

Salisbury Town Centre Renewal: *Stage 3 Survey*

Overview

A questionnaire, included in the newsletter as well as available on-line and a number of Council facilities, invited respondents to provide feedback on:

- Which of the 3 Salisbury Town Centre design options they most/least like in order of their preference
- What do they like/dislike about each design option
- Which of the 4 traffic movement options for John Street they most/least like in order of their preference
- What do they like/dislike about each traffic movement option
- Other ideas that they would like Council to consider in developing a Structure Plan to renew the Salisbury Town Centre.

An opportunity to be in the draw for 3 \$100 vouchers was offered as an incentive to complete the questionnaire.

A total of 128 completed questionnaires were received by Friday 9 December. While some people chose not to prioritise their preferences on options provided, the majority of respondents indicated their preferences and provided comments, which are summarised in this document.

Addresses were provided by 124 respondents, of which 99 live in Salisbury Council across 17 suburbs:

- Brahma Lodge – 2
- Burton – 4
- Direk – 2
- Gulfview Heights – 1
- Mawson Lakes – 3
- Para Hills West – 1
- Para Vista – 1
- Parafield Gardens – 8
- Paralowie – 11
- Pooraka - 1
- Salisbury – 38
- Salisbury East – 4
- Salisbury Downs – 3
- Salisbury Heights – 1
- Salisbury North – 16
- Salisbury Plains – 2
- Waterloo Corner – 1

The remaining respondents (25) mainly live in surrounding Council areas:

- Playford – 10
- Port Adelaide Enfield – 4
- Tea Tree Gully – 3
- Adelaide City Council – 2

- Prospect – 1
- Adelaide Hills – 1
- Burnside – 1
- Light – 1
- Mallala – 1
- Interstate – 1

Of the respondents who provided details about them,

- 95 were City of Salisbury residents
- 25 were property owners within the City of Salisbury outside the Salisbury Town Centre
- 5 were property owners located in the Salisbury Town Centre
- 6 were traders in the Salisbury Town Centre
- 15 worked in the Salisbury Town Centre
- Other – 37
 - Regular shoppers to John Street – 9
 - Voluntary work in area – 4
 - Family / friends reside in Salisbury area – 4
 - School / study in area – 3
 - Used to live / go to school in area – 1
 - Retired – 1
 - No response - 15

Respondents were invited to comment the options for Salisbury Town Centre independently of the traffic movement options for John Street, noting that all four options for John Street could be overlaid on all three options for Salisbury Town Centre. While mixed views were expressed, a pattern of responses emerged with:

- about 40% of the respondents supporting the retention of the current layout of the STC (Option 1), with 66.7% favouring Option A of retaining one way traffic movement on John Street;
- about a half favouring Option 2 for the STC of extending Church Street to create a high street, with 35% of the respondents also preferring Option A of retaining the current John Street traffic movement, with 10% preferring Options B of two way without buses and D of transforming John Street into a pedestrian mall;
- Option 3 for the STC – of focusing new development at the interchange – receiving the least support from those supportive of the idea of TOD or opposition to the proposed 8-12 storey heights;
- Option D received the most mixed views – while 27.8% respondents supported this as their most preferred option while it was also one of the most unpopular options, next to the most unpopular Option C (two-way with buses).

Irrespective of which of the STC options they support, participants are keen to see the STC given a good 'make-over' and activation. Many of the comments received echoed those at the first Stage consultation, with people suggesting a range of initiatives including better use of the Town Square and

public realm including the river area for entertainment and activities such as bands, more family / kids friendly activities (eg play café, grassed area), improved access to car parking, improved safety initiatives and increased access to community facilities and services.

Feedback received from *Stage 3 Surveys* will be considered by Council along with an analysis of views gathered from the Street Talk Two and Youth Council Workshop which also outlined the various options for STC and traffic movements.

