

Item No: 15.10

Subject: TRANSFORMING JETTY ROAD

Summary

On 25 February 2025, Council approved concepts plans for the Coast and Transition Zones of the Transforming Jetty Road Project for consultation. Community consultation was undertaken to meet the requirements of Council's Community Consultation and Engagement Policy. This consultation started on 3 March 2025 and was extended to 16 April 2025. In addition, consultation was also undertaken to meet the requirements for possible road closures as required under section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

This report presents the results of community consultation. Having considered the consultation feedback, and additional investigations undertaken, this report also recommends to Council a final design for the Coast and Transition Zones of the Transforming Jetty Road Project.

Recommendation

That Council resolves:

1. to note the report prepared by Council Administration;
2. to note the responses received from the public during the community consultation process for the Transforming Jetty Road Project Coast and Transition Zones, and during the public notification process undertaken under section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, and the 'Feedback Analysis Report' prepared by TSA Riley;
3. that having regard to public responses described above, it is determined not to proceed with the following proposals that were the subject of public consultation:
 - a. Concepts B or C;
 - b. closure of Jetty Road (between Moseley Street and Colley Terrace) as proposed in Concepts B and C;
 - c. closure of Colley Terrace (between Jetty Road and Hope Street) as proposed in Concepts B and C;
 - d. closure of Durham Street (between Jetty Road and Chittleborough Lane) to all traffic except permit holders, bicycles and emergency vehicles, as proposed in Concepts A, B and C.

4. to proceed with Concept A (Durham Street Alternative Option) subject to the changes described in the 'Summary of Changes to Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option' section of the Council Administration report and detailed in the plans attached as Attachment 8 to the Council Administration report;
5. for the purposes of rationalising the flow or impact of traffic within a part of the Council's area, to close Durham Street to all vehicles turning right from Jetty Road on to Durham Street except permit holders, bicycles and emergency services vehicles;
6. to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to take such further steps as necessary under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* to implement the Durham Street Alternative Option referred to in Recommendations 4 and 5 above by the installation of traffic control devices in the nature of signs prohibiting all vehicles turning right from Jetty Road on to Durham Street except permit holders, bicycles and emergency services vehicles;
7. to authorise the Chief Executive Officer to take such further steps as necessary:
 - a. under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* for the installation, alternation and removal of any other traffic control devices necessary to give effect to Concept A (Durham Street Alternative Option);
 - b. for the purposes of the implementation of Concept A (Durham Street Alternative Option) as set out in this resolution.

Background

The City of Holdfast Bay has long recognised the need to invest in Jetty Road, Glenelg and the surrounding precinct. At its meeting on 8 September 2015, Council resolved to adopt the following Motion on Notice regarding the streetscape design for the Jetty Road precinct (C080915/193).

"That the administration report to Council via a workshop what plans, ideas, designs and any such other such diagrams, summaries etc have been developed for the street scape design for the Jetty Road precinct prior to Council's response to the Minister initiated DPA for Glenelg an in any event before Tuesday 13 October 2015."

In accordance with the resolution a workshop was subsequently held on 15 September 2015 and funds were allocated in the FY2017 Annual Business Plan to prepare a Masterplan for the major upgrade of Jetty Road, Glenelg.

The Jetty Road, Glenelg Masterplan was endorsed by Council on 13 February 2018 (C130218/1032).

- "1. That Council endorse in principle the final Jetty Road Glenelg Masterplan, as provided in Attachment 1 to Report No: 33/18 subject to final detailed plans, specifications and costings in each stage, being submitted to Council for review, consultation with relevant traders/landlords and ratification.

2. *That Council note the 'Engagement Summary Report on Phase 3 of community consultation and engagement, as described in Attachment 2 to Report No: 33/18.*
3. *That after the initial two years of construction and yearly thereafter further implementation reviews to be performed to determine the impact of removing car parking spaces on the street. The Masterplan and detailed design would be updated to reflect changes required to avoid adverse parking effects on the remainder of the implementation.*
4. *Undertaking that no car parks will be removed from side streets without consultation with affected traders."*

The endorsed Masterplan described an over-arching and coordinated vision for Jetty Road Glenelg, identifying a program and guidelines for the progressive and staged upgrade of Jetty Road and its side streets.

In 2021, the City of Holdfast Bay completed Stage 1 of the Masterplan, which included Chapel Plaza and Bouchée Walk.

