

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



To: Amol Kingaonkar, Transport Planning, PA/E Council.

12th April, 2021.

Dear Amol,

Please find below comments & recommendations from the PortBUG following your request for comment on the draft Walking & Cycling Plan (version dated 1 March, 2021). These notes are largely in dot-point & brief comment form with minimal explanation as time for comment has been relatively limited. As per your request, comments have been drawn from our small Committee group only with none from the broader membership of the BUG (nor from our larger Port Adelaide Bicycle Forum on facebook). *We believe that a further adequate consultation phase with residents & constituents and our broader BUG community will essential!*

The context for many of our comments is our belief that the development of the Port Adelaide/Enfield Council's Active Transport Network – now some 3 decades old - has reached a critical stage in its formation. Many of the key 'backbone' or framework elements of the Network are in place and future development now requires *the transition of planning & investment* to a more systematic & 'granular' scale of functional & structural analysis, consultation & design.

We make a number of recommendations that focus on this new scale of planning, how we think this Plan should work over its 5-year span, and a renewed role for the Council with regard to consultation, planning & annual investment processes. In particular we recommend that this Plan be understood & published as a truly 'public' document – that is, a document that:

- is *easily accessed, read & understood* by Council's residents & constituents
- assists all residents as well as other readers to *understand & share Council's vision for Active Transport* and the roles it might play
- defines the role that Active Transport must play in *mitigating risks & challenges* that we face, reducing the *negative impacts* of our current transport system & fostering *transport access & equity*.

As it stands (and as we hope our comments explain) we find the current document *does not yet* meet these criteria. We feel:

- as a public document, it needs a more direct, succinct & graphic style of presentation
- its current form it may not currently provide an adequate 'vision statement' for readers – a vision for the Network & its functional potential more clearly explained & presented
- that it does not yet provide clear recommendations re several key, high-priority infrastructure outcomes previously recommended by the PortBUG
- it does not satisfactorily address key community engagement, participation & support strategies.

We'd certainly value further discussion of these issues with you and your colleagues.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Powrie,
Secretary, Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group.

c/- 25 Coppin Street, Semaphore. S.A. 5019.

Web: <http://portadbug.org>

E: portadbug@gmail.org

Date: 12/04/2021

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



Comments: Draft Port Adelaide/Enfield 'Walking & Cycling Plan' (Version dated 1 March, 2021).

1. General Comments:

1.1 Purpose & General Design: The PortBUG believes that this Walking & Cycling Plan (W&CP) should clearly convey a Vision for the development of Active Transport within the PA/E Council Area – that is:

- a clear hierarchy of infrastructure to support all forms of Active Transport, but predominantly walking & cycling
- a strong focus on *functional* use of Active Transport – its integration with public transport, and a design focus on 'destination' & 'catchment'
- its potential to *replace* motorized transport & car-based trips
- a strong rationale for adopting such a vision - mitigation of climate-related economic & ecological risk factors, enhanced transport equity & community health outcomes etc
- a strong focus on the strategies & processes required for reducing our current dependence on motorized transport & increasing 'transport resilience' in our community.

Development of Active Transport (or 'Active Travel') within our community is *not* simply a matter of infrastructure – the term 'active' reflects a necessity for behavioral change involved. Nor is providing for safe, secure & convenient for Active Travel simply catering for a 'life style' choice – it is increasingly obvious that provision for Active Transport *must* be seen as an essential economic, ecological & social necessity if we are to address the challenges we face, sustain a good standard of living for all & ensure a reasonable degree of equity within our community! Providing for 'Active Transport' implies supporting a much higher level of physical activity in daily travel tasks & more thoughtful participation in transport choices & issues.

We feel that this draft W&CP should focus more on key strategies for building community participation – both in use of Active Travel *and* in the ongoing development & implementation of this Plan over the next 5 years! We'd recommend that these strategies include a strong focus on:

- regular, repeated & targeted online *consultation opportunities*
- *annual public review of progress*, particularly with regard to setting annual goals & implementation strategies
- the provision of a designated officer with a central role in ensuring effective Council representation of Walking & Cycling issues & liaison & engagement with the community
- building of Council's information resources, particularly on-line network mapping, route finding & regular data provision
- a clear & detailed strategy & set of recommendations for building community participation at all levels & stages of the project.

