PROSPECT RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INTEGRATED MOVEMENT RESPONSE

Recognition

The ‘Background Paper’ and the ‘Discussion Paper’ fail to recognise our Indigenous Communities who have been dispossessed by the development of Adelaide and the suburbs.

Traditional tracks are now roads and their camps have been swallowed up by suburban development.

Our footprint, roads and freight lines all have historical connections to the indigenous history of Adelaide and its burgeoning suburbia. The proposed containment of our urban footprint provides the opportunity to formally recognise the traditional owners.

THE PROSPECT RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

The Prospect Residents Association Inc (PRA) is a not-for-profit, local community organisation with a strong interest in the present and future development and welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Integrated Movement Systems Discussion Paper and the supporting Summary and Background Papers. Members of the PRA frequently provide input and critique of the City of Prospect’s development and social programs, often by invitation but also in response to Council ‘initiatives’.

1: Aligning South Australia’s growth with transport infrastructure.

1(a). We recognise the importance of containing our ‘Urban Footprint’ and accept that in achieving the objective the result will be in part ‘Urban Intensification’, or the less threatening term ‘infill’.

The City of Prospect is an inner suburban area and ‘benefits’ by its location to the best (all the options) and worst (packed in like live sheep exports on a bus) of the transport options. The City of Prospect shares its Southern boundary with the City of Adelaide and as a consequence many of the residents live close to their employment because the City of Adelaide is a major employment area. Residents can take advantage of walking and cycling options to the ‘City’. Whether those options are viable choices of course depends on the residents’ physical capabilities, time available, the weather and the purpose of the journey.

The Integrated Movement systems proposals’ aim to encourage the design of new neighbourhoods which result in residents’ reliance on cars being vastly reduced is a commendable one, but proposals needs to recognise the realities of the Adelaide life style and geography, so as to ensure that the proposals do not lead to unforeseen negative
results. (eg. Deterioration of the Portrush, Ascot, Hampstead Roads due to the increased weight of High Productivity Vehicles and tarmac destruction due to climate change.)

Huge cities in Europe have evolved over hundreds of years and contain many of the features embodied in the Healthy Neighbourhoods ideals as they have become a series of small villages where people work, play and socialize without having to rely on individual car ownership. In London car ownership is low, and many people have become members of car share groups; in Spain Pontevedera makes its citizens park their cars on the outside perimeter, away from the 300m sq city centre and many other cities are also banning cars from the city centre.

In Adelaide we could evolve gradually over time to live like this too. Many of us with improved public transport would be happy not to drive to work. Many more people would take public transport if park and ride facilities were provided as more of us than not, live too far from bus stops and train stations to walk to them. However at present most of us have lifestyles that need cars.

For a considerable part of our life span we cannot do our everyday activities without our own transport. People who have children, people who have elderly parents who need to be taken to appointments, people with disabilities, people who need to do one weekly huge shop, people who work shifts, people who need to take equipment to and from work, all cannot walk or bike or take public transport to fulfil work and social duties.

At the same time, we do need to decrease the use of cars and good ideas were raised in the Adelaide Metropolitan Car Parking Summit1, as well as the Healthy Neighbourhoods design imperatives. Planning new areas to be like villages containing most of the necessary facilities for day to day living within walking distance would result in people using their cars much less on a daily basis.

Mandating that developers include enough off street parking for the number of residents, or constructing a car park area within a new development would decrease parking congestion.

Encouraging carpooling to work, “Smart” initiatives such as real time parking availability information, ride-sharing apps, upgrades to public transport technology2 and “Greater education around the ‘full cost’ of purchasing a home, balanced against transport needs and access to alternative transport options.”3 are all low cost high impact proposals.

However, some of the ideas raised by the Summit need further investigation, and unintended consequences identified and considered.

1 'WHAT WE HAVE HEARD REPORT- METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE CAR PARKING REVIEW' - saplanningportal.sa.gov.au
2 'Feedback +ideas from Car Parking Summit'
3 'Feedback +ideas from Car Parking Summit'
How will the elderly and disabled, who cannot walk easily and who do have “the deserved need and (sense of) entitlement to free car parking space”, be catered for?