As an outcome of the 2022 Federal election, the Australian Government invited the City of Holdfast Bay to apply for a \$10 million grant as contribution towards the implementation of the Jetty Road Masterplan.

Considering the application for the Federal Government grant, and consistent with the resolution of 13 February 2018, Council approved a high-level review of the Jetty Road Masterplan on 23 May 2023 (C230523/7454).

"That Council:

1. *approves an investment of \$30 million of Council funding to deliver the upgrade of Jetty Road Glenelg;*
2. *approves the design elements to be considered as identified in this report under the 'Design Elements and Parameters' section;*
3. *approves Administration to undertake a high-level review of the existing Masterplan design for consideration by Council with a value not to exceed \$80,000;*
4. *approves Administration and their design consultants to commence discussions with the Department of Infrastructure and Transport and determine their support for changes to traffic and public transport along Jetty Road, Glenelg and the surrounding precinct".*

Regarding the design elements and parameters, Council identified the Moseley Street, Jetty Road, Colley Terrace corner as the section of Jetty Road requiring the most focus both for design and investment. It was identified this section of the street will require a change in its function due to the number of competing usages between pedestrians, private vehicles, buses

and the tram. Council prioritised the following design elements as the most important:

- pedestrian access and safety
- increased greening
- reduction or removal of tram barriers

Consistent with the Council resolution, a high-level review of the Masterplan was undertaken, and a Business Case was prepared to support the application for \$10 million in grant funding from the Australian Government. On 6 October 2023, Council was notified by the Australian Government's Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts that the application for grant funding had been successful.

The high-level review resulted in Jetty Road being sectioned into three zones, similar to the original Masterplan. The zones are outlined below:

Coast Zone

The Coast Zone from Colley Terrace at Hope Street, along Jetty Road to Sussex Street. The zone is characterised as more of an entertainment and tourism precinct, with the design looking to prioritise pedestrian use, improve safety and create a feel of space with more flexible multi-use spaces. The Coast Zone was the area identified as the area of focus for design and investment, with focus on the Moseley Street/Jetty Road intersection and the pedestrian crossing on Colley Terrace.

Transition Zone

The Transition Zone extends from Sussex Street to Partridge/Gordon Streets. The characteristic of this zone is one of transition from the Coast into the City Zone. It is more about creating a community feel with flexible spaces, while retaining parking and vehicle movement.

City Zone

The City Zone is from Partridge/Gordon Streets to Brighton Road. This zone is characterised as a local shopping precinct. While there are some new design elements, works in this zone was identified as predominantly involving renewal of existing assets.

In mid-2024, Council was made aware of the State Government's Tram Grade Separation Project. This project would result in tram services to Glenelg ceasing from August 2025 to December 2025. This disruption to tram services provided an opportunity the Transforming Jetty Road Project to undertake construction within the roadway, along Jetty Road, without having to impact tram services. To leverage this opportunity, the planning and construction timeframes for the construction of the Coast and Transition Zones had to be accelerated to start construction of these two zones in August 2025.

At its meeting on 8 October 2024, Council approved the concept plans for the City Zone of the Transforming Jetty Road Project and for Administration to commence construction of this zone. Construction of the City Zone commenced in November 2024 and is scheduled for completion by July 2025.

On 25 February 2025, Council approved concept designs for the Coast and Transition Zones to be released for community consultation. Three concepts were released for the Coastal Zone, Concept A, B and C, with an additional variation to Concept A. The three concepts prioritised pedestrian safety to vary degrees, consistent with the direction previously provided by Council, to demonstrate how the Coastal Zone could be transformed depending on the level of change and impact the community support. One concept was released for the Transition Zone.

Each of the three designs included the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Moseley Street and Jetty Road. This intersection was identified as the area of most concern by Council, with the signalisation allowing for designated pedestrian access across the intersection, improving safety. Each concept also included a reduction in speed from 40km to 30km per hour along Jetty Road to further improve safety. Following is an overview of each concept.

Concept A – Colley Terrace Open to Traffic

Concept A maintained all vehicle access along Jetty Road and Colley Terrace. Pedestrian safety improved with the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Moseley Street and Jetty Road. In addition, a closure to Durham Street was proposed (between Jetty Road and Chittleborough Lane) to all vehicle traffic except permit holders, bicycles and emergency vehicles. The road and footpaths at the same level along with increased greenery, integrated outdoor dining, new street furniture and lighting.

