
11.1 Elizabeth Street bicycle lane

Reference: D20/140119

Authoriser: Director Planning and Place Making

RECOMMENDATION**Start time: 8.28pm**

1. That Council note that:

- (a) the December 2019 Council resolution required officers to implement a 12 month trial of protected bike lanes in Elizabeth Street and to monitor its performance via quarterly update reports before reporting back formally to the Council on next steps within 6 months of the conclusion of the 12 month trial period;
- (b) the project had been stated as an intended bike project in Council adopted strategies since 2010, being referenced specifically in the 2010 Bike Strategy, the 2015 Bike Strategy Refresh and also, in the Climate Emergency Plan (May 2020);
- (c) the protected bike lane trial was designed to specifically provide for safer cycling on a strategic bike route;
- (d) the protected bike lanes were installed and completed in early July this year through the process of a 'pilot and trial' methodology so that:
 - (i) it could be tested, adapted and adjusted, as need be, through minor changes to improve its performance, and
 - (ii) its performance can inform future decisions of the Council as to whether or not the separated bike lanes should be confirmed and formalised through more permanent road surfaces and treatments;
- (e) the separated bike lanes require a particular width of bike lane and buffer strip to be effective, safe and efficient. This enables cyclists to travel in a safe and comfortable manner and for the lanes to be capable of accommodating increased ridership into the future;
- (f) the width of the separated bike lanes implemented in the trial are similar to those used in stage 2 of the Wellington Street, Collingwood separated bike lanes;
- (g) the current 2016 VicRoads guidelines of the Department of Transport provide certain minimum widths of bike lanes abutting parked cars and carriageway lanes, and also buffer lanes to minimise propensity for car dooring of cyclists;
- (h) the Department of Transport have developed draft new Cycling Guidelines, which, it is understood, will be considered for formal endorsement very shortly, possibly by the end of September this year; and
- (i) the limited road width (kerb to kerb) of Elizabeth Street, east and west of Lennox Street, does not enable carparking on both sides of the street to be provided unless the protected bike lanes are reduced to a width of approx. 1.5 m in some sections with a buffer lane of 0.5 m, that is not compliant with the 2016 VicRoads guidelines.

2. That Council further note:

- (a) the concerns of the local community expressed since the installation of the trial separated bike lanes, and in particular, the matters raised regarding safety, and perceived safety, due to stated need to often park their car further away from their homes and the concerns stated regarding local behavioural issues in the street;
- (b) the other concerns raised in the written material provided to Council by many community members (as reproduced in Attachment 3);
- (c) the petition lodged with Council on 21 July, 2020 with some 75 signatures as reproduced in Attachment 2;

- (d) the dialogue that has occurred to date between senior Council staff and the local community spokespersons;
 - (e) the minor adjustments made to date, and the possible other adjustments that may be shortly made, as outlined in the report and attachment 4;
 - (f) the criteria outlined in the report that specify what would be considered fundamental changes to the trial and therefore in the domain of requiring full Council consideration and determination;
 - (g) that the trial has been installed for approx. 2 months at this stage;
 - (h) that a formal trial update report is scheduled which details data collected 3 months after the trial has been in operation;
 - (i) that further parking occupancy surveys are commissioned and being undertaken in preparation for a first formal evaluation period report to Council; and
 - (j) that as part of the evaluations during this 12 month period, there would be intercept surveys with persons using Elizabeth Street including residents, drivers, cyclists and pedestrians to further inform the evaluation of the trial for Council consideration.
3. That Council note that the community concerns relate substantially to the removal of parking on the north side of the street and consequential aspects as a result of that parking removal; including such matters as:
- (a) reduced opportunity to park as close to home / work / place of worship and for persons to visit premises in Elizabeth Street;
 - (b) the increased likelihood in some cases of needing to travel further and / or longer as a pedestrian in the local streets where particular behavioural issues exist; and matters of safety / feeling safe to those persons;
 - (c) issues relating to delivery of materials to premises for building works;
 - (d) issues relating to delivery of supplies and or purchasers to homes / businesses;
 - (e) access to parked cars;
 - (f) access for pedestrians across the street; and
 - (g) similar aspects; as outlined in the Attachment 3.
4. That in this regard, Council further note:
- (a) that further parking surveys are being undertaken at present, and will again be undertaken once COVID restrictions are relaxed to assess the parking occupancy rates in the local streets;
 - (b) that Council has requested the DHHS to improve the lighting in the DHHS off street carparks in order to increase the propensity for residents in the DHHS estate to use those carparks and to reduce the demand for the onstreet parking in Elizabeth Street and nearby streets;
 - (c) that some aspects of residents / business concerns can be pursued with normal Council operational protocols, such as persons obtaining Council approvals for time limited occupations of the road / bike lane for particular needs (i.e. road occupation permits) and officers can assist local community members on accessing that information;
 - (d) that some aspects raised by community members have been partly addressed with some minor changes (such as a disability parking bay, stencils on the footpath to warn pedestrians to look right), and some other minor changes can equally be addressed by some other installations of loading bays / taxi ranks etc as sought by the community;
 - (e) that parking restriction changes in Elizabeth Street and surrounding streets can be assessed and determined by the Council through normal parking restriction protocols and committees to address and determine the requests; and