“Negative perceptions of public transport in relation to personal safety, uncertainty and infrequency of services, and difficult to access” are not “perceptions they are real – women have been assaulted at railway stations and many people refuse to use the Gawler line, and Salisbury station due to frequent violence. How will these barriers to using public transport be addressed?

Businesses also rely on parking, and a classic unintended consequence of trying to decrease car usage by restricting car parking and raising parking fees is that people are avoiding Adelaide City centre, and North Adelaide as they either cannot find a park, or it’s too expensive, and are going to shopping centres instead. One business on Prospect Road is considering re-locating due to lack of parking for potential customers.

Adelaide is also looking at a driverless car future as way of decreasing reliance on cars – recent research in Canada has shown, using food delivery services as an analogy, that before the service, people would choose to walk or catch public transport to get takeaway food but now use the delivery services, thus increasing car congestion!

Two points in the Summit, which will have the unintended consequence of provoking social tensions, trouble us.

What are the implications of the phrase “the deserved need and sense of entitlement to free car parking space”. People respond well to “nudges” to make changes in their social perceptions and behaviour, and this has an accusatory “how dare you expect car parking which you have had for the last 100 years and on which your lifestyle depends?” tone. Moreover some, like the elderly and disabled, do “deserve” to feel “entitled” to easy parking.

“Move away from minimum car parking rates and start to consider maximums” – does this suggest that rather than a car parking space (or only a half a space at Regency Gardens apparently – presumably to allow more profit for the developers fitting in more buildings) for each dwelling, a maximum number not to be exceeded will be stipulated? Who decides on this “maximum? Not the developers surely! And then how are these spaces allocated? By lottery? By whomever gets there first?

As a society we need to change our reliance on cars and effective change can only occur with careful long term planning and taking incremental steps.

2: Capitalising on strategic transport infrastructure

2(a). We accept that governments are seeking to maximise the value of existing infrastructure networks due to cost but, by way of an example, we put a hypothetical question as to
whether investing in public transport in southern Adelaide would have been a better option than the Darlington Project? (Overseas research suggests that road works designed to relieve congestion have only a short-term benefit as it only encourages residents to use their cars).

2(b) The PRA supports the maximising existing potential of infrastructure networks but it should not compromise the existing ‘livability’ of suburbs such as Prospect.

2(c) Current residential developments on Prospect and Churchill Roads, viewed on the premise that they are an example of ‘infill’, are of concern to the PRA, as most replace the previous 45% green component (Trees, lawns, gardens, both ornamental and vegetable), with hard surfaces. We do not deny that such developments are servicing a niche in the market, but they give back little in return to the environment.

We note that the highest number of respondents to the ‘Your Say’ on the SA Planning portal were from ‘inner metropolitan suburbs’.

2(d) The comment, ‘policy should encourage the development of land at higher densities for a wider mix of activities, strategically located in areas close to a wide variety of transport options, particularly quality public transport.’, appears to be at odds with the reality of both Prospect and Churchill roads. Cafes, restaurants, dress and curio shops, showrooms etc. will only bring an ambience, for a short time, if at all, as change of ownership and the increase of traffic, both public and private, will repeat the Melbourne Street experience of a once vibrant destination to what it is now a tired arterial road to the City.

In addition we would question what are the ‘wide variety of transport options’?

2(e) The PRA believes that issues concerning the three matters at ‘3(g)i’ below have, or will be, put in the ‘too hard basket’.

3 (f) The PRA supports the principle of protecting necessary infrastructure and recognises that our road networks are vital to the development of the State. They are also valuable assets. The task of providing access to markets locally and the world is dependent on reliable transport and the facilities that allow for the movement in, through and out of the State, be it by road, rail, plane or ship.

3(g) The PRA has a particular interest and concerns about the following:

   i. The Portrush Road – Ascot Avenue – Hampstead Road freight route;
   ii. The Main North Road; and
   iii. The rail crossing at Ovingham.

