

HOBART BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NOTES

Meeting held Wednesday 18 April 2018 at 12pm in the Lady Osborne Room, Town Hall.

PRESENT:

NAME	POSITION
Philip Cocker	Alderman, Hobart City Council (Chairman)
Anna Reynolds	Alderman, Hobart City Council
Bill Harvey	Alderman, Hobart City Council
Luke Middleton	Project Manager Active Transport and Signage Infrastructure, Department of State Growth
Corey Peterson	Sustainability Manager, Commercial Services and Development, UTAS
Mary McParland	Executive Officer, Cycling South – Greater Hobart Councils Regional Cycling Committee
Alison Hetherington	Public Affairs Advisor, Bicycle Network
Alicja Mosbauer	Community Representative

CITY OF HOBART OFFICERS:

NAME	POSITION
Mark Painter	Director City Infrastructure
Neil Noye	Director City Planning (ICAP representative)H
Angela Moore	Manager Traffic Engineering
Greg Milne	Program Leader Bushland Recreation and Engagement
Stuart Baird	Senior Transport Engineer

FACILITATORS:

John Hepper	Inspiring Place
Edwina Hughes	Inspiring Place

1. Apologies:

NAME	POSITION
Jeff Briscoe	Alderman, Hobart City Council
Helen Burnet	Alderman, Hobart City Council
Emma Pharo	Senior Lecturer, Discipline of Geography and Spatial Science, School of Land and Food, UTAS
Will Oakley	Community Advisor, RACT
Bernd Wechner	Community Representative
Ann Edge	Road and Public Order Services, Tasmania Police
Robert Mather	Group Manager Open Space, CoH

2. Scoping of new Hobart Bike Plan – Session 1 – facilitated by John Hepper of Inspiring Place – Refer to attached Notes.

3. Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 20 June 2018 – 1.00pm – Elizabeth Street Conference Room, Town Hall

4. Meeting Closed: 2.35pm.

Hobart Bicycle Advisory Committee
City of Hobart Bike Plan Workshop #1
Lady Osborne Room, City of Hobart Offices, Wednesday 18th April 2018

Present: Alderman Phillip Cocker, Alderman Anna Reynolds, Alderman Bill Harvey, Cory Peterson (UTAS) Emma Pharo Little (UTAS) Mary McPharlan (Cycling South), Luke Middleton (Dept State Growth), Alison Hetherington (Bicycle Network), Alicja Mosbauer (Community Representative) and City of Hobart officers - Mark Painter, Neil Noye, Angela Moore, Stuart Baird, Greg Milne. Facilitators John Hepper and Edwina Hughes.

Apologies: ?

Welcome and introduction to the workshop provided by Alderman Phillip Cocker (Chairman).

The workshop was organised into four sessions facilitated by Inspiring Place. The following notes provide a list of the key points that were raised and discussed by the Hobart Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Session 1 Making the Pitch for a Bike Plan

WHY PREPARE A BIKE PLAN?

The opportunity to close gaps / building better bike culture / connectivity / different areas / different needs / local area planning was mentioned at the last meeting the Advisory Committee (source Meeting #24 notes)

City of Hobart Transport Strategy will recommend the preparation of a Bike Plan

Low cost / safe / healthy transport options and safe recreation activities

A response to the traffic congestion

We need to cater for all road users / walking / cycling / public transport

Giving people transport and mobility choices

The facility to encourage tourism / to encourage users to engage with our natural environment and recreation opportunities. Tourists want to engage with the natural environment

Climate change / pollution / environmental imperative

Achieve an attractive, healthy and liveable city

Environmental benefit - 500k car tyres per year we need to dispose of / issues around car /tyre dust / impact of motor vehicles

Parents feeling comfortable with children having independent transport

Children are currently limited in how they can move around

Responding to an existing need / planning for future development of the city / a lot more people living within easy living distance of the city

Working towards the same goals

Guide existing infrastructure spend

An opportunity for the public to have a say

Being explicit about what you are providing where and why

Businesses in Hobart who might want to establish tourism ventures and how they can engage with this process

Ability to share resources

Providing a safe space for cyclists where they don't face aggression

WHAT ARE THE REALLY BIG ISSUES THAT MUST BE TACKLED IN THE BIKE PLAN?

Implementation; tactical urbanism / pop-up responses, rather than envisioning the perfect system that never gets implemented. Community wanting to see results and action. Ensuring that bike plan has a fast roll out. What are the quick wins that we can use to demonstrate that we are serious about bike choices.