We *do not* feel that the current draft conveys either *a clear vision* for Active Transport – walking & cycling – within PA/E nor do we feel it identifies or sufficiently emphasizes the key strategies required to recruit support from the community (as potential participants), elected members (as decision makers) and the state Government (as a primary funder). Without this we feel that the infrastructure goals it identifies have little chance of being supported, funded or implemented within the time frame required!

1.2. Historical & Developmental Context & Direction: We find that the draft Plan lacks a clear 'narrative' as to 'how we got here' & 'where we should be going' - it does not yet adequately explain key contextual aspects of the current stage of development of the PA/E Active Transport Network:

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



- that a 'functional framework' for the Network is now largely in place
- that ongoing network development now requires a more 'granular' focus, & an orientation to access & continuity issues & localized destinations & catchment
- that broader ecological, economic & social imperatives are rapidly becoming much stronger 'drivers' in provisions for walking & cycling
- a need to now focus on *Council's role* in behavioral change & effective strategies for driving alternative travel choices.

The PortBUG believes that such an explanation will be essential if the Plan is to fulfill its role as a public document. We believe that it's essential that this draft Plan be seen – *and written* - as a clear statement of Council's longer-term commitment to walking & cycling, and its adoption of a purposeful agenda & direction for development of Active Travel.

1.3. Factual Errors & Omissions: We understand that any draft will have errors & omissions. However as it currently stands, the W&CP has many that we feel are quite significant! Here are some examples:

- P1. Introduction - About (the) Walking & Cycling Plan: No mention *at all* of a vision for reducing car use, transport associated pollution, GGE or health impacts, risk mitigation, community support, recruitment or participation. No mention at all of the challenges Council faces in reducing the rapidly growing impacts of heavy vehicle traffic, industrial development (& associated commuting traffic) or new housing developments within the PA/E area. No mention at all in this introduction of Active Travel & the W&CP as *a part of Council's response* to the challenges of Climate Change, current transport inequity (a particular feature of the PA/E population) or economic futures (ie; 'economic & social resilience').
- P5. Alignment With State Strategic Documents. No mention *at all* of SA's key Climate Change prevention & mitigation policy – the **Climate Change Action Plan 2021–2025** (<https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/climate-change/climate-change-action-plan-2021-2025>)
- P11-12. Open Spaces & Crossings. No explanation as to *why* this infrastructure might be relevant (ie; as destinations, as linkages etc). We note that a significant number of pedestrian road crossings have been *omitted* from the map on page 12, notably on Semaphore Road-East (just west of the Fletcher Rd corner), on Semaphore Road – West, on Lady Cowrie Drive, on St Vincent Street – East *and* West, on Lipson Street & on Grand Junction Road – Rosewater & on Hart Street, Semaphore. Many of these crossings have been installed over the last 5 years & their omission illustrates (we suspect) a lack of understanding of the progress that Council has made in addressing barriers to Active Travel.
- P14 – Map. The Port River Bikeway is neither shown nor identified (the map advises use of the Expressway shoulder – both extremely dangerous and illegal!) Neither the Parks Connector nor the East-West Connector are shown or identified. The proposed linkage across the Gilman Rail Reserve from Perkins Drive Bikeway to the OHG (Rosewater extension) is shown – this does not as yet exist! The separated bikeway on Hart Street is neither shown nor identified (proposed name is Hart Street Bikeway). The off-road bikeways on Semaphore Road East & West are neither shown nor identified nor is the off-road bikeway on Causeway Road!
- P15. Map – The Gawler Greenway is incorrectly shown as proceeding down Pym Street and along Janice Jensen Reserve. These *are* not part of the Gawler Greenway – this route was supplanted two years ago by the current & correct route from the Davenport Trc Bikeway across the rail line, down the *off-road bikeways* on Regency Road to Gallipoli Drv (not shown). There is also an off-

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



road link further west on Regency Road connecting to the new walking & cycling overpass across South Road that is not shown.

- P19. Crash Analysis – we note that one of the most well known fatalities in recent years on the PA/E Network has been omitted. This was the death of a well-known local identity – a man with cerebral palsy - on Semaphore Road as he walked his mobility device across the (then) poorly designed intersection with Woolnough Road. This fatality resulted in the extensive redesign & rebuilding by Council of this intersection and the bike-pedestrian crossing in 2019-20. There has also been *at least* one cycling fatality on Causeway Road that the PortBUG is aware of that is not mentioned here. We note that there appears to be no attempt at analysis of crash data or provision of conclusions & recommendations (eg; generalized consideration of lower speed limits on specific routes etc).