3(g)i. The Portrush Rd. – Ascot Ave. – Hampstead Rd. freight route to the Islington/Dry Creek intermodal facility runs along the eastern border of the City of Prospect. We recognise that this transport route
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7 Increasing Highway Capacity Unlikely to Relieve Traffic Congestion’ 2015; National Center for Sustainable Transportation
8 page 20 Theme 1 Discussion Paper
is vital for the movement of goods both to and from the Eastern States and links to the North and West of Australia. It is unlikely to be replaced in the foreseeable future and as the only route authorised for ‘B Doubles’ Hampstead Rd. but it presents a dangerous mix of Heavy transport, Public Transport, passenger cars and cyclists.

The Transport Industry and the Federal and State Governments need to be questioned about the level of safety and how the public can have confidence in the Portrush – Ascot- Hampstead freight route.

Even more concerning is the potential for ‘B Triples’ to be authorised to run on the Melbourne – Adelaide route. We note the South Australian Freight Council ‘urges the State Government to immediately gazette the Northern Expressway and the duplicated section of the Sturt Highway to the PBS3 network (accommodating vehicles up to Double Road Train and B-Triple Higher Mass Limit categorisation). SAFC believes that specific facility access issues adjacent to these routes will then emerge.’

‘It is critical that the full value of new infrastructure spending is realised by gazetting new roads.’

3(g)ii The Main North Road is the major road carrying traffic to and from the Northern Suburbs of Adelaide.

Traffic separates at the Fitzroy/Robe Tce intersection, either continuing into the City or turn Right down the new Fitzroy Tce. – Park Tce. – Port Road connection. The remainder of the traffic continues on down into the city down O’Connell Street – King William Road. This route has had the ‘Clearway’ times extended freeing the left hand lane but it is intermittent because of the buses that need to stop for passengers.

The Main North Rd from Regency Rd to ‘Scotties Corner’, a distance of approximately 2.5 kms has five sets of crossings lights at North Park; Edgworth St.; Johns Rd. (Fire Station); Nailsworth Primary; and Kintore Ave.. The impact of these lights together with the number of buses stopping along the route mean that it is not unusual for traffic to be backed up from Regency Road to Fitzroy Terrace.

The PRA believes that significant improvement to Northern Suburbs Public Transport (access, reliability, on time, comfortable and frequent) network is critical if there is to be any leveling out, let alone decline in passenger car numbers on the Main North Road.

We would suggest that ‘mini-circle routes’ be established in the Northern and Southern suburbs picking up and dropping off passengers at arterial road stops and schools shopping centres etc. This approach is based on recognising the ‘spiders web’ nature of our converging arterial roads and local streets cutting across the Arterial roads as Adelaide’s suburbs have spread

---

9 Moving Freight The First and Last Mile The South Australian Freight Council November 2015 page 2.
3(g)iii Torrens Road is a major arterial road from the South Western suburbs that crosses the National Rail narrow gauge line at Ovingham. There are three other crossings at Hawker St, Belford Ave and Pym St., which will need to be closed if the predicted doubling of the Rail Freight Task.

'The demand analysis completed as part of this Study indicates that the most likely scenario for freight volumes carried on the Adelaide Hills section of the east-west rail line is an annual average growth of around 3.6% over the 30-year evaluation period. This translates to an increase from the current level of 4.8 million tonnes to approximately 14.3 million tonnes by 2039. These forecasts, which are aligned with the ARTC’s budget volume forecasts, suggest that without any expansion of capacity26, the Adelaide Hills section of the railway would reach its maximum capacity of 10.7 million tonnes per year between 2025 and 2030.40

We understand that the increase in tonnage will be achieved by both more traffic mitigated by introduction of low-slung bogies, which will allow stacking of containers.

3(h) ‘Managing the community effects of freight, including safety
The effects of freight movement on the community need to be better managed. Communities need assurance that access by more and larger vehicles will not compromise road safety. The community dialogue needs to acknowledge, respect and address community concerns, and manage expectations in an open way by presenting real choices and policy options."11

PRA does not believe that sufficient discussion and explanation of the ‘B-double route through the suburbs of Adelaide has occurred and further that there has been little information let alone discussion of the potential possibly imminent introduction of other High Productivity Vehicles (HPV’s) onto the suburban roads and the safety implications as they relate to pedestrians, cyclists and passenger vehicles.

