

Comment on Leichhardt - Reconfiguration of City West Link, Norton Street and James Street intersections

Leichhardt residents
27 April 2020

General comments

As long-term Leichhardt residents and community representatives on the WestConnex Community Reference Group, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the TfNSW proposals, specifically the 'Leichhardt Local Area Improvements.'

We agree that measures should be considered to manage the congestion and rat running in Leichhardt, and delays on the City West Link, noting these issues have materially worsened following the opening of the WestConnex M4 East. It is disappointing, after being told for many years that WestConnex would ease local traffic, that the reverse has occurred and that measures are now required.

We support certain measures proposed, which we believe may assist in improving traffic flow onto and across the City West Link, and consider that, in principle, merging the two sets of traffic lights on the City West Link is sensible. A summary of our response to each measure is set out in the Table on pages 7 - 8 of this submission.

However, we believe that several material changes are required to this proposal to avoid **moving traffic from arterial roads onto local streets**, which will be the outcome of the current proposal if amendments are not made. At present, the overall effect of the changes proposed is to prioritise arterial traffic movements at the newly formed intersection, at the expense of safety, traffic and amenity of nearby local streets. As such, the proposal fails to recognise and respect the functional classification of local versus arterial roads. Respecting the road hierarchy is critical as it impacts on the relative priorities to be accorded to road users - pedestrians, for example, are generally accorded greater consideration on local roads. As further explained in this submission, the proposal fails on this account, prioritising vehicular movements on local roads.

In addition, the key issues that locals have been raising with the Council and State Government over many months - congestion and rat-running on local streets (and laneways) - is simply not addressed in this proposal. In fact, the proposal will likely worsen these issues by funnelling heavy traffic onto such roads - thereby negatively impacting the liveability, safety and amenity of our neighbourhood, as well as our ability to engage in active transport.

We are also very concerned that no traffic figures or modelling have been made available. Residents and other key stakeholders are being asked to support permanent, radical (and extremely disruptive measures), with *no supporting traffic data*. Lack of such data makes it impossible to reliably assess the merits of a particular change, given that the impacts, in terms of vehicle movements, is simply not known.

We therefore request that TfNSW urgently release the traffic modelling on which this proposal is based. The Government should not support any proposal without appropriate data being made available to residents and key stakeholders to substantiate any alleged 'improvements'.

In addition, much of the proposal's impact is unclear - there is no detail about, nor ability to comment in the interactive map, on tree removal for example. Similarly, it is proposed to add lanes in Darley Road, but no information is provided as to whether land from the median will be acquired, with resultant footpath amenity and safety issues.

The proposal, which is touted as 'improvements,' is not transparent about any negative outcomes. At best it offers a fairly high-level and superficial opportunity to comment within the interactive map. There are other gaps noted in this proposal. The proposal is not transparent about the inevitable need for tree removal to accommodate clearways (on Norton north/south and James St north). Importantly the proposed removal of the pedestrian crossing on Darley Rd (by Dan Murphy's bottle shop) ignores the fact that this pedestrian crossing was part of the decision of the Land and Environment Court in relation to Development Application D/2006/311 and therefore removal is not permissible. No information on proposed speed limits is made available. The proposal does not take into account the two pre-DAs for William Street which involve an additional 200+ residents to be housed, instead proposing wholesale parking removal directly out front such locations.

Structure of submission

This submission is structured as follows:

- A. Key Issues
- B. Our Proposal and recommendation
- C. Best practice considerations
- D. Summary Response to Changes Proposed

A. Key issues

Key Issue 1: Removal of existing ability to directly access Darley Road from north of City West Link

The TfNSW proposal makes the following changes:

- James St north of the City West Link (CWL) becomes one way northbound; therefore there is no access is permitted to Darley Road via the intersection from James St north (removal of current access)
- No direct access is permitted from Norton St north onto Darley Rd via the intersection - all south bound traffic must access from Norton St north.

1.1 Degraded arterial road connectivity

The effect of the above two changes is to **entirely remove the ability** of southbound traffic to directly access Darley Road, which is possible under the current traffic configuration. The James St/ Darley Rd route is a heavy volume, key arterial route. This access point is heavily utilised - by local traffic to access Leichhardt, and by non-local traffic to travel through Leichhardt to Canterbury Rd and Dulwich Hill.