Concept A – Durham Street Alternative Option

This variation to Concept A kept vehicle access to Durham Street open from Jetty Road, via a left-hand turn, with one-way vehicle movement in a south to north direction.

Concept B – Colley Terrace Closed to Vehicles (except Public Transport)

Concept B enhanced the pedestrian experience through closure of the Jetty Road and Colley Terrace corner to all traffic except trams and buses, which would continue to operate unchanged. Vehicles would be prevented from entering Colley Terrace, south of Hope Street, with a turning circle allowing vehicles to travel both ways along Colley Terrace. Vehicles would be prevented from turning into Durham Street from Jetty Road, as described in Concept A. The road and footpaths at the same level along with increased greenery, new street furniture and lighting. The reduction of traffic at the Colley Terrace corner gave pedestrians priority with increased space to create better integration with Moseley Square.

Concept C – Colley Terrace Closed to Vehicles (except Public Transport) with changes to Bus Routes

Building on the previous concept, Concept C transformed the Coast Zone into a pedestrian-focused shared zone with further reduction of bus movements through the Jetty Road/Colley Terrace corner by redirecting bus routes from Moseley Street, to exit east along Jetty Road rather than the current route of west through the Colley Terrace corner. Buses and vehicles would be prevented from entering Colley Terrace, south of Hope Street.

Report

Consultation

The community consultation for the Coast and Transition Zones of the Transforming Jetty Road Project served to meet the requirements of Council's Community Consultation and Engagement Policy as well as the consultation requirements for possible road closures as detailed in section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*. The objective of the consultation was to ensure the community was given an appropriate opportunity to review the plans, ask questions and provide feedback in a meaningful way that can be used to shape the final concept plans and meet the requirements under section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

The feedback being sought through the consultation was:

- Preference regarding design elements for traffic changes, public transport services, parking, signalised crossing points, levels of greening and general design;
- Level of support for road closure as per Council's obligations under section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* (road closing by councils for traffic management purposes);
- Community sentiment, concerns and insights on proposed designs and changes; particularly regarding traffic movements, parking losses and the reduction of vehicle amenities to support pedestrian safety and amenities.

To raise awareness of the community consultation, council undertook the following:

- A brochure was distributed to all residential properties (approximately 19,000) and businesses (approximately 1,000) informing residents and business of the consultation and providing an overview of the concepts being consulted on;
- Project website (transformingjettyroad.com) providing detail of the concepts and associated information;
- Extensive social media campaign;
- Articles in the Holdfast Bay e-newsletter;
- Emails to the YourHoldfast database;
- Media release/news on holdfast.sa.gov.au;
- Article in the Jetty Road Glenelg consumer e-news.

Promotion of the consultation included:

- Community digital LED screens
- Tram/bus shelters
- Corflutes at community parks and reserves
- Displays in council libraries and Brighton Civic Centre

Consistent with the requirements under the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, a public notice was placed in The Advertiser on Saturday, 15 March 2025, as well as a public notice on Council's website, notifying of consultation under the Act. The Notice outlined due consideration would be given to all written submissions made on the proposal received by 5pm, 14 April 2025. In addition, letters were hand delivered to properties located on Durham Street, Colley Terrace, Moseley Street and parts of Jetty Road informing of the consultation under the Act.

To provide community members the opportunity to ask questions and provide a greater understanding of each of the concepts proposed, 11 community drop-in sessions were held at a pop-up store in Jetty Road, Glenelg and in locations across Holdfast Bay during the consultation period.

In the third week of consultation, Administration received feedback from residents and stakeholders they would like more time to consider the impacts of the concepts before providing their feedback. A request was made for specific drop-in sessions for the residents of Sussex Street, Moseley Street and Gordon Street. In addition, legal advice was received that the issuing of letters to affected properties, under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* consultation, may have not been appropriately issued in as far as the letters were hand delivered rather than mailed via Australia Post.

Considering the requests and advice received, the general community consultation was extended for an additional two weeks, with a new closure date of 16 April 2025. In addition, a new Public Notice under section 32 of the *Road Traffic Act 1961*, was advertised in The Advertiser and on Council's website on Wednesday, 26 March 2025, with consultation closing by 5pm, 30 April 2025. Letters (962) informing property owners of the change to the consultation were sent via Australia Post to properties abutting: Jetty Road (whole street), Durham Street (whole street), Colley Terrace (whole street) and Moseley Street (between High Street and Jetty Road).