- (f) that in some instances, advisory signage and warning signs can be provided on pavements, and in conspicuous locations, to provide warnings to pedestrians and cyclists and persons accessing parked cars whilst the new arrangements become more familiar with the local community and the road users.
5. That Council note the section of the report headed *Guidelines for bike lane and buffer widths*, and in particular paragraphs 56-57 in relation to the discussion regarding widths of protected cycling lanes and associated buffer lanes.
 6. That Council note Attachment 5 which provides both information and an illustration of the assessment of various widths of bike lanes, and buffer lanes, against State guidelines, and in particular the consequential width of those lanes if parking on the north side of the street was reinstated.
 7. That Council also note advice from officers that a bidirectional bike lane in Elizabeth Street, as some community members have suggested as an alternative, would not be appropriate or recommended due specifically to connection issues at Hoddle Street and Church Street which would largely render such a facility as ineffective and cumbersome for cyclists.
 8. That Council note that any realignment of the various lanes and buffer widths would create the need for corresponding changes to be undertaken to other line marking across the street.
 9. That in the context of all of the above, Council:
 - (a) note the officer report, the analysis provided to date, the material provided in the attachments, the commentary of the local community as reproduced in Attachment 3, and comments received at the Council meeting; and
 - (b) consider these comments, and points of view, as part of its deliberations in determining a way forward in this matter.

Public Submissions

The following people made a submission to Council on the matter:

Ronen Savicky;

Dora Houpis;

Jenny Duong;

*Cuc Trang * (Rhys Thomas read out the submission);*

Sasha Beitner;

Alex Marks;

*Thay Minh Tri Dang - Monk, Chua Phuoc Tuong * (Rhys Thomas read out the submission);*

*Helen Nguyen * (Rhys Thomas read out the submission);*

Adam Promnitz;

Michael Smith;

William Ly;

Mark Soffer;

Sarah Dixon;

Herschel Landes;

Robert Buttery;

Karen Hovenga;

Kate Drake;

David Balding;

Diana I;
Lucy Platt;
Kathryn Skidmore;
Jeremy Burke;
Troy Parsons; and
Jeremy Lawrence (Streets Alive Yarra).

MOTION

Moved: Councillor Jolly

Seconded: Councillor O'Brien

1. That Council note that:
 - (a) the December 2019 Council resolution required officers to implement a 12 month trial of protected bike lanes in Elizabeth Street and to monitor its performance via quarterly update reports before reporting back formally to the Council on next steps within 6 months of the conclusion of the 12 month trial period;
 - (b) the project had been stated as an intended bike project in Council adopted strategies since 2010, being referenced specifically in the 2010 Bike Strategy, the 2015 Bike Strategy Refresh and also, in the Climate Emergency Plan (May 2020);
 - (c) the protected bike lane trial was designed to specifically provide for safer cycling on a strategic bike route;
 - (d) the protected bike lanes were installed and completed in early July this year through the process of a 'pilot and trial' methodology so that:
 - (i) it could be tested, adapted and adjusted, as need be, through minor changes to improve its performance, and
 - (ii) its performance can inform future decisions of the Council as to whether or not the separated bike lanes should be confirmed and formalised through more permanent road surfaces and treatments;
 - (e) the separated bike lanes require a particular width of bike lane and buffer strip to be effective, safe and efficient. This enables cyclists to travel in a safe and comfortable manner and for the lanes to be capable of accommodating increased ridership into the future;
 - (f) the width of the separated bike lanes implemented in the trial are similar to those used in stage 2 of the Wellington Street, Collingwood separated bike lanes;
 - (g) the current 2016 VicRoads guidelines of the Department of Transport provide certain minimum widths of bike lanes abutting parked cars and carriageway lanes, and also buffer lanes to minimise propensity for car dooring of cyclists;
 - (h) the Department of Transport have developed draft new Cycling Guidelines, which, it is understood, will be considered for formal endorsement very shortly, possibly by the end of September this year; and
 - (i) the limited road width (kerb to kerb) of Elizabeth Street, east and west of Lennox Street, does not enable car parking on both sides of the street to be provided unless the protected bike lanes are reduced to a width of approx. 1.5 m in some sections with a buffer lane of 0.5 m, that is not compliant with the 2016 VicRoads guidelines.
2. That Council further note:
 - (a) the concerns of the local community expressed since the installation of the trial separated bike lanes, and in particular, the matters raised regarding safety and due to stated need to often park their car further away from their homes and the concerns stated regarding local behavioural issues in the street;

