

2 March 2007

## **Meeting 28 February 2007 with Department of Planning's Chris Johnson**

### **Bicycling: Draft City Centre Plans – Liverpool as case study Elaboration of conclusions identified.**

---

The conclusions were:

1. **Affirmative action for cycling** is needed and justified on many grounds
2. This means further addressing for each City Plan, the following matters:
  - **Add principle: Improve cycling access**
  - **Prepare a bicycle network plan**
  - **Prepare a bicycle infrastructure program**
  - **Provide for appropriate bicycle parking and destination facilities**
  - **Require the preparation of transport management and accessibility plans, and transport access guides for larger developments**

#### **Affirmative action for cycling**

The case for 'affirmative' action is clear and as follows:

Ref 1: DUAP, RTA & Transport NSW 2002 *Integrating Land Use and Transport Planning Policy Package, Sydney: Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development*, quote – Principle 7, Improve cycle access (page 16):-

*“Cycling is a cheap, efficient, clean and healthy mode of transport. It is well-suited to trips of less than ten kilometres. If people are to be encouraged to use bicycles instead of cars, they need to be convinced that cycling is reasonably safe, convenient and comfortable way to travel. This means providing an easy to follow and direct network of roads/paths, spaces, lighting (where feasible), direction signs, and storage and other facilities at destinations.”*

Currently, the draft City Centre plans do not do this well or consistently and means further addressing for each City Plan, the following specific priority matters.

#### **Add principle: Improve cycling access**

The City Centre Plan's Vision and Principles should be improved with specific statements for bicycling and under other relevant Principles, where walking/pedestrians is referred to, cycling/bicycles should usually also be mentioned. It is important to draw the attention of all future readers/users of the plans to the bicycle mode to overcome ignorance and inertia.

IBID Ref 1; quote (modified to suite the case):-

*'Maximise cyclists' accessibility to the centre – its services, facilities and employment.'*

The list of *'Best practice is achieved when:'* (IBID Ref 1, page 17) should be relied on to inform re-drafting to improve the Vision and Principle statements for bicycling and the review plan process.

## **Prepare a bicycle network plan**

The CC planning proposals must require either the preparation of a bicycle network plan leading to and through the city, or if the local bike plan is recent, an up-date of that plan.

Ref 2: DIPNR, Dec 2004 *Planning guidelines for walking and cycling*, Sydney. This guide was prepared (quote) “... to assist land-use planners and related professionals to improve consideration of walking and cycling ... [and] influences urban form, which sets the scene for walkability and cycleability for decades to come.”

For key supportive policies and documents, see section **2 Policy context** in the above document. Also see Ref 2, **4.3 Walking and cycling catchments** to ensure no opportunities to connect areas with the city are overlooked.

The most important additional reference document is:

Ref 3: RTA 2002 *How to Prepare a Bikeplan*, Sydney.

## **Prepare a bicycle infrastructure program**

Being able to implement the network plan is fundamental. The issues differ substantially from catering for walking or motor vehicles, especially in fitting into an existing urban fabric. There is a need to practically integrate urban design/landscaping proposals and road and traffic management designs, with the required bicycle infrastructure works and relate to other works and programs.

It is also very important to plan for cyclists' needs in any review of current or new transport interchanges (which current interchanges all fail cyclists' present, let alone future, needs).

Ref: RTA 2003 *NSW Bicycle Guideline*, Sydney.

## **Provide for appropriate bicycle parking and destination facilities**

Review of the Liverpool city Centre plan reveals that a very basic provision based on gross floor area was chosen. This approach, while not uncommon, serves some centre land use types very badly. It would not provide parking that affirms, or demonstrates, encouragement for this travel mode. (See below for a 'thumb-nail' comparison) Moreover, some consistency would help developers adapt and more readily comply and this will help attract bicycle use.

Ref 2, **7.6 Bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities** (quote):-

*“Implementation of bicycle parking provisions is an important element in improving consideration of walking and cycling in development assessment.*

*The bicycle parking rates shown in Table 1 are determined as a percentage of numbers of people where possible, as this is considered a more reliable indicator of number of bicycle trips than floorspace. Rates reflect the higher end of current local bicycle usage and allow for increasing bicycle use in NSW in the future.”*

### Comparison between floorspace and number of people provisions

Liverpool City Centre DCP, Table 4.1, requires 1 bicycle space per 200 sq metre gross floor space: 15% of this requirement is to be accessible to visitors.

Planning guidelines for walking and cycling, Table 1 provides a % formula that relates to the expected number of people using the building: residents, workers, customers or visitors.

For comparison purposes for a development of 1,000 sq metres, bike parking numbers, are:

- Liverpool DCP max., 5 for every land use type, with 15% for customers/visitors

- Planning guide has a range from as little as **5 up to 23**, taking the lower percentage, as shown in the table below. The higher percentage makes the max., 46

**Table:**

<i>Land use type</i>	<i>Planning guide</i>					U = unit; S = staff; Sc = seating C = customers
	<i>Resident/ staff (long term use)</i>		<i>custom/visitor (short term use)</i>		<i>Total bicycle parking</i>	
	% U/ S/Sc	No of bikes	% U/ S/Sc	No of bikes		
Residential – 1- bed/sitter	30	4.5	5 to 10	0.75 - 1.5	5 to 6	
Residential – 2- bed or more	30	4.5	5 to 10	0.75 - 1.5	5 to 6	
Commercial offices (40 S)	5	4	5 to 10	2 – 4	6 to 8	
Retail shops (see note 1) (10 S x 100 C/hr)	5	1	5 to 10	5 - 10	6 to 11	
Drive-in takeaway 10 S x 150 Sc	5	1	5 to 10	7.5 – 15	9 to 16	
Cinema (Small 3 screens) 5 S x 450 Sc	5	1	5 to 10	22.5 to 45	23 to 46	

Note: Assumed provision may not be less than one parking place

Note 1. For retail, the Dutch rate per 100sq m gfa = 4- 6 bicycles for major centres; 5- 7 for district centres; and 6- 8 for neighbourhood shops, clearly a much higher standard.