STC OPTIONS: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Three options were presented about how the Salisbury Town Centre could develop:

- Option 1 – to revitalise the current heart of the STC
- Option 2 – to reinforce and extend the heart of the STC by extending Church Street to create a high street
- Option 3 – to relocate the centre to the interchange.

For each option, a visual diagram was displayed together with a description of the proposed, heart of the centre, height of buildings, road layout and key gateways/entry statements.

As shown in Table 1, there were mixed views amongst respondents with:

- 41.1% preferring Option 1
- nearly a half (48.4%) preferring Option 2
- Only 10.5% preferring Option 3

It should be noted that the above breakdowns are indicative only of preferences, as 33 respondents did not respond and 9 gave a first preference only.

While the majority of participants tended to only award a first prize, where they didn't like an option they awarded this the last prize. Of note is that Option 3 attracted significantly more 'third prize' nominations.

Table 1: Preferences for STC Options

Options	1st	2nd	3rd
1: Revitalise the current heart of the STC	39	40	8
2: Reinforce and extend the heart of the STC	46	36	10
3: Relocate the heart of the Centre to the Interchange	10	10	68
TOTAL	95	86	86

Key reasons underpinning participants' view points related to:

The height of buildings

- Many people expressed great support for increased development opportunities and residential developments but opposition to any development higher than 6 storeys.
- The proposed height of 8-12 storeys for Option 3 was therefore opposed by a number of participants, while in contrast those who supported this option liking the idea of TOD.

Character

- Options 1 and 2 were seen as more in keeping with the current character of the STC with people valuing its 'village like' atmosphere.

- Many people thought Options 1 and 2 would strengthen the existing assets (eg John Street, Civic Square, Interchange, Parabanks, the Little Para linear park) by bringing in more residential and other development and potential opportunities to activate public realm
- Some people thought there will not be much change with Option 1.
- Re Option 2, some people thought there was a risk of 'sprawl' resulting in loss of business associated with increased development opportunities along the new Church Street extension.
- Re Option 3, some expressed concerns over the possibility of isolating other key anchors (eg Parabanks) and the shrinking of the Town Centre.

Access

- Traffic into and around the STC particularly access to car parks featured heavily in responses.
- Those who preferred Option 1 supported pedestrian friendliness of the existing John Street while providing traffic flow and access to car parking.
- As highlighted in stage 1 consultations, many participants identified difficulties accessing STC from Park Terrace, especially from Salisbury Highway, due to long traffic light waits at the both intersection of Park Tce/Salisbury Hwy and railway crossing into Park Tce. This results in a preference to access STC from Salisbury Hwy turn off north of the underpass (near Pitman Park).
- Based on the above, Option 2 was seen as a preferred option by many. Even those who supported Option 1 expressed the need to improve the situation.
- Conversely Option 3 was preferred by some because of its utilisation of public transport and potential to encourage it further. Although many of the participants had driven to STC and were predominantly in favour of providing easy vehicular access and more parking, the importance of adjacent public transport and an enhanced pedestrian experience in STC was acknowledged.
- Some expressed concerns over further traffic congestion around the Interchange that may be resulting from Option 3.

