided with a green bicycle signal at the pedestrian/ level crossing, releasing cyclists before general traffic.

- The existing crossing point opposite North Adelaide Station Road has been remodelled as a pedestrian crossing and relocated to between Fourth and Fifth Streets. As there is no path linking North Adelaide Station Road to this crossing point, nor even turning bays at either side of the crossing point, this will make the east to west crossing more dangerous for cyclists, who will have to stop in the bicycle lane (potentially obstructing other cyclists) and look over their shoulders to find a gap in traffic, rather than being able to sit in North Adelaide Station Road and look right.

We further note that due to the Bowden Development, Fifth Street will become a stronger destination for both pedestrians and cyclists, and it is undesirable to detour these road users by some 50m from their desire line to a point that (on the Park Lands side) is accessible by neither a formed footpath nor shared use path.

In keeping with the priority of active modes over car traffic enshrined in state government policy, the U-turn bay should be moved further north and shortened to enable a pedestrian/cyclist crossing point to be located closer to the desire line for these road users.

As a minor detail, we query why a kerb ramp wing is provided on one side only of the associated kerb ramps and suggest that central median plantings providing shade to crossing users would be desirable. We further note that all kerb ramps appear to be provided at the minimum allowable width and suggest that a more desirable width would cater to our ageing population through provision for mobility scooters – albeit not at this site, since there is no accessible path connection.

- No details regarding guard or pedestrian fencing are given and we wish to raise potential danger related to pedestrian fencing in particular as an issue. Austroads advises that a minimum clearance of 1.0m (and a clearance of greater than 1.0m for high speed cycling) should be provided between the edge of any path for cycling and any obstacle which, if struck, may result in cyclists losing control or being injured. (See AP-G88-14). This situation applies in the case of pedestrian fencing, where the main danger is of handlebars being hooked into vertical fencing.
- We note that the shared use path in War Memorial Drive transitions to pedestrian-width crosswalks at the War Memorial Drive/ Hawker Street intersection with Park Terrace. While this is as per the existing situation, we would like to see this improved by wider crosswalks and bicycle lanterns being provided. Further, the current practice seems to be to provide minimum width gaps in islands, typically narrower than the crosswalk width. Instead, these should be wide enough to cater for two-way pedestrian flow, prams and mobility scooters in the first instance, and for pedestrian storage and cyclists as needed. As shown, the space for pedestrians at the south-western corner of Hawker Street/ Park Terrace intersection has a traversable width half that of the crossing width. This should be altered to provide the maximum pedestrian space possible, aligned to actual desire lines. The matching kerb ramp is similarly narrower than the crossing width and does not appear to meet current standards. A response to footpath width constraints would be to drop the footpath height using longitudinal ramp sections on either side of the crossing point i.e. a pedestrian crossing to Hawker Street would enter the footpath at road level, then turn left or right and onto a ramp up to footpath level. The guard rail should also be cut back to provide clearance to the kerb ramp.
- Given that as few as two through vehicles from Hawker Street (or one bus) is sufficient to block the slip lane provided to Park Terrace, we query whether this slip lane is required. Slip lanes add a safety hazard and inconvenience to both pedestrians and cyclists and all slip lanes must be justified. This slip lane may well fail such an examination.

- We query whether the median in Hawker Street could be narrowed and a bicycle lane provided in Hawker Street for westbound cyclists. The lane width at this point appears to be generous for vehicles, and a bicycle lane could be possible. Although this would be relatively short, intersection locations are particularly hazardous for cyclists and every effort made to accommodate facilities at intersections.
- Depending on signal phasing, we suggest hook turn line-marking at each leg of the intersection.

#### Park Terrace/ Fitzroy Terrace/ Torrens Road intersection (Sheet 2)

- The bicycle stand-up lane on the Park Terrace approach is very long (approx. 120m) and uphill. Ideally, we would like to see this widened, but we are aware that this would require changes to the vegetative mounding and general widening that may be outside the scope of this project. We note that the left turn lane developed to the left of this stand-up lane has a long lead-in, at a rate of less than the minimum taper requirement. The minimum taper should be used and this lane shortened as much as possible to reduce the length of the stand-up lane and hence cyclist's exposure to crossing traffic. This lane should also be given a green pavement treatment.  
As an alternative, this could be a location where a kerbside bicycle lane is warranted, with a turning area at the signals to allow cyclists to cross conveniently at the crosswalks.
- Given that cyclists are expected to use the traffic signals to/from paths, the crosswalks should be wider than provided for pedestrian crosswalks – especially as cyclists will use these as two-way connections.
- Similarly, the kerb ramps should be provided at the width of the shared use path, not at a pedestrian kerb ramp width. Shared path signage and logos are required to enable legal use of these paths.
- The decorative wall located in the vegetative mounding at the south-west corner of the intersection is not shown accurately. This does not have adequate clearance to the path on the south-west side of Torrens Road to meet Austroads requirements (previously noted). This path provides local access to Park Terrace service road and hence the local precinct without requiring use of Torrens Road, which is a valuable role. We would like to see this wall cut back. A bicycle lane sign is located within this path and should be relocated onto the nearby light pole or otherwise off the path.  
This path also provides access to the Torrens Road service road, which is a quiet alternative to Torrens Road. We would like a kerb ramp from the path to the entry of Torrens Road to encourage use of this alternative route.  
It would then be desirable (and feasible, given a very wide verge) to provide a section of separated path adjacent to the footpath from Gilbert Street to Guthrie Street and its signals, plus with “bicycles excepted” signage of the one-way restriction to provide a two-way route. This would connect the Adelaide Aquatic Centre via quiet routes and signal protected crossings to the Gawler Greenway.
- Where the length/depth of the kerb ramp cuts into a path, creating a narrow point in the path (e.g. at the north-western corner of this intersection), the path should be widened to allow for cyclist turning movements, with an absolute minimum 3.0m clear, level path width provided at the back of the kerb ramp. More desirably, this should be designed around expected travel lines, on the basis of a 3.0m path width and 2.0m minimum inside radius.

