

Submission: Sydney's draft East Subregional Plan – Cycling

Introduction:

The draft East Subregional (ES) plan does not address existing inequities and the cultural context of bicycling in Sydney, in the City's CBD and throughout the Eastern suburbs.

The draft ES therefore fails to recognise the realities and current issues confronting the broader community's expressed interests in bicycle riding. It therefore fails to identify the actions necessary for bicycling, the infrastructure, facilities and information needed and for the successful promotion of bicycling.

The question is:- What are the required priority actions making for attractive everyday commuting, recreational or everyday bike-riding trips again possible?

The basic thrust of this submission is the need to address this question and the facts that:

- Contrary to State Government policy, vehicle (car based) kilometres travelled is significantly increasing and is well beyond targets set in the 1980's for this millennium¹;
- Many potential bike trips are currently car based with all the attendant congestion and environmental problems and health and amenity benefits unrealised; and
- Serious social equity and transport paucity exist – hundreds of thousands of people cannot easily reach essential services within a reasonable time and cost, causing depravity² – , even in Sydney's East – that access to perceptively safe bicycling facilities would help solve.

Consequently, this means there are real impediments affecting city economy, personal well-being and achieving better living environments city wide and for Sydney's East, specifically.

The context and required actions to successfully address the bicycle mode of transport, for recreation and community access and well-being, consistent with the Metropolitan Strategy's vision and sound cycling related policy objectives, are set out below.

The context:

Compared with best-practice in Australian cities and the State's applicable guidelines³, Sydney is currently served very poorly in terms of bicycle infrastructure and facilities. Why?

For three inter-related reasons:

1. Cycleways, bicycle lanes and paths while being developed are often built well below guideline standards. This includes bicycling facilities designed and funded by the RTA⁴.
2. There is no inter-connected system of signed cycleways, bicycle lanes and paths (except over short distances and within some small local areas and parks). That is, there is no consistent bicycle network emerging that communities see as safe and comfortable and therefore attractive to use.

¹ Action for Transport 2010 – an integrated transport plan for NSW; Roads Transport Future Directions – summary report on options.

² *'Transport and social disadvantage in Western Sydney'*, Anne Hurni, (Western Sydney Community Forum & University of Western Sydney) Nov 2006. The study finds significant access disadvantage for people living in Western Sydney. That assessment applies to Eastern Sydney's suburbs – see Index of Disadvantage Map 1

³ DoP - "Planning Guidelines for Walking & Cycling", 2005; RTA - "NSW Bicycle Guidelines", 2003

⁴ Action for Bikes: Bike Plan 2010 NSW, Route 44 – Mascot to Darlinghurst on-road bike lanes completed [sic] 2003, but where prevailing traffic speed and volumes imply separation from motor traffic is desirable.

3. Insufficient funds are allocated across all three levels of government to address needs, but in particular, to overcome low standards and network discontinuities. Even the City of Sydney, which has recently adopted its new Cycling Strategy, sees a need to seek Federal and State funding support to implement its sound plan.

Basically, there is insufficient planning, coordination and funding across all levels of government. A network, implementation priorities and appropriate funding needs to be agreed across levels, driven by a State agency.

Importantly, the Department of Planning must be mindful of the bicycle movements policies and views⁵ and the potential role of cycling, not just for transport, but for all its other benefits that flow from this active form of travel and the very low costs involved when compared with providing for other transportation and recreational options.

It must also consider bicycling in terms of current public perceptions about safety and other expressed wishes pointing to the need for cycleways separated from relatively high traffic.

Comments for East Subregion

On the positive side: considerable work has been undertaken over the last five years, under adopted local bike plans and the now outdated BikePlan 2010⁶. With these efforts and despite the above mentioned failures in standards and not achieving connectivity, commuter cycling has approximately doubled over that period⁷.