1.4. Plan Resources: P13-15. Bicycle Infrastructure Mapping - One significant positive outcome of the last Bike Plan (PA/E Local Area Bike Plan, 2015-20) was the provision by the consultants of detailed & 'enlargable' pdf maps of key areas of the PA/E Cycling Network and based on each of the major, 'backbones' cycling routes.

PortBUG is progressively posting these maps [at our website](#) and we *hoped* to be able to *update & add* to these as a result of this new W&CP. Unfortunately this does not seem possible as the maps contained within the draft W&CP *do not* appear to align with those produced for the 2015-20 or with the major and specific 'framework' bike routes around which the Network functions & is structured.

If the Plan is intended as a public document for posting on the PA/E website we consider this lack of focus on specific routes (or specific sections of the Network) to be a significant shortcoming that really needs to be addressed, particularly if the map files are to be usefully employed by council elsewhere!

2. Treatment of Key Issues. The PortBUG believes that there are a number of key issues which are universally acknowledged as underlying & shaping the development of walking & cycling behavior & networks. How the draft W&CP appears to deal with these is briefly outlined below.

2.1 Traffic Volumes. This is probably one of the most pressing challenges facing PA/E Council yet it is accorded only a single map and a few 'factoid' notes (P17) with no mention *at all* of the risk factors & challenges that have been the subject of much discussion with (and within) Council over the past few years.

Commuter and heavy vehicle traffic volumes across the PA/E area are projected to increased several times by 2030 due to new industrial and housing developments. This will present significant challenges for both the State Government & Council as to how they manage the competing and potentially conflicting interests of different road users. It is of no help for the Plan to simply identify 'indicative' traffic volumes'. What is required are strategies to deal with the current – often untenable – situation bicycle users (in particular) face, the projected increases over the next decade *and the consequent impacts on the current & planned Walking & Cycling Network!*

A key example would be the current situation on Lipson Street South – a section of the Outer Harbor Greenway. Currently *no provisions at all* are provided for bicycle users along this (approx.) 300m length of the Greenway – no bike lanes, no appropriate off-road pathway, no signage and no alternative route. Yet this section carries many articulated heavy vehicles every day as well as large numbers of cars and lighter commercial vehicles seeking (often at considerable speed) to bypass the lights at the junction of

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



Commercial Rd & St Vincent St! PortBUG expects these traffic volumes to *increase significantly* over the next decade!

The lack of discussion of the likely impacts of current *and* projected traffic volumes on the PA/E Bike Network & the lack of any recommendations made to deal with these challenges is a significant gap in the draft Plan which we feel needs further exploration, particularly as any recommendations made *are very likely* to have some impact on current transport & movement patterns across the Council area!

2.2. Speed Issues. P16. Again, this is a key issue across the current Network yet the Plan offers no significant analysis, general strategies or recommendations. We expected to see some detailed guidelines as to the setting of traffic speed limits in 'shared traffic zones, particularly where residential streets & particularly vulnerable road users (such as school students) are involved, where provision of off-road alternatives are not practical and where heavy vehicles or high speeds are involved.

Key examples where such more detailed recommendations could be considered:

- Semaphore Road East (between Causeway Road & Nelson St) which has an adjacent bike path, a school & preschool, many house frontages, extremely heavy articulated & B-double traffic and a 60km/h speed limit. We would expect to see a 50km/h speed limit recommended for this stretch of roadway.
- Semaphore Road East between Military Rd & Causeway Rd. This is currently set at 50km/h yet it receives significant traffic volumes (particularly on weekends), quite a bit of commercial traffic, has many(!) residential & commercial driveways and intersections and sees quite a bit of pedestrian & bicycle traffic. It is in fact very similar to Semaphore Road West which is set at 40km/h. The PortBUG would strongly content that Semaphore Rd east – at least as far as Causeway Road – should now be set at 40 as well!

2.3. Destination & 'Catchment'-Based Network Planning: The previous 2015-20 Bike Plan identified 'destination' & 'catchment' as key concepts in identifying & designing appropriate bike routes. An illustration of this approach is provided on page 17 of the 2015-20 plan in an info-graphic based on shopping-centre catchment across the Council area. The same concept can be applied to *all* community destinations including schools, shops, services, post offices, recreation areas & bus and rail stations. With the extension of the current W&CP to *include pedestrian activity* it seems even more important to carefully consider this principle, especially as provision for walking activity clearly implies a more 'granular', detailed *and localized* approach. Unfortunately there is little evidence of systematic use of destination or catchment-based analysis in preparation of the current draft W&CP, and certainly nothing *extending or updating* that evident in the 2015-20 Plan.