The Liverpool DCP provision is simplistic providing well for residential, reasonably for office/commercial and retail land use types, but will serves very poorly for most other land uses, particularly for shorter-term bike parking i.e. for students, customers or visitors.

### **Require the preparation of transport management and accessibility plans, and transport access guides for larger developments**

To promote modal shift from cars to other forms - public transport, cycling and walking – it is highly desirable to require for larger developments the preparation of transport and accessibility plans, and prior to occupation or use of buildings, the preparation and dissemination of transport access guides. Basic requirements for these should be in all plans.

Ref 2, **7.4 Transport Management and Accessibility Plans; and**

**7.5 Transport Access Guides**, where the justification and relevant references are provided.

## **Conclusion**

Ref 2: DIPNR, Dec 2004 *Planning guidelines for walking and cycling*, Sydney, has a complete list of references, including web pages, to enable retrieval of the references mentioned above.

The letter to the Director-General, dated 29 January 2007, **Re: Bicycling: Draft City Centre Plans – Liverpool as case study**, should be referred to when revising the draft Liverpool CC Plans: the detail therein, matters. A separate letter regarding this draft plan has been sent to the General Manager, Liverpool City Council for the attention of the Senior Strategic Planner, Theo Zotos.

Submitted as confirmation of the meeting, the matters discussed and materials referred to.

Adrian Boss B Arch UNSW; Member PIA  
BIKEast  
Planning Working Group, Bicycle New South Wales

## Appendix 'A' – Critique of the Liverpool City Centre Plan and suggested changes

---

### City Centre Vision and Principles

#### General overall comments:

The vision and principles statements do not see the potential role the bicycle may serve. This is wrong and contrary to the Metropolitan Strategy.

In announcing the program towards a City of Cities under the Strategy, the preamble says (quote):

*“Each of Sydney's cities must be supported with a hierarchy of transport, addressing local, intra city and inter city needs.”*

and specifically, The Sustainable Transport in Sustainable Cities recommends accordingly, consistent with the Metropolitan Strategy,

(quote) to:

- *work with Local Government to increase investment in pedestrian facilities and **cycleways** with an immediate priority given to investing in those which service city and regional centres*
- *implement “greenways” of pedestrian pathways, **cycleways** ... to service the shorter trips to centres” [emphasis added]*

Clear active transport initiatives – walking and cycling – must be more fully considered and then integrated with the land use and other transport proposals under the plan. This is essential for health, environmental and social equity reasons so making this centre as attractive and accessible as possible to all people and fulfil all the plan's expectations.

Another oversight is that motorised scooters will likely become significant for travel for many people, due to the increasing prevalence of disabilities and illnesses, such as diabetes. Cycleways and shared paths can serve this future need as well and help justify cost of works.

An opportunity to provide a comprehensive bicycle service centre within the Liverpool railway/bus station complex, as is now in development at Roma Station in Brisbane (albeit at a different scale) has also been missed.

This centre could provide secure parking, public change facilities, bicycle servicing and hire . This would help to encourage use of public transport to and from this centre instead of the car, for many trips. Its location must be established now to ensure its future connection to the Centre's bicycle network and integration with other activities at this transport node.

#### Conclusion

The plan needs amendment to make it a good plan for the community and the environment.

## Vision: Growing the City Centre

### **Principles:**

*“As the regional city for the south-western Sydney metropolitan region, Liverpool will be the primary centre for jobs, key regional services, and cultural activities. Jobs will focus on high growth industries and build on existing strengths including health, education, retail and business services/commercial activity. The city centre will have 15,000 new jobs and 12,000 more people within the next 25 years”*

### **Comments:**

The large number of existing, but in particular new jobs and households, will generate additional travel and access demands. These will tend to further increase congestion and cause related adverse effects, which may be partly offset if a significant modal split to increasing the use of the bicycle, not just walking and public transportation, is achieved.

## Vision: Building the City's Role in the Knowledge Economy

### **Principles:**

*“Knowledge based jobs, particularly health, education and business services, will provide higher incomes, adaptability and career paths.”*

### **Comments:**

Currently, regular cyclists tend to be substantially over represented by professionals and obviously are more flexible, motivated and fit people. Many more people are likely to be attracted to cycling if their current perceptions about risk and car fixation is overcome. This requires a commitment to providing safe and convenient bicycle infrastructure and facilities. Such facilities will help employers attract knowledgeable and skilled persons consistent with the stated vision and principles.

