

Claremont College Resident Consultative Committee Meeting No 3

Wednesday 2 May at Randwick Room, Randwick Council Building, Frances St Randwick

Meeting Notes

Item 1 – Attendance and apologies

Apologies:

- Bernard Roberts, resident (13/32 Coogee Bay Road)
- Raymond Bowles, resident (15 Queen St)

Attendees:

Claremont College

- Doug Thomas (DT) Principal
- Lulu Mitchell (LM) Administration Manager
- Tadd Pike (TP)

Claremont College Parents and Friends Association

- Lisa Stamatelatos (LS)
- Damien Chee (DC)
- Theresa Fearn (TF)

Residents

- Paul Freeman (PF) (17 Chatham St)
- Wolfgang Babeck (WB) (3 Dolphin St)
- Nick Kiossoglu, resident (20 Dolphin Street)
- Barbara Dougan, resident (10 Heath Street)
- Judith Pini (JP), resident
- Wayne Costin, resident (10 Heath Street)

Randwick City Council

- Tony Lehmann (TL), Manager Integrated Transport

Chairperson

- Stuart McDonald (SM)

Item 2 – Recap of presentation and review of results of traffic audit

- TL provided a summary of the Judge Lane traffic count for the 7 days commencing 25 July 2017, prior to the current traffic management measures being implemented. Average weekday peak for the period of the concept lane closure period (8am-3pm) was 8-9am with 24 movements: 19 westbound and 5 east bound.
- Paper copies of the traffic count table were circulated to the attendees and will also be circulated electronically by the Chair.

- TL advised that there will be further counts undertaken in the next 2-3 weeks and reported to the next meeting.

Items 3 and 4 (discussed concurrently)

Trial closure concept – resident feedback

Discussion of School proposal

- JP, BD and WB provided a summary of resident feedback:
 - Approximately 20-25 residents met to discuss
 - Residents were from a number of streets adjoining and surrounding the School and lane
 - The contents of the previously circulated information sheet were discussed, including the initiatives introduced by the School and the possibility of Judge Lane being used for afternoon pick-up
 - All residents in attendance expressed their opposition to the concept
 - Residents feel that the traffic management measures introduced address the safety concerns and that this effectiveness needs to be measured/assessed prior to any other intervention being considered
 - Residents feel that a more comprehensive assessment of the operation of the local road network is required rather than a one-off solution.
- SM noted the feedback and also noted that he had requested of the residents, in providing feedback:
 - the street location of resident(s) consulted;
 - the number of residents in respective streets consulted;
 - the reasons for or against the concept;
 - any other traffic management suggestions put forward for the consideration of the Committee.
- LS and TF suggested that the School has taken measures to address the resident concerns, particularly regarding the queuing of vehicles on Dolphin Street.
- TF advised that the School will request that the lane closure be reported back to the Council for the Councillors to make a decision, consistent with item (e) of the Council resolution of 22 August 2017.
- JP suggested that taking the matter back to the Council would be premature.
- DT questioned why this was the case.
- LS advised that there are approximately 600 crossing/day across Judge Lane and the School feels that there is a safety concern that must be addressed. The closure of the lane to vehicles during school hours will result in minimal disruption to individuals and to the local roads, based on the July 2017 traffic audit.
- TL advised the meeting that the potential lane closure for the hours proposed would have very minimal impact on the local road system with the impact at the busiest time of day being one car every six minutes being and that redirected traffic through alternative streets and this would be imperceptible to people living on those streets.

Formatted

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 11 pt

- BD advised that she raised child safety in 2003 when the School was proposing to have children crossing the lane and the School's response at that time was that the circumstances were acceptable.
- WC/BD requested clarification from the School regarding work health and safety concerns as this is not clear to the residents.
 - SM reinforced to the meeting that the past and current position of the School has been raised at every meeting and does not warrant further discussion – the School's position has changed based on what they see as changed circumstances. SM acknowledged that the resident representatives don't accept the School's position and also acknowledged that some of the residents attending meeting 3 had not attended the first two meetings so did not necessarily have the background on the previous discussions at those meetings.
 - JP and WB asked about the School's acquisition strategy, as residents are anxious to know due to wider concerns about possible future impacts.
 - DT advised that the School does not have a position regarding acquisition or use of acquired properties.
 - BD requested that the meeting move on to the proposed "brainstorming" discussion.
 - Following some general discussion about this occurring SM suggested that this item may be pursued later in the meeting if time permitted or at another meeting. SM advised that "brainstorming has been on the agenda for meeting 2 but attendees did not proceed (note: time did not allow the brainstorming session).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, No bullets or numbering

