



Brisbane Central Business District Bicycle User Group

CBD BUG

GPO Box 2104, Brisbane 4001

convenors@cbdbug.org.au

0423 974 825

www.cbdbug.org.au

Office of the Lord Mayor
GPO Box 2287
Brisbane Qld 4001

My dear Lord Mayor

The North Brisbane Bikeway (stage 1B) officially opened on Wednesday 14 September 2016. It is an excellent facility with what appears to be Brisbane's first priority road crossing for people riding bikes, and the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) path terminal treatment at either end. These are both commendable treatments based on TMR's Technical Note 128 "Selection and Design of Cycle Tracks".¹

The BUG has previously communicated with you about these subjects (concerning BCC facilities: Archer Street in Toowong and banana bars)² recommending the TMR approach, with limited success.

On a related note, we are delighted that "floating bus stops" as in the Technical Note are to be implemented in the forthcoming Stanley Street protected bike lane project, but dismayed that BCC explicitly rejected the concept in the Kingsford Smith Drive (KSD) project.³ In the BUG's view this will render the KSD "bike lanes" (between Theodore St and Racecourse Rd) wedged between a bus lane and traffic lane with a 60 km/h speed limit unsuitable for "8 to 80" riders and useless for all except "fast and fearless" riders. This is again in defiance of TMR's guidelines which show that separated cycle tracks should be provided where posted speed limits are 60 km/h. The design also defies Austroads guidelines - "Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides 2014"⁴ Figure 2.2 on "Separation of cyclists and motor vehicles by speed and volume" guidelines indicate that with a speed limit of 60 km/h and a volume of traffic of more than 5,000 vehicles per day the appropriate facility is "separate paths", not "bicycle lanes or shoulders" or "mixed traffic". Kingsford Smith Drive average annual daily traffic figures are currently about 65,000 vehicles per day with 15% being heavy vehicles.

By refusing to provide separated cycling facilities in new build locations Council will continue to miss lowered active transport targets such as the already missed 2.5% of trips by bike in 2016, and 5% of trips by bike in 2026.

We are also concerned about the total lack of progress in lighting on the Grammar Shared Path. A petition containing 185 signatures (170 electronic and 15 paper) concerning this issue was presented to Council in September 2015.⁵

¹ <http://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/business-industry/Technical-standards-publications/Technical-Notes/Traffic-engineering.aspx>

² <http://www.cbdbug.org.au/wp-content/uploads/1970/01/0/CBD-BUG-letter-to-BCC-LM-re-archer-street-20140707.pdf>

<http://www.cbdbug.org.au/wp-content/uploads/1970/01/0/CBD-BUG-letter-BCC-LM-re-Banana-Bars-20150611.pdf>

³ <http://www.cbdbug.org.au/wp-content/uploads/1970/01/0/CBD-BUG-From-LM-KSD-20160629.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.onlinpublications.austroads.com.au/items/AP-G88-14>

⁵ <http://www.epetitionsbrisbane.qld.gov.au/petition/view/pid/272>

The response (20 January 2016, petitions CA15/802356 and CA15/860110) stated:

The location of this route provides significant complexities to the installation of lighting with consultation and formal agreements needing to be reached with property owners including Queensland Rail and the Brisbane Girls and Boys Grammar Schools.

Council recognizes this path is an important commuter route and it is identified as a primary cycle route within Brisbane City Plan 2014. Primary routes provide key lines in the bicycle network and are therefore Council's priority to ensure they are of suitable standard. ...

As such, this route has been identified as a high priority lighting project to be completed in stages as funding is available and integration with adjoining land holders is feasible.⁶

Unfortunately, this response was virtually superfluous. It is similar to trite phrases offered verbally by Council officers in explanation such as "if this was easy it would have been done by now".

There is no difference from the petitioners' perspective between Council doing nothing and the (now repetitive and quite tiresome) response to petitions that Council "supports the project but funding has already been allocated for bikeway projects for the current financial year".

We also note that the path is a shared path, not a dedicated bikeway, and any lighting improvement would benefit both people riding and people walking. There have been several incidents since the petition closed, most recently a commuter who broke his arm slipping on gravel there in June 2016 and an incident involving multiple people riding bikes falling after one slipped on leaves (sustaining concussion) in August 2016.

Communication with the BUG and petitioners on this issue has been non-existent since this time. This is deeply disappointing, given Main Roads Minister Mark Bailey's continued personal involvement on this issue, with two letters of support sent to you. The North Brisbane Bikeway stages 2, 3B and 3C are due for completion in late 2018. These excellent facilities with priority bike crossings will attract more riders. But the bikeway cannot achieve its full potential without lighting in the Grammar Path area. The issue will not "go away" and the safety issues around the Grammar schools will only worsen with increasing traffic.

As the State Government supports the lighting project, this leaves negotiation with the Grammar schools as the only sticking point; but it is inexplicable that with the adjacent Normanby Pedestrian Cycle Link opening in September 2007 that nothing has been achieved in the nine years since.

Are you able to provide any substantive update on this issue?

I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully

Dr Richard Bean
Co-convenor
Brisbane CBD BUG

22 October 2016

cc Mark Bailey
cc Adrian Schrinner
cc Vicki Howard

⁶ https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/sites/default/files/20160421_-cclo_-council_-minutes_-post_recess_-2_feb_2016.doc