## Vision: Protecting and Conserving Historic Elements

### **Principles:**

*“The city centre plan will protect and conserve the heritage of the city. Heritage elements such as the "Hoddle Grid" street pattern, the Liverpool railway station buildings, and the Francis Greenway designed St Luke's Church will be preserved. New development will fit comfortably within existing historic streetscapes.”*

### **Comments:**

The octagonal grid pattern generally would lend itself to cycling. However, the one-way traffic system for many of the streets leads to higher than otherwise traffic speeds, circulating traffic, hence more congestion, causing alienation of street-side life which substantially detracts from the heritage values of “Hoddler Grid”, the identified heritage items and to the cities environment generally. As part of traffic planning review and future LATM schemes as many streets as possible should be returned to two-way traffic, with removal of kerb-side parking for footpath widening adjacent to significant heritage buildings, incorporating appropriate cycling facilities.

## Visions: Strengthening the Connection Between the City and the Health and Education Precinct

### **Principles:**

*“The commercial core will be connected to the Liverpool Hospital and Liverpool TAFE. The NSW Government is committed to the development of the Liverpool Health and Educational precinct. The vision focuses on strengthening these assets and their integration into the growth of the city centre with links to the Georges River.”*

**Comments:**

The proposed integration is very important. To ensure stronger connectivity and easy public access to, around and even through these large precincts for walkers and cyclists requires a pedestrian and cyclist network to be designed, agreed and integrated with the master plans for these precincts. This is so that these precincts may be developed by the different responsible bodies to an agreed program that will not frustrated development of the needed transport arrangements and new links to the Georges River.

**Vision: Reconnecting the City Centre to the Georges River****Principles:**

*“The city centre and the Georges River will be linked by upgraded pedestrian access to the river front. Creation of a continuous pedestrian and vehicle link between the southern city centre and the Casula Powerhouse Art Gallery and Theatre will be pursued. Linkages between the city centre and the Georges River will be improved by extending the concourse over Liverpool railway station.”*

**Comments:**

To provide a convenient and high amenity bicycle facilities to and within the Georges River parkway system is extremely important. The bicycle links to and along the Georges River that need to be provided or enhanced needs careful planning and design consideration for shared use. This is to determine where separate facilities and walkers is appropriate and to avoid the need to duplicate river-side pathway systems elsewhere.

An unfortunate example of poor planning is the recently developed concourse over Liverpool railway station. This would need significant expensive modifications to make this crossing attractive for cyclists to use. This, or some alternative crossings for cyclists from various parts of the Centre, needs to be considered. Additional crossing are needed and could happen at places such as between the educational and health precincts (or nearby), near the Warwick Farm railway station and to Lighthouse Park, with a linear connections north, and south to Casula and beyond.

The importance of connecting the centre to other high activity nodes is a major failure and appears to have been totally overlooked. For example, links to the E G Whitlam centre, Liverpool Council's Administrative centre through Woodward park, connecting up with the good existing cycleway following the bus-way along Hoxton Park Road all the way to the Miller TAFE complex, is extremely important to include as the city edge is redeveloped for high density living.

**Vision: Celebrating the Special Character of Liverpool****Principles:**

*“The form of the city centre will reinforce the importance of the Macquarie Street mall as the active pedestrian centre of the city. New commercial buildings will be developed around the mall stepping up in height to ensure solar access to the mall is maintained.”*

**Comments:**

The centre should also be an active place for cyclists. Ample bike parking needs to be provided. And as proposed for the Sydney CBD, as part of the street lighting and signposting system. It is also very important that cyclists should be free to ride through and along the mall, as happens now in centres such as Chatswood and Bondi Junction. This is especially the case due to the expected heavy traffic using the parallel streets. As Macquarie Street is closed to riders through the Westfield Shopping Centre, separate cycleways will need to be

developed around this key area, with generous perimeter bike parking facilities provided. Clearly defined and wide on-road bicycle lanes may be suitable where carefully designed and coupled with 40 km/h speed zoning.

#### **Vision: Improving the Quality of the Public Domain**

##### **Principles:**

*“Public domain improvements including street trees and additional plantings at the city gateways and within public domain spaces, as well as public art in the city centre will encourage and enhance local identity.”*

The landscaping, art and cultural improvements need to be carefully designed to ensure pathways are appropriate for the destined pedestrian and cyclist traffic. Larger parks need to provide bicycle access to and through them, with bicycle parking also provided and this may also require path widening or new separate cycleways depending on the desired bike network route plan.

#### **Vision: Improving the Quality of New Buildings**

##### **Principles:**

*“New buildings within the city centre will be of high quality architecture and design. Architectural competitions for key sites and buildings will ensure well-designed buildings distinguish the city centre.”*

High quality design includes bicycle access at ground level and convenient parking outside and close to the building entrance, preferably within the building. For non-residential buildings, it is important to provide shower, change and locker facilities for workers/students and secure bike parking near the lifts as close to the ground level as possible.

#### **Vision: Consolidation of the City Centre**

##### **Principles:**

*“Liverpool's natural features and environmental quality are important to the city's character. Building heights within the city centre will be controlled to guarantee solar access for open spaces. New buildings will have to meet strict requirements for energy and water conservation. The natural edge of the Georges River and Chipping Norton Lakes will be preserved and tree planting and greening programs will also be implemented to increase biodiversity and the amenity of the city. The creation of a continuous urban parkland on the west bank of the river will be pursued.”*

##### **Comments:**

Improvements to vehicular access should not be limited as indicated. Bikes are vehicles. Cyclists are vulnerable parties as are walkers, particularly when required to cross or share high speed and heavily trafficked roads. For cyclists there is a need to provide safe traffic light controlled access across the Hume Highway at least at about 0.75 kilometre intervals and similarly, across the railway line.