- (b) the other concerns raised in the written material provided to Council by many community members (as reproduced in Attachment 3);
 - (c) the petition lodged with Council on 21 July, 2020 with some 75 signatures as reproduced in Attachment 2;
 - (d) the dialogue that has occurred to date between senior Council staff and the local community spokespersons;
 - (e) the minor adjustments made to date, and the possible other adjustments that may be shortly made, as outlined in the report and attachment 4;
 - (f) the criteria outlined in the report that specify what would be considered fundamental changes to the trial and therefore in the domain of requiring full Council consideration and determination;
 - (g) that the trial has been installed for approx. 2 months at this stage;
 - (h) that a formal trial update report is scheduled which details data collected 3 months after the trial has been in operation;
 - (i) that further parking occupancy surveys are commissioned and being undertaken in preparation for a first formal evaluation period report to Council; and
 - (j) that as part of the evaluations during this 12 month period, there would be intercept surveys with persons using Elizabeth Street including residents, drivers, cyclists and pedestrians to further inform the evaluation of the trial for Council consideration.
3. That Council note that the community concerns relate substantially to the removal of parking on the north side of the street and consequential aspects as a result of that parking removal; including such matters as:
- (a) reduced opportunity to park as close to home / work / place of worship and for persons to visit premises in Elizabeth Street;
 - (b) the increased likelihood in some cases of needing to travel further and / or longer as a pedestrian in the local streets where particular behavioural issues exist; and matters of safety / feeling safe to those persons;
 - (c) issues relating to delivery of materials to premises for building works;
 - (d) issues relating to delivery of supplies and or purchasers to homes / businesses;
 - (e) access to parked cars;
 - (f) access for pedestrians across the street;
 - (g) nowhere for emergency vehicles to stop on the Northern side;
 - (h) nowhere for anyone to safely access taxis and ubers on the street, especially at North Richmond train station; and
 - (i) similar aspects; as outlined in the Attachment 3.
4. That in this regard, Council further note:
- (a) that further parking surveys are being undertaken at present, and will again be undertaken once COVID restrictions are relaxed to assess the parking occupancy rates in the local streets;
 - (b) that Council has requested the DHHS to improve the lighting in the DHHS off street carparks in order to increase the propensity for residents in the DHHS estate to use those carparks and to reduce the demand for the on street parking in Elizabeth Street and nearby streets;
 - (c) that some aspects of residents / business concerns can be pursued with normal Council operational protocols, such as persons obtaining Council approvals for time limited occupations of the road / bike lane for particular needs (i.e. road occupation

permits) and officers can assist local community members on accessing that information;

