

RECEIVED

03 Dec 2018

DPTI



Response to the Integrated Movement Systems Policy Discussion Paper

The Integrated Movement Systems (IMS) discussion paper acknowledges key changes in demographics and travel options. Ride-share, car-share, new vehicle technologies, diverse mobility devices, later licensing, an aging population, health and environmental challenges along with changing industrial sectors will create new opportunities and challenges. South Australia has a chance to move away from the twentieth century pre-occupation with planning for private car use and re-orient our transport system to foster diverse travel modes and provide genuine transport choice. Investing in active transport brings a host of benefits including improved population health, reduced traffic congestion and better budget bottom line.

As a community based Bicycle User Group, we have addressed aspects of the three IMS themes most relevant to sustainable/active transport and community concerns.

Theme 1: Aligning growth with infrastructure

Residents across Greater Adelaide are generally supportive of higher density, mixed use development along transit corridors, urban core zones and mixed-use zones. They are not supportive of bulky, poor quality, poorly landscaped development. In low rise, low density metropolitan areas, developments of more than 5 stories are imposing and lack coherence or sympathy with the surrounding area.

Traffic generation and parking is a major issue raised by communities in relation to increased density. While development in transit zones is ideal for limiting or de-linking (unbundling) car-parking (see theme 3.4), mechanisms must be in place to ensure residents take up the alternative transport options available. Any on-site private car-parking should be underground while alternative transport options such as car-share (personal mobility devices, bike parking, mobility scooters) should have parking or storage provision at ground level. Priority must be assured for these alternative transport modes.

High quality public transport services and infrastructure for alternative modes (e.g. cycling, small wheeled vehicles etc.) must be provided before encouraging higher density developments in transit corridors, urban core zones or mixed-use zones. Without serious transport alternatives, people will continue to use private motor vehicles to access new developments and any transport benefits of increased densities will be lost.

Theme 2: Strategic Transport Corridors

Road widening is a 1960s response to transport planning and is well understood to encourage private motor vehicle use and ultimately more congestion. Land should not be identified in the Planning Code for Road widening as it risks becoming a first rather than last transport option. Investing in the full range of transport options from public transport to walking, small



wheeled vehicle and cycling infrastructure must be a priority and planning policies need to support these modes.

Theme 3: Sustainable/Active Travel: Focus on cycling

For the past two decades, successive strategic planning documents produced by Federal, State and Local governments have recommended ‘promoting walking and cycling’. The Integrated Movement Systems (IMS) paper provides an opportunity to move beyond promotion and start *enabling* walking and cycling.

As it stands, the IMS reproduces the view that cycling is a mode for short distance/ neighbourhood travel. In the Netherlands, 15% of journeys between 7km-15km are made by bicycle and 2% of journeys over 15km are made by bicycle.¹ Translated to the Adelaide context, 15% of journeys into the CBD from Henley Beach in the west, Magill in the east, Bedford Park in the south and Mawson Lakes in the north could be made by bicycle. Achieving these results requires appropriate infrastructure, responsible investment and supportive land use policies.

3.1 Safe walking and cycling access and appropriate cycle parking

The South Australian Planning Policy Library includes key principles for cycling and walking that should be strengthened in the new planning Code. Despite existing SAPPL policies we continue to get development that:

1. disregards safe and convenient cyclist and pedestrian access,
2. ignores cycle parking,
3. allows inappropriate cycling infrastructure (including poorly designed bike rails in medium density housing and poorly designed paths in new sub-divisions), or
4. places infrastructure in inappropriate locations.

The Planning Code will need to provide greater direction on the provision of cycling infrastructure and facilities including guidance on what is *not* acceptable.² Guidance is required at both an area-wide and individual-allotment level. Similar policies should be developed for mobility scooters, personal mobility devices and other small wheeled vehicles to cater for diverse populations and their diverse transport needs. Further, planners require training in the implementation of these policies.

3.2 Cycling routes

Cycling routes should be identified in the Code along with guidance on design elements that improve the safety, convenience and comfort of cycling along these routes.

3.3 Cycle park & ride: Integrating public transport and cycling



The Code needs to consider policies on the integration of public transport and cycling. Car park and ride has been vigorously pursued in Adelaide over the past 5 years. Strategically located, these facilities can reduce private motor vehicle travel into the inner suburbs and CBD. However, they foster sprawl into peri-urban areas. Car park and ride stations are expensive to build and costly for commuters. They use large areas of land and, when poorly located, have perverse outcomes³.

IMS is an opportunity to introduce or expand cycle park and ride at train stations, O’Bahn stops, and public transport interchanges. Planning policies should work to integrate cycling and public transport by stipulating safe on-site access and secure, conveniently located, ground level bike parking at all park and ride facilities.⁴ Areas around stops and stations should be identified in the Planning Code as public transport cycling (and walking) catchment zones. Local area traffic management strategies should **prioritise** safe, convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists to these facilities.

3.4 Car parking and new vehicle/transport technologies

While adaptable car parking structures allow flexibility into the future, any new car parking structures will foster private motor vehicle travel in the short term and undermine the use of public transport and other active modes of travel.

Developments within transit corridors, urban cores, mixed use zones and major public transport stops/stations/ interchanges should have no parking or limited maximum parking. Developers should be incentivised to work with car-share companies (like Go-Get or Flexicar) to provide on-site spaces for car-share vehicles. De-linking (or unbundling) car-parking from development can increase supply of dwellings (retail space, offices etc.) and foster the use of public transport, car-share, ride-share, cycling and so forth. We should investigate including ‘transport plans’ rather than traffic management and parking provisions with new development applications. These transport plans can include a mix of services and infrastructure such as walking and cycling paths that link to public transport interchanges, car-share pods and so forth.

Conclusion

Adelaide has the opportunity to significantly improve health, transport, and budget outcomes with judicious investment in active transport and responsible planning policies. Seizing this chance will benefit us for years to come.

*Dr Jennifer Bonham (Chair) and Dr Angus Wallace (Secretary)
Unley Bicycle User Group

*Correspondence

████████████████████
████████████████████
██



1. Fietsberaad (2009). *Cycling in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat
2. Hamnett, H, (2015). Skilling landscape architects and urban designers for design of bicycle parking and network facilities. In J. Bonham & M. Johnson (eds.) *Cycling Futures*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press. Pp. 357-406.
3. Wiseman, N., Bonham, J., Mackintosh, M., Straschko, O., Xu, H. (2012) Park and ride: An Adelaide case study. *Road & Transport Research: A Journal of Australian and New Zealand Research and Practice* 21(1): 39-52.
4. Bell, W., Ferretti, D. (2015). What should planners know about cycling. In J. Bonham & M. Johnson (eds.) *Cycling Futures*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press. Pp. 321-356.