The extension to the consultation was announced on the Transforming Jetty Road project page, Council's website and Council's social media platforms, with a notification to the YourHoldfast database. Three additional community drop-in sessions were hosted and residents and businesses in Sussex Street, Gordon Street and Moseley Street were notified of the dedicated sessions.

Respondents could provide feedback through multiple channels, which included:

- Online feedback survey via the website
- Hardcopy survey via libraries, civic centre, drop-in sessions and by request
- Mail
- Phone
- Email.

In addition, there was a quick response survey on the website where respondents could select one of the three concepts without providing additional information. While the Project Team sought as much information from respondents as possible, it recognised respondents may wish to provide a response to their preferred option, given the information provided to them. In addition, if respondents did not want to provide feedback they could provide the reason as a quick response.

Consultation Feedback

A total of 2,227 feedback submissions were received during consultation. It is important to note that because respondents were able to provide feedback through multiple channels and may have provided more than one submission. Each submission has been counted as a separate entry.

The response numbers via all feedback tools were:

Feedback tool	Response number
Online and hard copy survey	993
Quick response (online)	1,031
Emails, letters and phone calls	203
Total	2,227

TSA Riley was engaged to undertake an analysis of all the feedback received during consultation. The Feedback Analysis Report prepared by TSA Riley is included as Attachment 1. Feedback was analysed by question and segmented by demographic subcategory type to give a comprehensive overview of what various respondents thought about the draft concepts. Demographic subcategories included: Jetty Road Precinct Traders, Jetty Road Commercial Landlords, residents in the Glenelg suburb (broken further down into age category), 5045 residents (Glenelg East, Glenelg North and Glenelg South), City of Holdfast Bay residents (Somerton Park, Hove, Brighton, South Brighton, North Brighton, Kingston Park, Seacliff and Seacliff Park) and Visitors to the area.

Refer Attachment 1

Of the 993 responses received via the online and hard copy survey, the breakdown by respondent type is provided below.

Respondent type	Response number	Percentage
Holdfast Bay resident	808	81%
Jetty Road precinct trader	41	4%
Jetty Road precinct commercial landlord	9	1%
Visitor	135	14%

All qualitative responses were thematically analysed as well as by demographic indicators (respondent type, suburb and age). All quantitative questions were analysed by all respondents and then further demographic indicators (respondent type, suburb and age). Attached to this report is a copy of the qualitative responses received.

Refer Attachment 2

While the consultation was not designed as a formal statistical sample survey, the volume of feedback provided strong indication of community sentiment and the views of the population within a reasonable margin of error. As at the 2021 Census, the City of Holdfast Bay had a population of 37,543. Using a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, the required sample size is 380 respondents. Feedback gathered as part of the consultation, including the survey and other channels, yielded a total of 2,227 responses.

There were 1,031 responses received to the quick response surveys. For the question of which concept design was preferred, 847 responses were received. The results of the responses are provided further in the report.

In response to the question of why the respondent had chosen not to provide feedback, 187 responses were received with the breakdown by option provided overleaf.

Option	Response number
I don't think my feedback makes any difference to the outcome	140
I don't like any of the draft concepts, but I don't want to leave feedback	29
I'm happy with any of the draft concepts	12
I don't have time	1
I have nothing to say/just curious	2
I don't like providing feedback	0
Total	184

Road Traffic Act Consultation

As previously mentioned, consultation included requirements under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* to consult on proposed road closures. The second Public Notice issued outlined the closure of consultation under the *Road Traffic Act 1961* by 5pm, 30 April 2025. The consultation requirement also allows for submissions to be received up until the council meeting in which a decision on the final design would be made. At the time of this report being prepared four responses have been received. Attached to this report is a copy of the responses received.

Refer Attachment 3

Survey undertaken by Mr Andrew Taplin

Mayor Wilson and Councillor Smedley met with Mr Andrew Taplin on Thursday 10 April to discuss his concerns with the concept designs released for public consultation. At this meeting, Mayor Wilson and Councillor Smedley consistently maintained that traders should complete council's online consultation survey. Mayor Wilson also committed to accepting a non-conforming petition to be tabled at an upcoming Council meeting.

Following the meeting, Mr Taplin distributed survey material to businesses in the Jetty Road precinct, and surrounding residences. Administration has not been provided with a map or scope of the distribution area.

