

Safe Active Streets – Florence, Strathcona, Golding – Consultation Comments

Respondent	Administration Comments
Respondent #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROW's do not have safe egress due to sightlines. • Parked cars will cause sightline issues. 	SAS design does not change the sightlines and speeds will be reduced from 50 Kmh to 30 Kmh, making the street safer for all road users.
Respondent #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street lighting 	SAS grants do not allow for street lighting upgrades. The existing street lighting is typical of residential streets within the City.
Respondent #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newcastle St crossing not safe. 	Proposed crossing meets the Department of Transport design guidelines. The anticipated volume of cyclist using the crossing initially does not warrant a higher level treatment at this time. Can be reviewed in future.
Respondent #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with broader cycle network. 	Beyond scope of this project. However the network is constantly evolving and with the adoption of the LTCN there is potential for increased funding in the future.
Respondent #5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with safety around the Carr/Strathcona/Florence Parking 	SAS will slow traffic speeds along its length making the road environment safer for all users. Overall parking numbers not affected, minor impact only to accommodate trees. Note: surveys indicate existing parking not fully utilised.
Respondent #6 (Non-EHQ Comment #1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various minor queries. 	Respondent contacted and queries answered.
Respondent #7 (Non-EHQ Comment #2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queried why Cleaver St could not be used. 	Cleaver St has existing on-road cycle lanes, is a bus route and does not link to the signalised crossing at Florence Street, not considered a suitable road for a SAS.
Respondent #8 (Non-EHQ Comment #3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why could Cleaver St not be used? • Can tree wells have fruit trees? 	See above. Generally not supported by the Parks team. Creates additional work and hazards.
Respondent #9 (Non-EHQ Comment #4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exact location of tree wells. 	Tree wells will be installed as per the plan, with minor amendments on site if required.
Respondent #10 (Non-EHQ Comment #5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with safety around the Carr / Strathcona / Florence. • Traffic hazards around parked cars. • Reduced Car parking • ROW Egress / high fencing 	SAS will slow traffic speeds along its length making the road environment safer for all users. Overall parking numbers not affected, minor impact only to accommodate trees. Note: surveys indicate existing parking not fully utilised. SAS design does not change the sightlines and speeds will be reduced to from 50 Kmh to 30 Kmh.
Respondent #11 (Non-EHQ Comment #6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access issues from ROW's. • Install a loudspeaker. • Unsafe intersections. • Loss of parking. 	Sight lines and access to ROW's does not change. To what purpose? Not supported, will impact upon resident amenity. SAS will slow traffic speeds along its length making the road environment safer for all users. Overall parking numbers not affected, minor impact only to accommodate trees. Note: surveys indicate existing parking not fully utilised.
Respondent #12 (Non-EHQ Comment #5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golding treatment have impact on truck access. • Reduced availability and ease of truck deliveries. • Not safe to mix cyclists with trucks. 	Truck access will be maintained, albeit at lower speeds. As above. With the recent closure of the adjacent motor vehicle dealership the volume of commercial traffic has reduced significantly, which will likely continue to decrease with the changing land use in the area. The reduced commercial traffic, in conjunction with the traffic calming should improve the road safety for all road users.