Item 5 - Further School comments

- PF raised concern with the School's interpretation of the Police comments at meeting No. 2 and in particular that that the Police representative "recommended" *'No Parking' signage along Dolphin Street during afternoon school hours.*
- PF noted that this had not been a Police "recommendation" and that the matter of Dolphin Street no parking signage during school hours arose in considering whether or not there was a need to address emergency vehicle access in Dolphin Street at times when the School pick-up queue extends into Dolphin Street.
- PF suggested that the Dolphin Street queue is not linked to child safety and the School's desire to have the Judge Lane closure – they are 2 separate issues – and that no parking signage would not change the length of the queue as it would not create extra capacity.
- TL advised that the Police are of the opinion that there is no problem with emergency vehicle access to Dolphin Street and so are not recommending the introduction of no standing signage.

Item 6 – Review requirements for enhancing safety features on Judge Lane post safety review

- BD raised how the implemented measures would be assessed.
- TL confirmed that there will be an audit of traffic numbers and speeds in the next 2-3 weeks. Any additional signage to also be erected.
- There followed a wider discussion among the attendees regarding how a trial closure of Judge Lane might be evaluated/measured. Matters/suggestions included:

- List the functions of the lane such as access to adjoining properties and stormwater collection and then determine whether these functions will be achieved;
- Determine baseline data on pre-closure traffic movements in the local street network;
- Evaluate the traffic impacts of diverted traffic on the local road network;
- Qualitative measures and analysis perhaps including of “loss” of public space during school hours, perhaps through local surveys.
- TL undertook to prepare some draft terms on which evaluation of a trial closure may be undertaken.
- SM question the resident representatives as to whether they would consider supporting a trial closure if there were to be some agreed evaluation terms.
- BD and JP advised that residents will not support a trial or permanent closure but would participate in discussion regarding some evaluation criteria in the event that in the future the Committee agreed to a trial or the Council resolved to proceed with the trial.

Item 7 – Staggered pick-up times

- BD questioned whether there is or should be a process for evaluation of the success or otherwise of the staggered pick-up times. Evaluation in a linear process, for example -implement and evaluate staggered pick up times on Dolphin Street congestion prior to implementing any other changes.
- DT disagreed with this suggested approach based on the discussion at the April meeting (meeting 2).
- ~~a qualitative analysis.~~
- TL advised that there is some data for conditions pre-stagger and that a post-stagger survey can be undertaken.

Item 8 – Terms of Reference (ToR)

- Agreement that the ToR should be amended to include a Quorum of 6 made up of minimums of 3 residents and 3 School representatives (combined School and P & F for a total of 3).
- Agreement that resident representatives should, to the extent possible, be consistent at each meeting acknowledging personal circumstances may not always allow this for each individual.
- Agreement that the future meeting cycle would be 3 monthly with set dates unless otherwise agreed. Remainder of 2018: 28 August and 28 November.
- Agreement to continue current practice of draft and final meeting notes to be distributed by Chair following each meeting rather than being adopted at following meeting.
- Agreement that the notes of each meeting should be made publicly accessible on the Council’s website. TL undertook to initiate this.
- Following circulation of the 2 May meeting notes all Committee members to review the notes of all meetings to advise of any suggested refinements prior to posting on the website.

Item 9 – Other business

- Nil

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, No bullets or numbering

Item 10 - Next meeting date

- 28 August 2018

Item 11 – Meeting actions

- TL to initiate/undertake:
 - Audit of Judge Lane vehicle numbers and speeds post recently installed traffic management infrastructure and any additional signage recommended
 - Survey of Dolphin Street queuing since introduction of staggered pick-up times and School management of parent driving behaviour
 - Survey of current vehicle movements in local street network in order to establish a base line for any future analysis associated with a potential trial Judge Lane closure
 - Desk-top analysis of impact of Judge Lane closure on the local street network
 - Preparation of draft terms for the evaluation of a proposed trial lane closure in the event that a trial proceeds at some time in the future
- The above matters to be reported to the next meeting.
- All Committee members to advise Chair of any suggested refinements to meeting notes for meetings 1-3 prior to website posting.

The meeting closed at 8pm.