On Wednesday 16 April, council received materials submitted by Mr Taplin. The materials provided consisted of:

- a covering letter;
- 547 'voting' forms; and
- a typed list of persons attributed to the voting forms.

A copy of the document provided to 'voters' is included as Attachment 4. This document was not provided to council as part of the submission. It should be noted that the document indicates that *"Council have agreed to count these votes and for transparency we would ask that votes are sent to us this way we can track the number of votes submitted to council."* Administration has not made any commitment to count the votes nor is there any broader binding voting process which these votes count towards.

Refer Attachment 4

The full list of 'voters', with addresses redacted, is included as Attachment 5. The unredacted list and the individual voting forms can be provided to Elected Members upon request.

Refer Attachment 5

Under the *Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013* or Council's *Code of Practice for Meeting Procedures* the material provided does not constitute a conforming petition, however Council may still wish to have regard to this survey. While the typed list of names does take the appearance of a petition, including restating the request (albeit formulated slightly differently to what was in the 'voting' forms) at the top of each page, it does not contain any signatures and there appears to be no suggestion that any of the persons who signed the 'votes' either intended or knew they were signing a supposed 'petition'.

Analysis of the material submitted by Mr Taplin shows:

- Administration has been provided copies of the forms rather than the original;
- some forms have not been marked to select Option A – noting that the form provided for signing had Option B and Option C crossed through;
- Mr Taplin has signed 87 forms electronically;
- another four instances of one person signing multiple forms;
- 14 instances of forms signed by two people;
- two instances of a form being recorded/counted twice.

Taking into consideration the above anomalies, the number of individuals voting for Option A is 426.

Elected Member Workshop

Elected Members were provided with a copy of the Feedback Analysis Report, all qualitative responses, written submissions and Mr Taplin's survey. A workshop was held with Elected Members on Tuesday 6 May, at which time TSA Riley presented on the findings of their analysis of the feedback received through community consultation and provided an opportunity for questions to be addressed.

Final Design

Workshops were conducted with Elected Members on Monday 12 May, Tuesday 20 May and Wednesday 28 May. The purpose of these workshops was to undertake a co-design approach with Elected Members in the development of the final design, based on the feedback received through the consultation processes.

The following sections outline the considerations, including key feedback received during the consultation process, that shape the recommendation on a final design for the Transforming Jetty Road Project Coast and Transition Zones.

Speed Limit

All concepts presented to the community included a lowering of the speed limit on Jetty Road and Colley Terrace from 40km/h to 30km/h. Through the survey 966 participants that answered the question relating to the lowering of speed, 69% indicated they were extremely supportive or somewhat supportive. This support was consistent across demographic

breakdowns. It is recommended Council proceed with the lowering of the speed limit along Jetty Road and the surrounding area. In the event Council endorses the recommendations of this report, Administration will seek the necessary approvals under the applicable legislation.

Traffic Lights

All concepts presented to the community included the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Moseley Street and Jetty Road. The survey results indicated that of the 975 participants that answered the question, 72% were extremely supportive or supportive of the traffic light with pedestrian crossing proposal. This support was mainly consistent across demographic breakdowns, with Jetty Road precinct commercial landlords being the least supportive.

In addition, respondents to the survey were asked to rank design principles from lowest to highest. 810 respondents answered the question, and the highest rated design principle was pedestrian safety followed by pedestrian space and accessibility.

Through the qualitative feedback received, the impact on travel time and traffic congestion was a sentiment that came through. The traffic modelling undertaken in development of the concept designs outlined the impacts on vehicle travel in peak times for the AM and PM during the weekdays and the peak period on weekends. The details of this modelling were provided during community consultation. Below are the vehicle delays by peak period.

Weekend Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	10min 21s	1,133m
Jetty Road – East Leg	10min 14s	633m
Jetty Road – West Leg	9min 45s	884m

AM Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	1min 15s	313m
Jetty Road – East Leg	1min 10s	141m
Jetty Road – West Leg	1min 30s	220m

PM Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	2min 26s	235m
Jetty Road – East Leg	2min 22s	208m
Jetty Road – West Leg	2min 15s	504m

Attached to this report is the SIDRA Analysis Modelling that derived the information provided in the above tables.