Much has changed across the PA/E area over the past 6 years, including new housing developments in & around the Port CBD, to the north in the Salisbury Council area and to the east (Lights View etc). There is also extensive housing and heavy industrial development occurring on LeFevre Peninsula that will see several thousand extra commuters travelling through the Port each day over the next year or so - so a great deal of observational evidence of both demographic change and urban development!

Despite this the current draft's consideration of catchment issues appears to be a single page (P18) with a map & list of schools, libraries & community centres. There is no mention at all of employment hubs or specific industries, tourism or recreation destinations, preschools, child-care centres or the most significant new housing developments and industries. There are also several obvious omissions (eg;

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



Dominican School, Semaphore & Tauondi Aboriginal College, Port Adelaide) and perhaps most importantly, no apparent attempt to provide:

- any sort of people-movement data focussed on these destinations (student or employee numbers, new housing development numbers, car parking provision in new developments etc)
- any conclusions for network design based on a destination & catchment approach.

We consider this lack of acknowledgement & apparent consideration of these key principles a significant flaw in the current draft W&CP. We find it difficult to see how it can be considered as a viable 'plan' when these key data sets –the basis for any successful future funding submissions – are missing from the Plan!

2.4. Crash Analysis. P20-21 record in map form pedestrian & cycling crashes from 2014-18. We note that no analysis, conclusions or general recommendations are provided.

Given the extension of the draft W&CP to cover pedestrian activity and its necessary inclusion of many more 'vulnerable road users', we would expect to see some level of analysis and recommendations made, particularly with respect to:

- new housing developments adjacent to main roads
- rail & bus stations & interchanges
- school crossings and main roads adjacent to schools & school routes
- shopping & service centres bordering major routes
- key hazard points such as formal & informal crossings near shopping & service centres, bike/car route intersections & crossings and main roads bordering recreation & sporting locations.

We consider the absence of this extended consideration of crash data as a weakness in this draft W&CP to the extent that it may limit subsequent Council applications for State Gov't funding, and in particular *Black Spot funding* upon which a significant proportion of the Network development to date has relied!

2.5. Continuity & Connectivity. For vulnerable road users, 'continuity' is essentially a measure of ease or travel along a particular route without unnecessary diversion, interruption or risk. Similarly, 'connectivity' is the provision of effective linkage between a journey's start & destination. These are generally seen as key principles in the design of walking & cycling networks yet they appear to have been given scant acknowledgement & explanation in this draft Plan, & particularly in the recommended actions.

Walking & cycling are more flexible & 'low impact' forms of travel than cars & trucks & require less constraint & regulation. Effective consideration of continuity & connectivity for pedestrians & bicycle users - vulnerable road users - will *frequently require alternative approaches* to those employed for motorized vehicles. This is why we speak of a 'bike network as opposed to a 'road network'! As a public document the draft W&CP does not appear to acknowledge this reality. As a consequence the proposed Priority Investment Plan (P59-69) appears to place an inordinate emphasis on installation of signage & sharrows, & routing bicycle users *along roadways* rather than considering more direct, secure & 'mode-appropriate' alternatives.

By way of example:

- There are a number of recommended treatments for Church Street (in the Port CBD) that focus on signage & sharrows when it has been previously acknowledged that this roadway is simply too narrow, too 'busy' & often too chaotic for providing for secure bicycle travel or for the secure

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



connectivity required! The PortBUG has repeatedly suggested that Church Street *not* be seen as a preferred bicycle (or general Active Transport) route, and has recommended that instead, a route be developed along the emerging 'clearway' between Robe Place, adjacent to the 'Farmer Joe' green grocer & Naval Association building, across the Quebec St corner (via a formal crossing & improved ramps), along the broad pavements bordering the car park to the raised crossing on Dale Street and thence via the newly-opened walkways to the Port Plaza shopping precinct. This route avoids the pitfalls of Church Street and provides direct access to a number of shops & services along the way. It also better provides for pedestrians & disability/mobility device users and is a more appropriate way of traversing the CBD for bicycle users!