#### **Vision: Improving the Natural Environment**

##### **Principles:**

*“Liverpool's natural features and environmental quality are important to the city's character. Building heights within the city centre will be controlled to guarantee solar access for open spaces. New buildings will have to meet strict requirements for energy and water conservation. The natural edge of the Georges River and Chipping Norton Lakes will be preserved and tree planting and greening programs will also be implemented to increase biodiversity and the amenity of the city. The creation of a continuous urban parkland on the west bank of the river will be pursued.”*

**Comments:**

To fully realise the use of the Georges River and Chipping Norton Lakes' open space system, new cycleways or shared paths and direct access from the Centre for pedestrians and cyclists at several additional locations needs to be provided. This will reduce the need for city dwellers and workers from having to use their cars to gain access to these important recreational resources. This provides health and environmental benefits by inducing active travel and reducing green house gas generation.

## Vision: Enhancing Pedestrian Networks

### **Principles:**

*“A pedestrian “heart” will be created in Liverpool by enhanced pedestrian networks in and around the city centre mall. The city’s major civic spine of Macquarie Street will be enhanced and reinforced as a pedestrian promenade.”*

### **Comments:**

This vision statement must be expanded to say: **“and Cycling Networks”**.

Lack of an inter-connected bicycle network – a Bicycle Network Plan – is the most significant omission in the draft proposals. The current principles also fail to address network links for pedestrians and cyclists **to and through** (not just in and around) the Centre from the surrounding residential neighbourhoods and the large open space system along the city’s eastern boundary.

The bicycle network should be designed to cater for the motorised scooter users and like bike riders, they must have reasonable access to all places pedestrians go to.

## Vision: Ensuring Human Scale Active Street Edges

### **Principles:**

*“New development within the city centre will complement pedestrian functions and add interest and vitality at street level. Public places such as pocket parks, plazas and squares will provide opportunities for street activity. Active edges to buildings, quality paving and well designed street furniture will make the city a people place.”*

### **Comments:**

To achieve this vision the cycling function needs to be added as it will play a significant role in adding interest and vitality at the street level. Moreover, if this mode is integrated with Local Area Traffic Management schemes the traffic calming achieved will significantly add to street amenity by reducing traffic congestion, noise and greenhouse gas emissions.

## **Recommendations**

It is therefore requested that the bicycle mode be fully considered in the finalisation of the current draft City Centre plan and made consistent with the Metropolitan Strategy. Bicycling statements need to be incorporated into the relevant vision and principles statements taking into account the comments made above.

The bottom-line is that a bicycle network and infrastructure plan needs to be prepared for the Centre. That plan needs to identify linkages to neighbouring residential, industrial, institutional and open space areas. Subsequently, the plan needs to be integrated with all relevant aspects of the City Centre plan’s provisions and proposals, including any LATM and other traffic management plans for the Centre and its immediate surroundings.

Consideration should be given to providing a comprehensive bicycle service centre within the Liverpool railway/bus station complex at some stage of the City’s growth.

There is time to do all this. But the task should be initiated immediately by the Cities Taskforce together with the Liverpool City Council, so that those otherwise worthy plans may be improved and bicycle infrastructure and related needs are added to the civic improvement plan in a timely way. This is to ensure new development provides for the bicycle and contributes capital for infrastructure and so that the detailed planning for public projects and programs also effectively caters for bicycle travel.

END – VISION

## **Draft Local Environmental Plan's**

### **General observation and comments:**

It is noted that this plan is to control land-use and not the development of roads and other transportation.

Development under the LEP has considerable implications for walking and cycling. Some improvements are identified in the Civic Improvement Plan, but these generally fail to directly recognise the needs of cyclists, except along the Georges River. But infrastructure improvements to and a network for bicycling must be available to ensure future development produces urban design outcomes that fit and enhances the street-front environment and will make for safe and convenient walking and cycling.

### **22B Design excellence**

Sub- clause (3) (quote)

*(f) how the proposed development addresses the following matters:*

...

*(ix) pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and requirement;*

### **Comments:**

To achieve good outcomes the important criteria and standards for the access and circulation needs to be spelt out in the DCP. This has not happened for the bicycle in the DCP.

### **22C Car parking**

#### **Comments:**

While it is clear the provision currently governs only car parking, this means that the LEP is silent about parking for bicycles and needed end of trip facilities.

The *Planning guidelines for walking and cycling*, DIPNR, Dec 2004 suggests in 7.6 Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities (quote) *“Effective implementation relies on the existence of bicycle parking provisions in the planning instruments such as parking or related DCPs.”*

An appropriate covering provision should be added to require bicycle parking and end of trip facilities in accordance with the Liverpool DCP, wherein, such provisions need to be spelt out based on the above mentioned guide.

### **22D Ground floor development**

#### **Comments:**

This calls for active street frontage, which is good.

However, as sub-clause (2) excludes this operating for any part of a service lane, this means these lanes will have poor public surveillance and may then generally not be attractive for cycling unless special attention is given to this safety issue in the bike network and infrastructure planning.

### **22D Ecologically sustainable development**

In the clause a 'whole of building' approach is set calling for:

- (a) greenhouse gas reduction
- (i) reduction of car dependence.

**Comments:**

Sustainable development can be significantly aided by properly catering for and encouraging cycling. Yet this is not provided for under either the LEP, DCP or even under the CIP

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that all of the above comments be considered with an appropriate enabling provisions added to the LEP.