- (d) that some aspects raised by community members have been partly addressed with some minor changes (such as a disability parking bay, stencils on the footpath to warn pedestrians to look right), and some other minor changes can equally be addressed by some other installations of loading bays / taxi ranks etc. as sought by the community;
 - (e) that parking restriction changes in Elizabeth Street and surrounding streets can be assessed and determined by the Council through normal parking restriction protocols and committees to address and determine the requests; and
 - (f) that in some instances, advisory signage and warning signs can be provided on pavements, and in conspicuous locations, to provide warnings to pedestrians and cyclists and persons accessing parked cars whilst the new arrangements become more familiar with the local community and the road users.
5. That Council note the section of the report headed *Guidelines for bike lane and buffer widths*, and in particular paragraphs 56-57 in relation to the discussion regarding widths of protected cycling lanes and associated buffer lanes.
6. That Council note Attachment 5 which provides both information and an illustration of the assessment of various widths of bike lanes, and buffer lanes, against State guidelines, and in particular the consequential width of those lanes if parking on the north side of the street was reinstated.
7. That Council also note advice from officers that a bidirectional bike lane in Elizabeth Street, as some community members have suggested as an alternative, would not be appropriate or recommended due specifically to connection issues at Hoddle Street and Church Street which would largely render such a facility as ineffective and cumbersome for cyclists.
8. That Council note that any realignment of the various lanes and buffer widths would create the need for corresponding changes to be undertaken to other line marking across the street.
9. That in the context of all of the above, Council:
- (a) note the officer report, the analysis provided to date, the material provided in the attachments, the commentary of the local community as reproduced in Attachment 3, and comments received at the Council meeting; and
 - (b) having particular regard to the extensive community representations, especially the concerns relating to the adverse public safety impacts of removing the car parking spaces, now request officers to:
 - (i) undertake the works designated as **Option 2** in clause 46 of the Officers Report, that is, to narrow the separated bike lanes/buffer zone on both sides of the road and reinstall car parking on the northern side; and
 - (ii) re-instate parking restrictions on the north side as per the pre-trial restrictions, and in turn, alter the south side to pre-trial restrictions,
as soon as possible.

LOST

CALL FOR A DIVISION

For: Councillors Jolly and O'Brien

Against: Councillors Coleman, Fristacky, Stone, Chen Yi Mei, Searle and Bosler

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Moved: Councillor Fristacky

Seconded: Councillor Coleman

1. That Council note that:
 - (a) the December 2019 Council resolution required officers to implement a 12 month trial of protected bike lanes in Elizabeth Street and to monitor its performance via quarterly update reports before reporting back formally to the Council on next steps within 6 months of the conclusion of the 12 month trial period;
 - (b) the project had been stated as an intended bike project in Council adopted strategies since 2010, being referenced specifically in the 2010 Bike Strategy, the 2015 Bike Strategy Refresh and also, in the Climate Emergency Plan (May 2020);
 - (c) the protected bike lane trial was designed to specifically provide for safer cycling on a strategic bike route;
 - (d) the protected bike lanes were installed and completed in early July this year through the process of a 'pilot and trial' methodology so that:
 - (i) it could be tested, adapted and adjusted, as need be, through minor changes to improve its performance, and
 - (ii) its performance can inform future decisions of the Council as to whether or not the separated bike lanes should be confirmed and formalised through more permanent road surfaces and treatments;
 - (e) the separated bike lanes require a particular width of bike lane and buffer strip to be effective, safe and efficient. This enables cyclists to travel in a safe and comfortable manner and for the lanes to be capable of accommodating increased ridership into the future;
 - (f) the width of the separated bike lanes implemented in the trial are similar to those used in stage 2 of the Wellington Street, Collingwood separated bike lanes;
 - (g) the current 2016 VicRoads guidelines of the Department of Transport provide certain minimum widths of bike lanes abutting parked cars and carriageway lanes, and also buffer lanes to minimise propensity for car dooring of cyclists;
 - (h) the Department of Transport have developed draft new Cycling Guidelines, which, it is understood, will be considered for formal endorsement very shortly, possibly by the end of September this year; and
 - (i) the limited road width (kerb to kerb) of Elizabeth Street, east and west of Lennox Street, does not enable carparking on both sides of the street to be provided unless the protected bike lanes are reduced to a width of approx. 1.5 m in some sections with a buffer lane of 0.5 m, that is not compliant with the 2016 VicRoads guidelines.
2. That Council further note:
 - (a) the concerns of the local community expressed since the installation of the trial separated bike lanes, and in particular, the matters raised regarding safety, and perceived safety, due to stated need to often park their car further away from their homes and the concerns stated regarding local behavioural issues in the street;
 - (b) the other concerns raised in the written material provided to Council by many community members (as reproduced in Attachment 3);
 - (c) the petition lodged with Council on 21 July, 2020 with some 75 signatures as reproduced in Attachment 2;
 - (d) the dialogue that has occurred to date between senior Council staff and the local community spokespersons;