It is proposed to make James St one way northbound and the new intersection does not allow access to Darley Road directly from Norton Street north at the combined intersection. Instead, all of the southbound traffic will be forced onto Norton Street. For cars to access Darley Road they will need to use William Street or Allen Street, or via other local roads (such as Hubert, Charles and Elswick St North).

Hence ALL of the traffic from north of the CWL will need to access Darley Road via local streets - most likely William Street judging by the plans to strip parking on William St, construct turning lanes and remove the roundabout (which is a traffic calming measure).

These are local roads that will now be forced to bear the arterial traffic that was previously able to directly access Darley Road. The effect of this change is also a poor outcome for through traffic - the proposal forces cars to take an indirect route via local roads to reach Darley Road. This is less efficient and simply not sensible. This is a poor outcome for drivers and the Leichhardt North community alike.

1.2 Inducing arterial traffic onto local roads: unsafe and adversely impacting residents and active transport

Plans to strip parking on one side of William St, introduce turning lanes and remove the traffic calming measure of the roundabout at James St are planned because of the decision, in this proposal, to move arterial traffic from Darley Road to Norton Street, with William Street being the most likely access point to Darley Road. William Street is not designed for, nor is it appropriate, that this local street be forced to bear arterial traffic.

William Street has a small park, cafe and a child care centre and primary school on the corner of William St/Elswick Street North. In addition, it is a key cycle route for both local trips and those towards the CBD. It also houses the historic Cyclops Toy Factory Apartments whose residents access their garage via William St. The additional traffic, coupled with measures designed to increase speed and capacity (i.e. turning lanes, removal of parking and removal of roundabout) will create serious safety issues for residents walking to the childcare centre and school on the corner, as well as those accessing the light rail, park and cafe and the Norton St shopping strip. The steepness of William St makes it very unsafe to introduce arterial traffic, which tends to travel at higher speeds, through what is an important route for pedestrians and cyclists.

1.3 Delineation of local and arterial roads not respected

The proposal does not respect the fact that local streets are not designed, nor should they be used, for arterial traffic. This is most evident in relation to the plans for William Street. William Street is an important part of the neighbourhood and community of Leichhardt. It is inappropriate for it to be turned into, what will be, in affect, an arterial road. Comments have been made by TfNSW that William Street is 'underutilised.' We strongly disagree with that statement and consider that it is well utilised for a 'local' road. It is not designed for, nor is it appropriate, for this pleasant, neighbourhood street to be turned into a feeder road for arterial traffic that has previously had the benefit of being able to directly access Darley Road (which is an arterial road).

There are many small, local businesses that depend upon the parking in these streets. A lack of parking further south along Norton Street has also already contributed to the demise of this once vibrant retail strip - why is it necessary to inflict further pain and pressure on local businesses? This of course doesn't just affect local businesses – it impacts upon the amenity of the suburb to the detriment of the local residents.

This plan represents poor policy - where an arterial road is being used for heavy traffic, including heavy vehicles, this access should be retained. It is a retrograde step and contrary to the principles of liveable cities and the NSW government's own Future Transport vision, to shift arterial traffic onto local roads.

We note that all of the measures proposed for the streets in the vicinity (such as traffic lights on Hubert Street) **would not be necessary** without the plan to move arterial traffic in this way.

Darley Road is an arterial road and should therefore take the burden of arterial/heavy traffic, as is currently the case. The removal of car spaces, as proposed, and the creation of dedicated turning movements, on Darley Road, will improve its ability to accommodate such vehicle movements.

However, what is proposed for traffic heading south, is to force all such traffic onto Norton St (s). This is a poor outcome for vehicle users and local residents. Local streets are not designed for, nor is it appropriate, that they accommodate this additional heavy volume of traffic. The effect therefore of this proposal is to force arterial traffic onto local roads. This represents poor planning and is a worse outcome than current conditions, which enables cars to directly access Darley Road from the intersection. It also forces through traffic to take a less direct and longer route to Darley Road, which is not efficient, nor sensible.

1.4 Safety of pedestrians and cyclists

To achieve safe, well connected infrastructure, consideration needs to be given to cycle and walking routes. The design of car movements should not create safety issues and degrade the ability to use active transport. However, the proposal falls seriously short with respect to liveability and promotion of active transport.