A recent City of Sydney survey⁸ established that people living and working in its inner city areas are potentially motivated to cycling. Potential riders saw themselves as taking up riding as dependant upon:

- the availability and access to a usable and perceptively safe bicycle network and other facilities that are made as attractive as possible, particularly to those that may be categorised as 'novice' cyclists; and
- good information on cycling (where, when and about its benefits); and
- promotion to address negative public and aggressive driver attitudes.⁹

The key motivating words used by survey participants otherwise positively inclined to ride, where: for the sake of fitness and leisure!

A reasonable interpretation of the study is that people seek cycleways separated from traffic and a range of bicycle facilities at destinations. That is they are likely to consider riding if there is a perceptively safe way to travel from origin to destination along and across high-traffic routes or otherwise away from such high-traffic routes, and having access to parking and change facilities at destinations. Therefore, critical here is the provision of appropriate

⁵ Attachment entitled: Bicycle NSW's Policy Recommendations in lead up to 2007 State Election and beyond

⁶ Note: apparently the latter plan has now been suspended, despite a number of routes designed and ready for implementation.

⁷ The RTA has some cycleway cordon-counts that verify this.

⁸ Sydney Cycling Research: Focus Groups, Nov 2006 and Sydney Cycling Research: Internet Survey, Feb 2007 (City of Sydney, Social Research – input to its Cycling Strategy)

⁹ 'Do-the-right-thing' campaign to complement the 'share the road' campaigns of the recent past.

infrastructure and facilities and information and promotional programs that will overcome people's concerns and hesitation and thus ultimately influence a change in their travel choices.

Conclusion

Implementation of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy points to the need for more State-level planning and more explicit programs for bicycling, particularly at the subregional level and across levels of government.

Making Metropolitan policies actionable for cycling in subregions

Recommendations are made to revise and add to the ES Actions (EA) justified by the Context, above and in terms of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy's Transport vision, which states that: (*quote 1st 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.” (emphasis added)

Affirmative actions for cycling¹⁰:

Primary action areas

1. prepare a bicycle network plan; and
2. develop a bicycle infrastructure program.

The case below is that these two are specific outcomes necessary to achieve the following Metro Strategy policy objectives:

D3 - Influence travel choices to encourage more sustainable travel'

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

with related policy areas:

D2 Improve the existing transport system

D2.3 Improve the integration of public transport

D4 Improve transport decision making: Planning, evaluation and funding

D4.1 Improve transport planning

F1 - Increase access to quality parks and public places

F1.3 Improve access to waterways and links between bushlands, parks and centres.

1. Prepare a bicycle network plan

Priority subregional bicycle network routes must be identified and included in an agreed plan. Such a plan should be based on adopted local bike plans and BikePlan 2010 routes, updated to ensure appropriate standards are achieved.

¹⁰ Note: Under the relevant Metro Strategy's policies, distinct action areas are identified that could be applied Sydney wide i.e. to subregions other than just ES:

Preparation of such plans is a precedental step to rational and effective infrastructure funding within and across the Sydney region (and connecting up with adjoining subregions) and for sound design of projects within each subregion's local council areas.

Comments for East Subregion

A project to prepare a subregional network plan for ES and Sydney City Centre Subregion is almost completed. It is based on local bike plans adopted by the five Councils¹¹. This study was commissioned by SSROC in partnership with those Councils. It will need to be considered, verified and supported by the RTA, then agreed and funded to become useful and effective.

Underpinning that plan is are the premises that routes should connect neighbourhoods to: centres and other nodes of high activity such as schools and higher educational institutions; health and welfare facilities; parks, beaches and headlands; and with public transport services¹².

As a priority, State funding should focus on areas where commuting is potentially most attractive and in localities of social disadvantage, particularly to enable children to ride to school in those areas.

In detail this also means that each neighbourhood or residential area confined by main or arterial roads should have at least one high standard bicycle route passing through it and across, (at grade, over or under) any such high speed¹³ and trafficked roads to overcome any severance from adjoining areas and to any major centres that would otherwise occur. This means that specific traffic light controlled intersections need to be designed for cyclists.

