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## Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>A generic term used to describe footpaths, on-road paths, shared paths, trails etc. Note: Some Council documents refer to ‘trails’ rather than ‘paths’.</td>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>Paths that are provided along roadsides for the use of pedestrians and cyclists under the age of 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Path (Shared use path)</td>
<td>A path that can be used for a number of activities including walking, cycling, inline skating, jogging, dog walking etc.</td>
<td>On-road paths</td>
<td>These are typically known as bike lanes and are provided as part of the road infrastructure. Some bike lanes are for the sole use of cyclists while others are shared by cyclists and motorists (e.g. for parking, turning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road paths</td>
<td>Paths that are physically separate from road carriageways. These paths might be located on road reserves or they may follow natural features such as waterways.</td>
<td>MTN</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Trails Network – Trails (walking and cycling) recognised by the State Government as key linkages to destinations in and around Melbourne. These paths are primarily off-road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBN</td>
<td>Principal Bicycle Network – Trails / paths recognised by the State Government as key cycling linkages to destinations in and around Melbourne. These paths are primarily on-road.</td>
<td>Active Transport</td>
<td>The term given to describe transport or commuter options that require physical activity e.g. cycling or walking to work or school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter cycling and walking</td>
<td>Cycling and walking for the primary purpose of accessing work, school or routine activities. These activities are distinct from walking or cycling activities undertaken for recreation or fitness purposes.</td>
<td>Activity Centres</td>
<td>Refers to community hubs such as transport hubs, education / school hubs, retail hubs, recreation hubs etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has been prepared to guide the development of a network of quality paths that encourage residents, workers and visitors to become more involved in walking and cycling as part of their daily recreation, health and commuter routines.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy proposes a 5-year path development and upgrade program that addresses barriers in the existing path network and ensures barriers are minimised in new path networks.

In particular, developers will need to work closely with Council to ensure new estates or greenfield subdivisions include provision of both on-road and off-road paths. These paths will provide effective linkages within new residential areas and to existing paths and activity centres in the wider region. They will also need to comply with the requisite development standards designed to ensure paths meet community needs.

Local communities and interest groups such as the Hume Bicycle User Group, resident associations, open space management groups, retailers and service clubs will also be key to identifying additional path development opportunities and addressing barriers in the network.

Paths are an important component of the City’s recreation infrastructure and are becoming a key element in the City’s transport network. Paths provide for the most popular recreation activities undertaken in the community, namely walking and cycling.

These activities have all experienced a phenomenal growth in participation over the last 5-7 years indicating a significant trend towards casual or non-organised recreation activities rather than organised sport.

Paths are popular for recreation because they allow people to exercise in their own time, there is no cost to use them, they are in safe spaces that are inviting of social engagement, and they are in the natural environment. Paths are also becoming increasingly popular as commuter routes for people who are looking for healthier options to access their workplace and recreation facilities. They are also critical in relation to initiatives that aim to reduce the use of vehicles.

Council faces significant challenges in providing for a growing community that has increasing expectations about the standard to which paths will be constructed, the range of different activities paths will accommodate, the range of age groups and abilities paths will cater for, the quality of path environments and the connectivity of paths to important destinations in the local and wider community.

Council has made an allocation of $1,205,000 for the development of paths (excluding the maintenance of footpaths) over the next 4 financial years - $225,000 in the 2010/11 financial year and $250,000 in the 2011/12 financial year $325,000 in the 2012/13 financial year and $405,000 in the 2013/14 financial year. The Walking and Cycling Strategy has identified on-road and off-road path development priorities that will be addressed over this time and are included in the action plan of this document.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has not made works recommendations in relation to the footpath network because these are addressed in Council’s footpath maintenance works plan. The strategy does however highlight the need for the footpath network to be well connected to the wider off-road and on-road path networks.
1. Purpose of the Walking and Cycling Strategy

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has been prepared to guide the development of quality path infrastructure to encourage residents, workers and visitors to become more involved in walking and cycling activities.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy will provide a 5-year plan to remove barriers that discourage the use of paths for recreation, health and wellbeing and commuter activities.

While there is a considerable use of paths in Hume, the Walking and Cycling Strategy recognises a number of barriers that restrict use. These barriers include:

- missing links and detours that make it difficult to navigate the path network to community destinations such as schools, work places and recreation facilities
- paths that are indirect and do not respond to residents’ preferred routes of travel to facilities and transport connections such as railway stations
- a lack of secure bike storage facilities at schools and transport interchanges, and a transport system that does not have bike transportation facilities
- poor condition of path surfaces
- poor infrastructure including a lack of seating, and directional and distance signage
- pathways that are congested because they have not been designed to cater for the level and type of use required by the community
- congestion at end of trip destinations e.g. between bikes, cars and pedestrians at schools
- a lack of separation between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles, particularly between cars and bicycles along some on-road paths and between cyclists and pedestrians along some shared paths.

In addition, the strategy provides Council, the community and in particular developers with a framework for the future provision of pathways. It also provides the information required to evaluate future path network proposals and to determine planning and development priorities.

2. Scope of the Walking and Cycling Strategy

The Walking and Cycling Strategy considers all on-road and off-road path opportunities including those located:

- alongside waterways
- on service easements
- in environmental areas
- on road carriageways (bike lanes)
- in reserves
- in open spaces.