An enabling provision is required to provide the framework for bicycle infrastructure, bicycle parking and end of trip facilities, which provisions need to be added to the DCP and also to the Civic Improvement Plan and its S94 Development Contributions Plan once the basic bicycle network plan and related infrastructure requirements have been identified.

END LEP

## **Draft Development Control Plan**

### **General observation and comments:**

The DCP generally has very good provisions regarding the built form, pedestrian amenity, access, parking and servicing. Unfortunately, a basic omission is the intrinsic need to address the bicycle under many of these provisions as well, with the addition of some exclusive provisions, such as for bike parking end destination facilities and services.

It is apparent that the authors have not considered, let alone applied, the *Planning guidelines for walking and cycling*, DIPNR, Dec 2004. This guide was prepared (quote) "... to assist land-use planners and related professionals to improve consideration of walking and cycling ... [and] influences urban form, which sets the scene for walkability and cycleability for decades to come."

This is regretful and a serious omission and that the above Guidelines (Parts 3, 4 & 5) and its development assessment provisions (Part 7), have apparently not been followed and built into the DCP. If not addressed and included, then this desirable form of travel will continue to be stifled.

Basically, almost wherever pedestrians or the pedestrian network is referred to a reference to cyclists and bicycle network may be appropriate.

However, it is not that simple. Some specific cyclist's needs arise. This is to ensure their convenience and safety is satisfied in the location, design and implementation of infrastructure. Often, very different requirements to those serving pedestrians arises and need to be planned for in advance of development to both achieve convenience and be cost effective to build and maintain.

In some locations, pedestrians and cyclists may need to be separated, such as at the proposed Gateways (which may be the best entry points for cyclists as well as pedestrians) and routes where future bicycle commuter traffic may become quite high. This is just as is the case and the need to separate cyclists from motor traffic along high capacity and/or high speed roads. This is to minimise the risk of harm and address perceived safety concerns of the vulnerable party involved: pedestrians and cyclists at crossing, pedestrians along shared paths, or cyclists along streets shared with other vehicle traffic.

This means that the DCP needs considerable revision once a bicycle network plan and infrastructure needs has been identified. However, it is possible to put enabling provisions into the DCP, based on the suggested provisions in the above mentioned Guidelines.

### **Figure 1.2 City Centre Character Areas**

#### **Comment:**

This map should be amended to show the proposed bicycle network. It may well be that it may not coincide with the main pedestrian network when the opportunities and constraints are examined, although it is advisable to use the same Gateways, wherever possible.

#### **Conclusion:**

In the context of the above, further detailed comments to the existing DCP provisions are not considered worth while as a comprehensive review is indicated and required.

### **Recommendations**

A bicycle network and infrastructure plan needs to be prepared following the plan making process set out in the *Planning guidelines for walking and cycling*, DIPNR, Dec 2004, *How*

*to prepare a bike plan – an easy 3 stage guide*, Roads and Traffic Authority, Feb 2002 and the *NSW bicycle guidelines*, Roads and Traffic Authority, Nov 2003.

It is possible to amend the DCP to foreshadow that plan. This is by incorporating enabling provisions drawn from the above mentioned guide to govern bicycle parking

END DCP

## **Draft Civic Improvement Plan**

### **General comments:**

The Civil Improvement Plan identifies a number of civil, urban design based and access related projects where the bicycle may be incorporated. However, other than for the Georges River specific mention is scarce and no mention is made of LATM projects to improve the safety of cyclists using the Centre's roads, although opportunities to do so may arise under repaving and landscape improvement projects.

An assumption is made that potentially all the civil projects affecting streets and parks may cater for the bicycle, but that the CIP should be more explicit and this can only be addressed if a bicycle network plan is prepared that identifies route, infrastructure and facility needs.

### **1. Introduction**

This clearly states that the CIP provides (quote):

*“... a description of the civic infrastructure needed to support the growth and development of the city centre, and outlines the framework for contributions to be made towards the funding and provision of the infrastructure in association with future development in the city centre.”*

*“The special city centre projects are to be partly funded by monetary contributions levied from new development in the city centre under the Section 94A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ...*

### **Comments:**

There is no specific mention of bicycle infrastructure projects either as a substantial part of projects identified for the public domain (other than along the Georges River) or for special City centre projects where developer contributions apply to assist funding of bicycle related capital works. This is a significant omission.

In this situation, the proper planning and integration of safe bicycle facilities will not occur. Any provisions for this mode will only happen incidental to the plan's projects and probably only if funded under special bicycle infrastructure allocations, which programs presently do not exist or are not evidently planned.

### **2. Public domain projects**

*“The principles set out in this section of the CIP provide an urban design framework for the city centre as a whole. This underpins the capital works projects and infrastructure improvements ... [and] ... strategies for enriching and expanding the public domain and design parameters for streetscapes and key public spaces.”*

#### **2.1 Objectives**

##### **Comments:**

No mention is made of 'active transport', or cycling, as needed to fulfil the transport objectives under the Metropolitan Strategy.

Reference to 'active transport' is missing from general objective 7 and to 'cycling' in specific objectives 1, 3, 5, 8, 10,12, 13 & 16.

Under 17, which reads: *“Achieve a balance between vehicle access needs and pedestrian amenity in main streets and laneways;”*

reference to the actual safety of pedestrians and cyclists needs to be spelt out as most people do not see safety as part of amenity.