We note there is **no reference** whatsoever in the proposal to pedestrian or cycle movements. Indeed, the current cycling route along William Street appears to have been removed from the plans. The proposal instead appears to prioritise car movements over pedestrian and cycle movements. The addition of high-volume traffic (including heavy vehicles) onto William Street and other local streets in Leichhardt North will create safety issues and reduce active transport options. Leichhardt North is a high cyclist and pedestrian access area for school children (those accessing the tram, St Columba's, Sydney Secondary College), as well as those accessing the green link to the bay run and parks. Many locals travel by foot to Norton Street and local cafes and parks. All of this existing, safe access will be compromised if the proposal to divert and funnel heavy traffic onto local streets, is allowed to proceed.

It is dangerous and inappropriate to force southbound heavy traffic onto William Street (which will be the most likely route used).

It is also stated in the 'Update' that the 3rd benefit of the improvements, will be to deliver safer pedestrian crossings. There do not appear to be any plans to improve the safety of the pedestrian crossings in and around Leichhardt. Safer pedestrian crossings should be a key priority and outcome of road changes. It is already dangerous for pedestrians when accessing Leichhardt North Light Rail in particular from Norton Street (southern section) and from Darley Road. When Leichhardt Oval is used for major sporting fixtures (which is not uncommon) the problems are multiplied and pedestrians are literally taking their lives into their own hands in this area. It is only a matter of time before a pedestrian is killed accessing or exiting Leichhardt North Light Rail.

No consideration has been given, in this proposal, for pedestrian footbridges to guarantee the safety of pedestrians coming from Norton Street, across Darley Road and also across City West Link to James Street (north). No explanation for this failure has been provided from TfNSW, when this query has been raised.

Summary - a seriously defective design

What this proposal provides is removal of (existing) direct access to an arterial road - cars forced onto local streets - because of the decision not to provide direct access to Darley Road via either James or Norton Street. This is a serious defect that needs to be remedied. We also note that the inability to access Darley Road is not clearly set out in the map used for this proposal. Despite emails to this effect, no changes to the online map have been made to clarify the position.

This proposal will also have a devastating effect on local streets by forcing arterial traffic, intended for Darley Road, onto local streets. The community has not been provided with traffic statistics for the number of cars currently accessing Darley Road via James Street, but we suspect it is a significant number, potentially thousands of vehicles per day. The decision to force arterial traffic onto Norton Street (north) creates a raft of negative impacts and necessitates changes to local streets such as William Street (i.e. the introduction of turning lanes, removal of traffic calming roundabout and large-scale parking removal) and Hubert Street (traffic queues, turning lanes and potential traffic lights).

This is a poor outcome for all. These changes to William Street and other local streets will have a devastating impact for local streets in the vicinity and is not a sustainable, nor fair or balanced solution. Importantly, these changes will NOT be required if the ability for traffic to directly access Darley Road is reinstated.

Our submission, as detailed in our Recommendation below, is that traffic should be able to directly access Darley Road from the north of the City West Link, as is currently the case. The proposal needs to be materially altered to facilitate such.

Key Issue 2: Removal of right-hand turn from Norton St into the City West Link eastbound

The TfNSW proposal makes the following changes:

- No right turn from Norton St south into the eastbound lanes of the City West Link
- No right turn from Norton St north into Lilyfield Rd

2.1 Inducing arterial traffic on local roads

It is critical that the right-hand turn from Norton St into the City West Link, to enable traffic to head east (to the city) is reinstated. Removal of this right-hand turn will result in all of the traffic wanting to head east on the CWL in the morning commute and at other times being pushed onto local streets in Leichhardt North. This appears to be the intent of TfNSW, evident in plans to install traffic lights on Hubert Street and effectively convert William Street into a highway. Traffic coming from Norton St seeking to turn right onto CWL will need to access Darley Rd via William, Hubert or Charles Streets, or via the laneways. This will include heavy vehicles currently not permitted on these local streets. Residents already face issues with rat-running in laneways - this proposal will increase this dangerous and

inappropriate rat running. We already are aware that no measures can be introduced to prevent rat-running down laneways, following extensive consultation with TfNSW and the Council on this issue.

As the only way to access Lilyfield Road heading east will be by Darley Road/James Street, additional traffic will be induced to travel through William, Hubert and Charles streets to access the intersection at Darley Road/James Street in order to travel up James St north to make a right hand turn into Lilyfield Rd

This proposal will have a devastating effect on local streets by forcing arterial traffic intended for Darley Road onto local streets.