OPTION 1: REVITALISE THE CURRENT HEART OF THE STC

What do you like?	What don't you like?	What's missing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like residences above buildings Revitalising is good to create a friendly atmosphere Most cost efficient and sensible Keeps things central Improves retail options in John St. Is the simplest option Most affordable option. Least disruptive. Quickest to implement. I like the extension of John St to the Interchange and building up the activity around Civic Sq. Is the obvious choice Opportunity to create a mall Like low level traffic coupled with good trade Practical, people-friendly Open and relaxing Space is already contained and/community friendly Better access and traffic flow Like café strip Like getting rid of shopping centre parking Keeps heart of Salisbury where it should be It already handles car and pedestrian traffic well Like contained, traffic-safe village style shopping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan will not create as much change as there should be Railway crossing stops us coming into town centre This option too difficult I don't like confining the town centre to the current length of Church St. ie between Park Tce and James St, because this both limits the footprint of the Town Centre shop-top residences and continues to turn the Town Centre's back on the waterway of Little Para River with its potential as a water feature Feels like original area will stay the same Parabanks parking is still too far for older people to walk Too small for growing community Traffic too congested at present John St upgrade needs to go further Cannot see what will change Limits room to expand for traders as only one street Will need inducements to encourage „social“ type traders on John St (cafes eateries) No improvement until overpass is made similar to Mawson Lakes Lesser of 3 evils Leave it alone! Keep it quaint and historic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs total change Need to cater for improved entry by pedestrians and cyclists by clearly defined travel routes from all directions with safe crossings of arterial roads, especially via the Little Para Trails in both directions; this is relevant for all three options. Bridge over train line for cars Already nice, just needs to be modernised

OPTION 2: REINFORCE AND EXTEND THE HEART OF THE STC

What do you like?	What don't you like?	What's missing?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be a great addition to shopping and living in Salisbury • Like Park Terrace / Church Street Entry Statement • It adds an extra roadway to divert traffic from John St. • This new road may create the opportunity to remove buses from inside the town centre by creating an anticlockwise loop route • The Church St extension is an opportunity to focus a significant part of the Town Centre to face the Little Para linear park and water feature • This will make it more accessible for people catching public transport and increase housing near the Parabanks shopping centre • This will make the traffic flow quicker and easy for shopping • A more user friendly modern answer, allowing for continual growth • I like the residential buildings • It looks to be more affordable and sensible option • Good as it keeps existing parts of town centre and makes most of park/creek outlook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Street extension would require relocation / reconstruction of the Civic Centre and would thus be far too expensive to implement • 6 storey buildings would be too high • The loss of multi-story development around the Interchange can leave the Interchange unsafe • Reinforce yes, but extend no. Too big and it will dilute the activity • De-emphasises John St and will cause traffic bottleneck at Gawler St roundabout • Traffic going in and out of the main street could cause problems • Extension looks good but the worry is the extension coming too close to existing housing and the then increased traffic at entry ways already chaotic and dangerous • Height of buildings too high • The spread of shops can possibly create active and dead areas of the town fringes. • Avoid spreading out like Gawler's businesses • To me this would make it too much of a "sprawling" area! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John St. could be revitalised as art centres and specialty shops with cheap rent until real renters can be attracted back to the area • Extending would provide for new businesses to come into Salisbury. • Would like to see more of the cafes, restaurants, entertainment places being included more in the town centre, feels like it is a separate place (between pedestrianised area and the interchange) • Takes in some more areas where people may gather to eat at night and opens new space for speciality areas other (new) end of Church St • Leave it alone. No buildings. Our historical Salisbury is wrecked certainly don't want a modern one. Can go to Munno Para for that • Only if there is no change to interchange, park, oval, green or sporting areas • Needs a facelift badly. One way traffic had lost a lot of business. People can't be bothered to go around in circles to obtain what they want it"s all about easy access
--	--	---