The strategy examines opportunities associated with shared-use paths (e.g. walking and cycling) and single use paths (e.g. pedestrian or bike only).

It is not the purpose of the Walking and Cycling Strategy to address footpath planning and development as this is the subject of Council’s footpath maintenance works plan. However, the Walking and Cycling Strategy does make comment about the need to ensure footpaths are well connected to the entire path network both within Hume and in the wider region.

Similarly, it is not the purpose of the Walking and Cycling Strategy to address broader transport issues. However, the strategy does incorporate opportunities to support Council’s alternative transport initiatives (e.g. commuter cycling), as identified in the Draft Hume Integrated Land Use and Transport Strategy.
The Walking and Cycling Strategy reinforces the need for a whole-of-council and whole-of-network approach to the planning and development of paths.

3. Project Context

3.1 Policy and Planning

The Federal, State and Local Governments recognise they have a role to play in the planning and provision of path networks. This is evident from the planning and policy documents at each level of government that identify path related strategies for addressing a range of social, economic and environmental needs.


Council’s *Open Space Strategy* provides the framework for the development of open space in the City. The *Leisure Strategy Plan* maps out Council’s role in the provision of healthy lifestyle activities and facilities. Both of these documents include recommendations that are relevant to the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

Other documents such as the draft Hume Integrated Land Use and Transport Strategy (HILATS) will continue to inform the Walking and Cycling Strategy as it is implemented. Priorities identified through preliminary work undertaken as part of the HILATS have been incorporated in the Walking and Cycling Strategy action plan.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy supports other Council initiatives relating to improving health and wellbeing outcomes (*as in the Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan*), environmental protection and enhancement (*as in Pathways to Sustainability*) and community safety (*as in the Community Safety Strategy*).

These documents recognise the opportunity paths afford in relation to:
- improved community *health and fitness* outcomes because they provide access to low / no cost recreation and health and wellbeing opportunities
- safe and attractive environments that encourage people to engage with each other
- decreasing *road congestion* and associated noise and chemical pollution because they provide an alternative transport option
- improving connectivity between communities and to community facilities and points of interest
- environmental enhancement because they provide opportunities for increased vegetation plantings and wildlife protection.

To optimise these outcomes Council will work with the community, other councils and state authorities to ensure an integrated approach to the planning and provision of path infrastructure in the region.

A summary of key reference documents is contained in Appendix 3.
3.2 Demographics of Hume City

By 2021 the population of Hume is expected to reach 204,931 and by 2031 it is expected to reach 244,575. Based on these projections the population of Hume will have increased by 76,240 people, or 45% in the 21 years from 2010 to 2030. The suburbs that will experience the most significant growth are:

- Craigieburn - 13,330 additional dwellings
- Sunbury - 10,270 additional dwellings
- Greenvale - 4,180 additional dwellings
- Airport-Rural - 1,940 additional dwellings
- Roxburgh Park - 1,660 additional dwellings
- Broadmeadows - 1,140 additional dwellings

The Craigieburn Planning Precinct will experience the most significant increase in population (55,307 new households by 2030) followed by the Sunbury Planning Precinct (24,843 new households by 2030).

Because of the population growth across all age groups there is significant pressure for the development of new paths and the upgrade of existing paths. This is particularly the case in the Sunbury and Craigieburn Planning precincts where there is significant greenfield subdivision development occurring. To encourage residents into commuter cycling, then to use safe on-road bike lanes will be a priority in these developing areas.

3.3 Car Ownership in Hume

The Walking and Cycling Strategy provides an opportunity to encourage a lesser reliance on the car and encourage people to walk and bike ride as a preferred mode of transport.

According to the Victorian Transport Statistics Portal, Hume City has a significantly higher level of car ownership than the adjoining City of Moreland and the Melbourne metropolitan area. In Hume City 59% of households own 2 or more cars compared to 39% in the City of Moreland and 52% metropolitan Melbourne.

There are a number of factors that may contribute to this scenario including distance from home to the workplace, and a lack of effective commuter options.

The impact of this high level of car ownership is twofold.

The City’s roads are likely to experience greater congestion than surrounding LGAs, and Hume motorists are likely to be significant contributors to congestion on the wider metropolitan road network. Strategies that reduce this reliance on the private motor vehicle will be critical, particularly given the increase in the number of households forecast for development in Hume.
Council’s Draft Integrated Land Use and Transport Strategy (HILATS) identifies an additional impact of a poor public transport network. The strategy recognises there are Hume households that are required to own a motor vehicle despite not having the financial means. This is due to the lack of other transport options.

‘Required’ vehicle ownership and an inability to access an effective transport network is recognised in the draft HILATS as ‘transport disadvantage’.

An effective path network, an effective public transport network and community transport initiatives (e.g. ride sharing, and active transport) will contribute to overcoming transport disadvantage in Hume. They will also encourage a decrease in car ownership and road congestion in Hume.

3.4 Financial Capacity of Council

Council has prepared a number of key service planning documents to guide decision making over the next five to ten years. Similar to the Walking and Cycling Strategy most of these documents propose significant infrastructure works relating to roads, recreation facilities, family and children’s centres, new estates and the upgrading of existing infrastructure.