- The draft Plan also suggests similar signage & sharrow treatments for the Outer Harbor Greenway on Lipson Street, Port Adelaide with no acknowledgement of the compromised security of this shared space (frequent heavy vehicles, speeding 'rat running' cars etc) and the lack of a clear strategy giving secure access to and from the Waterfront Precinct. The BUG feels that this is a tacit example of the Plan simply accepting compromised safety & connectivity as the status quo when clearly, more appropriate alternatives might be available. As per our previous written submissions to Council regarding the W&CP (see attached), we would have expected to see some better analysis of the complexities of this section of the Greenway and presentation of alternatives, including construction of an upgraded crossing & west-side shared pathway and improved strategies for access & crossing St Vincent Street.

3. Review of Past Actions – 2015-20 Plan. We have a number of comments in this section that mainly address inaccuracies & omissions, and hence have some implications for ongoing Network development. At the outset though we'd express some disappointment that the *extensive* voluntary work provided by the PortBUG *in cooperation with PA/E Council* on promotion of the bike network *and* bicycle safety training has not been recognized as a matter of principle. The BUG has embarked on a partnership approach – notably:

- our participation in 2 Tour Down-Under events (providing Network displays & hosting secure bike parking)
- co-organizing & running 3 x 'Be Safe-Be Seen' staff & community workshops &...
- hosting (at our expense) a PA/E cycling-related website & facebook forum (with several hundred participants)
- providing extensive written submissions to annual 'bike budget' planning processes...

...because we were committed to community engagement & the various aspects of 'Promoting Cycling' as a key element of the 2015-20 Plan *and* as an attempt to *augment* what Council is able to provide.

We do not mention this omission here to specifically highlight BUG contributions! Rather we'd simply say that the principle of (and possibilities for) community participation in the progressive development and use of the walking & cycling network - *in any form* – needs to be considered as an essential element, particularly as planning necessarily becomes more detailed & requires much more 'local information'! We'd hope to see the new W&CP consider the principles of community participation and opportunities for community engagement & 'active partnership' to a much greater degree.

The comments that follow are inevitably incomplete due to time constraints, lack of explanatory graphics & prior opportunity for direct discussion with consultants. We would hope that this can be remedied in *future community consultation processes*.

3.1 Metropolitan Network.

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



- We note that item 2.1 – 2.2b may no longer be relevant as the Gawler Greenway *is no longer routed down Pym Street or along Janice Jensen Reserve* (Map B, P48 also needs correction).

3.2 Neighbourhood Route Networks.

- #10 Gilman East-West Connector – missing from the explanation & outline of this route is acknowledgement of the **Rosewater Loop Project**, utilizing a walking & cycling connection along the disused rail reserve between the OHG at the Russell Street, Rosewater rail crossing and the proposed East-West connector adjacent to the corner of Railway Trc, Ottoway (immediately west of Eastern Parade). This is an important project that PortBUG understands is currently on the investment agenda of Council and ought to be acknowledged in this W&CP.

4. Review of the Current Network. P31 – Introduction - we note a number of key issues which don't appear to have been acknowledged as current considerations, notably:

- lack of an ongoing budget & program for further development & refinement of the Greenways under Council control – shade tree planting, lighting, surface maintenance, signage, interpretive installations etc
- lack of identification of connectivity opportunities (to local and neighborhood networks)
- lack of identification of street front *and* secure bicycle parking as a key issue (particularly for use of Local Links).

4.1 Metro Route Review.

- P32 – we note the omission of the Port River Bikeway from mention as a 'Primary Bikeway' here.
- P32 – PortBUG feels that it's important to acknowledge here that the PA/E's Metropolitan Routes Network *is incomplete!* Grand Junction Road *cannot* reasonably be described as 'the backbone of this network' as it is completely inappropriate – even with the consistent addition of painted bike lanes – for the status this description provides. Grand Junction Road is dangerous for all vulnerable road users! This cannot easily be improved by provision painted bike lanes. PortBUG feels that it is essential that the W&CP acknowledges this and considers more suitable provisions for pedestrians *and* alternative routes for bicycle users.

4.2 Neighborhood Link Review. P34 - We note the omission of any mention of PA/E's use of *off-road bikeways* as a key strategy in provision of safe & efficient neighborhood links. Notable examples are the Semaphore Road Bikeways, the Harbor Loop Pathways, the Causeway Road Bikeway and the Perkins Drive Bikeway. It seems important to acknowledge this, now well-established strategy in this draft W&CP given that so many of the existing *and potential* neighborhood walking & cycling routes lack any suitable infrastructure provision at all.