As part of the above network plan, the Coastline Cycleway and Sydney Harbour foreshore routes should be included, even though some segments of such cycleway scheme may not be as a high a priority for implementation where they do not also serve diverse needs such as commuting and social equity. This routes are necessary to implement **F1.3**

The network plan needs to be planned in partnership with the Councils and involve the relevant Bicycle User Group – the advocacy groups – affiliated with Bicycle NSW. In Sydney's east, the applicable BUGS are: BIKEast, Bike Sydney and MASSBUGS.

Consequently, **EA D3.1.1**, **D3.1.2** and **D3.1.3**, and the text that follows each of these action statements, is far too narrowly stated and very limiting. Based on the above case and material, the draft should be amended with inappropriate dated text deleted and new text added to better reflect the above and the following recommended action(s).

2. Develop a bicycle infrastructure program

This program is to implement the network plan. The infrastructure should be related and timed with public transport actions developed under **D2.3**.

The program must also provide signage, maps showing connections with public transport, location of public facilities and institutions and public short and secure long-term bicycle parking.

¹¹ The Cities of Botany, Randwick and Sydney and Municipalities of Waverley and Woollahra

¹² This premise is more specific and slightly broader than envisaged under the Metro Strategy vision.

¹³ High speed in terms of cycling, means speed zoned roads permitting tempo of 60 km/h and above. Cycle safe streets for mixed traffic use (cars and cyclists sharing a lane) should be zoned 40km/h (or less).

Overall, this program needs to be correlated with undertaking land use planning, public transport, roads, public safety, health, education and sport and tourism initiatives, involving the relevant range of State agencies at the appropriate time and place.

Therefore there is a need to expand the existing DoP Coastline Cycleway program to serve the 90 kilometre missing section through metropolitan Sydney and complement the Sharing Sydney Harbour Access program.

These programs are very important for recreational and inter- and intra-state and international 'venture' tourism reasons. Compared with many other international cities, Sydney is failing to capture the cycling based 'venture' tourist, despite having a world class harbour and beaches.

Conclusion and recommendations for actions 1 and 2, above

In terms of all of the above, the EA3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 action statements are far too limiting in fact and by implication, particularly by including in 3.1.1, the phrases:

... including cycleway development in Randwick and pedestrian facilities in Bondi and Double Bay

which phrases should be deleted.

Amend EA D3.1.1; to read:

The Roads and Traffic Authority and local government to upgrade walking and cycling facilities to improve everyday access within neighbourhoods and to centres, local schools, institutions, facilities and services and places of work and for recreation.

Amend EA D3.1.2; to read:

State and local government to plan and develop walking and cycling networks to improve accessibility and align such trips to connect with public transport.

Amend EA D3.1.3; to read:

The State Government to implement the Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Program and expand the Coastline Cycleway Program, to improve public access to Sydney Harbour, its tributaries, parks and coastal beaches and headlands.

Secondary action areas

3. Provide appropriate bicycle parking and destination facilities; and

4. Require transport management and accessibility plans and transport access guides;

The case below is that these two are specific outcomes necessary to achieve aspects of the following Metro Strategy policy objectives:

D3 - Influence travel choices to to encourage more sustainable travel'

D3.2 – Implement a metropolitan parking policy

with related policy area:

D4 Improve transport decision making: Planning, evaluation and funding

D4.1 Improve transport planning

3. Provide appropriate bicycle parking and destination facilities

Parking and destination facilities, particularly at suitable and all major bus stops, railway stations and transport-interchanges, must also be planned for and provided. The facilities aiding connectivity with public transport must happen at all places where subregional network routes intersect, with stops as close as possible to such intersections.

Such facilities should also be required for new residential flats, commercial, industrial and institutional developments.

The topic is adequately covered in the Department's Planning guideline's¹⁴, but requires to be dovetailing with **D3.2**, with a direction for inclusion in local planning instruments and integrated with the Metro and local parking policies/instruments.

Conclusion and recommendations for action 3, above

Integrate with **D3.2**, the Metropolitan Parking Policy, and with consultancy based transport planning practice, by including requirements for the provision of bicycle parking and destination facilities in major developments through planning instruments and planning practice.