OPTION 3: RELOCATE THE HEART OF THE CENTRE TO THE INTERCHANGE

<p>What do you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am a supporter of transit orientated development (TOD) so this should be the centre of Salisbury • I like the idea of bringing buses back through John St 	<p>What don't you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disaster! Without fixing Park Tce. Maybe close Park Tce. for good and find another way of getting over railway line • Tends to isolate Parabanks and the eastern end of John Street, similar to what 	<p>What's missing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should also include complete streetscape of Wiltshire Street, including undergrounding of powerlines and improvements to open car parking areas by changing to
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the Park Terrace / Church Street Entry Statement. The Interchange is a competitive advantage and should be exploited, so this is a good option to consider • Safer for public transport users/easy to access • Great for transport access and businesses • Main infrastructure already in place. Main attraction railway buses and two way traffic back into John St with parking • Good as it would encourage more public transport use • More convenient for commuters/shoppers being close to bus and train interchange 	<p>happened with the western end of John Street post Parabanks, therefore John Street would need to be included in the heart to provide the link between the two</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think this option shrinks the Town Centre too much, and continues to turn the Town Centre's back on the Little Para park • Loss of the current, historical heart of the town, waste of resources • Salisbury isn't known for high 8-12 storey buildings • I fear the existing STC will be left to deteriorate if this option goes ahead • I feel it would be far too congested having the heart at the interchange • Will take the heart out of city centre to two hotels and pokie venues • Seems to completely isolate the main shopping area - disjointed separate areas • the two areas should be kept separate: transport and public areas • TOD's are stupid in Australia our small business can't use them 	<p>below or above new developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't understand how the interchange can become a civic town centre. Would the railway line be moved? • I like the idea of greater connections to the interchange, but I feel density of 8-12 storeys is not right for Salisbury. • I think it would only be asking for more trouble being close to the interchange. Unsavoury types would easily spill over to the shops etc. • 12 storey buildings - aviation problem surely. Narrowing railway crossing would be very disadvantageous to Salisbury residents in Central Zone. Would not be able to exit area to Salisbury businesses over railway line • NO! Drag people up John St. from the station to the city centre where the entertainment on Friday- Sat nights will generate economy for the businesses and foodmall!
--	--	---

TRAFFIC MOVEMENT: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Four options were presented regarding traffic movement in John Street:

- Option A – leave as is with one-way traffic only (with on-street parking)
- Option B – make John Street two-way without buses (no on-street parking)
- Option C – make John Street two-way with buses (no on-street parking)
- Option D – remove vehicles and create a mall (no on-street parking)

As shown in Table 2, there were mixed views amongst participants with:

- 44.4% preferring Option A
- less than 15% preferring either Option B (14.4%) or C (13.3%)
- just over a quarter (27.8%) preferring Option D.

It should be noted that the above breakdowns are indicative only of preferences, as 38 respondents did not respond and 4 gave a first preference only.

Table 2: Preferences for Traffic Movement Options

Traffic Movement Options	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
A: One way traffic	40	25	16	5
B: Two way traffic no buses	13	32	33	9
C: Two way traffic with buses	12	13	23	39
D: No Vehicles	25	16	14	33
TOTAL	90	86	86	86

The qualitative comments recorded indicate that these differing preferences reflect different priorities with regard to transport modes – ie vehicular, pedestrian or public transport – as well as access to car parking.

Option A

- Those preferring Option A, consider the current situation is working well, familiar with it; therefore any change would be a waste of money. They particularly value the opportunity for on-street car parking and pedestrian friendly atmosphere.
- Some dislikes included concerns about traffic congestion and access that are not working well now.

Options B and C

- In contrast, those preferring either Option B or C believe these options would increase convenience for drivers.
- Those that chose Option B supported the idea of not having noises of buses and no on-street parking.
- Those that chose Option C overwhelmingly did so with idea of strengthening links between the Salisbury Interchange and that would encourage use of public transport to travel to STC. They also liked the idea of no on-street parking.
- Dislikes for both Options B and C included concerns about traffic congestion, reduced safety for both cars and pedestrians, and reduced parking. Option C was particularly perceived to be undesirable.

Option D

- Those preferring Option D placing greater emphasis on both pedestrian safety and amenity.
- Dislikes included too drastic change, inconvenience for shoppers who bring their cars, fears that John Street will ‘dry up’ and reduce the accessibility to shops / service particularly for the elderly and those with mobility impairment.
- Some also suggested that Option D would only work with increased shops and attractions of John Street to draw residence towards the street. A pilot / trial was suggested.

Irrespective of which option, more car parking is required or at least the existing car parking numbers should be retained. This needs to be conveniently located or immediately adjacent to John Street.