Refer Attachment 6

Through the final design process, further investigations were undertaken on how improvements could be made to the functioning of the Moseley Street/Jetty Road intersection, with the introduction of traffic lights, that would lessen the impact on vehicle travel. The following changes were made specifically to Concept A to ensure optimisation of the intersection:

- Collaboration with the Department of Infrastructure and Transport to refine the inputs into the traffic model to ensure the outputs reflected and were in accordance with the Department's processes.
- Due to the width of Moseley Street, a dedicated left- and right-hand turn lane could be accommodated on the approach to Jetty Road. To accommodate for the left-hand turning lane space, car parking on the western side of Moseley Street (between Jetty Road and Elizabeth Street) had to be removed. This allowed for greater capacity for the Moseley Street leg to move vehicles through the intersection.
- Further iteration of traffic signal phasing and phase timing associated with the phases for Concept A, supplemented with the new dedicated left turn lane on Moseley Street, lessened the impact on vehicle travel. The changes allowed for more evenly distributed timing across all signal phases at the Jetty Road and Moseley Street intersection.

Below are the vehicle delays under the new model by peak period and the improvement from the delays consulted on.

Weekend Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	32s (-9min 51s)	148m (-985m)
Jetty Road – East Leg	2 min 25s (-9min 49s)	160m (-473m)
Jetty Road - West Leg	2min 53s (-6min 52s)	532m (-352m)

AM Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	18s (-57s)	58m (-255m)
Jetty Road – East Leg	39s (-31s)	46m (-95m)
Jetty Road - West Leg	42s (-48m)	131m (-90m)

PM Peak

Intersection Leg	Delays	Queue Lengths (m)
Moseley Street	20s (-126m)	34m (-201m)
Jetty Road – East Leg	2min 21s (-1s)	84m (-124m)
Jetty Road - West Leg	47s (-1min 28s)	303m (-201m)

Attached to this report is a copy of the Traffic Analysis and Modelling Report prepared by Tonkin.

Refer Attachment 7

Given the support from the community for the introduction of traffic lights at the Moseley Street/Jetty Road intersection, and the improvements to vehicle delays, it is recommended that Council proceed with the installation of traffic lights, the extension of the left-hand turning lane on Moseley Street, approaching Jetty Road, and the removal of four car parks to accommodate the extension of the turning lane.

Concept Designs

Three concept designs, Concept A, B and C were presented to the community during consultation.

The quantitative feedback received through the survey, on each of the concepts presented during community consultation are provided below.

Option	Supportive	Neutral	Unsupportive
Concept A	50%	7%	42%
Concept B	39%	5%	56%
Concept C	41%	3%	56%

For the quick response, 847 responses were received with the breakdown by option provided below.

Option	Response number	Percentage
Concept A	423	50%
Concept B	88	10%
Concept C	336	40%
Total	847	100%

Durham Street

In relation to Durham Street, two options were presented as part of consultation. The first option, which was consistent across Concepts A, B and C resulted in the closure of Durham Street, between Jetty Road and Chittleborough Lane, to all vehicles except permit holders, bicycles and emergency vehicles. This would result in entry into Durham Street from Augusta Street, the street being open to two-way vehicle movement, with a turning circle at the southern end of Durham Street to facilitate the two-way movement.

The second option, formed part of a variation to Concept A. This allowed for Durham Street to remain open via a left-hand turn into Durham Street from Jetty Road. Right-hand turns from Jetty Road into Durham Street would be prohibited. This right-hand movement would not be allowed due to further phases required for the traffic light signalisation. Physical access would not be blocked to vehicles turning right, but that such right-hand turn movements from Jetty Road would be prohibited by traffic control devices in the form of signs. One-way vehicle movement would occur in a south to north direction. This one-way movement is how the road typically functions; however, Durham Street is currently under temporary conditions with vehicles moving in a north to south direction. This option is referred to as Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option.

During consultation survey participants were asked to indicate their level of support of the closure of traffic entering Durham Street from Jetty Road. 961 participants responded, with 62% extremely supportive or somewhat supportive of the closure. Participants were also asked to indicate their level of support if Durham Street remained accessible to vehicles via a left-hand turn from Jetty Road. 973 participants responded with 50% indicated they were not supportive at all or somewhat supportive. Key themes emerging from feedback related to Durham Street were:

- traffic access and connectivity;
- safety and local amenity;
- support for closure or restrictions;
- concerns about increased congestion elsewhere; and
- local access for residents and connectivity.