4. Require transport management and accessibility plans and transport access guides¹⁵

These are important tools for planning of development and ultimately providing customised travel information to people to encourage use of lower energy forms of transport – walking, cycling and public transport. Such plans and guides must be required to be prepared for all larger traffic generating developments and under park management plans. This seems totally missed in the draft ES plan.

There is a need to guide the transport planning of the private sector and large institutions.

This require some direction being provided to ensure all planning documents and park management plans applicable have these requirements.

Conclusion and recommendations for action 4, above

Integrate with **D3.2** the Metropolitan Parking Policy and include requirements for the provision of bicycle parking and destination facilities in planning instruments.

EA D3.2.1 could have explanatory text noting the requirement to prepare transport management and accessibility plans, and transport access guides, for larger traffic generating developments and under park management plans. Such guides and plans will also assist in addressing **E2** and **F1**.

Minimum bike parking and related facilities should be included and integrated with the Council's local DCPs for Parking

Tertiary action area

5. Develop bicycling promotions program

The case below is that specific outcome is necessary to achieve aspects of the following Metro Strategy policy objectives:

¹⁴ Ibid 3

¹⁵ See 'Producing and using Transport Access Guides, RTA and SEDA

D3 - Influence travel choices to to encourage more sustainable travel'-

D3.3 – Implement TravelSmart voluntary travel behaviour change programs

5. Develop bicycling promotion programs

BIKEast's experience and assertion is that the TravelSmart and related behavioural change programs are not working well.

However, such programs are basically commendable and are supported as they will have an impact once the above primary and secondary actions have been well addressed. This condition needs to exist for that part of a subregion where such promotional programs are to be run and provided concurrent driver and cyclist awareness programs are also undertaken.

Driver and cyclist awareness programs are needed, but these are more suitable to run as State-wide programs. These need to raise issues such as the vulnerability of cyclists and pedestrians on roads and paths, highlight the road rules designed to protect cyclists and pedestrians – speed and proximity when passing are common factors of concern to cyclists and pedestrians alike– and also address ways to changing negative driver attitudes towards cyclists. Giving clear advice to cyclists to 'do-the-right-thing', is possible as local promotion by BUGs. Gaining respect between and acceptance of all road users of the road rules and to sharing the road, are aims.

When local facilities are completed a local promotional program is required. That needs to promote the network plan and the availability and location of facilities. This program can then be expanded upon by TravelSmart, Ride2School and Rider Training programs etc.

Conclusion and recommendations for action 3, above

The primary and secondary EA's need to be completed or at least coordinated with awareness raising, TravelSmart, Ride2School and local cycling promotional programs. The State needs to broaden the promotional programs to raise driver awareness for safety reasons.

Specific cycling capital works programs

Appendix 'B', sets out BIKEast's bicycling capital works programs for the five electorates affected by the ES and City Centre Subregion area plans. These suggested works would need further consideration once the two subregion's bicycle network plan has been agreed.

Conclusion

The above contextual information, action areas, conclusions and recommendations and Map and Appendices are submitted for consideration in the finalisation of the ES plan.

A meeting to present and discuss this submission with the Executive Director – Metropolitan Planning and Regional Director, is requested.



Adrian Boss
Vice President – Projects, BIKEast

Map 1 – Transport Index of Disadvantage Score

Problems of equitable access are broadly defined as being personal mobility factors (characteristics that affect individual's ease of travelling), transport accessibility factors (characteristics of the available transport services) and urban accessibility factors (characteristics of facilities, services and activities that individuals may need to access).

Examples of some transport disadvantaged groups include: sole parents, young unemployed people and recently arrived humanitarian entrants. A broader response to the travel needs of these groups is required including, inter alia, improvements to local accessibility through constructing and upgrading bus stops and shelters, foot paths, and **cycleways** (emphasis added).

Eastern Sydney's suburbs of Banksmeadow, Botany, East Botany, Eastlakes, Daceyville, Hillsdale, La Perouse, Mascot, Pagewood, Philip Bay, Redfern, Rosebery, Waterloo and Zetland are all identified, below, as having a score of under 1000 score, and should be addressed as a priority.