TRAFFIC MOVEMENT: OPTION A – ONE WAY TRAFFIC

What do you like?	What don't you like?	What's missing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least expensive to implement. • Maintain flow in safer way for pedestrians • Safer • Good to leave traffic option as it is. People like to park close to where they shop. • Perfect option because parking still available and not too much traffic. • One way traffic suits the width of this street. • Easier for pedestrians to look only one way • Allows people to move through by car, but keeps a restriction on it. Allows pedestrians to move more freely, reduces congestion and environmental pollution • This works and provides access to the entire area, particularly to those with limited mobility and also provides short term, handy access to businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will cause confusion for drivers and will still have heavy traffic flows during peak times. • It makes it difficult to get around • Possible access concerns • Just makes it more difficult getting around the one way street • This option does not work well with congestion noise and pollution • Too restricted • Dislike no additional link to interchange • It makes it harder to get out and in Salisbury Town Centre • Doesn't work well now 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We own National Pharmacy and find clients use Cash Converters carpark but always full. More John St carparks • Remove the sheds and allow more parking • No buses means limited noise so is good for outdoor dining area, but one-way traffic makes vehicle flow difficult in the town centre

TRAFFIC MOVEMENT: OPTION B – TWO WAY TRAFFIC NO BUSES

What do you like?	What don't you like?	What's missing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic would flow better • This is my most preferred option. Traffic congestion will be reduced and buses will use alternative routes to/from the interchange. Better access to street stores with walkways being updated will also help • Allows traffic to flow through with easy accessibility to shops etc. • Like no on-street parking and no buses and link to interchange • Like shared zones to slow vehicles • Good as it will improve access to town centre without noise of buses, e.g. promenade at Mawson Lakes • This is a great option. Buses would be a nuisance in such a narrow street • John St. definitely would benefit from being a two way street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't see the point of allowing traffic if there is no parking • Expensive to implement • Parking would be a problem with two way traffic • It increases congestion and reduces safety • Not public transport/pedestrian friendly • John St not wide enough for two-way traffic • Two way too busy regarding intersection • Very hectic for older and disabled residents as well as mums with children and prams. Accidents/injuries will result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the place like Semaphore but it needs a natural or interesting feature (beach, structure) • This option okay, but I think the buses need to stop in John St. • I would like to see a landscaped median for ease of pedestrian crossing • There should be no bus stop in front of 91 John St. The bus stop used should be around the corner on Ann St. to allow for carparking on John St. • If we are going to have two way traffic - might as well go the whole hog and have buses • I prefer short term parking to be available rather than 2 way traffic.

TRAFFIC MOVEMENT: OPTION C – TWO WAY TRAFFIC WITH BUSES

<p>What do you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport is included • The best option for public, transport and people. • Easy to get around. Get off buses where you want • Like no on-street parking • Because buses can service the public and less walking distance • Good for elderly and public transport • I like the slow speed idea, people who find it hard or impossible to walk can use motorised transport, private or public, and those who can walk are still able to do so 	<p>What don't you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parking, no point and buses would add to traffic problems • Most expensive to implement • This could become congested and dangerous • Will create a total gridlock plus pedestrian safety issues • No way!!! Shocking bottleneck already at Gawler St/Salisbury Hwy intersection • Dislike buses on John St. • Don't like two way - removes pedestrian focus • Noise and smell! Risk of accidents higher. Who would even think of enjoying cafes etc in John st with noise and fumes 	<p>What's missing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping this option along with other streets will feel like minimal changes have occurred. Reduced 40 km/ph areas as an option will help • Worry there would not be enough room for indented bus bays and walking areas • Fits in better with Option 2, for a better modern future to expand
---	---	--