4.3 Recreational Route Review.

- P36 (illustrations) – It is interesting to note that the draft Plan *appears* to define the Mersey Road Bikeway as a recreational route! This route was originally conceived by both the PortBUG & Council as a functional local access and commuter route for employees at businesses & industries along Mersey & Elder Roads *and* for residents at Osborne & Taperoo who would otherwise have to deal with the hazards of on-road cycling on Victoria Road. The PortBUG feels it's important that the Mersey Road Bikeway be acknowledged as an important *Neighborhood Route* and as part of PA/E's functional bike network.
- P36 – Missing Links – The PortBUG feels that it's important that the missing sections of the Nelson Street off-road bikeways be acknowledged. To facilitate secure connections between the

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



OHG, the Harbor Loop, the Mersey Road Bikeway *and* the Port Rive Bikeway, it is essential that continuous shared use pathways be provided on *both sides* of Nelson Street between the Birkenhead Bridge Pathway/Jenkins St Junction, Semaphore Road & the Victoria Road/Diver Derrick Bridge Junction.

4.4 Local Links. The plan states (P37) that the local network 'is already extensive and there are no apparent missing links'. This is unfortunately not the case. The PortBUG can point to many 'missing links' at a local level, particularly those preventing convenient access via local streets & pathways:

- to major infrastructure such as the Jervois, Diver Derrick & Red Hill Bridges
- into & through shopping precincts such as the Port CBD (isolated by major roads and areas of undeveloped reserve)
- between key existing bikeways (notably the 'missing link' between the Perkins Drive Bikeway and the existing section of the proposed Gilman East-West Connector (which provides direct access to the Outer Harbor Greenway).

The PortBUG considers that such 'missing links' are legion, and we'd expect to see this draft W&CP recommend a separate and ongoing study based on *extensive & systematic community consultation* to identify them & formulate a strategy to address them.

4.5 LATM Review. P39 - There are many issues with LATM within the PA/E Area which seem to be glossed over or ignored in this section. We note (for instance) the ongoing & pressing issues associated with pedestrian safety for students attempting to cross at traffic lights adjacent to the Port Christian School, corner of Bower & Causeway Roads.

With the inclusion of pedestrian activity & as greater attention is paid to more localized points of view and more 'granular' levels of movement observation & analysis, we would expect to see acknowledgement of the *inevitable emergence* of such LATM issues & a strategy to address them in this draft W&CP.

5. Delivery Focus & Actions - Strategies & Initiatives.

- P41 – Desired Outcomes – We note the absence of *any mention at all* of key issues such as increased tourism visitation, transport access & equity & our community's social & economic resilience. We feel that this omission is not appropriate given the circumstances we find ourselves in now & into the future. We also note that absence of mention of increased integration of walking & cycling in use of public transport, reduced reliance on the car & reduced green-house gas emissions – all important considerations for and within our community! We would expect to see some acknowledgement of such issues here.
- P42 – PortBUG would question the interpretation & presentation of research from Portland provided here, particularly in the context of a document that is intended to provide key positive messages to the community about the benefits of walking & cycling. We would also question the inordinate focus in this penultimate section of the Plan on cycling alone, given its framing as a vision for *both* walking & cycling!

We note (for instance) that 'strong & fearless' bicycle users (unfortunately illustrated here dressed in unrepresentative lycra) might also be described as 'irresponsible', 'senseless' & 'unrepresentative of the broader community'! Many, many experienced & otherwise 'strong' & 'confident' bicycle users avoid cycling on main roads & in traffic simply because their experiences & logic tell them that the risks of injury are real and not worth taking. Research suggests that

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



much the same outlook is shared by many otherwise willing & interested *potential bicycle users* who remain concerned about their safety in traffic & on roads.

The key issue here is that it should not simply be assumed and argued here that a 'functional bicycle network' necessarily relies on braving traffic & cycling on roads! The example of the Netherlands and a number of other countries across Europe demonstrates this quite clearly.

- We would also question the obvious implication here (P42) that walking & bicycle use are life-style choices. Many people walk or use a bike simply because they are too young, too old, too disabled or too poor to use a car (or indeed public transport)! Walking & cycling are forms of transport that can be shared by almost everyone in the community – they represent a 'bottom line' in terms of access & equity! In terms of promotional value we do walking & cycling a great disservice if we ignore such behavioral 'drivers' and rely on principles of lifestyle & personal preference alone! We would expect to see clear acknowledgement of such issues here in this draft W&CP, particularly if it is intended as a useful public information document.