Avoid cultural battle of bike vs car

Work on the cultural issue where women and children are currently afraid of riding / safety concerns

Changing the conditions so it's safer; this needs to be evidence based

Connecting the network e.g. permeability and barriers within and through the CBD

Getting the right mix between transport and recreation and how best to direct focus and resources

UN sustainable development goals – item 11 – inclusive / safe city. An element of inclusivity that needs to be thought of

Catering for all levels of cycling ability. Not recreation vs commuting; a broad spectrum of cyclists / cycling issues that need to be catered for

The CBD recognised as a hub to linkages

On street parking / how does this bicycle plan talk to other plans? Parking as an allocation of streetscape. However, parking is a contested space

Pedestrians vs cyclists

Another very big issue is taking a holistic approach given other Councils and government agencies make decisions that impact on bike planning

The impact of electric bikes; emerging technology

Emerging transport; what is this and what needs to be considered?

Bike share schemes. Imposed on us, or do we design this?

WHAT ARE THE MAIN OUTCOMES THAT YOU WANT TO SEE ACHIEVED FROM THE BIKE PLAN?

Plan for an integrated network

A clear set of priorities and costs

A commitment to implementing the plan and a clear set of time frames

A plan of how we implement it

Who authorises the plan?

An innovative way to both develop a bike plan, and planning through doing; avoiding front loading of plan; can we build capacity of not for profit sector, eg active routes to school plans, how do we build capacity as we plan and deliver? Who can we work with to implement small parts of the plans? Data from bike users / developing bike planning in alternative / proactive methods. Important to get people on board as part of the plan, rather than a 'desk-top' planning exercise

A vision / identified priorities / funding / identified activities

Similar to what Clarence MTB Park has done

A regional approach

Connecting Glenorchy to the mountain / connecting West Hobart / Leah Valley to the City

How does Clarence Council operate / manage /and develop their cycling infrastructure? The council have two separate streams that manage parks and trails (mountain bikes) and community paths / shared paths. They are treated as two separate entities as they have very different issues, and the needs of the two groups are measured independently

Trip generators; regional facilities – how to get people on their bikes

Innovation / capacity building

An increase in cycling / across all categories

A change in how people move / getting people out of cars / different ways of accessing the city

Different types of bicycle infrastructure, away from traditional bike paths / shared use paths.

The Plan should be of sufficient quality to drive cultural change

End of trip facilities; bike parking, showers etc

Regulatory leaders and ways to deliver the plan other than just council funding

Not just trying to cater for cyclists, but catering for cycling. Removing division. Facilities for a very broad age cohort (8-80 year olds)

A funded plan

Integrated networks on-road and off-road (should it include this?)

Integrated network, jurisdiction of boundaries

Session 2: Setting Some Boundaries for the Bike Plan

AREA TO BE INCLUDED IN THE PLAN?

Boundaries are quite distinct between Councils; the plan is not overly dependent on the surroundings but the plan must recognise what is going on beyond Hobart

Clarence has issues around the Bridge as a barrier to commuting into the city. Recognition that bikes may use ferry – how does Hobart engage with this? The ferry terminal would be a major activity area – perhaps location for end of trip facilities. These are the items that need to be highlighted in plan

Taking the bigger metropolitan view point, but focusing efforts on what Hobart can do

Needs to identify more than just an arterial network

PLANNING FOR HOW FAR AHEAD?

Integrating with Council budgeting methods which are currently at 10 years

However recognise there could be interim goals within this timeframe

A pop-up plan? Implementing in works program....where we can start putting infrastructure in immediately

Realistic to have action plan/priorities for 10 years, but with a wider set of goals / vision that is documented within the plan, that may be outside of the 10 year plan

A major review in 5 years plus yearly review of what is happening

How to allow for flexibility in the plan as things happen?

Cycling growth targets as a measure?

Fear that cycling growth targets may conflict with walking targets

National cycling strategy had targets, however these were never achieved, so it may be detrimental to the project to attached a growth target

We can discuss the need or role of targets in the next workshop;

General agreement that the Plan should be looking forward/ setting up an implementation set for the next 10 years / with a short term and an immediate implementation plan / with big, long term vision

WHERE WILL IT FIT IN THE CITY OF HOBART STRATEGIC POLICY?