The possible notion that the bicycle mode may be effectively addressed under vehicle traffic and objectives where vehicles are mentioned, while technically correct, ignores the

fact that current professional knowledge of cycling needs and public perceptions about safety and their general unawareness of the bicycles potential, requires bicycling to be separately spelt out to ensure it receives attention and funding.

A further error is that the CIP wording sees the centre as if an island, planning solely to its internal arrangements, rather than also addressing vital access links to, through and from the centre to its surroundings, particularly for walkers and riders which are currently faced with real physical barriers to attractive and safe access from the surroundings to and through the centre.

The exceptions to this are some Gateway projects, such as the crossing of the Hume Highway at Hoxton park Road, but where the provision of bicycle crossing is not mentioned.

Ample crossings are particularly important for walkers and cyclists which are currently faced with real physical barriers to gaining access to the Centre. Attractive and safe ways from the surroundings residential and industrial neighbourhoods are required.

## 2.2

### 2.3 Public Domain Framework

*“A clear hierarchy of streets and movement corridors is proposed for the city centre...”*

#### **Comments**

This fails to fully recognise the need to connect with the surrounding neighbourhoods. If not addressed, important access requirements, such as a bicycle network to and through the city centre, will be overlooked during the more detailed planning and development stages of the variety of projects involved.

The reviewer could not find Council's Public Domain Strategy on their web site.

The description of the Gateway project seems to focus on creating visual statements rather than creating safer crossings for pedestrians and cyclists, other than for the major \$1.5M pedestrian bridge proposed in the vicinity of Hoxton Park Road.

The ring road proposals does not specifically address cycling. This is an omission, unless an alternative network for bicycle access into and around this core area is defined in a bicycle network plan.

The description of the proposals for lanes and service ways is contrary to the LEP provisions which specifically says that the active frontage provision do not apply. In that situation, it is not likely that anything comparable to Melbourne's lanes, in terms of amenity and ambiance, will be achievable.

## 2.4 ...

### 2.5 Tree planting strategy

This strategy should not be finalised until bicycling requirements in the street space is known. Street space is at a premium, the question arises, will the tree species fit in with a footpath or kerb-side cycleway location, should this be proposed?

### 2.6 Paving strategy

This strategy should not be finalised until bicycling requirements in the street space is known. Paving design and kerb-edging, extensions, ramps and the like, will need to be designed to cater for the bike in many locations. While a detail, the current strategy does not consider the bicycle.

## **Conclusions:**

A separate strategy for the bicycle should be incorporated into this part. This is to define the design approach, bicycle parking, access ramps, transforming travel from shared path to street pavement (and visa-versa), pavement, street and path marking and signage. Otherwise, these could be addressed under the various strategies defining the special needs and works.

In regard to bicycle parking, parking rings on light poles and/or regulatory parking signs, similar to that being implemented in the City of Sydney Council, should be considered as this can meet needs without adding to clutter.

### **3. Special city centre projects**

#### **3.1 Georges River Foreshore Improvement and Bridge Connection**

This project specifies (quote):

*“The waterfront upgrade will enhance the recreational opportunities and improve access for pedestrians and cyclists in and around the city centre.”*

*“A suitable location for an accessible pedestrian crossing over the railway linking the city centre with the George River parklands will be the subject of further investigation ..”*

#### **Comments:**

The reviewer is unfamiliar with Liverpool City Council's Georges River Corridor Plan of Management and could not find it on their web site. Consequently, the adequacy or otherwise of that plan's proposals for the bicycle has not been assessed.

Regarding the crossing of the railway, this facility must also provide access for cyclists and be designed to serve as part of a shared path system.

#### **3.2 Bigg Park Landscape Upgrade**

#### **Comments:**

It is noted that cycle paths are proposed. It is important that these are linked the adjacent precincts, including the Liverpool transport interchange and integrated with a city centre bicycle network.

#### **3.3 Pioneer Park Embellishment**

#### **Comments:**

There is not mention of cycling to or through this park. This may be appropriate because of its narrow linear shape and heritage values. It may be better for cycleways along the boundary of this park.

However, it is very important for cycle access into the park, bike parking at facilities and safer access across Sydney Road (Hume Highway) to Brickmakers Creek, into and through the Warwick Farm suburb, with links across and along Liverpool City Council's boundary into the Fairfield LGA, and following Cabramatta Creek, provided.

#### **3.4 Woodward and Collimore Parks**

#### **Comments:**

A bikeway is mentioned. This is very important not only to serve the western edge of the city centre, but because of the large residential hinterland to be served in the opposite direction the west, as well.

Only by the preparation of a bicycle network plan for the city centre and its surroundings may appropriate routes and the standard of bicycle facilities, whether as shared paths or

separate cycleways that connect to the existing Hoxton Park cycleway, and the M7 shared path, be determined.

3.5 ...

### 3.6 Access – Carparks, Intersection Upgrades and Bus Priority

#### **Comments:**

This completely overlooks the bicycle vehicle traffic: commuter trips. This may be because existing demand is low as this choice of travel is suppressed due to lack of a safe network and public unawareness of its benefits.

A specific measure must be to provide a connected cycleway system into and throughout the city centre. This should be a distinct and separate infrastructure program under the CIP.