2.2 Degraded connectivity for cross district trips

Out of area vehicles such as those coming from the direction of Stanmore and Petersham that would not normally use Darley Rd to turn right onto the CWL will need to take an indirect, longer route that uses local streets including William, Hubert and Charles St to access Darley Road. This includes traffic that would normally use Norton St and then Balmain Rd or Lilyfield Rd to travel to Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain. Drivers making these trips will be induced to take the route which takes them closest to the Darley Rd intersection, which will be through William, Hubert and Charles St.

2.3 Degraded connectivity to Lilyfield from Leichhardt and unsafe consequences for Orange Grove Public School

Traffic that would normally use Norton St and then Lilyfield Rd to travel to Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain will no longer be able to do this. The design is a poor outcome as it reduces the options for local trips. This includes school run traffic (Orange Grove is in the local school for Leichhardt North), and drop offs and pick ups at the daycare centre and pre-school next to Orange Grove Public School. Importantly the kiss n ride at Orange Grove Public School on Perry St has to be approached from Balmain Rd, not from Mary St. Forcing parents to travel along James/Mary/Perry will result in dangerous manoeuvres and u-turns in the school zone to get to the right side of the road to approach the kiss n ride zone. Alternatively school run drivers will travel down Emmerick St and Perry Lane to get to Lilyfield Rd so they can approach the school from the right direction. The only option will be a big detour through Leichhardt to cross the CWL at Balmain Rd.

If the right-hand turn is retained at the intersection, while it will result in extra time at the Norton Street intersection, the need to make changes to local streets will not be required as there will not be the influx of cars needing access to Darley Road. This will mean there will be no need for traffic lights at Hubert Street, changes to William St etc, which represents a better outcome for all.

B. Our Proposal and recommendation

1. Preserve a direct arterial connection to access Darley Road from north of City West Link (CWL)

An extra traffic phase should be added at the new intersection to enable cars from Norton St (north) to directly access Darley Road. While this will result in some additional timing at the lights, it is critical for both for the network and to keep arterial traffic off local streets that the ability to directly access Darley Road from the North (without the need to take an indirect route via local streets) is retained.

We appreciate that there will be a time cost at the intersection to accommodate this. However, this proposal needs to balance the amenity of the area for local residents, with the need for traffic to move easily along and over the City West Link. The current proposal does not achieve that balance - instead, local roads are expected to accommodate this additional traffic which will be diverted to Norton Street. The proposal clearly prioritises moving (tunnel and through traffic) on the City West Link, over the amenity of the area for local traffic.

If the above suggestion is not supported, we believe that James St (north) should **not be** made northbound only and the current ability to access Darley Road via James Street should be reinstated. This will of course affect the ability to have dedicated traffic movements coming out of the Darley Road intersection.

It is a matter for TfNSW to determine which measure is more expedient - however the key outcome that needs to be achieved is reinstating the ability of traffic from the north to directly access Darley Road.

If vehicles are able to directly access the City West Link from Norton Street north and are permitted to directly access Darley Road via Norton St (north) or James St (as they currently can), then the need to force traffic onto local streets, as is proposed in this plan, can be removed. This will mean that the many changes to local streets that are proposed; in particular, William St and Hubert St, will not be required. This is a better, fairer and more balanced outcome for all.

2. Retain the ability to turn right into the City West Link eastbound from Norton St

It is critical, in order to keep arterial traffic off local streets, that the right hand turn from Norton St into the City West Link is retained.

Removal of parking to allow faster progress for both right turning and left or straight ahead traffic is a more measured and reasonable option.

TfNSW needs to act in accordance with its own design principles and not design to bring arterial traffic onto local streets. Local Streets should not be expected to accommodate the additional traffic which will be diverted to Darley Rd to make a right turn there.

If the ability to turn right is reinstated then the need to force traffic onto local streets, as is proposed in this plan, can be removed. This will mean that the many changes to local streets that are proposed; in particular, William St and Hubert St, will not be required. This is a better and fairer outcome for all.

We do however, query the maps provided for removal of parking on Norton St (n). It appears that, in order to facilitate a dual carriageway, that parking on both sides will be required to be removed, along with 5-6 mature trees. none of this is marked up on the maps provided and clarification is urgently required on this point.