5.1. P49 (map) We note that the Gawler Greenway route is represented incorrectly – it does not utilize Pym Street & Janice Jensen Reserve. The Greenway route continues beyond Pym Street on Davenport Trc as far as a railway crossing to new off-road paths on the northern side of Regency Road, and continuing westwards to join Gallipoli Drive. The route shown on the map on P49 perpetuates an incorrect & out-of-date route shown at the DIT website (and which DIT have been asked to correct many times!)

5.2. P50 – Improving Cycling Facilities... We note that some paragraphs here are apparently located under the wrong headings ((e; lighting issues under bike parking etc).

5.3. P51 – Improving the Walking Network. We are surprised to see no mention here of 2 very important reports which we understood had made many, detailed recommendations relevant to improving conditions for pedestrians, namely:

- The **PORT ADELAIDE CENTRE AND PORT DOCK RAIL STATION - ASSOCIATED MOVEMENT AND ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS STUDY 2018**
- The **DRAFT Network Operating Plan - Port Regional Centre 2018**

We would like to see evidence in the draft W&CP that consideration has been given to the *implementation* of recommendations made in both of these reports with regard to pedestrian facilities, access & safety in and around the Port CBD.

5.4 Previous Recommendations from PortBUG re the Port CBD – The PortBUG has made a number of specific recommendations over 2019-20 regarding improving pedestrian, cycling & disability access to the Port CBD. We see a need to focus in particular on *key access points* into the CBD which we identify as:

- Across Commercial Road from Lipson St
- Across St Vincent St from the Waterfront Precinct via the Town Hall pedestrian crossing and opposite Robe Street
- Along Dale Street
- Across Grand Junction Road adjacent to College Street, Queenstown
- Across Bower Road adjacent to the Old Port Road intersection, Western Regional Park, Tam o'Shanter Creek etc.

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



These are all important existing and potential pedestrian, cycling & mobility vehicle access points to Port CBD shopping & services. PortBUG would expect to see this W&CP offer a CBD access strategy based on such (or similar) access points.

5.5. Cycling/Walking Conflict... Potential for conflict between pedestrians and bicycle users - and indeed mobility devices – and associated 'competition' for pathway space, are seen as increasingly important issues within our community. PortBUG would expect to see this identified and considered with appropriate recommendations & strategies offered by a draft W&CP. We would in particular expect to see such consideration regarding key 'shared space' & 'mixed traffic' areas such as:

- The PortCBD and other major shopping & service centres across the Council area
- More intensely shared thoroughfares such as Coast Park, Semaphore Road off-road bikeways, the Birkenhead Bridge & Harbor Loop shared paths and the Outer Harbor Greenway access route through the Waterfront Precinct (and in particular along the waterfront between the McLaren Parade Crossing & Nelson Street).

We would like to see consideration of issues such as collision & crash risk the potential impacts of bike & mobility device parking on the pedestrian environment.

5.6. Data Collection etc... PortBUG believes that Council has a valuable opportunity to collect key cycling & walking participation data along sections of the Outer Harbor Greenway. This data has specific potential to illustrate the *value* of investments in off-road cycling & walking facilities – that is, illustrate key aspects of 'vision building' to build strategic support within both Council & the community! Given the efforts Council has made to build key 'framework' routes (such as the OHG) over the past decade, we would like to see the W&CP offer a specific strategy (or set of specific strategies) aimed at building this support!

We would expect (for instance) to see mention of specific strategies such as:

- automatic bike counter studies on specific routes (as done by City of Charles Sturt on the OHG)
- 'vox pop' type interviews to gather user experiences & suggestions at commuter stops & interchanges and along the Greenway during commuter hours
- offering an ongoing series of online household and network participation user surveys.

5.7. Summary of Key Actions. *P 58 - We would hope that the issues raised above (section 5) can be more specifically reflected in this Summary of Actions.*

6. Cycling Infrastructure Priority Projects:

6.1. #25 This recommendation is somewhat confusing. It appears to note a lack of signage facilitating connection between the Mersey Road Bikeway on the northern side of the intersection (not apparently identified by the draft W&CP) & the access path for the Port River Bikeway (Southern side, Diver Derrick Bridge). Clearer if this recommendation specifically notes need for such a linkage.