One of Council’s challenges is to balance competing community demands and expectations for services and programs, including those relating to paths.

Council has allocated $1,205,000 for the development of paths (excluding footpaths) over the next 4 financial years. This includes:

- $225,000 in the 2010/11 financial year
- $250,000 in the 2011/12 financial year
- $325,000 in the 2012/13 financial year and
- $405,000 in the 2013/14 financial year.

Path developments priorities for the next 4 financial years have been determined using the criteria outlined in section 12 of this document.

A key challenge for Council is ensuring there is an appropriate allocation for the regular maintenance of paths. While there is a significant cost for the establishment of paths, the maintenance of paths is an ongoing and significant mandatory inclusion in Council’s annual budget.

3.5 Partnerships

Council has a limited financial capacity to address all path development needs within the desired timeframe without assistance from other community, private and government stakeholders.

These partnerships will be important in identifying walking and cycling infrastructure priorities and in developing the City’s network of paths.

The Hume Bicycle Users Group (BUG) has been significant in identifying opportunities to enhance the path network, particularly in relation to recreation and commuter cycling. Submissions made by the BUG group have informed a number of the recommendations in the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

Council recognises the need to work with local community interest groups such as the Hume BUG group, residents groups, service groups and retail associations. This will ensure the integration of cycling into public environments and will develop and promote participation strategies.
Partnerships with land developers will also be critical so they understand the basis of Council’s recreation, health and wellbeing and transport objectives relating to paths. Paths will be progressively installed by developers in ‘greenfield’ (undeveloped) areas as these areas are subdivided.

Council will continue to work closely with adjoining Councils and government departments such as Parks Victoria and VicRoads. This will ensure the needs of the Hume community are understood and incorporated into future regional and State Government path projects. This is particularly relevant in relation to the State’s Principal Bicycle Network and the Melbourne Metropolitan Trail Network.

4. Definitions

4.1 Hierarchy of Paths
Paths have been classified according to their role in the overall path network. This will assist Council to determine the level to which paths will be developed. These classifications are based on the open space hierarchy (Hume City Open Space Strategy) but have been refined so they are more relevant to the planning and development of the path network.

In some cases a path will provide for regional, district and local needs because of its location along a particular route. In these cases development standards for the higher level of path will apply.

Classification 1 - Regional / State Paths
These paths will be significant in terms of the regional path network. They are likely to link with paths in adjoining municipalities, to major facilities in the region and may also be part of the statewide or national path network.

Included in this classification are paths that are part of:
- the Principal Bicycle Network (PBN) - a network of on-road and off-road cycle routes that provides access to key destinations within the Melbourne metropolitan area and
- the Metropolitan Trail Network (MTN) – a network of recreational routes in metropolitan Melbourne largely consisting of shared pedestrian and bicycle paths.

Examples of these paths are: Moonee Ponds Creek Path, Merri Creek Path, Broadmeadows Valley Park Path.

Classification 2 - District Paths – These paths will link suburbs and neighbourhoods to each other and to major community, commercial and transport hubs. District paths will typically link into the regional / state network of paths.

Examples of these paths are: Blind Creek Path (Sunbury), Merlynston Creek Path.

Classification 3 - Neighbourhood Paths – These paths provide residents with access through their neighbourhood and to facilities such as schools, local shops and parks. Neighbourhood paths will typically link into the district network of paths.

Examples of these paths are: Aitken Creek Path (Craigieburn), Attwood Creek Path.

Classification 4 - Site Specific Paths – These paths are located within the bounds of parks or reserves and may or may not be part of the wider path network. They add to recreation opportunities provided in parks and reserves and support activities such as walking, inline skating and bike-riding for children and families.
4.2 Types of Walking and Cycling

The challenge for the Walking and Cycling Strategy is the need to consider a diverse range of walking and cycling needs and community expectations. The following table highlights the range of walking and cycling activities and the different environments required to support these.

For example the local family may choose to use the local path for introducing their youngster to their new bicycle, the local jogger as an opportunity to take a run with their dog while the commuter cyclist sees the path as a safe off-road option to speedily access the railway station.

Table 4 - Environments required to support different types of walking and cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Typical Activities</th>
<th>Environments and Infrastructure Required to Support Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual walking / cycling</td>
<td>▪ Reflective walking / cycling environments that minimise need for 'alertness' and where people can relax e.g. paths through the nature reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ A casual walk with the pet dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Introducing children to new recreation activities e.g. bike riding, skateboard riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Local footpaths that eliminate / minimise the need for walking / cycling on roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / cycling to access local destinations</td>
<td>▪ Strong pedestrian linkages around local neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ambling paths or paths that traverse through different environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Seating, shade and green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Access to quiet, calm, reflective green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / cycling</td>
<td>▪ Walking / cycling to the local shops, reserve, maternal child health centre or pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational distance destination walking / cycling</td>
<td>▪ Integrated footpath, path network that accommodate multiple and required uses e.g. mothers with prams, children on bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Secure bicycle storage facilities at shops and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Paths within parks for children's bike riding, inline skating, prams etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Appropriate amenities (e.g. seating, shade, water) and environment (landscaping, trees) at destinations and along routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Bike hire opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / jogging / cycling for fitness</td>
<td>▪ Walking / cycling to the regional park, or sporting reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Social (group) outings with friends or as part of walking and cycling clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ A casual walk with the pet dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Integrated footpath, path network that accommodate multiple and required uses e.g. dog walking, bike riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Secure bike storage facilities at relevant destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Appropriate amenities (e.g. seating, shade, water) and environment (landscaping, trees) at destinations and along routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ On-road bike paths / lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Bike hire opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter walking / cycling</td>
<td>▪ Walking / cycling to access other transport links such as trains or buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Walking / cycling to work or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Walking / cycling to access local services or routine activities e.g. the gym, sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Paths that accommodate multiple uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Bike paths that accommodate 'speed cycling' and/or separate pedestrians from cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Secure bike storage facilities at relevant destinations such as railway stations, transport interchange and workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Relevant amenities e.g. showers / toilets incorporated into public and private infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Integrated transport options for bikes e.g. ability to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Types of Paths