3. Recommendation

Our overarching recommendation is for TfNSW to reconsider its radical, permanent proposal at the current time and adopt potentially temporary and/or minor changes which will lead to improvement of the current network without the very severe impacts that will result when arterial connectivity is compromised and local streets are turned into traffic corridors.

The uncertainty around future traffic levels in light of the Covid 19 situation should give TfNSW pause to reconsider whether expenditure on such extensive and extreme changes are appropriate at this time. Lower economic activity and an increase in working from home and flexible working could by themselves deliver a reduction in demand on the network, especially at peak times. In addition the assessment required post opening of the M4 East is not required to be undertaken until August this year. It is premature to canvass any final design until that assessment has been carried out. It is also premature to consider such significant permanent changes prior to the opening of the M4-M5 link when we expect the often promised benefits of WestConnex to surely flow through to our local area in the form of reduced traffic at peak times.

It would be unwise to commit expenditure for such an extensive program of works without considering what minor, low risk changes could be made including temporary measures that don't involve funnelling traffic onto local roads. In addition, no changes, whether minor or major, should occur until the modelling on which they are based has been made available and until TfNSW has provided a full range of options under consideration.

If TfNSW is determined to push on with major, permanent changes at this time, we strongly recommend that our proposals, as set out above, to amend the design, are made.

C. Best practice principles should be adopted

We also ask that TfNSW, in considering our submission and its proposal generally, apply the following principles which, in our view, represent best practice:

- a. Arterial roads should be used to accommodate the majority of vehicle traffic, with local roads protected from arterial traffic to the extent possible, to maintain the integrity, safety and amenity of the street for locals.
- b. Active transport needs to be maintained, protected and encouraged.
- c. The proposal needs to respect and reflect the nature of the community. Leichhardt is a small village-like neighbourhood with high pedestrian and cycle movements. The area of investigation provides a busy green link to the Bay run, accommodates the Leichhardt North light-rail stop, a childcare centre and primary school, as well as bicycle connections.
- d. The safety of the community, pedestrians, cyclists and car users is a priority. The safety of the community is compromised when arterial traffic (including heavy vehicles) is funnelled into local roads.
- e. The proposal should address current traffic issues - congestion on local streets and rat-running on local streets.
- f. Radical, permanent, and extremely disruptive road changes should not be introduced without a clear understanding of the long-term traffic outlook for this area. Rather than make major changes at this early stage, consideration should be given to incremental changes which can be monitored and assessed over time.
- g. Any changes proposed to traffic movements needs to be supported by reliable traffic data to enable its impact to be assessed.

Our analysis of how the TfNSW meets these principles is as follows:

- a. **Arterial roads should be used to accommodate the majority of car traffic, with local roads protected from arterial traffic to the extent possible, to maintain the integrity and amenity of the street for locals**

As outlined above, the proposal will force arterial traffic onto local streets, which represents poor planning and a negative outcome for the community and car user.

- b. **Active transport needs to be maintained, protected and encouraged**

In considering the merit of the proposed solution, we have had regard to the [Future Transport Strategy 2056](#), which sets out NSW's Long Term Traffic Master Plan. One of the key goals of the Future Transport Strategy is 'encouraging active travel (walking and cycling) and using public transport'. The focus is on creating 'liveable cities.' We further note that the 'Guide to Road design: Part 2' refers to 'recognition of the need for planning and designing a road network which caters for the potential increase in active travel, and for providing facilities for safe pedestrian activity'.

We note that the Community Update for this proposal also states that the improvements in the road network are 'to make travel to and around the area easier and safer for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians'.

As set out above, we do not consider that the proposal achieves this objective.

¹

c. **The proposal needs to respect and reflect the nature of the community. Leichhardt is a small village-like setting with high pedestrian and cycle movements.**

Significantly, the proposal does not appear to take into account the culture and nature of the area and its high level of pedestrian activity. In fact, the proposal will jeopardise the ability of residents to easily and safely move about in their neighbourhood. As stated in the Guide to Road Design; 'A road is but one element of a transport system, which operates in the natural and built environment to meet a range of expectations of the users and broader community. the design cannot be carried out in isolation, but must be sensitive to the context in which the road will operate.'²

Context-sensitive design is an approach that equally addresses safety, mobility and the preservation of scenic, aesthetic, historic, environmental, and other community values.