#### Schedule of Works for S.94 contributions

As indicated above, a bicycle network plan needs to be prepared for the city centre and links to and through the centre from its surrounding areas established. This is so that the extent and cost of bicycle infrastructure that needs to be undertaken may be added to the schedule and partly funded under the S.94 development contributions provisions.

#### **Conclusions:**

The bottom-line is that a bicycle network plan be prepared and integrated with all relevant aspects of the City Centre plan's provisions and proposals, particularly under the CIP.

### 4. Section 94A Development Contributions Plan

As already indicated above, the Schedule of works for S.94 contributions, must provide for the bicycle mode of transport, which is a current serious omission that detracts from the Plan.

#### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that a bicycle network plan for this area be prepared as soon as possible and added to the Plan. This study needs to establish and agree the required bicycle infrastructure and facilities to and throughout the city centre, its cost and timing so that it may be added to the CIP and the capital costs associated with the new development of the centre applied as appropriate under the S.94 provisions already set out in the CIP.

END CIP

---

Review prepared by:

Adrian Boss B Arch UNSW, PIA

BIKEast

Assistance in the review was provided by Kate Marley and Chloe Mason who also advised and participated in a site visit together with George Leindekar and John O'Neill. However, the author is solely responsible for this material and any possible errors.

## Appendix 'B' – Policies for Cycling – NSW Government's Metropolitan Strategy

(The following are extracts from: City of Cities – a plan for Sydney's Future.)

### D – Transport

#### VISION

- Sydney's neighbourhoods will have improved local transport with walking and cycling facilities and bus services to major centres. People will be able to carry out more of their trips closer to home, reducing the time taken and cost of longer trips.
- Sydney's major centres will have improved transport links with fast, safe and reliable train services and a network of strategic bus corridors connecting the centres across the city.
- The transport system will improve access to jobs, ports and other economic activities, reducing the cost of doing business.
- Transport investment decisions will be based on sound planning, evaluation and assessment.
- Impacts of increased freight activity on the community will be minimised through land use and transport planning.

#### MEETING THE METROPOLITAN STRATEGY AIMS

The Strategy for Transport addresses and provides benefits across all five aims of the Metropolitan Strategy:

1. It addresses **enhanced liveability** by improving people's access to shopping, friends and family, parks and recreation, and other daily activities. Community health is also an important measure of liveability. The more people use active transport such as walking, cycling and public transport, the more the health of the community improves. Growth in population and the economy both contribute to an increase in freight. To enhance liveability in Sydney, effective land use and transport planning is required to ensure that the impacts of increased freight movements and activity are minimised on surrounding communities.
2. It addresses **economic competitiveness by managing congestion and improving access to jobs**, ports and other locations of economic activity to reduce the cost of doing business.
3. It addresses **fairness** by ensuring that high quality, efficient and sustainable transport systems are available so people have equitable access to jobs, activities and services.
4. It addresses **environmental protection** by providing transport systems that meet the needs of a growing population while minimising the impact on the environment from land take, energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, other air pollutants and noise. Growth within the identified urban areas of the city ensures the city doesn't keep expanding with suburbs that are car dependent. Freight transport can meet the needs of a growing population and economy while also controlling transport related emissions which add to greenhouse gases and affect air quality.
6. It addresses **improved governance** by ensuring that decisions on investment in transport are well informed with improved and integrated approaches to transport planning, evaluation and assessment.

#### OBJECTIVES AND INITIATIVES

## D3 INFLUENCE TRAVEL CHOICES TO ENCOURAGE MORE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

- D3.1 Improve local and regional walking and cycling networks
- D3.2 ...
- D3.3 ...

## D4 IMPROVE TRANSPORT DECISION MAKING: PLANNING, EVALUATION AND FUNDING

- D4.1 Improve transport planning through strategic, subregional and place planning

## BACKGROUND ACHIEVING A SUSTAINABLE BALANCE

5<sup>th</sup> Paragraph:

“Many of the social, resource and environment impacts of transport can be managed through a greater emphasis on sustainable transport to meet travel needs - walking, cycling and public transport. Greater use of these modes also contributes to broader Metropolitan Strategy goals of creating vibrant liveable communities.”

Diagram D2 shows that 45% of short trip (2 km or less) and 73 % of medium trips (2 – 5 km) were undertaken by car in 2002. (These are distances where cycling is quicker or as quick and desirable for the social equity and health benefits, resource use and environmental gains while also reducing adverse impacts.)

## MANAGING DEMAND FOR TRAVEL

There is an increasing awareness of the health and environmental costs of current travel patterns. The economic, social and environmental costs of no action are so high that it is not an option, however, the cost of meeting unconstrained travel demands, particularly in peak periods, is becoming prohibitive. Building new capacity just to meet peak needs is very expensive, and as has been demonstrated in other cities, will not solve transport problems or improve accessibility on its own.

Demand for travel needs to be managed and sustainable travel choices and access should be maintained or improved.

## ACTIONS

### D3 INFLUENCE TRAVEL CHOICES TO ENCOURAGE MORE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

#### D3.1 Improve Local and Regional Walking and Cycling Networks

[D3.1.1 Improve local and regional walking and cycling infrastructure through the implementation of the Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling.](#)

Almost one in five of all trips are made by walking or cycling. There is potential to increase this, as many short trips currently made by car could also be made by walking or cycling, improving local accessibility, neighbourhood amenity and community health. Walking and

cycling provide both local access and access to public transport for longer trips to centres across the metropolitan region. Better facilities will encourage more walking and cycling for everyday travel. Walkers and cyclists need high quality, safe and direct routes.

The Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling released by the Department of Planning and the RTA in January 2005 include information, concepts, case studies and illustrations to help meet the challenge of improving planning for walking and cycling.

The Guidelines will be implemented throughout the metropolitan region including in new development in the North West and South West growth centres and other new release areas, in renewal corridors such as the Parramatta-City and CBD-Airport corridors, and in existing urban areas.

Support will be provided to local government to upgrade walking and cycling facilities in small-scale projects across many locations to improve everyday access within neighbourhoods. Projects include completing missing links, resurfacing existing facilities, widening facilities, improving physical accessibility (through gradients, kerb ramps and crossings), and improving lighting and signage.

Subregional access will be improved by connecting up local networks, by overcoming major barriers of road, rail and waterways through overpasses and underpasses and by developing new routes such as 'rail trails' along selected rail corridors and along rivers and foreshores through open space (see Parks and Public Spaces Strategy). These larger-scale projects will be funded through existing programs and in conjunction with new development.

The existing Cycleways program provides cycleways for regional trips, often in conjunction with major infrastructure such as the M7 Motorway. However, there is also a need to improve local facilities by supporting local government in the provision of high quality, safe local facilities for trips to schools, shops and local activities.

#### **D4 IMPROVE TRANSPORT DECISION MAKING: PLANNING, EVALUATION AND FUNDING**

Significant changes have been made recently to planning and assessment processes in NSW. Further improvements of all stages of the transport decision-making process from strategic planning, subregional planning, project evaluation, funding, delivery and review are required. All elements of transport decision-making will continue to be improved to deliver a safe, reliable and efficient transport system and improved accessibility to centres. Improvements may need to be centrally coordinated within Government to ensure all elements are consistent and coordinated.

##### **D4.1 Improve Transport Planning**

[D4.1.1 Improve transport planning through strategic planning, subregional planning and place planning.](#)

[D4.1.2 Government to develop integrated transport planning for transport expenditure.](#)

[D4.1.3 Investigate adapting existing mechanisms used to fund infrastructure in the North West and South West growth centres to other areas.](#)

#### **PLANNING**

Systematic and full integration of transport and land use planning is essential to achieve Metropolitan Strategy objectives. Strategic planning must consider the full spectrum of land use, transport and related issues including all relevant social, environmental and economic

factors such as direct and indirect economic costs and benefits; redistributive and equity implications; environmental and energy-efficiency implications; risks and risk management; and impacts on land use, development and travel patterns.

Recent changes have produced improvements in the project specific stages of the planning process. There must be similar reform at earlier stages - for the development and review of overall directions and strategies, the development of broad business cases and the development of procurement strategies.

Transport planning will take place within the broad framework and objectives of the Metropolitan Strategy. Clear objectives at all stages of planning will provide the basis for identifying and evaluating potential strategies and projects. They also give guidance to external project proponents on the types of initiatives that are likely to be more favourably received. The transport objectives in turn inform project, program and policy selection, and prioritisation.

Subregional structure planning is a key implementation tool of the Metropolitan Strategy used to translate metropolitan housing and employment directions into local decisions. Transport will be integrated into the Metropolitan Strategy subregional planning process.

While the focus will be on subregional planning, place-specific transport planning will be undertaken to support major changes in land use and activity such as East Darling Harbour.

#### EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

The traditional approach to appraising transport initiatives has tended to concentrate on individual modes, physical infrastructure solutions, and assessment via conventional project appraisal techniques. However, a more holistic, multi modal approach to transport planning, appraisal, investment, and evaluation is required at both the strategic and individual project level. Changes have already been introduced to realise this objective

- (three examples are provided)

The Government will continue to ensure economic evaluation guidelines take into account social and environmental aspects of projects and apply to integrated assessment of multiple projects.

#### MONITORING AND REVIEW

Monitoring and review are key elements of the planning process to ensure changing requirements are addressed. ...

Performance indicators will be developed to report on the key transport objectives of improving accessibility and sustainable travel. ...

END

## **Appendix 'C' – Transport and social disadvantage in Western Sydney**

a partnership research project, written by Anne Hurni

University of Western Sydney & Western Sydney Community Forum, Nov 2006

The report looks at the impact of transport disadvantage on families and individuals with low incomes and no motor vehicle, living in areas with poor public transport provision. The report finds transport is unevenly distributed across Sydney and impacts more heavily on lower income households, reducing access to jobs, education and recreational options. The report concludes **that a mix of creative solutions are required to address people's travel needs** (emphasis added).

Unfortunately, while this study defines the impacts and the possible responses in terms of public transport and social and funding mechanisms to help overcome access disadvantage, it too fails to see and imagine the role the bicycle may be able to play in helping to address access issues for many of the people affected.

The only exception to this is noteworthy (page 4):

*“ ... NSW Government implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy alongside transport service reform, a genuine opportunity exists to:*

*[1} ... [5] ...*

*[6] Fund local government to improve local accessibility through constructing and upgrading bus stops and shelters, footpaths, and **cycleways**. ”* (emphasis added)

This underwhelming note of opportunity will be further taken up by Bicycle NSW, with the author, separately. This is because it is believed that considerable benefits could flow from taking a much more pro-active economic and social program approach to improve accessibility for those suffering some disadvantage, by providing for the bicycle and promoting its advantages and use.

END