**Appendix 'A' – Letter to Executive Director – Metropolitan
Planning**

24 August 2008

Copy of text

Ms Gail Connolly
NSW Department of Planning
Executive Director, Metropolitan Planning
REDFERN NSW 2016

Submitted by facsimile:
Original will not be issued unless requested

Dear Ms Connolly,

This covering letter and the attachments, forms BIKEast's advanced submission regarding the above. A further submission making suggestions to improve the details of the draft plan will follow, by the due date.

This early submission is made to enable the Department to consider the context for bicycling in terms of public perceptions of need, mindful of the bicycle movements policies¹⁶ and views and the role of cycling for transport and recreation for State and regional planning.

The material submitted may inform Sydney's other Subregional Plans and is justifiably based on the first of Sydney Metropolitan Strategy's Transport visions, which states that: (quote)

*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.* (emphasis added)

Key issues

Metropolitan Strategy - Key Transport Actions

D2 - Improve the existing transport system

D3 - Influence travel choices to encourage more sustainable travel

Catering for and encouraging cycling is intrinsic to achieving these key actionable policies. However, this requires recognition of factors influencing community attitudes presently inhibiting many taking up and accepting cycling for everyday travel and leisure.

A recent City of Sydney survey¹⁷ established that people living and working in the inner city are potentially motivated to cycling, subject to:

- availability and access to a usable and perceptively safe bicycle network and other facilities that are made as attractive as possible to 'novice' cyclists; and
- good information on cycling and addressing driver (negative/aggressive) attitudes.

Key motivating words used by participants then positively inclined to ride, were: for fitness and leisure.

¹⁶ Attachment entitled - Bicycle NSW's Policy Recommendation for the 2007 State Election.

¹⁷ Sydney Cycling Research: Focus Groups, Nov 2006 and Sydney Cycling Research: Internet Survey, Feb 2007 (City of Sydney, Social Research commission)

A reasonable interpretation of the study is that people seek cycleways separated from traffic: i.e. for perceptively safe travel generally away from, but where unavoidable, on separated cycleways along and across high-traffic routes. Critical here is the provision of infrastructure and facilities and information and promotional programs that will over-come people's concerns and thus ultimately influence a change in their travel choice.

Consequently, the implementation of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy points to the need for State-level planning and explicit programs for bicycling.

Four distinctive State-wide Programs for bicycling

Four programs are needed to develop and fund the planning and provision of basic bicycle infrastructure and for promoting this mode of transport and recreation. These programs¹⁸ are:

Whole-of-government active transportation policy

This entails broadening the existing government-wide departmental commitments. These need to fully recognise the role of cycling in reducing traffic congestion, the potential for health cost savings, the scope to foster well-being and free choice in the travel mix by integrating public transport with walking and cycling, and the greenhouse-gas reduction and other environmental benefits to be gained.

For example, programs such as TravelSmart may be successfully promoted around completed infrastructure projects, but is not likely to be successful otherwise if based on current facilities and public perceptions.

RTA bicycle infrastructure program

BikePlan 2010 needs to be revived and updated. The RTA's local bike plan funding program is basically sound. However, the existing program needs enhancing to better reflect Council commitments so as to achieve \$ for \$ funding: it falls well short to matching this demand and therefore hinders implementation of local bike plans, significantly.

Safe main roads & intersections scheme for cycling

Many cycleways and on-road bike lanes already built do not have safe and convenient crossing of main roads. Traffic lights are mostly involved. Such discontinuities make it relatively riskier and unattractive for riding. Sometimes bike routes have to follow a main road as well: where there are no alternatives routes able to following local roads or pass through parks.

The RTA needs to take full responsibility for such crossings and routes. This requires a new funding program.

Coastline Cycleway program

This is an existing Department of Planning program that currently excludes Sydney. For Sydney, the program should be expanded and integrated with the *Sharing Sydney Harbour*¹⁹, and other open space related programs. The case is strong to do this.