A holistic view of the city; a healthy city; this should be the framework where it sits

Some similarity with the Melbourne Bicycle Plan 2016-2020 where there is an agreed Strategic Framework, Strategy (e.g. Transport Strategy) and implementation Action Plans (e.g. Walking Plan, Bicycle Plan)

A social inclusion plan? There are aspects that are not just about transport but can be related to community development, recreation, tourism, economy etc; Bike Plan doesn't fit wholly in one Action Plan.

It's not just about transport

Every City of Hobart department may contribute to the end goal e.g. city infrastructure, parks, bushland, community services

Cycling needs to be considered across all aspects of what we do. Taking a wider understanding will help how it's perceived within community. It will have more impact if it fits into more than just one area

Shouldn't be just a Council delivered plan? It must inspire action in other quarters; how does it inspire all the sectors who will be involved / or where others can take action. Does the Advisory Committee have a role to play? University are committed to the plan / e.g. end of trip facilities. Hobart wheelers / dirt devils (recreation) are keen to engage / be more actively involved; can council provide some autonomy to the meeting group?

Council would have oversight / budget constraints that may feed into this

What are the models / can the council create a separate entity? This may help create community engagement / driving plan in different community groups. eg Bicycle Network program in schools, Cycling South running education projects in schools

However, is there enough space for setting up another cycling group in a sector that is already stretched? How do we engage with the groups that are already established so we can implement?

The meeting group may help to determined how funding is spent / decide on key issues (once the plan is established and budget is allocated)

WILL THE BIKE PLAN NEED TO FOCUS ON ANY BIKE TYPE?

When we talk about roads, we are not defining road users (eg car trips)

Shouldn't be distinction between cyclists

How do you integrate user groups?

How do we accommodate for all user groups? How do we educate people to use infrastructure?

Every route has a gap in it;

Why aren't we gaining market share of riders? Uptake is failing

Depends on objectives of the bike plan; is it recreation?

WHAT USEFUL INFORMATION DO YOU HAVE ALREADY?

We know upcoming developments that will feed into bike routes (for example the UTAS new campus developments), and this will help us to identify gaps

We have an audit of existing infrastructure

A rapid growth in electric bikes

A growing tourism base

Do we have hard data? University has a strong data set / with a variety of items. Corey can provide these

Super Tuesday data

Strava data (although Strava data is now greatly restricted due to recent social media privacy concerns)

Continuous counters

WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WILL BE ESSENTIAL FOR THE BIKE PLAN?

A good understanding of the socioeconomic cycles; regional areas / who wants to cycle? Ageing components / younger families. Socioeconomic analysis that would provide better bang for buck for putting in cycling infrastructure

No evidence for what people want out of cycling infrastructure

The commons: A Melbourne centric understanding / approach to cycling. Will this work in Hobart?

Crash data? Very patchy. Only crashes reported to Tas police; and crashes that involve injury. This would be disappointing if we incorporated this into our plan, eg may lead to avoidance of certain routes

WHO ARE THE PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS THAT NEED TO BE INVITED INTO THE PROCESS?

The Tasmanian media

RACT

University of Tasmania

Commercial bike shops

Education Department; critical in changing the culture

Private schools

Chamber of Commerce

State Government

Physical Activity Council

Major developers - how to strengthen planning scheme so cycling is built into new development, eg end of trip facilities, bike parking, wider footpaths

State Growth

Department of Treasury;

Cycling Club (Hobart Wheelers)

Heart Foundation

SECONDARY STAKEHOLDERS

Community / everyone else;

Major employers; wanting their employees to get to work safely

WHO MAY TRY AND BLOCK THE PROGRESS OF THE BIKE PLAN?

Cultural wars: (political) right vs left. Certain commentators. This needs careful strategic thinking

Who's going to lose out of the bike plan? Generally, residents who feel they are losing their car parking outside the front of their house

Some Alderman

Business sector – anti business outcome (a perception), loss of parking etc

Recreation: potential/perception of conflict between bush walkers / mountain bikers, pedestrians including older persons (safety issues with riding on the footpath, bike speed) and cyclists (certain user groups)

WHAT THE CORE MESSAGES THAT SHOULD UNDERPIN ALL COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE BIKE PLAN?

Health and wellbeing / it's a method of transportation but also a method to keep fit and healthy

Giving people choice

Moving people

Bike riders are people, too

Safety

Children having independence in their own transport (perception from parents that its no longer safe)

Other general views expressed were:

- Traffic problem in city due to dropping children at schools
- Vision for Hobart that its differently imagined in the future – liveability in the future
- 'A tale of two cities' good numbers in city for walking / public transport in City; however, in outer areas, it is a different a story with greater dependence on the car.

