

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS - Proposed Charles Street Bus Bridge**

<b>Overall Total Number of Responses</b>	In favour 10	Against 5	Neither for nor against 1	<b>Total Responses 16</b>
<b>Florence Street: Plan No 3268-CP-03</b>	In favour 8	Against 3	Neither for nor against 0	
<b>Carr Street: Plan No. 3268-CP-01</b>	In favour 9	Against 5	Neither for nor against 0	
<b>Stathcona Street: Plan No. 3268-CP-02</b>	In favour 7	Against 3	Neither for nor against 0	

**General Comments on all Plans**

<b>In favour</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
1 in favour with no further comment	Noted
I value the additional road safety aspects that these changes will make to Carr, Strathcona & Florence Sts	Comments noted
Please improve signage for existing 40kph LATZ	The signage was recently improved by MRWA to comply with current standards for Local Traffic Speed Zones to enable enforcement by the WA Police.
Support rationalisation of public transport systems, Support location of high frequency services on major roads.	Comments noted
Changes will be helpful to make the road and paths safer for all concerned.	Comments noted
Drawing TSbus001-Plan A- review design to allow replacement new trees.	Comments noted however there is no scope to review the design on Charles Street. This street is under the care, control and management of MRWA and the median will be removed to accommodate the bus lanes. There may be some scope to plant trees in the verges however this would need to be determined once the project has been completed.
With reduction on existing paving widths cannot trees be provided to Newcastle Street median strip –shown on previous CoV Master plans?	No width reduction is being proposed on Newcastle Street.
The indicative location of the bus stop for bus turning right into Cleaver from Newcastle St looks problematic-it is very close to the intersection , the location is on a slope thus presenting issues for accessibility and there are a number of existing trees providing amenity	Comments are noted. This location will have minimal impact on residents and the bus stop will be designed to enable access.
Given the following changes to the flow of traffic on Charles Street and the inability to turn right onto Carr Street, it is highly likely that traffic will turn right onto Vincent Street and then left into Florence Street in order to access Carr Street and Stathcona Street. As a resident of Florence Street, I have some concerns regarding the traffic calming measures that have been proposed.	The proposed traffic measures have been designed with this in mind. The proposal for Florence Street will be a deterrent for non-residents using this street to access Newcastle Street
..the removal of the RH turn off Charles Street (heading south), ...the corner of Carr & Fitzgerald Sts could be modified to include a RH turn....this would also ease the congestion at Bulwer/Vincent Sts.	There are no plans in the current proposal to change the Carr/Fitzgerald Street intersection
Please put white lines on the road for all proposals....I don't support nibbing out Florence/Vincent. I do support 3 low profile speed humps if they are of substance. No trees on corners as it blocks visibility.	Painting lines is the responsibility of MRWA and is not part of the proposal as these road are access road not higher order roads. The nib at Florence/Vincent is designed to slow vehicles and provide an entry statement into the

	residential street. The speed humps will be of a standard size 100mm in height.
<p>Will lead to further traffic on Cleaver St. Recommend City work with the State Government to reduce car access to and from Cleaver St at the intersection of Newcastle St;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signalised pedestrian crossings</li> <li>• Speed humps and calming below Carr St</li> <li>• No entry for cars into Cleaver St</li> <li>• Left-turn only for cars exiting Cleaver in Newcastle.</li> </ul>	<p>In comparison to Charles Street Traffic, very few vehicles currently turn right from Charles Street into Carr Street. These vehicles will need to turn right from Charles into Vincent and then proceed to Loftus or turn left into Florence or Cleaver Street. This redistribution will not be known until the bus lanes have been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigating a crossing at Vincent Street at present</li> <li>• This will be on the bus route so options are limited however this will be monitored</li> <li>• The status quo will remain. Only buses will be permitted to turn right into Cleaver</li> <li>• Status Quo will remain.</li> </ul>

<b>Against</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Disappointed in the removal of Carr St bus stops also the prospect of my quiet street becoming a thoroughfare. There will be no R turns into Carr St at Fitzgerald and Charles	This is the PTA proposal as part of the bus bridge project. Currently no right turn permitted from Fitzgerald Street into Carr Place.
Increase traffic, increase noise, modify Cleaver/Newcastle will allow more traffic on Cleaver to Vincent Streets. Suggest buses go through Loftus, turn right to Newcastle to CBD bus port. Change zoning in compensation for lowering value of property due to additional traffic.	Comments noted. The intersection of Cleaver and Newcastle Street will be designed to ensure only busses turn right at this location and no straight through movements will be permitted. The alleged lowering of property values in only speculation at this stage
We are opposed to stopping right turns into Carr Street from Charles travelling South as it will not reduce traffic rat-running (just force it via Florence instead) ...we suggest an arrow be added to the traffic lights to improve safety. We are concerned that proposed strategies have not demonstrated how traffic will be reduced or how traffic management and parking will be improved in the Cleaver Street precinct. Proposed increased development in the Cleaver precinct and surrounding areas will have a significant impact on traffic and parking in this area. Any changes made should be part of a broader and longer term strategy to safely manage traffic and parking in the precinct.	Comments noted however reintroducing right turns from Charles Street (which is a primary Distributor Road under the care control and management of MRWA) is not negotiable. Other comments noted.
Please reconsider where the speed humps on Carr St are installed. Consider extending and developing these existing crossovers for pedestrians who use Florence, Carr and Strathcona Streets and incorporating these into the plan for traffic calming on Carr Street.	This will be incorporated in the revised plans

<b>Neither for nor against</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
My interest is along Cleaver itself and the narrowness of the verge and lack of verge greening to assist in noise and amenity separation from bus traffic and to facilitate two way pedestrian traffic. Can there please be a consideration as to whether a broader green pedestrian verge could be constructed, noting this will obviously reduce off street parking bay numbers, but would assist in making it pedestrian friendly. Underground power would help achieve this obviously.	Comments noted and opportunities for more green in the street will be explored.