3(i). Domestic freight projected to grow 80% between 2010 and 203012
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10 Adelaide Rail Freight Movements Study Final Report pg 15
12 Slide 12 The Australian freight task: trends, future outlook and alternative data sources Australian Road Transport Suppliers Association – Conference Thursday, 8 September 2016. David Mitchell Director, Infrastructure & Corridor Analysis, BITRE
The increase predicted will be through more vehicle movements and heavier loads as a result of ‘B Doubles’ and other High Productivity Vehicles.

The increase in heavier vehicles places the freight route infrastructure under increased pressure. The impact of the stress as a result of increased weight and frequency will require maintenance and improved engineering. It is the PRA’s position that more information is required as to how the Government and Industry will address the ‘reinforcing’ of the freight route.

3(j) Climate Change:

‘Climate change and increased environmental awareness

An increased awareness of environmental impacts and climate change will result in strengthening of policies supporting sustainable movement and production. Movement networks and systems in South Australia will transition to a low-carbon and low-emissions base as regulations tighten and consumers exercise their preference for emerging, affordable travel options’ P13 Background Paper

The Background Paper approach to ‘Climate Change’ is a focus on ‘low-carbon and low-emissions’. The impact of Climate Change on Road Infrastructure itself is not addressed.

‘Road networks are the socio-economic backbone of any community. They provide access and movement of people and goods that fulfill all the functions necessary for people in a community to live and prosper. Roads mostly consist of natural gravels in combination with other materials such as asphalt and concrete.

The design of the pavements and materials takes into account the natural impact of the environment. Engineers are well aware of the negative impact water ingress has on pavements and design the pavements and associated drainage assets to counter this impact. Likewise, asphalt and other surfacing materials are designed for prevailing climatic conditions including rainfall and ambient temperatures expected during the design life of the surface.

Both rainfall and temperatures are starting to vary beyond the accepted design envelopes in the current design methods and standards of road pavement, surfacing and drainage structures. While slow changing environmental impacts put strain on the performance of the road network, a more significant impact is often observed from shock events of weather patterns.

Historical design methods expect shock events to exceed the design parameters on the premise that these events are infrequent. Recent studies have strongly indicated these shock events to be increasing in frequency and intensity, such that roads are now subject to more extreme events within their design life.

Simply accepting these events to exceed the design capacity of roads and structures is not a sustainable option any longer as there is a shortening of life cycles and/or temporary loss of accessibility.”

Climate Change will have impact on both the population and road assets. Higher average temperatures and will result in the need to ‘up scale’ road engineering, not only because of Climate

13 Integrating Climate Change into Road Asset Management – 2017 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development /International Development Association or The World Bank
Change but also because of the increase in the size of loads. B-Doubles and other HPV's which are predicted to increase.

First Mile – Last Mile

‘First Mile – Last Mile’, in the context of the freight industry refers to the issues of loading and unloading at Intermodal facilities, warehouses and single drops at businesses. While some facilities are set apart from suburban environments many are not and the impact of these heavy vehicles on what are essentially ‘suburban streets’ requires reinforcement to those streets and design that allows for turning spaces.

These issues have not been addressed. Local Government may well be faced with serious ‘upgrading’ not only to address the requirements of the SA Planning Policy, in which ‘intermodal’ is mentioned over 20 times, but also the damage caused on the daily ‘assault’ of heavy vehicles on roads, kerbs and footpaths.

3: Sustainable mobility, car parking and the impact of technology

‘Theme 3’ as it is presented is a distraction. Commencing with ‘non-motorised transport’ immediately divides the community. While it certainly promotes ‘good health outcomes’ the majority of the community see the ‘active modes of transport options’ as ‘recreation’.

Our society is time poor, and maintaining international competitiveness places more and more pressure on ‘better, faster, cheaper’! Active modes of transport require time and are not likely to impact the level of motorised transport short, medium or long term.

The PRA questions the following:

‘As more jobs, services and community infrastructure are located close to where people live (or more people live where jobs and services already exist) the required travel distance for some purposes lessens. In view of this, it is expected that active travel will have an increased role in mobility across Greater Adelaide and in regional centres as walking and cycling become more popular, viable transport modes.’