Through the workshops with Elected Members, concerns were raised about the unintended impacts on adjacent streets, particularly Sussex Street, because of a closure; difficulties with larger vehicles being able turn around to exit out of Durham Street; and two-way movement along the street while still maintaining much of the car park spaces.

Considering the feedback received in relation to all three concept designs and Durham Street, as well as the concerns raised, it is recommended that Council proceed with Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option.

Attached to this report is the Final Concept Report for the Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option.

Refer Attachment 8

Parking

The plan for Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option that was released for community consultation included a loss of 26 parking spaces. The survey results showed of the 947 participants responding, 46% indicated they were extremely supportive or somewhat supportive of the loss of 26 parking spaces. It should be noted that 40% of respondents indicated they were not supportive at all or somewhat unsupportive. Questions were also asked of the level of support for increased losses under Concept B and C. The responses demonstrated that support for car parking losses decreased with the increase in number of parking losses. There were key themes that emerged from the feedback relating to parking. These themes were:

- concerns about reduced parking availability;
- parking and access to local businesses;
- support for reduced parking or alternative uses;
- turnover and short-term parking;
- parking difficulty.

In addition, a survey question asked respondents to select any reasons they would support the loss of on-street parking. Multiple 'reasons' could be selected so numbers per category are higher than the overall response rate. Most respondents indicated they would support the loss of parking "to provide space for greening" as indicated in the table on the following page.

Reason	Response number
To provide space for greening	474
To provide space for outdoor dining	441
Changes to traffic/road operations	424
None of the above	313

The survey results indicate there is an appetite in the community for a level of car parking losses, but the level of losses be minimised. Car parking losses need to be weighed up against the want to improve pedestrian safety, particularly within the Coast Zone, and preference for providing some space for greening. Through the final design process, a balanced approach was taken to minimise the impact of car parking losses but also meeting the need of the competing priorities of pedestrian safety and greening.

Attached to this report is a plan identifying the location of car parking losses in the final design.
Refer Attachment 9

The following is an overview of the level of car parking losses that were consulted on for the Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option by section, and the changes that are recommended.

Area 1

There were 3 car parking losses consulted on for this area, located on the southern side of Jetty Road near the corner of Partridge Street. In the final design the car parking losses in this area has been reduced to 2. These car parks are being lost for safety and compliance reasons.

Area 2

There were 2 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses in this area remains the same. These car parks are being lost to increase the tree canopy and increase greening along the street.

Area 3

There were 2 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses in this area is reduced to 1. This car park is being lost for compliance reasons.

Area 4

There were 4 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses in this area remains the same. These car parks are being lost due to the installation of traffic lights and for compliance reasons.

Area 5

There were 4 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses in this area remains the same. These car parks are being lost due to the installation of traffic lights and for compliance reasons.

Area 6

There were 3 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking loss in this area is reduced to 1. This car park is being lost for compliance reasons.

Area 7

There were 2 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses in this area remains the same. These car parks are being lost due to the installation of the traffic lights and to improve pedestrian flow around the corner into Colley Terrace.

Area 8

There were 3 car parking losses consulted on for this area, with 2 losses on the eastern side and 1 loss on the western side. Due to the proposed changes to the Moseley Street/Jetty Road intersection, as outlined previously, the extension of the left-hand turning lane on Moseley Street has resulted in a change to the number and location of car park losses. In the final design, 4 car parks are lost along Moseley Street on the western side, with no losses on the eastern side, which is a net increase of 1 car parking loss for this area.

Area 9

There were 4 car parking losses consulted on for this area. In the final design the car parking losses are reduced to 2. These car parks are being lost to create an entrance, increase the tree canopy and increase greening.

It is recommended to Council that a total of 22 car park spaces are removed from the Coast and Transition Zones. This would result in a total of 25 car park spaces being removed from the Jetty Road Precinct due to the Transforming Jetty Road Project.

Mountable Kerbs

The plan for Concept A Variation that was released for community consultation included mountable kerbs throughout the Transition Zone, between Sussex Streets and Gordon/Partridge Streets. Through the survey 974 participants who responded to the question, 66% indicated they were either very supportive or somewhat supportive of the proposed mountable kerbs for on-street parking bays along Jetty Road. 25% of respondents indicated they were either somewhat unsupportive or not supportive at all. While there was support for the mountable kerbs, the following themes emerged from the feedback:

- functionality and practicality;
- accessibility and safety;
- aesthetic and design concerns;
- confusion or clarity of purpose;
- suitability for the local environment.