For example, the cities around San Francisco Bay and the State of California have now completed a Bay Trail right around this body of water which has generated bicycle - venture - tourism visits from inter-state and overseas. This tourism potential and the local needs co-exists for Sydney's harbours, beaches and bays.

These programs must be an integrated part of the Metropolitan Strategy and its subregional plans and also apply State-wide under City Centre and Regional Plans.

- Preparation of Regional/subregional bicycle network plans

¹⁸ See Attachment B, for more context and details.

¹⁹ The Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Program must be extended beyond 2008 and should be enhanced.

Priority regional network routes must be identified. This is a precedent step to rational and effective infrastructure funding and sound design of projects under the above suggested four State-wide applicable programs.

A project to do this, based on local bike plans adopted by individual Councils is almost completed, commissioned by SSROC in partnership with Councils, for Sydney's East Subregion. This draft plan should be sought by the Department and the approach and detail considered as a model for wider application.

Conclusions

The above information, key issues and proposals are commended for early consideration.

Bicycle NSW will be taking the policy issues up with the Hon. Watkins MP, Deputy Premier and Minister for Transport, the Hon. Frank Sartor MP, Minister for Planning and the Hon. Eric Roozendaal MLC, Minister for Roads, for their further and urgent consideration.

Sincerely-



Adrian Boss

Vice President – Projects, BIKEast

**Appendix 'B' –
Specific cycling capital works programs for ES and CityS plans**

**Cycling Infrastructure Program for Sydney's east –
Electoralates of: Coogee; Heffron; Maroubra; Sydney; and Vacluse**

This should be read with the Bicycle NSW Policy Recommendations in lead up to the 2007 State Elections. <http://www.bicyclensw.org.au/PolicyRecommendations.asp>

Basically, State level initiatives are required under current and new programs. These are: the RTA \$for\$ bicycle infrastructure funding scheme and the Department of Planning's Coastline Cycleway program - in partnership with local councils and new programs.

(See BIKEast's paper '*Bicycle transport – a lifestyle choice: Four State-wide bicycle programs*', 26 Feb 2007 (Updated 24 August 2007), which identifies the programs under the four headings used below.)

The program projects should be undertaken for completion by 2011.

Develop an Active Transport Policy

- (i) Transport interchange pedestrian/cyclist upgrade** (amounts = State funding)
Grafton Street, Bondi Junction. Provide direct traffic controlled crossing from interchange into Westfields at grade, with on-site bike parking/lockers.
Vacluse and Coogee electoralates **\$150,000**
- (ii) TravelSmart and Ride2Schools programs** (amounts = State funding)
Fund these and destination infrastructure and promotion for behaviour change in Eastern Suburbs schools (co-funded by Departments of Education, Health & RTA)
All electoralates **\$360,000**

RTA's bicycle program – regional routes (*BikePlan 2010*)

- **Bondi Junction – UNSW** (*Route 23*) Queens Park to UNSW - Queens Park cyclepath, between Baronga Ave facilities, York Road crossing to Bourke St
Vacluse and Coogee electoralates **\$200,000**
- **Harbour Bridge – Woolloomooloo** (*Route 17*) via Cahill Expressway and along southern edge of the Botanical Gardens – a route of tourism significance
Sydney electoralate **\$1,200,000**
- **Eastgardens – UNSW** (*Route 27*) via Pagewood and across Anzac Pde
Heffron and Coogee electoralates **\$300,000**
- **Airport – Eastgardens** (*Route 22*) via Botany/Pagewood along Wentworth Ave
Heffron and Maroubra electoralates **\$300,000**
- **University of NSW to Sydney University** (*Route 28*) between Lower UNSW Campus and Green Square
Sydney and Heffron electoralates **\$300,000**

Safe main roads & intersections scheme for cycling:

(i) Intersection projects:

- O'Sullivan Rd/Blair St across Old South Head Rd, Bondi Beach
- Edgecliff Rd across Ocean St and New South Head Rd, Edgecliff
- Old South Head Rd/Oxford St across Bondi Road/Sid Einfeld Drive, Bondi Junction
Vacluse electoralate: **\$300,000**
- Queen Street, Moore Park/Lang Roads @ Paddington Gates across Oxford, Paddington(improved safer access into Centennial Parklands from Woollahra LGA)
Sydney & Vacluse electoralates: **\$150,000**