Reference to ‘work’ in the future being ‘close to where people live’ is challenged.

‘Over the past decade, advances in information and communication technologies have led to a decrease in the number of people needing to travel for work. In response, planning controls have provided more allowances for home-based businesses and it is expected there will be an increase in the number of mixed-use precincts that will further reduce the separation between employment and residential uses. This will create more places where people can live, work and play without having to commute or travel as far to access services and amenities’

There is no dispute that technology driven industry can reduce the requirement to be ‘at work’ or ‘in the office’, but we question whether that is in fact what is happening or likely to happen.

---

14 Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper page 21 Theme Three first column second paragraph
15 Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper page 21 ‘Technology is changing how we live and how we move’
'Megatrend 6: Agglomeration and the re-urbanisation of jobs, business and capital

Technology continues to foster business concentration in cities. The technology powered knowledge economy was thought to have enabled everyone to work remotely, from dispersed locations. Instead it has pushed more high value and specialised economic activity towards CBDs and key locations in inner cities that can foster face to face interaction. This effect has been observed in all of Australia's large cities where commercial growth in the CBD has been substantial.¹⁶

The 'Megatrend 6' is sourced from the Property Council of Australia in May 2018, but the statement made on page 21 is not. The proposition of the Discussion Paper cannot be accepted and as a consequence the PRA challenges the 'work close to home' proposition will result of an alleged decline in motorised transport.

The emergence of new technologies such as a 'ride sharing app’, electric vehicles, semi/autonomous cars and buses have the potential to make public transport more effective, especially in ring route services to the major public transport corridors. We also recognise that these types of new technology transport vehicles are likely to be in operation sooner rather than later. The challenge will be to move them from experimental through ‘novelty’ to ‘work-horses’.

The 'villain' in the picture being painted by the Discussion and Background Papers is the passenger car. It well may be, but is there an alternative for families and parents?

The writer lives under 500mtrs from both St. Phillips Kindergarten and Nailsworth Primary School. The attire of the parents who drop off their children at the kindergarten is revealing, but not unexpected. Of the children who walk to the kindergarten most are brought by mothers who have another child ‘in tow’ or in a pusher or by a grandparent. Of the children who are dropped off by car nearly all are accompanied by a parent in work attire and it is not unusual for there to be older children in the car wearing local school uniforms.

At Nailsworth Primary the observation for those children who walk accompanied by an adult is much the same as for the kindergarten, but for the older children the ‘kiss and drop’ area is the option that is used especially if there is more than one child being ‘dropped off.’

The passenger car is the only alternative for working parents.

Public Transport has very little to offer families when both parents work.

¹⁶ Paper 1 Australian Cities: Megatrends, Disruptors, Futures page 16 For Property Council of Australia May 2018
The Background Paper’ lacks the recognition of ‘people’ and more importantly ‘families’.

A ‘word search count’ of the Paper for ‘people’ found:

- family/ies – 0
- children/child childcare – 2 (pp 26 & 69)
- parent/s - 0
- school – 4 (pp 40, 41, 51 & 60)
- home – 11 (pp7, 14, 17, 17, 18, 26, 38, 46, 47, 66)

The dependence of families on the ‘second car’ to get children to and from school/sport/ballet and other ‘after school activities’ has been completely overlooked by the authors of the Background Paper.

‘Walking to school’ is an option that should be promoted, but it is dependent on distance from the school and the time demands placed on parents and of course the weather. It is not unusual for a parent or parents to ‘drop off’ children at all three categories, Childcare, Kindergarten and School. A descriptor of, let alone a commentary on the family, childcare, school, and work profile is lacking’ as is its relationship with public transport.

Rightly or wrongly families feel vulnerable to rely on Public Transport. On 8 October 2018 Sydney suffered a Public Transport ‘fail’ due to ‘sickies and weather’, on 25 October 2016 Melbourne trains suffered a ‘switching fault’ stranding commuters. Failures such as these give no confidence to the community.

The Real Cost of Public Transport.

‘Regarding Adelaide’s situation, South Australian Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) annual reports give disaggregated financial statements for the various business sections it administers.

