

"May sustainable transport systems be at the heart of Adelaide's success as a people-friendly and environmentally responsible city."

James Mitchell  
Manager Engineering  
Draft Movement and Transport Plan Project Team  
City of Holdfast Bay  
By email: [jmitchell@holdfast.sa.gov.au](mailto:jmitchell@holdfast.sa.gov.au)  
cc: [mail@holdfast.sa.gov.au](mailto:mail@holdfast.sa.gov.au)

22 April 2024

### **City of Holdfast Bay's Draft Movement and Transport Plan 2024-28**

Bike Adelaide appreciates the opportunity to comment on the City of Holdfast Bay's Draft Movement and Transport Plan 2024-28 (the Plan).

Bike Adelaide has recently reviewed metro Adelaide council's strategies/plans for active transport and integrated transport. While almost all councils have or had such plans, it is not always clear which councils are actually delivering such strategies and how. We do note, however, that the City of Unley has committed funding in their 5-year strategy

(<https://www.unley.sa.gov.au/files/assets/public/v/1/council/about-the-council/unley-walking-and-cycling-plan-2022-2027.pdf>). We urge the City of Holdfast Bay to review past documents, with particular focus on Unley's plans and implementation, and adapt best practice to local conditions.

1. Overall we support the Plan, particularly alignment to the principles stated in 1.4. We suggest adding emphasis on independent transport options for young people, under 'Active and Sustainable', not just active ageing/ageing well. We also suggest emphasising the need for a 'well-planned network of diverse transport options for business and freight' and that consideration of adjoining councils' routes/transport plans should be made.
2. We agree with focus areas at 1.5. However, as above, emphasis is needed on social inclusion for all ages, and expressly include young people. There is growing evidence that young people are seeking alternative transport options to car ownership because of economic, social and environmental factors, and also delaying acquiring a drivers license or a private car.
3. At 2.1 we suggest including an infographic highlighting Holdfast Bay becoming the first LGA to implement a subsidy for e-bikes and cargo bikes. This demonstrates potential for more future leadership in sustainable transport.
4. At 2.2.7 we advise avoiding the term 'vehicles' when meaning 'cars' or 'motor vehicles'. Bikes, scooters and PMDs are all vehicles and have rights to use public paths and roads.
5. At 'Future of travel', there is no mention of contemporary high rates of car-dependence for journeys to school and low rates of active transport for children. Increasing congestion and vehicle size/weight necessitate a need to make these journeys safer or they will exacerbate the feedback loop of poor perceptions of active transport safety (from

cars) causing more parents to chauffeur children. 'Future of travel' should state a clear aim to increase active transport journeys to school and set a percentage target.

6. Also at 'Future of travel', we contend that increased congestion actually *suppresses* participation in active transport because it makes it less safe to use roads. Road congestion does not directly translate to increased demand for AT; it is generally politically more feasible to implement improvements to AT *before* congestion reaches critical levels, therefore improvement should focus on reducing car movements. Generally across Adelaide, the trend has been increased congestion resulting from post-COVID return to work, during which period people were discouraged from using public transport. Public transport patronage has not yet returned to pre-COVID levels, while road congestion increased by over 16% compared to 2019. Rates of cycling and public transport patronage have both demonstrated decreases over that same time (as congestion worsens bus network reliability, and road safety for cyclists).

7. We question whether City of Holdfast Bay is prepared, or if preparation is required, for the imminent legalisation of privately-owned e-scooters. The Plan does not yet indicate how council will handle the demands they place on active transport and street infrastructure. This is of particular importance, given that e-scooters have not been trialled in the city and have not tested their regular use on city paths and streets.

8. At 4.1 we support a lower default urban speed limit in residential areas to 40kph, and support further reductions in high pedestrian activity areas e.g. main streets. The text on action regarding school traffic management would be better phrased as "encourage active transport through improved safety and accessibility to educational facilities"; this flips the comment to promote safe and independent active travel and de-emphasises car journeys to school as a default. The Plan should set a target for journeys to school, for example, 30% journeys by 2030 citywide (30 by 30).

9. At 4.2 we support the suggested actions but the Walking and Cycling Plan should be tied to budget allocations. In this regard, City of Unley provides a useful and achievable example of ongoing budget allocation set against established priorities. Moreover, clearly stated milestones and key performance indicators are needed to demonstrate efficacy of the strategy.

Bike Adelaide would welcome the opportunity to have ongoing participation in the development of the Walking and Cycling Plan.

Regards,

David Elliott, Chair

---