Paths will differ depending on their primary function. Some paths have a ‘transport’ focus (e.g. cycling to access work, school, shops), while others are mainly for recreation (e.g. walking or cycling to get fit, see the countryside, enjoy the outdoors).

The following table provides examples of different types of paths and the type of activities they generally cater for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Path</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>Pedestrian paths are for the exclusive use of pedestrians. Cyclists under 12 years of age are permitted to ride on footpaths. Pedestrian paths can be found in built-up environments such as in residential areas, in natural environments such as along waterways or in roadside reserves. On these paths there is a physical separation of pedestrians from vehicles and bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Path</td>
<td>Bicycle paths are for the exclusive use of cyclists. Bicycle paths can be provided on-road (e.g. bike lanes) or off-road. The exact nature of bicycle paths (e.g. width, amenities) will depend on the level of use and the degree of separation needed between cars and bicycles. These paths will generally cater for both recreation and commuter (‘at speed’) cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Path</td>
<td>Shared paths are designed to cater for a range of different users. Generally these paths are shared by walkers and cyclists but they will also be used for activities such as skateboard riding. A shared path may be along a roadside or it may travel through parkland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1 provides detailed information on path network hierarchies as proposed in the Draft Hume Integrated Land Use and Transport Strategy.

5. Benefits of Walking and Cycling

The benefits of walking and cycling are extensive and well documented. These benefits include:
- increased health and fitness outcomes particularly in relation to ‘lifestyle’ illness (e.g. obesity and diabetes)
- the opportunity for enhanced social / neighbourhood interaction and ‘conversation’
- the opportunity for involvement by a diverse range of age groups and physical abilities
- minimal or no financial outlay or requirement for specialised equipment
- the opportunity for increased activity in local neighbourhoods which enhances perceptions of safety. It also increases the passive surveillance of private and community infrastructure
- an opportunity to decreases the pressure on the public transport system
- an opportunity to lessen the impact of traditional modes of transport (e.g. noise and air pollution)

These benefits can only be realised if there is a safe, popular and well publicised path network that is well connected to key community destinations.
6. Participation in Walking and Cycling

6.1 Recreation Trends
In Australia, participation in ‘casual’ or ‘non-organised’ physical activity (e.g. walking, cycling) has increased at a significantly greater rate than participation in ‘organised’ activity (e.g. competitive sport).

Between 2001 and 2008, participation in non-organised activity increased by 12%. This compares to the relatively small increase of 1.5% in the same period for organised activity.

Of the top ten most popular (undertaken at least once in the last 12 months) non-organised physical activities for 2008 walking (most popular), cycling (4th most popular) and running (5th most popular) have particular implications for the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

The frequency of participation in walking, running and cycling also increased significantly over the last 12 months. Between 2001 and 2008 there was a 50% increase in participation in walking, a 57% increase in running and a 36% increase in cycling.

Walkers are likely to be the most active of all participants walking an average of 3 times a week followed by joggers who are likely to exercise an average of twice a week. The only activity to have experienced a larger increase in participation is aerobics / fitness with an increase of 152%.

Unlike aerobic / fitness activities, walking and cycling do not require access to an indoor facility or attendance at prescribed times. As a result, residents can choose their fitness or recreation time to suit other lifestyle demands and can participate without having to pay a fee.

Data also shows how important paths are as people age. Participation in activities such as walking increases for both males and females with age. Participation by women in walking is high across all age groups, indicating the important role paths play in providing flexible recreation and fitness opportunities.

This data highlights the important role paths play in supporting and encouraging participation in three of the top five most popular recreation activities in 2008.


6.2 Commuter Trends
The number of students walking and cycling to school remains low. However, there is an increase in the number of people cycling to work.

Between 2001 and 2006 there was an increase of 11.7% in the number of ‘cycle only’ journeys to work in the City of Melbourne. There was also an 8.5% increase in ‘cycle only’ journeys to work in nine of the inner Melbourne municipalities.

While this data cannot be directly extrapolated to Hume City there are a number of trends that have potential implications for the Hume City even if on a smaller scale. The key reasons attributed to the increase in commuter cycle journeys in these areas include:

- safer and more direct bicycle routes to the workplace
- supporting infrastructure such as secure bike storage, showers
- the development of commercial districts which result in local employment hubs
- bicycle routes that connect with other modes of transport
- road and transport congestion and
- costs associated with traditional commuter travel.