#### Fitzroy Terrace (Sheet 2)

- The Bicycle Institute has considerable concerns regarding the removal of the existing westbound bicycle lane on Fitzroy Terrace, given that no replacement has been secured via an off-road path in the Park Lands, and given that construction of such a path may take years.
- The proposed off-road path would clearly need to be located outside the door zone of parked cars, away from the kerb, clear of light poles, have priority over minor driveways and maintenance roads and be straight. Adequate path lighting should also be considered. Where it intersects with the existing shared use path near the Aquatic Centre, appropriate turn radii and priority line-marking should be applied.
- It is understood that a perimeter path has been proposed, which might be as much as 10m from the kerb line and could also provide for cyclist access. This would be supported by the Bicycle Institute, subject to appropriate design and lighting. In terms of ‘appropriate design’, separation of at least westbound cyclists from pedestrians should be considered.
- We understand that removal of the right turn from Braund Road into Fitzroy Terrace is proposed under a separate project. The Bicycle Institute supports this proposal.
- The Bicycle Institute does not support an unsignalised crossing of Fitzroy Terrace to Braund Road. Braund Road has been identified as a “bicycle boulevard” and an unsignalised crossing does not provide adequate safety for bicycle boulevard users.
- While designated as a shared use path, the path between the Braund Road service road and the Fitzroy Terrace service road is essentially a footpath, with inconvenient kerb ramps. This has considerable potential for pedestrian/cyclist conflict, especially at the intersection of Braund Road, where sight distances are limited.  
The Bicycle Institute would like to see a one-way (minimum) or two-way (desirable) link from the end of the Braund Road service road over/through existing mounding into the Fitzroy Terrace service road, so that cyclists who wish to can avoid using the footpath. This also applies further west, where a shared use path is proposed from Fitzroy Terrace service road to Braund Road.  
We understand that duplication of paths is contentious and we would support a single path if this were of adequate width and alignment, with good connection via convenient kerb ramps. However the existing shared use path and the proposed shared use path do not meet these criteria.  
A similar comment applies from the Fitzroy Terrace service road to the pedestrian crosswalk at Prospect Road. In this case, an existing path from the end of the Fitzroy Terrace service road should be removed and a direct link provided.
- Comments previously made about maximising pedestrian space at islands also apply at Prospect Road intersection.

#### Torrens Road (Sheets 2 and 3)

- The stand-up lane on the Torrens Road approach to the Park Terrace/ Fitzroy Terrace/ Torrens Road intersection is amazingly long (some 250m) and uphill. This is one location where the Bicycle Institute would query whether providing a stand-up bicycle lane is the safest option. We would suggest that a kerbside bicycle lane would be a safer option. This would need a turning bay leading into the crossing at the Park Terrace signals, and we would suggest that a bicycle-specific crosswalk provided to the south-west of the pedestrian crosswalk over Fitzroy Terrace would be desirable. (The pedestrian island could possibly be shifted to the south-west to suit, replacing the bicycle lane shown adjacent to the bus lane.) Separate signalling with automatic call that promotes convenience for cyclists would then complete this facility.

We note that such a facility could perhaps be ‘marketed’ as a separated bicycle lane, which would be in line with our recent discussions with the Minister.

- The Bicycle Institute would like to see the use of Australian Standard mazes at rail lines, providing for disability access. Apart from the overkill shown on the northern side between the double and single tracks – we assume that this is an error; please remedy if not – we note that where a convenient crossing is not provided, pedestrians and cyclists are likely to use the road to bypass the treatment. We therefore suggest that extra-wide bicycle lanes be provided in this area, with bicycle line-marking continued through the area marked in yellow hatching.
- We suggest that turning bays be provided on the approach side of the pedestrian crossing adjacent to the rail line, so that cyclists using the Torrens Road bicycle lanes can move out of the way of continuing cyclists when turning to cross.
- A small section of back-to-back kerb impedes access to the short section of right-turn bicycle lane opposite Guthrie Street and should be cut back.

To reiterate, the Bicycle Institute has a number of major safety concerns and several concerns related to connectivity. If you wish to discuss any of these further, please feel free to contact me on 0409 284 165 or at [fay@bisa.asn.au](mailto:fay@bisa.asn.au).

A further concern is the public consultation process. As a volunteer committee whose first meeting for 2015 was on 14 January, we have had difficulty in adequately reviewing the major works proposed within the given timeframe. The use of artist’s impressions without scaling has not assisted in this. Nor does the time between public consultation and commencement of works – scheduled for March, with tenders closing only days after the end of the public consultation period – engender confidence that our very real concerns will be given weight or sufficiently investigated.

We can only hope that we are mistaken in this.

Yours sincerely,



Fay Patterson  
BE, MAITPM

On behalf of the Bicycle Institute of SA.