- Darley Rd @ Musgrave Gate CP across Avoca St/York Roads, Randwick
- Darley Rd/King St across Alison Road, Randwick
- Belmore & Coogee Bay Rds/High St across Avoca St, Randwick
- Darley Rd/McPherson St across Carrington St, Waverley
- Coogee electorate: \$400,000**
- General Bridges Cr/Sturt St crossings of Bunnerong Rd and Anzac Parade, Kingsford
- Heffron & Maroubra electorates \$150,000**
- Irvine At/Byrd Ave across Anzac Pde, Kingsford
- Haig/Wise Sts across Anzac Pde, Maroubra
- Boyce Road across Anzac Pde, Maroubra
- Maroubra electorate \$420,000**
- DunningAve/Sutherland St across and link along Gardiners Road, Rosebery
- Heffron electorate \$150,000**

- (ii) Main Road and state agency projects:** Cycleway = On-road; Cyclepath = Off-road
- New South Head Road - Rushcutters Bay to Edgecliff (partly cycleway and cyclepath)
 - Sydney & Vaucluse electorates \$200,000**
 - New South Head Road - Double Bay to Point Piper (partly cycleway and cyclepath)
 - Rose Bay Promenade cyclepath, Rose Bay
 - Vaucluse electorate \$500,000**
 - Oxford Street cyclepath, between Ocean & Queen Sts – i.e
between Woollahra and Paddington gates CP along Oxford St
 - Sydney electorate \$160,000**
 - Wentworth Ave, between Botany Road, Botany & East Gardens, Maroubra
 - Maroubra electorate \$360,000**

(iii) Local Bike Plan program 2007 – 2011: (Matching \$for\$ funding from RTA)

This is for the implementation of Council's adopted Bike Plans

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Botany Bay City Council (connecting routes to Wentworth Ave route) | |
| Heffron & Maroubra electorates | \$200,000 |
| Randwick City Council (various projects throughout the area) | |
| Coogee, Heffron and Maroubra electorates | \$1,300,000 |
| Waverley Council (various projects throughout the area) | |
| Coogee and Vacluse electorates | \$400,000 |
| Woollahra Municipal Council (various projects throughout the area) | |
| Sydney and Vacluse electorates | \$300,000 |
| Sydney City Council (various projects eastern half of the area outside the CBD) | |
| Heffron and Sydney electorates | \$1,000,000 |

(iv) Coastline Cycleway program

Matching \$for\$ funding, which requires an expansion of the current Department of Planning's program. This is for that part of a pedestrian/cyclists' shared path bike route system between Watsons Bay and La Perouse within public reserves & parklands (Commonwealth & State owned land)

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Randwick City Council (Maroubra to La Perouse, including within the Anzac Rifle Range and Botany Bay National Park) | |
| Maroubra electorate | \$400,000* |
| Waverley Council (Clarke Res; Bronte Park, Waverley Cemetry) | |
| Coogee and Vacluse electorates | \$200,000 |
| Woollahra Municipal Council (The Gap & Christison Parks) | |
| Vacluse electorate | \$200,000 |

Note: *Half this amount should be sought from the Commonwealth Government for the shared path through the Anzac Rifle Range area.

Total Program costs: State of NSW funding over four years **\$9,500,000**

Notes: This serves a population of approx., 475,000 living in Sydney's City and East Subregions, costing: **\$5.00 per/person/ year, which compares with direct expenditures in 2005-06** of:
 \$4.30 per person in Queensland;
 \$4.93 per person in Western Australia; and
 \$1.29 per person in NSW (direct investment – does not include incidental investment where bike related facilities are included as part of new main road projects).
 The \$5.00 is a very low cost compared with the personal well-being, public health savings environmental benefits and congestion cost savings, to be gained.
 A regional bike network plan in preparation by SSROC may affect/amend the above.