Research shows that during the 1990s 60% of all weekday bicycle trips in Melbourne were less than 5 kilometres and 38% were less than 2 kilometres. This provides valuable information for
urban planning. Ensuring key community facilities are within a 2 kilometre reach will encourage greater use of the bicycle as an alternative local transport option.

There has also been a significant shift in the way children access school. In 1974 only 7.7% of parents drove their children to school. In 2005 this had increased dramatically to 91%. It is estimated that 17% of all morning peak period vehicle travel is now school related. The reasons for this shift are various but include concerns about road crossings, distance and directness of the route to the school, concerns about children obeying road rules, poor condition of paths, traffic congestion around the school and a lack of secure bike storage at schools.

There are a number of non-path related concerns (e.g. stranger danger) that prevent parents allowing children to walk or cycle to school. However, many of the barriers can be addressed by improved path and bicycle infrastructure and community education initiatives.

Encouraging greater use of the bicycle for commuter use will require safe on-road and off-road routes that are direct. It will also require end of journey facilities such as bike storage facilities. Community education and awareness programs and safe off-road paths will also be a key requirement if an increase in the number of children walking and cycling to school is to be achieved.


6.3 Walking and Cycling in Hume

Hume residents have a lower level of walking and cycling than the adjoining Moreland LGA. This is for both recreational and commuter trips. According to the Victorian Integrated Survey of Travel and Activity (VISTA) 2007, Hume City residents make 8% of their daily trips on foot and 1% of their daily trips by bicycle. This compares with Moreland where 19% of daily trips are made on foot and 4% of daily trips are made by bicycle.

Moreland residents are also more likely to cover greater distances on their walking and cycling trips than do Hume City residents. Hume residents are likely to complete 1.5% (compared to Moreland, 4.5%) of their trips on foot and 0.1% by bicycle (compared to 3.4% in Moreland).

Consistent with these trends is the significantly higher percentage of trips undertaken in the motor vehicle by Hume City residents either as a driver (53% in Hume, 42% in Moreland) or as a passenger (29% in Hume, 18% in Moreland).

The VISTA survey also found that 1.3% of Hume City respondents walk to work compared to 2.7% in Moreland, and 0.3% ride to work compared to 3.6% in Moreland.

The significant level of walking and cycling in Moreland may be the result of a number of active transport initiatives over the last 10 years. These include the implementation of sustainable transport initiatives and the ongoing promotion of walking and cycling as a mode of transport.

7. Barriers to Walking and Cycling

Research commissioned by the State Government\(^*\) identifies a number of barriers that can discourage people from walking and cycling. These are:

- gaps in the walking and cycling path network
- a lack of connectivity between on-road and off-road cycle paths
- indirect routes to key community destinations
- inadequate infrastructure such as a poor separation of cyclists and cars or cyclists (on roads) and pedestrians (on paths), poor design of paths (isolated areas, poor lighting, blind corners for cyclists)
- poor circulation through suburbs such as streets with cul-de-sacs with no access to other streets and
- a lack of end of trip facilities such as storage and showers (for cyclists).

In addition to these practical barriers research identified attitudinal barriers that discouraged participation in walking and cycling. These barriers include the greater convenience afforded by car travel (e.g. when shopping and for multi-destination trips), exposure to bad weather and perceptions of risk. The latter is particularly relevant to parents who are concerned about unsafe road crossings and ‘stranger danger’\(^*\).

\(^*\)Reference: Encouraging Walking and Cycling Focus Group, Wallis Consulting as cited in The Victorian Cycling Strategy, 2009

8. Discussion of Key Issues

8.1 Whole of Network Planning

This strategy focuses on both on-road and off-road paths to ensure the two networks are well integrated, duplication is minimised and a range of options for accessing community facilities included.

Whole of network planning will ensure the need for local paths within and between neighbourhoods is considered alongside the need for cross city and regional paths. Regional paths will optimise connections to destinations east and west of the City as well as destinations to the north and south (e.g. Melbourne).

Regional and cross city path infrastructure supports Council and the State Government’s transport and ‘liveable city’ initiatives. These relate to cycling as a practical transport option particularly between commercial and business activity hubs in the region.

Neighbourhood paths allow residents to access community facilities such as schools and sporting grounds without the use of a car. Given Council and the Victorian Government’s objectives to encourage more active lifestyles, infrastructure that supports these initiatives is required. This infrastructure will also support school initiatives to increase physical activity through ‘walk to school / walking school bus’ and bike education programs.

Council will continue to ensure that urban and business centre planning (activity centres) strategies identify opportunities to incorporate path networks and associated amenities. These strategies are critical for achieving Council’s objectives relating to increasing alternative transport options, relieving traffic congestion and providing accessible healthy lifestyle opportunities.

8.2 Footpaths and Shared Paths

Shared paths are particularly important for those communities that have no or poor access to footpaths. Hume City suffers from a past era of subdivision planning that has left many communities with a poor footpath network. In some cases this includes the encroachment of private property onto roadsides, reducing the opportunity for the retrofitting of footpaths.
In some areas Council is looking to address this matter but faces a number of challenges (including potential need to purchase private land) in doing so. In these areas it is important that opportunities for a comprehensive shared path network to partly redress the situation be optimised.