Based on this measure, the proposal simply fails. The proposal does not reflect, nor respect that fact that this is a neighbourhood community, with local roads. For example, at the Darley Road end, there are many pedestrian movements as commuters and school children access the light rail, runners and dog walkers also use this link to access the bay run, dog park and multiple children's playgrounds on Hawthorne Parade; many cyclists use the bay run and commute to the city. On the north side of Leichhardt there are also commuters accessing the light rail stop, the aquatic centre, and the bay run.

The changes that are proposed, will result in much higher volumes of vehicles, including heavy vehicles, on local streets, making it less safe and easy for pedestrians and cyclists to easily move around Leichhardt. The effect of the planned changes to car movements will be at the expense of active transport and local traffic movements. There will be many negative impacts for cyclists and pedestrians if the proposal is adopted. This is the result of plans to move arterial traffic onto local roads, necessitating the removal of traffic calming measures (such as the roundabout) and apparent removal of the bicycle link, on William Street, as well as the proposed installation of traffic lights on a small, local street (Hubert).

d. **The safety of the community, pedestrians, cyclists and car users is a priority. The safety of the community is compromised when arterial traffic is funnelled into local roads.**

Safety needs to be a prime objective in road design and modification. According to the 'Guide to Road Design'³

'In the context of designing and providing a safer road environment, the Safe System approach aims to ensure that potential collisions are avoided and, if they occur, that the crash impact forces do not exceed human tolerance. On rural roads and major arterials, multi-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes are the prime concern, whereas on urban local roads pedestrian activity, and the potential for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts, is greatest. pedestrians are particularly vulnerable to serious injury.' (emphasis added)

We consider that the plans for local streets do not address these core design principles.

The proposal creates serious safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. residents have complained about speeding cars on William Street making it dangerous to cross into Elswick Street to access childcare and St Columba's Primary School. Residents have for some time unsuccessfully advocated for a crosswalk, indicating that there already exists a perceived safety issue for residents on William Street - without the added risks of additional vehicle movements as is proposed.

The funnelling of arterial traffic will make William St and other local streets busier, less safe to cross for pedestrians and less safe for cyclists.

We also note that the streets from James to Elswick Street North, including William Street are 'no truck' zones. This prohibition was introduced 18 months ago, with approval from the Council and RMS on the basis these are local streets, not designed for heavy vehicle movement and the concern was to protect these streets from WestConnex construction vehicles and additional heavy vehicle traffic. Given plans to force all traffic from north of the City West Link onto Norton Street, and the removal of the right-hand turn from Norton Street, **all of these heavy vehicles** will need to access these local roads, despite this traffic prohibition. This is unacceptable. We consider this yet another example of why the proposal fails to respect the delineation between local and arterial roads and, in so doing, creates serious safety issues.

¹ Guide to Road Design: Part 2, item 1.9, at page 7

² Guide to Road Design: Part 2, 'Context-Sensitive Design', page 8

³ Guide to Road Design Part 2; Design Consideration, Part 1.4.1 at page 3

e. **Proposal should address current issues - congestion on local streets and rat running on local streets**

The proposal offers no mitigation nor plan to address the negative impact on residents with respect to rat-running and parking. While moving traffic through Darley Road may alleviate the need to rat-run in some situations, any such benefit is more than cancelled out by the removal of the second option to access the City West link (northbound) via Norton Street and the proposal to funnel traffic from south of City West Link onto Norton Street.

As TfNSW is well aware, residents already have a major issue with rat running down laneways and illegal turns into and out of streets abutting Darley Road. No measures to address this are proposed. For example, if approximately an additional 140 cars per peak hour will be accessing Darley Road (given the removal of the right hand turn from Norton Street), we are looking at an additional 400-500 cars per morning over a (conservatively estimated) 3 hour period. There is nothing legally stopping cars accessing Darley Road via the various laneways. We already know that illegal right hand turns occur on streets with current restrictions and that no measures are able to be introduced to address this, despite efforts by residents. In fact, residents have been told that their only option to prevent illegal driver behaviour is to 'call Highway Patrol', which represents a poor response to manage a safety and amenity issue. The laneways have become increasingly dangerous because of rat running, not to mention the degradation of the laneway which is a council cost to rectify. There are 4 laneways that would be able to be accessed by rat runners, and no plan whatsoever to address this in the proposal and a proposal that will simply increase this issue.