- (e) the minor adjustments made to date, and the possible other adjustments that may be shortly made, as outlined in the report and attachment 4;
 - (f) the criteria outlined in the report that specify what would be considered fundamental changes to the trial and therefore in the domain of requiring full Council consideration and determination;
 - (g) that the trial has been installed for approx. 2 months at this stage;
 - (h) that a formal trial update report is scheduled which details data collected 3 months after the trial has been in operation;
 - (i) that further parking occupancy surveys are commissioned and being undertaken in preparation for a first formal evaluation period report to Council; and
 - (j) that as part of the evaluations during this 12 month period, there would be intercept surveys with persons using Elizabeth Street including residents, drivers, cyclists and pedestrians to further inform the evaluation of the trial for Council consideration.
3. That Council note that the community concerns relate substantially to the removal of parking on the north side of the street and consequential aspects as a result of that parking removal; including such matters as:
- (a) reduced opportunity to park as close to home / work / place of worship and for persons to visit premises in Elizabeth Street;
 - (b) the increased likelihood in some cases of needing to travel further and / or longer as a pedestrian in the local streets where particular behavioural issues exist; and matters of safety / feeling safe to those persons;
 - (c) issues relating to delivery of materials to premises for building works;
 - (d) issues relating to delivery of supplies and or purchasers to homes / businesses;
 - (e) access to parked cars;
 - (f) access for pedestrians across the street, and
 - (g) similar aspects; as outlined in the Attachment 3.
4. That in this regard, Council further note:
- (a) that further parking surveys are being undertaken at present, and will again be undertaken once COVID restrictions are relaxed to assess the parking occupancy rates in the local streets;
 - (b) that Council has requested the DHHS to improve the lighting in the DHHS off street car parks in order to increase the propensity for residents in the DHHS estate to use those car parks and to reduce the demand for the onstreet parking in Elizabeth Street and nearby streets;
 - (c) that some aspects of residents / business concerns can be pursued with normal Council operational protocols, such as persons obtaining Council approvals for time limited occupations of the road / bike lane for particular needs (i.e. road occupation permits) and officers can assist local community members on accessing that information;
 - (d) that some aspects raised by community members have been partly addressed with some minor changes (such as a disability parking bay, stencils on the footpath to warn pedestrians to look right), and some other minor changes can equally be addressed by some other installations of loading bays / taxi ranks etc as sought by the community;
 - (e) that parking restriction changes in Elizabeth Street and surrounding streets can be assessed and determined by the Council through normal parking restriction protocols and committees to address and determine the requests; and

- (f) that in some instances, advisory signage and warning signs can be provided on pavements, and in conspicuous locations, to provide warnings to pedestrians and cyclists and persons accessing parked cars whilst the new arrangements become more familiar with the local community and the road users.
- 5. That Council note the section of the report headed *Guidelines for bike lane and buffer widths*, and in particular paragraphs 56-57 in relation to the discussion regarding widths of protected cycling lanes and associated buffer lanes.
- 6. That Council note Attachment 5 which provides both information and an illustration of the assessment of various widths of bike lanes, and buffer lanes, against State guidelines, and in particular the consequential width of those lanes if parking on the north side of the street was reinstated.
- 7. That Council also note advice from officers that a bidirectional bike lane in Elizabeth Street, as some community members have suggested as an alternative, would not be appropriate or recommended due specifically to connection issues at Hoddle Street and Church Street which would largely render such a facility as ineffective and cumbersome for cyclists.
- 8. That Council note that any realignment of the various lanes and buffer widths would create the need for corresponding changes to be undertaken to other line marking across the street.
- 9. That in the context of all of the above, Council determines to endorse Option 1 in Clause 46 to retain the current trial as endorse by Council in December 2019, allowing for adjustments, and refinements with further assessment at end of the trial period and:
 - (a) note the officer report, the analysis provided to date, the material provided in the attachments, the commentary of the local community as reproduced in Attachment 3, and comments received at the Council meeting; and
 - (b) additionally ask Officers to prepare the next quarterly report for new Council which includes community and resident consultation including materials in language, which proposes the options outlined in this Report for feedback, if viable and including new information from the DoT Guidelines.

CARRIED

CALL FOR A DIVISION

For: Councillors Coleman, Fristacky, Stone, Chen Yi Mei, Searle and Bosler

Against: Councillors Jolly and O'Brien

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9.57pm

The Meeting resumed at 10.03pm