Shared paths do not replace footpaths but rather should be an adjunct to them. It cannot be assumed that in the absence of a footpath residents will automatically use a shared path. If a shared path does not provide a direct route to a desired destination as does a footpath, then it is unlikely to be a substitute route. Instead pedestrians will resort to using local roads.

In Hume City there is a lack of footpaths alongside arterial roads. As a result residents use bike paths that were not intended for use by pedestrians. These paths were designed primarily for commuter cycling so are not appropriately designed and suited for use by pedestrians (e.g. they are very close to main roads and not of a width to cater for both pedestrians and commuter cyclists). VicRoads is the State Government Department responsible for the planning and provision of paths associated with arterial roads.

Research shows that a comprehensive footpath network is a key factor in encouraging people to be active as part of their every day routine - such as walking to the shops or walking for fitness.

It is important the planning of new greenfield subdivisions considers opportunities for on-road and off-road (shared) paths. This will ensure an integrated pedestrian and recreation bicycle network. It should be noted that commuter cyclists are likely to use on-road cycle paths in preference to off-road paths. On-road cycle paths take cyclists directly to their destination and are more continuous (e.g. less road crossings). This recognises the different role that off-road and on-road paths play as part of a transport network.

8.3 Commuter Cycling

Hume City currently does not have a path network that is encouraging of commuter cycling. There is a lack of connected on-road bicycle lanes on arterial and local roads. Cycle lanes appear on some roads only to disappear on the next, offering no consistency for on-road cyclists. Many on-road bike paths are shared with both moving and parked vehicles. This means parked cars intrude into bike lanes forcing cyclists to merge with fast moving traffic in adjacent lanes.

Currently many commuter cyclists are forced to take indirect routes to their destination to avoid cycling on busy roads. As a result the commuter cyclist has to deal with pedestrians, indirect routes to key community destinations, road crossings and not being able to travel at speed.

Conflict arises between pedestrians and commuter cyclists on ‘shared paths’ that are not designed for both pedestrian and bicycle use. These paths tend to be too narrow or have inadequate site lines and so are less suitable for a mix of activities (e.g. speed cycling and walking activities).

Conflict between pedestrians and cyclists also arises on some bike paths that are designated ‘bicycles only’. Pedestrians use these paths because there is no alternative option for them. As a result the path cannot be used for its designed purpose - commuter / speed cycling because of the presence of pedestrians.

Commuter cycling will be further encouraged when there is better provision for bicycles on the public transport system. Generally cyclists have to cease their travel by bike at a transport interchange because trains and buses have poor or no ability to accommodate bicycles.

Cyclists need to be assured of either secure bike storage facilities at transport hubs or the ability to transfer, together with their bicycles, to public transport.
8.4 Connectivity of Paths

The Hume City municipality contains key sections of the Melbourne metropolitan area's waterways and green corridors and key path routes. Although several key shared paths are located in these corridors, they are not complete and have major missing links.

In some areas the existing walking and cycling networks lack good connectivity and linkages - both at the local level and to the regional network. Sections of walking and cycling paths have been well developed. However, in contrast to the road network with its clearly defined hierarchy, there has not been the same co-ordinated approach to the planning and development of the network.

Some sections of footpaths paths and cycle routes along road reserves are missing and connections between on road and alongside road paths with paths in other open space corridors is often poor. This lack of connectivity is a disincentive to the use of paths in Hume City.

8.5 Path Infrastructure and Amenity Standards

There is little consistency in development standards for similar types of paths across Hume City. This has resulted in significant contrast in the quality of development in different areas. The reasons for this are various and include a lack of appropriate resourcing to develop the path to the requisite standard, and a lack of understanding as to the role of the path in the overall network.

Planning often appears to have been undertaken without a full understanding of user needs. Often path design does not address the requirement of the different user segments such as commuter cyclists, recreational cyclists and older walkers. Key destinations catering for walkers and cyclists, such as many railway stations, are of a low standard and / or are poorly maintained.

Broadmeadows and Jacana stations in particular, are examples of railway stations that could be better designed. This would improve perceptions of safety and encourage access by bicycle or on foot.

In many cases it is a lack of support infrastructure that will impact on the level and type of use of a path even if it is well located and should therefore attract a high level of use. If a path traverses through dark and isolated areas and has no lighting, if the path lacks seating for older residents or if it is unattractive because of a lack of shade or vegetation, the level of use will be lower than desired or expected.

Typically, the planning and development of paths in Hume City has focused on core path infrastructure such as the width and surfacing of paths. In some cases planning has considered important amenity and support infrastructure such as seating and signage. However, it has often not been installed because of a lack of funding which if not delivered does not encourage people to access these paths.

Signage is particularly important because it creates an awareness of the path, it provides a clear understanding of opportunities (e.g. cycling, walking) and user requirements (e.g. physical fitness, time to reach destinations) and communicates information about the safe use of the path. There is a need to develop a program for ensuring all existing paths are fitted with relevant signage and to ensure signage is installed as part of all new path developments.