**Carr Street: Plan No. 3268-CP-01**

<b>In favour (9)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
8 in favour with no further specific comment	Noted
<p>Hazard and directional tiling required for persons traversing proposed raised paving to Strathcona St and Florence St. in accordance with AS requirements.</p> <p>Proposed levels to raised road paving are not indicated – is paving to be flush with pedestrian paving?</p> <p>Cannot design of proposed pedestrian islands to Carr Street be revised to allow tree planting?</p> <p>Proposed island crossings to have handrails as the Cleaver Street precinct has a number of retirement and care facilities</p>	<p>Will be implemented in accordance with standards</p> <p>Entry statements will be flush</p> <p>Little scope in centre of road due to width</p> <p>Will be installed as per standards</p>
<b>Against (5)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Probably not necessary watch, wait and see	Comments noted.
Increase in traffic will devalue my property. Buses to go via Loftus St.	Comments noted The alleged lowering of property values in only speculation at this stage
Strongly opposed to speed humps...which we believe will be near to the front of our property...existing nibbing on Strathcona St is too narrow and makes it hard for cars to safely turn in and out at the same time creating a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians. We propose this is widened with either a pedestrian island or at least marking of a lane at the centre to facilitate safe turning. This needs to be considered for all other areas that nibbing is proposed e.g. Florence/Carr and Florence/Vincent.	Comments noted. Design has been reviewed.
Removes existing street parking for two cars immediately outside our property. Concerns about the decision to install an additional pedestrian crossing on Carr Street – enhance the existing. Significant amount of verge resumption. Concerns about traffic calming on left turn into Florence St. Concern about location and type of speed humps.	Comments noted. Design has been reviewed.
1 against with no further specific comment.	
<b>Neither for nor against (0)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Nil	

**Stathcona Street: Plan No. 3268-CP-02**

<b>In favour (7)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
5 in favour with no further specific comment	Noted
We support painted parking lines with the addition of formal parking bay marking on Strathcona St...marking proper parking bays (incl. front and back) would reduce the likelihood of this and allow safer turning in and out of driveways and laneways	Comments noted
Hazard and directional tiling required for persons traversing proposed raised paving to Strathcona St abutting Newcastle St in accordance with AS requirements...Proposed levels to raised road paving are not indicated – is paving to be flush with pedestrian paving	Comments noted – will be incorporated in design
<b>Against (3)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Probably not necessary watch, wait and see	Noted
<p>Strongly opposed to nibbing Strathcona St near the intersection of Newcastle St...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nibbing will mean cars turning left can't move due to the traffic turning right, causing traffic to bank up in Strathcona St. This will be worsened by added bus traffic on Newcastle St making it even harder to turn.</li> <li>• Significant foot traffic travels along Newcastle St... - would be safer to have a pedestrian island to aid crossing Strathcona St.</li> </ul> <p>We believe the Newcastle/Strathcona St intersection would be safer by implementing the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A pedestrian island ... crossing Strathcona St would be preferable to nibbing.</li> <li>2. AND EITHER</li> </ol> <p>2a) prohibit a right turn from Strathcona St into Newcastle St. OR</p> <p>2b) redesign the intersection with the following features as shown on the attached diagram:</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar Treatments have worked effectively in other streets in the City.</li> <li>• There is insufficient room in Newcastle Street to install a central median Island. With service relocations/road widening this could cost in the order of \$300k+</li> <li>• Strathcona is a residential street with low traffic volumes. Substantial on street parking would be lost with the installation of an island.</li> <li>• Banning the right turn from Stathcona into Newcastle Street is not part of this proposal and would restrict resident access into the residential precinct.</li> <li>• This design comprises nibbing out Newcastle Street at Strathcona so that Newcastle Street becomes a one lane road (heading east). Currently Newcastle Street is a four lane undivided road with kerb side parking permitted. The entire road section from Loftus Street to Fitzgerald Street would need to be reviewed if this proposal were to be considered. There are no plans to reduce the road width at present.</li> </ul>
<b>Neither for nor against</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Nil	

**Florence Street Plan No 3268-CP-03**

<b>In favour (8)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
5 in favour with no further specific comment	
Hazard and directional tiling required for persons traversing proposed raised paving to Florence St abutting Vincent St in accordance with AS requirements. Proposed levels to raised road paving are not indicated – is paving to be flush with pedestrian paving? Proposed northernmost speed hump appears to clash with existing crossovers. Proposed southernmost speed hump appears to clash with existing tree	Comments noted – will be incorporated in design
I support ... with the exception of the removal of the current slow point. The addition of the speed humps will have some effect, however, their low profile may result in traffic speed not being overly affected. Surely a combination of the low profile speed humps and the current slow point would be the most effective.	The slow point can remain in place. It has been effective over the years
If you 'nib out' Vincent & Florence corners it will create a blackspot...turning it into a hairpin...cars already proceed at 60kph.	This treatment works well in other roads and with the associated raised road are will slow vehicles entering and exiting the street.
<b>Against (3)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Slow point more effective, speed bumps not good. Watch, wait and see	The slow point can remain in place. It has been effective over the years
2 against with no further specific comments	Noted.
<b>Neither for nor against (0)</b>	<b>Officer comments where relevant</b>
Nil	Noted