It is not an acceptable response to state that measures will be looked at later - this is a critical concern and needs to be addressed in assessing the merits of this proposal. We cannot support a plan to shift hundreds of cars a day onto Darley Road via local streets under any circumstances, let alone one that is not accompanied by a well-thought out and effective plan to protect our local streets from rat running. It is ironic and disappointing that it was because of rat running that many of us reached out to TfNSW for assistance - and this plan will actually create greater risk of it occurring.

Parking for residents has also long been an issue. Many residents have tried unsuccessfully for years to have the parking capacity in their street increased by introduction of reverse angle parking. To suggest that additional parking capacity could be implemented is simply not good enough. There is no reason that parking on William Street needs to be removed, and further pressure be placed on the Council and residents to increase parking capacity. If traffic north of the City West Link (i.e. arterial traffic) can directly access Darley Road there will be no need for the vehicular capacity of William Street to be increased, with consequential parking removal. Therefore, no need to increase parking capacity in nearby local streets.

f. **Radical, permanent, and extremely disruptive road changes should not be introduced without a clear understanding of the long-term traffic outlook for this area.**

In considering the merits of this proposal, we have also looked at the extent of the changes and the cost and level of disruption involved. It is important to note that there are two major building developments that will be undertaken on William Street, likely to occur over the coming two years (noting the Government's intention to fast-track both). In addition, tunnelling of two twin tunnels in Leichhardt will be occurring over the next 18 months. In addition, there are extra heavy vehicles throughout the area, given Leichhardt's location near three major WestConnex construction sites. The level of disruption, with multiple road profile above-ground work to be undertaken at the same time, will be extreme and very disruptive. In fact, it is likely to cause traffic chaos for up to two years.

We note that pausing these radical measures until the opening of the final stages of WestConnex, to enable further monitoring to be undertaken, will spare the residents such further disruption at this time. More importantly, it will assist in ensuring that final measures made are in fact proportionate, reflect long-term traffic patterns and outlook and actually required.

This is because the longer-term traffic impacts of the last stage of WestConnex, and the impacts of COVID-19 (which has resulted in a material drop in vehicles) are also not known. We consider that the permanent and radical changes as are proposed are premature. A better approach would be to incrementally introduce minor changes at this stage to alleviate impacts, which can then be monitored and adjusted as we get a better understanding of the likely long-term traffic outlook from WestConnex. We consider that it is risky and inappropriate to make the changes in the proposal at this time, in particular in circumstances where no traffic modelling has been made available for scrutiny, to justify the cost, expense and disruption.