The purpose for including mountable kerbs in the concept design was to provide an opportunity to create flexible spaces, with the ability to use car spaces for other uses at times, for example outdoor dining. Considering the feedback received during consultation regarding

the importance of on-street parking along Jetty Road, a review was undertaken of the area that mountable kerbs be constructed. It is recommended to Council the area of the mountable kerb be reduced, starting from Chapel Plaza, on the southern side of Jetty Road, and Nile Street, on the northern side, extending to Sussex Street. The existing kerb line (stand up kerbs) will remain from Partridge/Gordon Streets to Chapel Plaza (on the southern side) and Nile Street (on the northern side). This is reflected in the Final Design Plan provided in Attachment 8.

Moseley Square

Included in the concept plans released for community consultation, was a concept design for the outdoor dining space on the southern side of Moseley Square, between the building line and the tram line. The concept included changing the area of outdoor dining from near to the tram line, to the building line, and having a pedestrian walkway between the tram line and the outdoor dining area. In addition, the concept included removal of the existing structures and the construction of an arbor. Through the survey, 76% of the 975 respondents to the question were extremely supportive or somewhat supportive of the Moseley Square concept. Direct engagement occurred with the businesses impacted by the concepts during the consultation period. Through this feedback it was clear further work needed to be undertaken on the design to ensure the functioning of the outdoor dining experience. Therefore, it is recommended to Council this part of the concept be decoupled from the Final Design Plan to allow for further design work and consultation be undertaken. Once complete, a separate report will be tabled with Council with the final design for Moseley Square.

Summary of Changes to Concept A Durham Street Alternative Option

As explained throughout the report, there are some minor variations to the concept design that was presented for consultation. The summary of the changes are:

- An extension of the left-hand turning lane on Moseley Street, approaching Jetty Road.
- The removal of four car parks on the western side of Moseley Street to accommodate for the extension of the left-hand turning lane (Refer to Section 8 in Attachment 8).
- Retain two car parks on the eastern side of Moseley Street to offset the car parking losses on the western side of the street.
- Retain one car park on the southern side of Jetty Road, near the Partridge Street corner (Refer to Area 1 in Attachment 8).
- Retain one car park on the southern side of Jetty Road, in front of the current Westpac building, near Milton Street (Refer to Area 3 in Attachment 8).
- Retain two car parks in Durham Street, near the Jetty Road entrance (Refer to Area 6 in Attachment 8).
- Retain two car parks on Colley Terrace, on the western side near Moseley Square (Refer to Area 9 in Attachment 8).
- The area of the mountable kerb be reduced within the Transition Zone. Mountable kerbs start from Chapel Plaza, on the southern side of Jetty Road, and Nile Street, on the northern side, and extend to Sussex Street.

Judicial Review

Proceedings have commenced in the Supreme Court of South Australia in relation to the Transforming Jetty Road Project. The Karidis Corporation and related entities commenced proceedings to declare the consultation for the Transforming Jetty Road project as unreasonable and failing to provide the applicant with procedural fairness; declare the consultation under the Road Traffic Act consultation as invalid; and restrain Council from making particular decisions in relation to the project. While the proceedings have commenced, they have not past the initial stage of lodgement. Importantly, no order has been sought or made to prevent Council from making a decision on the final design of the Transforming Jetty Road Project.

Budget

The budget for the Transforming Jetty Road Project is \$40 million. A budget of \$9.6 million has been allocated to the City Zone construction. The remaining \$30.4 million has been allocated to the design and construction of the Coast and Transition Zones.

Life Cycle Costs

Lifecycle costs are dependent on the final design approved by Council. On approval of a final design, lifecycle costs will be calculated as part of detailed designed.

Strategic Plan

Our Holdfast 2050+ Strategic Plan

Wellbeing: Good health and economic success in an environment and a community that supports wellbeing.

Open Space: Enhance character and vibrancy through innovation and distinctive public realm and placemaking.

Creative Holdfast: Arts and Culture Strategy 2019 - 2024

Council Policy

Community Consultation And Engagement Policy
Code of Practice – Meeting Procedures

Statutory Provisions

Road Traffic Act 1961

Local Government Act, section 48 (2)(d), section 50

Local Government (Procedures at Meetings) Regulations 2013, regulation 10

Written By: Chief Executive Officer

Chief Executive Officer: Ms P Jackson