6.2. #30 The 'gap' mentioned here is confusing & seems not to make sense. The proposed treatment appears to suggest a change to the well-established Outer Harbor Greenway route (down Junction Street), perhaps to improve direct connectivity. It should say so!

6.3. #43 – 45 It appears that these recommendations are advocating use of Church Place/Street as a cycling route. The PortBUG has previously opposed any designation of Church Place/Street as a suitable access point for the Port CBD shops & services. We consider this route to be unsuitable – too narrow, too densely by motor vehicles and often simply too chaotic! We have made previous

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



recommendations involving use of existing lower-speed areas providing more direct access through the Port CBD along a more central north-south axis. If the draft W&CP intends designating Church Place/Street as a cycling access route for the CBD we would expect to see:

- this explicitly stated as a key access strategy
- a suitable rationale put forward & argued.

In the absence of such a 'strategy statement' *and* given the central importance of the PortCBD as a *key* destination in the PA/E Bike Network, we would expect to see a careful analysis of all relevant access issues & opportunities for this key area.

6.4. #52 – 53 Lipson Street. While the PortBUG would support the installation of wayfinding signage as proposed, and possibly the use of sharrows on the roadway as well, we would like to see further analysis and discussion of this key section of the OHG route.

Lipson Street remains a heavy transport route with the frequent presence at all hours of articulated trucks (including B-Doubles), a great deal of other commercial traffic and many, many 'rat running' vehicles avoiding nearby traffic lights. The Greenway is heavily used during commuting hours. The OHG is also used by a wide variety of pedestrians and a significant number of people with disabilities. There is no proper roadway crossing at any point between the Greenway path exit and St Vincent Street *and* no warning or speed control for drivers.

PortBUG has expected to see an analysis of the many obvious 'mixed traffic' issues along this section of the OHG, identification of the relevant risks and consideration and recommendation of appropriate strategies to reduce or eliminate such risks!

6.5. #60 Russell St Sharrows. The recommendation here of additional sharrows for Russell St between Queen St & Davidson appears to be an error. The Greenway actually proceeds along Queen St and via an off-road linkage through to Torrens Road. It *does not* proceed past Queen St (as the recommendation seems to suggest) along Russell as far as Davidson.

6.6. #69 Semaphore Rd/Esplanade Intersection. We note that there is *already* a bike repair station adjacent to this point (by the nearby kiosk). A sign indicating this may be more appropriate than an entirely new duplicate station. We note that a *more pressing* issue at this point is the complete absence of any infrastructure providing safe & direct linkages between Semaphore Road-West *bikelanes* and the beachfront precinct & Coast Path. We would expect the draft W&CP to identify this deficiency and provide appropriate strategies such as:

- suitably widened & located kerb ramps on the west side of The Esplanade with free passage areas and additional colored 'directional' paving where there may currently be wall obstructions
- a suitable road marking & signage strategy to assist in separation of pedestrians & cyclists in this significant potential conflict zone.

6.7. Perkins Drive – Rosewater Loop Linkages. We note the absence from these recommendations of key suggestions made *in previous written submissions* by PortBUG of key linkages we consider essential between the new Port River Bikeway & the Outer Harbor Greenway/Gilman & Rosewater Pathways. Notably:

- a new road crossing over Bedford Street at the junction of the Perkins Road Bikeway and the Gilman Rail Reserve. The ramps for this crossing *already exist*, but lead nowhere on the southern side!

Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (the 'PortBUG').



- An associated new section of pathway – approx. 150m – from the southern side ramp (see above) across the Gilman Reserve to join up with the existing paved pathway leading east-west along the Gilman Rail Reserve.
- Extension of this existing Gilman Rail Reserve pathway *beyond* McNicol Terrace and utilizing an intensely used 'made pathway' as far as the corner of Railway Trc (where users commonly access it through an open rail line gateway) or even Eastern Parade. This pathway constitutes the northern section of the proposed Rosewater Loop, an important community-supported project for which PA/E Council has recently sought funding.
- The remainder of the Rosewater Loop, being the southern section of pathway utilizing the now disused rail line reserve access at the Railway Trc corner and extending south-west through Ottoway & Rosewater to its junction with the Outer Harbor Greenway on Russell St, Rosewater.

Attachments:

1. **PortBUG: Bike Project Proposals PAE Budget 2020-21**
2. **PortBUG: Recommendations PAE WCP 2020.**