Council’s Guidelines for the Planning, Design and Construction of Open Space recommends development standards. There is a need to review these standards to ensure they address industry best practice guidelines and incorporate additional infrastructure requirements identified in the Walking and Cycling Strategy (e.g. seating, drinking fountains and signage).
8.6 Planning and Management of Paths

There are a number of Council and industry guidelines relating to path development standards. In Hume City these standards have not been applied in a consistent manner. The classification of paths according to the role they play in the path network will determine features (e.g. width and location) required in the development of new paths, or the upgrading of existing paths.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has identified a number of completed paths that are not recorded on Council’s GIS system. It has also identified a number of paths that have been included as part of future precinct structure planning and development but again, not noted on the central GIS system.

There is need for more detailed information on the path network. Information relating to the existing condition of many paths and the gap between recommended standards and current provision is unclear for much of the network. Accurate information will provide Council with a clear picture on path upgrade and provision requirements so as to achieve the standards desired for Hume City.

A formal process for referring completed path development and upgrade works to Council records is required. This will ensure Council has up to date information on the status of the path network in the Hume City. It will also mean that maintenance works are appropriately scoped and programmed to maintain the integrity of the path network.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has identified the need for additional resourcing to ensure all paths are mapped on a central database. Centralising information will ensure records are complete and accessible for all relevant departments.

The strategy has also identified the need to allocate an appropriate maintenance budget for all new paths. This will ensure provision standards are maintained.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy recommends the formation of an interdepartmental working group to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the planning, development and management of paths and to address a number of issues raised in the strategy.

8.7 Encouraging the Use of Paths

There is an opportunity for Hume City to work with a range of community stakeholders to develop a unique citywide campaign to encourage residents into walking and cycling activities. This should incorporate existing programs such as the ‘Ride to Work Day’ and the ‘Walking School Bus’ program.

Expanding the promotional program to encourage different demographics and abilities into regular walking and cycling should be considered.

The State Government’s TravelSmart program has developed a number of initiatives with local government including municipal TravelSmart maps and travel plans. These aim to reduce dependence on cars by encouraging more sustainable modes for commuting. In the past, Hume City has been involved in programs such as TravelSmart with Kangan Batman TAFE in Broadmeadows.

Council can actively support the emergence of walking and cycling groups that target specific interests and needs (e.g. introduction to bike riding for the over 60s, fitness / jogging groups and ride to work groups), profile bike riding, walking activities and clubs in the community.

These groups will increase the range of walking and cycling options available and will provide forums through which the community can provide comment on path development needs and priorities.
A positive example of this is ‘Victoria Walks’ - a walking-for-transport health promotion charity aimed at increasing the number of people who walk. The aim of this program is to encourage vibrant, supportive and strong neighbourhoods and communities where people choose to walk wherever possible. ‘Victoria Walks’ encourages residents to undertake ‘walking audits’ to identify walking opportunities and challenges in local neighbourhoods. They also provide the platform for people to meet and form walking groups for health and fitness.

8.8 Criterium Cycling

As a component of the development of this strategy, consideration has been given to the development of a criterium track in Hume City.

Criterium is a form of cycle racing that is conducted on a specifically designed track or closed-off streets. The race length is determined by the number of laps or by a determined time.

The Greenvale Recreation Reserve Master Plan 2004 had identified the potential for a track at this site. Further discussions would be required with Parks Victoria who is responsible for the adjacent Woodlands Park if this proposal is to be further considered due to the proximity of sites and also the need to potentially extend any proposed track into Parks Victoria land.

There are a number of criterium clubs in Melbourne that conduct races on closed-off streets and there are currently two off-road tracks. These include a 2.2 km track at Casey Fields in Cranbourne and a 800 metre track at MacPherson Park in Melton. In July work commenced on a new 2.8 kilometre track in Belmont, Geelong.

This draft strategy recommends that a grant application be submitted to Sport and Recreation Victoria for funding of a feasibility study to determine the need for a criterium track in Hume City.

The aspiration or vision for the Hume City path network is for:

An attractive and functional network of paths that people of all ages and backgrounds are drawn to use because it provides a variety of opportunities, it is safe and easy to access, it provides great connection to places in the community and because trails are pleasant and attractive places to be.

The strategies for achieving this vision are as follows:

**Strategy 1 – Whole-of-Path Network Planning**

Walking and cycling routes will be planned and developed on a whole-of-network basis.

This means a planned hierarchy of local, district and regional paths to provide an effective on-road and off-road network. This network of paths will accommodate a diverse range of recreation, health and wellbeing and commuter needs. Whole-of-network planning will explore path options along natural waterways, rail and utility reserves, along roadsides and in parks.

**Strategy 2 – Connectivity of Paths**

A priority is to ensure all paths are well connected and linked with key community points of interest.

As a priority, gaps in the existing path network will be closed. Future paths will be continuous and well connected to each other and to destinations in the region.

**Strategy 3 – Standards of Provision**

Paths will be designed according to prescribed standards and in consideration of the primary function or use of the path.

Paths will be identified according to their role in the network as recreation or commuter paths and designed to relevant standards. Provision guidelines will address considerations such as the type of path surface; directional, distance, safety and interpretive signage; shade and access to seating, water and toilets across the network.

**Strategy 4 – Community Planning**

Opportunities to increase walking and cycling will be incorporated in all urban and town planning projects.

