

Ref: C-00107049

1st June 2026

Dear Minister Aitchison,

Thank you for your response of 25 May 2026 regarding the pedestrian crossing on Mayne Street, Murrurundi, sent via Mr Dave Layzell MP. We have shared it with the community and provide the following reply.

1. Community position. The original correspondence reflects a community view, not an individual one. Almost 200 households signed the accompanying petition. In a town of just over 900 residents, that indicates the breadth of concern and is consistent with the separate representations your office has received from other residents.

2. Acknowledgment of speeding. We note your letter's confirmation that *"Transport for NSW is aware of speeding issues through parts of Murrurundi."*

3. Pedestrian count warrants. The letter states it is "highly unlikely" that pedestrian counts would meet the warrants under TS02670.0_0.00 Section 2. No related pedestrian or vehicle count is cited, because none has been undertaken at this location to our knowledge. However we would also draw attention to Murrurundi's age profile, which is directly relevant under the standard: half the population is aged 55 or over, one third is 65 or over, one quarter is 70 or over, one in six is 75 or over, and nearly one in ten is 80 or over. The warrant framework allows thresholds to be adjusted where vulnerable user populations are demonstrably high. On that basis alone, the assumption that warrants cannot be met should be tested with actual data rather than assumed.

4. The 2025 speed survey. The survey is presented as reassurance, but the figures show that 15 per cent of drivers exceed the 50 km/h limit and 5 per cent exceed 55 km/h. Transport for NSW's own *Every K Counts* casual-speeding campaign sets out the position that even small exceedances materially raise crash and casualty risk. The survey finding is the source of community concern, not a counter to it. We request access to the data and the report that was conducted, which I am sure would be available under a GIPA request if you are not able to facilitate.

5. Sight lines and stopping distances. The 120 metres of southbound sight line cited must be read against actual heavy-vehicle performance. A B-double travelling at 60 km/h requires approximately 90 metres to stop on dry road. At the 95th-percentile speed recorded in your survey, that margin narrows; if the vehicle ahead is decelerating for a pedestrian, it narrows further. The standard is met on paper. In practical conditions, the margin is thinner than the headline number indicates.

6. Crossing behaviour. Residents and shopkeepers report near-misses on a regular basis. The practical consequence is that pedestrians — particularly older residents — increasingly

avoid the marked crossing and cross elsewhere on the highway, which transfers the entire risk onto the pedestrian. This is the same New England Highway traffic profile that has prompted bypasses further south. We are asking why the same traffic, passing through a narrow main street with a demonstrably vulnerable population, is treated differently here.

7. Proposed actions. The Town Entry Gateway treatments, the speed camera nomination, and the request for increased Highway Patrol presence are all pre-existing initiatives, as the letter itself acknowledges. We welcome them, but none address the crossing issue directly.

8. Request. TS02670.0_0.00 Section 2 confers ministerial discretion on these decisions. On the basis of the points above — and the matters acknowledged in your own letter — we ask that you, your department, and Mr Layzell revisit the case for signalisation at the Mayne Street crossing, and apply that discretion before the one threshold that would automatically guarantee signals is met: two pedestrian casualties within three years.

Thank you again for your engagement. We look forward to your further response.

Yours sincerely,

Carlo Bertozzi On behalf of the Fix Our Crossing campaign, Murrurundi