Values for total expenses (less grants and subsidies, but including depreciation) of the Public Transport Services division are reported as about $301 million for the 2010 financial year and $316 million for 2011 (DPTI 2011).

Total reported incomes (less grants and subsidies) for the division during this period were about $88 million in 2010 and $89 million in 2011 (i.e. incomes averaged about 29 per cent of expenses for these years). The most recent annual report (DPTI 2013) has total expenses (less grants and subsidies) for Public Transport Management of about $456 million during 2012 and $468 million during 2013; with total incomes (less grants and subsidies) of about $102 million and $94.5 million respectively (i.e. net incomes averaging about 21 per cent of expenses).\(^\text{17}\)
The cost of public transport to Adelaide raises questions of affordability and financing of major developments into the future. Has South Australia the ability to put in place a public transport system that will be capable of reducing the reliance on passenger cars?

Infill may contain Adelaide’s ‘urban footprint’ but Northern and Southern will still require a greatly improved public transport system regardless of ‘infill’.

‘Australia faces declining capacity of government budgets and balance sheets to fund new infrastructure. However, unlike many other countries, a clear position has not been identified to grow funding capacity, maximise proceeds from leasing or selling assets, improve cost and risk sharing between the public and private sectors and different tiers of government, use value capture and recycling tools, or build coordination through a new federal and state funding agreement. Limited institutions to manage growth Australian cities are not yet equipped with the governing institutions at the metropolitan scale to manage their growth, despite promising new initiatives of capable state governments that are targeting more integrated plans, policies and governance reforms.

The data confirms that Australia’s big five cities are behind in terms of affordability, land use efficiency, urban amenities, transport congestion, long journey distances, digital connectivity, high-level talent and innovation system. Australian cities have fragmented local governments and relatively limited institutional capacity or tools for metropolitan development.

Australian cities are caught in a clash between a previous low public-investment model of urbanisation that supported cities with smaller populations and less urbanised economies, and a new alternative model of high vibrancy and high amenity cities that can support new industries and talent. Many of these deficits are not yet recognised and recorded by global audiences or tracked by high-profile city benchmark studies. But this is changing as a new generation of benchmarks observe measures and indicators where Australian cities have deficits. The scorecards are starting to reveal weaknesses – from low density to high costs for young people, and from carbon inefficiency to weak innovation systems. Over the next few years, we can expect much wider reporting of these challenges. As this happens, Australian cities will be increasingly exposed to international scrutiny with consequences for investment, tourism, talent retention and wider appeal. The success model of the past is increasingly unlikely to work for the future. Australia needs to embrace a stronger set of tools for managing its cities.  

Of concern is the ‘snapshot’ of Australia’s lag in infrastructure investment below. Adelaide’s position is reinforced Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development – Urban Transport updated Information sheet 59 pg 11.
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18 Page 28 Creating Great Australian Cities Summary Property Council of Australia May 2018

19 Page 28 Creating Great Australian Cities Summary Property Council of Australia May 2018
Infrastructure investment 'catch-up' agenda

The cost recovery of Australia’s urban public transport systems is low in comparison to global cities. This is partly because the cost of providing transport services to far-flung low-density areas is much greater and cost recovery is often less than half that of more densified metropolitan centres.¹⁴

FIGURE 9 Cost recovery for public transport across global cities

Most Australian state governments have been pursuing an infrastructure investment 'catch-up'. While some may have reached the limits of their financial capacity, the investment cycle will need to continue for several decades to keep pace with growth. Therefore, it is especially important that they embrace new means to source capital such as asset recycling, PPPs, joint ventures with investors, and other forms of structured finance.
We recognise that the Property Council is a ‘pro-development’ organisation, and are conscious that Private-Public-Partnerships (PPP’s) have the potential of putting public assets into the hands of the private sector.

Analysis and statements may be biased towards ‘private interests’, but the statistics presented cannot be ignored at the very least they need to be addressed.

The Background and Discussion Papers are silent on how improved public transport will be financed when it is already operating at a significant loss.

Governments and developers will promote ‘public transport’ and other ‘user pays’ options, along with ‘infill’, but while the need to contain our urban footprint is accepted the Background and Discussion Papers do not present us with ‘the how’!

Elizabeth Crisp

President