TRAFFIC MOVEMENT: OPTION D – NO VEHICLES

<p>What do you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A safer option and could allow for a mall type area • Pedestrian friendly! • Relaxed and walkable safe street allow for street events • Less fumes safer for everyone great idea. • Pedestrian safety • It would make it a lot safer for pedestrians, exceptions would be workplace vehicles. • No pollution in Salisbury from cars or buses. • Provided carparks are improved this has to be the most people friendly option 	<p>What don't you like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does Adelaide need another Rundle Mall? • Possible access concerns • Will upset shoppers who come with their car • Dislike no vehicles - will limit connectivity in town centre • Option D is rather drastic • Boring no-one will be there. People like being seen • Disaster for retail. Reduces access to shops and banks • Makes it difficult for some, such as elderly to access services/shops in the street. • Distance for elderly, disabled and very young from one end of John st, eg Doctors too far and too great for waking in emergencies • I feel John St will 'dry up' 	<p>What's missing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to design an environmentally friendly, sustainable, Town Centre for the 21st century and beyond and we shouldn't be dictated to by the motor vehicle, which dominated the latter half of the 20th century • Outer streets will become more congested with parking - many commercial people in John St do not have rear entrance - lost business - compensation to relocate? • If you want a mall affect great idea, not sure it will work. Do a 6 month trial - fence off with flags at railway end
--	---	---

OTHER IDEAS: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Respondents were asked to provide comments on any other ideas they would like Council to consider in developing a Structure Plan to renew the Salisbury Town Centre.

Respondents made a variety of comments, mainly in the themes of: security, green spaces, easier access for disabled and elderly, traffic congestion, changes to railway intersection, bikeways and bus lanes. A number of participants re-iterated comments about the need to brighten up John Street, especially the Civic Square, to create a more attractive and vibrant area. They wanted more security, parks, toilets, pedestrian crossings, more colour and modern buildings, shops, offices, clothing and entertainment stores. They wanted less traffic congestion, fewer obstacles to planning permits for local traders and developers, also less cheap shops and traffic lights.

Comments made include:

- **More:** security, parks, toilets, pedestrian crossings, more colour and modern buildings, shops, clothing and entertainment stores.
- Lobby the State and Australian Governments to commit to establishing / relocating some of their offices to the Salisbury Town Centre for a long period of time
- Totally renovate 'Coles' building, Parabanks shops, and demolish rock pool centre. Enforce rules for shop fronts to be neat and clean on John Street. Bring families in perhaps create a play cafe or kid's art cafe. Bring bands (youth) to the civic square every week
- Consider aged and disabled when making your decision. Safety is an important factor.
- Create dedicated bus lanes while closing streets to cars. Build a new Salisbury Railway Station and Interchange as the current interchange is old and tired, build something modern
- Too many traffic lights - especially on Park Tce. Consistency in speed limits. Good signage for speed limits
- Enhance and develop the area around the river
- Bit of green grass in the square - encourage people to meet, lunch, meet after school. Keep cheap shops to a minimum and money lenders
- It needs a ring road like Elizabeth and TTG- Park terrace is a disaster
- If motor vehicles are restricted from John St or elsewhere, vehicle access must be maintained for taxis and vehicles with disability parking permits, esp. if buses are taken out of Church and John St
- I hope that "green" measures are taken strongly into account, such as solar power for as many options as possible! Consideration be given to accessibility, of buildings, ease of travel with continuous paths of travel, clear areas for people to travel along footpaths, a minimum of uneven footpaths
- Narrowing the railway traffic is unbelievable! The area is bad enough to cross now it will be heaps worse if this happens. An overpass or similar should be an option.
- Bikepath under Commercial Rd to improve cycling/walking activities (Pitman Park bridge)
- I would like to see traffic into and out of Gawler St from Park Tce restricted to left turn into Gawler Street from west side and left turn only out of Gawler St to east side of Park Tce. This would do away with the traffic lights at Gawler St/Park Tce intersection and help alleviate some of the congestion between Salisbury Hwy and Park Tce/Wiltshire St junction

- Council to make it easier for developing, planning and give owner and develop easier approvals so we can get builder and owners to develop shops and apartments (great idea).
- There is no late night shopping and the shops there don't appear to want it, due to security risks.