D. Summary response to changes proposed

Proposed change	Response	Further Comment
No right turn from Norton St to City West Link	Disagree	<p>It is critical that this movement is reinstated. Removal of this right-hand turn will result in all of the traffic needing access to the CWL in the morning commute to be pushed onto local streets in Leichhardt North. Traffic coming from Norton St seeking to turn right onto CWL will need to access Darley Rd via Hubert or Charles. This will include heavy vehicles currently not permitted on these local streets.</p> <p>See further discussion above.</p>
Parking spots removed on Norton St South to accommodate the northbound lane	Agree	<p>Although it is never ideal to remove parking, we agree that this will be a useful measure to facilitate traffic movements along Norton Street.</p> <p>However, the map provided is misleading - to have a dual carriageway as proposed parking will need to be removed on both sides and up to 6 mature trees on Norton street removed. This is not clear in the map. Details as to the number of mature trees to be removed needs to be provided so that the merits of this proposal can be fully evaluated.</p>
No direct access from Norton St North onto Darley Rd by the intersection	Disagree	<p>This proposal will have a devastating effect on local streets by forcing arterial traffic intended for Darley Road onto local streets. At present, cars can directly access Darley Road from the north of the CWL via James Street. We have not been provided with traffic statistics for the number of cars accessing Darley Road via James St at present but suspect it is a significant number.</p> <p>This ability has been removed as it is proposed to make James St one way northbound. And there is no ability to access Darley Road directly via Norton Street North. Instead, all of the traffic southbound will be forced onto Norton Street. For cars to re-join Darley Road they will need to use William Street or Allen Street, and access via other local roads (such as Hubert, Charles or Elswick St North). These are local roads that will be forced to bear the arterial traffic that was previously able to directly access Darley Road.</p> <p>The effect of this is to force cars to take an indirect route via local roads to reach Darley Road. It is dangerous and inappropriate to force this traffic onto William Street (which will be the most likely route used). William St houses a childcare centre and is most populated by small residential complexes. It also holds a park and is a bicycle route.</p> <p>See further comments above.</p>
Removal of pedestrian crossing on Darley Road out front Dan Murphys bottle shop		<p>Removal is a breach of the decision of the Land and Environment Court. Note that the removal of the existing traffic lights, which provide safe access to Dan Murphys, the green link and the light rail stop, is not highlighted in the map.</p>
James St becomes one way northbound	Disagree	<p>See comments above. We support making this street northbound only if direct access to Darley Road from Norton St north is available - if not, James Street needs to be retained as two way to enable a direct link to Darley Road at the new intersection..</p>
Removal of parking on James St north	Disagree	<p>Given the traffic is planned to be northbound, it seems unnecessary to remove all of the parking as proposed. A better approach would be to create a time-based clearway at the north end of James Street to facilitate the turning lanes. The planned parking removal will have a devastating impact on residents who have no off-street parking or rear lane access. There is a safety issue by having cars so close to the homes which are already built close to the street. Such homes will lose the buffer of parked cars. Young families and elderly live in these homes, all efforts should be made to preserve their ability to park near their residence.</p>
No right turn from Darley Rd into Hubert St	Comment	<p>This change will not be required if changes are made as proposed in this submission.</p>
The need for traffic lights at Hubert St to be determined	No traffic lights	<p>If the right-hand turn from Norton St into the CWL is allowed (or James St is retained as two-way), there will not be additional traffic on Hubert and other local streets in the vicinity so as to necessitate the installation of traffic lights - this is unnecessary expenditure and construction. Therefore there should be no need to install traffic lights. Hubert Street is a small, local street which is entirely residential. It is not appropriate that it be designed to handle arterial traffic flows. Trucks are also banned on the street. We also note that the Land and Environment Court approved the Dan Murphy's development on condition that</p>

Proposed change	Response	Further Comment
		the existing traffic lights were installed. it is not possible for TfNSW to remove those traffic lights and move to Hubert Street as proposed.
No right turn from Darley Rd into Francis St	Comment	Not necessary if our proposal is accepted.
Access permitted between Darley Rd and Norton St South	Agree	We would like to be provided with traffic statistics/modelling to understand the need for this movement and the likely number of users.
No Access to James St from Mary St	Disagree	This will lead to traffic back-up and reduce the amenity of the area and the ability of residents to make local trips.
No right turn from Norton Rd onto Lilyfield Rd	Disagree	This is a major amenity and travel issue. Local traffic will not be able to access Orange Grove Primary School and the childcare centres on Balmain Road, as well as other residences. It will make it more difficult for local trips to be made.
Access permitted between Norton St North and James St	Disagree	We do not understand why this is required. It appears to be an unnecessary movement. Please confirm the purpose of this movement (for example, is it to enable James St north residents to access James St north?)
Parking spots removed on Norton St North	Disagree	Suggest a partial clearway during peak time would be more appropriate, rather than permanent removal of resident parking. Doing so will free up the traffic turning left and straight ahead.
Removal of James St roundabout	Disagree	We strongly disagree with the removal of this traffic calming measure. Removal will be wasteful and disruptive and will facilitate speeding on this road. See further comments in this submission above.
Parking removal on William St	Disagree	It is proposed to remove large amounts of parking on the south side of William street. If safety is an issue, then 'no standing' signs should be implemented at those intersections only. To take away valuable parking will impact on all the neighbouring streets. William Street has been described by RMS as 'underutilised'. However, it is a local road. See out further detailed comments above.
Turning lanes constructed on William St	Disagree	There should be no need for this measure if our proposal is accepted and heavy traffic is not funnelled into William Street.
Removal of cycle marking on William Street	Disagree	Cycle routes should be maintained. There should be no need for this removal if our proposal is accepted and heavy traffic is not funnelled into William Street.
Parking removal on Darley Rd	Agree but clarification required	While in principle we support utilising all of the lanes on Darley Road to improve traffic flow, we are concerned to understand whether land from the median strips will be acquired. If so, this creates a safety and amenity issue for residents on Darley Road. We want to understand if tree removal is also part of this proposal.