- What are the limitations on cycling distances?? And how does this feed into where we stop our bicycle infrastructure eg 3/5kms beyond Hobart
- Economic benefits to bike plan; give businesses the reality of the statistics
- What do you call it? A bike plan? A cycling plan? An active plan? Something that needs to be thought about
- The reduction of traffic in school holidays – can we use this as a message to sell getting more people commuting on bikes?
- The impact of tourism / increased numbers of tourists visiting the state, and the impact of this upon traffic

Who pays for the plan? A partnership model? Should it be City of Hobart that pays for the bike plan? Or should the stakeholders contribute to this? Why should responsibility fall back onto the City of Hobart? Then this helps to promote ownership on the plan

Number of students coming into the city...3000 more students (what is UTAS's contribution to the plan?) The need to develop a movement plan of how to get students through the city

Co-investment between developers / COH

Hobart Bicycle Advisory Committee who implements the plan / with the backing of COH?

We aren't starting from scratch

If there is a partnership this gives more weight to the group when it comes to the Alderman making decisions (particularly, if there was a strong partnership with UTAS)

The City Deal; developed with all levels of government. The Bike plan will be part of the City Deal but does not have to be prepared for approval of the Deal. The City Deal will have funding dollars associated with it; hoping to have plan in place prior to next federal election. Connectivity to Sandy Bay campus/ movement strategies with UTAS will be part of City Deal. Delivering improved connectivity throughout the city for ALL modes of transport (this will be key in the City Deal)

Is there any risk in terms of Alderman rejecting this plan? Must be thought into how the plan is sequenced to ensure that everything is placed before the end of this particular Council.

WHAT ARE THE REALISTIC RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR PREPARING THE PROJECT?

City of Hobart has resource and timing limitations with City of Hobart Vision and Transport Strategy in final stages.

How to identify stakeholders / community groups – there is a huge amount of work in this exercise alone. The University may be able to help – eg using student resources / competent students. However, to lure a high quality student to do this work it may need a scholarship. This work could be undertaken July-October (to fit within University semester). Council could write to Vice Chancellor to encourage a partnership between the Advisory Committee and the University. This may help feed into the development of scholarship, and add weight to the project for alderman support after the October election.

What are the short-term capacity building exercises that we can do to foster the connections between UTAS and COH?

HOW LONG SHOULD THE PROCESS BE FOR PREPARING THE BIKE PLAN?

City of Hobart has resource and timing limitations with City of Hobart Vision and Transport Strategy in final stages. Expect the Transport Strategy to be available for community review and comment in July/August. The Strategy is the greater document that creates the setting for the Bike Plan; so, finalising the Strategy is important to the timeline of the Bike Plan and this may impact on who the people are available to actually do the work.

City of Hobart - Aiming to have a brief prepared by July is a realistic target; however, this would be a draft. This brief would be finalised by August, and presented to council with the Transport Strategy before the October election

The brief must be approved by Council before it can commence.

Do we need to have something in place prior to October Municipal election?

9-12 months max; other community groups may complicate this / extend time lines, however this method would encourage community engagement;

Engaging community / community consultation before plan. To use this as a marketing opportunity that helps to engage the community and take the 'fear' away from the plan (eg the people who may block the plan)

Session 3: The Process – Looking elsewhere first

Comparison of some selected recent Bike Plans in Australia was presented (handout material as attached) along with the common building blocks of these Plans.

Are the bike plans operation only? Do they have to go back to Council for various bits to be processes? There are some Councils elsewhere (City of Yarra) where bike infrastructure can go in without having to go through the Council approval process

Session 4: Next Workshop

There was general agreement that the second workshop could review the results from the first workshop, start building a vision, identify goals or guiding principles to under-pin the vision and consider need for setting some targets.

It was suggested that **Wednesday 16th May**, lunchtime could be the next workshop date.

There was some discussion around the development of the Brief and the Bike Plan being collaborative and to be undertaken in an open and transparent way with the Advisory Committee. It was seen that this may help relieve the workload on Council staff. It was important to have respect/trust amongst members and to share information and ideas.

There was interest in pushing forward as a matter of urgency and utilising the skills and resources of the Committee members as this may also help to trim down the timelines.

It was requested that material be circulated to all members of the Advisory Committee.

There was a question of resources required for getting the next meeting off the ground; this also feeds into greater issues of resourcing the project.

The facilitators were asked to review the vision/guiding principles/targets of selected Bike Plans to present an overview at the next workshop.