

By email: feedback@hindleystreetupgrade.com.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

Hindley Street Upgrade

This is a joint submission by Walking SA and Bike Adelaide.

Congratulations on the plans for Hindley Street. We think that their implementation will significantly improve the attractiveness of the street, giving it a much wider appeal. However, there are some corrections needed to inappropriate detailing, which appear to be based in landscape design without including the traffic engineering required to ensure pedestrian safety.

It would be wonderful to see seating back in the street, along with the new shading provided by trees and the addition of understorey greenery. And we particularly like the idea of a raised intersection at the Bank Street/ Leigh Street intersection. We initially assumed that traffic lights were to be removed due to the absence of vehicular stop bars and pedestrian crosswalk markings. We would support this with the addition of zebra markings to provide pedestrians with priority. In the absence of these, road users would be confused as to who needs to yield. However, the artist's impression shows traffic lights for east-west traffic, but not north-south traffic, and no pedestrian signals. We therefore seek confirmation about the intent at this location. Our experience with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport SA (DIT) is that they would be cautious about trialling partial signalisation and no pedestrian signals at a high pedestrian location. We suggest that it is more feasible that the intersection operate as a scramble crossing with north-south signal control and pedestrian countdown timers.

The corner radii provided are inconsistent and very wide on Leigh Street. We believe that kerb radii should be kept as tight as possible in order to minimise vehicular turning speeds, which is directly related to pedestrian safety; and provide straight kerb to give guidance for people with vision impairment. As it is, the use of tactile ground surface indicators (TGSIs) matching the wide radius offers people with vision impairment no guidance when crossing either Hindley Street or Leigh Street. Nor does it warn them about the presence of bollards. Bollards should not be placed within the Continuous Accessible Path of Travel (CAPT). While we understand that these are intended to protect pedestrians from vehicle intrusion, the correct way to place these would be a) along the property line b) in line with street lights/street furniture – these locations being outside the CAPT; and c) at the tangent point of the corner radius – this location setting the turning circle for vehicles.

Similar comments apply at Morphett Street, assuming that traffic signals are not proposed to be removed. On the other hand, kerb ramps at King William Street could be wider, given the high

Supported by



Government of South Australia
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

pedestrian numbers. Traffic signal posts are not shown but extending the kerb ramp close to a signal post can avoid the need for a wing to be provided, as this wing is to prevent tripping for pedestrians walking across the slope of the kerb ramp and no such travel is possible if the ramp is adjacent to the signal pole.

Four points to improve things further:

1. You will be well aware that there is a danger of seating for outdoor dining intrude into the CAPT. Can we ask that a pavement detail make it clear to all concerned (including the pedestrian) the limits of seating to prevent such intrusions.
2. We also suggest that more bike parking be provided, and under trees for shade. Placing these near driveway crossovers or laneways enables cyclists to quickly and conveniently pull off the roadway to access parking, reducing the likelihood of being rear-ended (bicycles do not have brake lights to warn drivers when they're slowing down.)
3. The cross-sections are a little confusing, making it difficult to compare what is planned with what currently exists. It appears that the existing traffic lanes are 3m in width, while the planned lanes are 3.25m. However, we understand that the plan involves "minimizing vehicle lanes", rather than widening them. 3.25m would seem excessive and is wider than many traffic lanes in the City. Pirie Street, for example, has vehicle lanes of 2.7m, which is effective in keeping traffic speeds low – using dedicated bike lanes to provide cyclist safety.

On the other hand, 3.25m is not wide if motorists are expected to pass cyclists within the lane, or for cyclists to safely avoid the very real hazard of car doors – but is wide enough to tempt motorists to pass. The (strangely) long centre line markings will make it more likely that the cyclist will be squeezed when they do so. (You might reconsider the need for centre line markings at all.) The hotel parking says it allows for coach parking, however is no wider than other parking. This means coaches will overhang into the roadway, creating further squeeze point conditions for cyclists.

The solution is either to widen each footpath by 20cm, creating a lane too narrow for vehicles to pass cyclists, or to reduce the footpaths by 25cm to provide more on-road space for cyclists. Neither option would have a significant impact on the pedestrian and other user space that is available. An innovative solution would have a central traffic lane without any centreline, and a zone of different paving between the traffic lane and kerb/parking forming a 'verge' that vehicles generally don't need to use – so is usually available to a cyclist or someone getting into/out of a car – but can enter when passing another vehicle (if safe to do so). Internationally, this is associated with increased cyclist safety and comfort compared to no on-road space. It has been used in Melbourne and is similar to Perth's safe active street treatment. It is very compatible with lower speed zones, as in Hindley Street.

4. What are called continuous footpaths are not. The contrasting paving immediately adjacent to the continuous footpaths undermines the concept. The TGSIs give an appearance of stop bars on each side of the roadway, telling motorists and pedestrians that motorists have priority. The kerb radii are excessive, enabling vehicles to turn off or onto Hindley Street at a higher speed than safe or desirable, and do not look like crossovers of a footpath. As a result, these treatments look like a raised threshold rather than a continuous footpath. Continuous footpaths should be what they say they are; a continuation of the footpath, both in pavement

and height, across the roadway. This is important in securing the safety and legal benefits of continuous footpaths as 'road-related areas' under the road rules. The NSW RMS's technical note (<https://standards.transport.nsw.gov.au/search-standard-specific/?id=TBA%20-%200003783:2022>) provides appropriate guidance (though their placement of bollards falls within the CAPT and we recommend this be adjusted). The driveway into Wilsons Car Park is shown as being particularly wide. We suggest better delineation to encourage driver discipline and adoption of appropriate speeds.

We put forward these suggestions with the intention of improving further what is already a welcome design for Hindley Street. We would welcome further discussion if you can identify reasons why these suggestions would not be appropriate.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "SKM Kelsey". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sharon Kelsey
Executive Director
Walking SA