All urban planning undertaken by Council (e.g. precinct / activity centre plans) or proposed to Council (e.g. by developers) will be required to consider opportunities to optimise the incorporation of paths for future recreation, health and wellbeing and commuter benefits. This will require consideration of design, connectivity between on-road and off-road paths and design for safety.

**Strategy 5 – Management of Paths**

Paths will be managed to ensure safe, clean and attractive environments and usage will be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure they continue to address community needs.

An allocation for both the capital and ongoing maintenance costs associated with paths will be identified in council budgets.
Strategy 6 – Optimising the Use and Benefits of Paths
Paths will be promoted and developed to optimise use and benefits to the community

Promotional initiatives will be developed with community organisations (e.g. schools, recreation clubs, transport agencies) and the media to optimise social, economic and environmental outcomes.

Strategy 7 – Partnerships
Community, government and private partnerships will be sought and encouraged to develop the path network.

The City’s walking and cycling networks will be planned and developed in association with other management agencies (e.g. VicRoads, Parks Victoria), neighbouring councils, and with local interest groups such as the Hume BUGs group. This will ensure integration of routes and infrastructure standards.

10. Future Path Development Requirements

Any proposals for future paths, including path upgrades will have to demonstrate how they address Council’s path planning and development requirements. These requirements are outlined below and are detailed in documents referenced in section 3.1.

Future path development proposals must demonstrate:

1. An understanding of how the path fits into the overall path network and addresses development requirements.
   Example
   - Path developed to the requisite standard for state / regional, neighbourhood and local paths in Hume City e.g. relevant widths, surface
   - Appropriate provision of both on-road and off-road paths, commuter and recreation paths etc.
   - Direct path routes to relevant destinations.

2. Design and provision requirements as per the role of the path in the overall network.
   Example
   - Design of pedestrian only, bicycle only and shared pathways to address different use requirements.

3. Specific design and safety requirements for different types of paths.
   Example
   - Bicycle only commuter lanes on arterial roads as opposed to bike lanes that are shared with parked and / or turning vehicles
   - Safety signage at intersections and road crossings.

4. How intersections with other paths and vehicle carriageways will be designed and developed.
   Example
   - Pedestrian islands
   - Traffic calming measures.

5. Strategies for connecting new paths to existing paths.
   Example
   - Ensuring paths in new estates are linked or can easily be linked to existing paths
   Example
   - Continuity of access through local neighbourhoods e.g. no ‘deadend’ walking routes such as at the end of cul-de-sacs or at estate boundaries.
   - Access to both recreation and commuter paths
   - Off-road pedestrian access.

7. Appropriate ‘end of destination’ design and facility provision.
   Example
   - Separation of pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic, particularly at school arrival points
   - Secure and easily accessible bike storage facilities e.g. transport hubs and schools.

8. Landscape and amenity provision.
   Example
   - Vegetation plantings
   - Landscaping
   - Seating
   - Water provision.

   Example
   - Route of path / site lines
   - Line marking
   - Width and surfacing of paths
   - ‘Safety’ signage e.g. on approach to road crossings, pinch points, where there may be a conflict between different users such as dog off-leash and cycling.

10. Relevant provision of signage.
    Example
    - Safety / potential risk awareness signage
    - Directional signage
    - Distance signage
    - Interpretative signage.

11. How the path addresses Council’s policy objectives.
    Example
    - ‘Active transport’ / alternative transport initiatives
    - ‘Getting Hume active’ programs
    - Liveable neighbourhoods.
11. Criteria for Determining Path Development Priorities

The Walking and Cycling Strategy has identified in excess of 40 paths (excluding footpaths*) for development over the next 5 years (refer section 13). These projects vary significantly in length and the standard to which they will be developed (that is, in line with the path hierarchy). As a result the installation of these longer paths will be staged in accordance with the resources available.

The following criteria have been developed to guide the setting of priorities for development of paths and associated infrastructure including car parking, disability access, landscaping, signage and toilets to ensure desired outcomes.

* Footpath development priorities as identified in Council’s footpath works plan

1. Minimises risk associated with paths
   E.g. Works make the path safer for users and / or minimises risk implications for Council.

2. Completion of gaps in the existing path network
   E.g. Gaps in existing paths and to key destinations.

3. Improves access to key destinations
   E.g. Works will improve pedestrian and cyclist access to activity centres, residential areas, education hubs, transport connections including those located in adjoining suburbs and neighbourhoods.

4. Path identified in planning documents
   E.g. The path has been identified as a priority in Council or State Government planning documents such as precinct structure plans or the Principal Bicycle Network development plan.

5. No / minimal alternative options to paths for pedestrians and young cyclists
   E.g. Works provide the community with a pedestrian pathway (and pathway for young cyclists) that is not otherwise available in the community such as in areas with no footpaths.

6. Current and future demand
   E.g. Works are needed to provide more appropriately for the existing level of use and to plan for future projected use and / or the path is part of a higher order path (e.g. regional path) or is a commuter path.

7. Poor / inadequate level of path provision in the area
   E.g. paths are narrow, have poor surveillance or do not have a sealed surface.

8. Cost of ancillary infrastructure required
   E.g. Cost of providing required ancillary infrastructure such as car parking, disability seats, water fountains, signage, toilets to ensure desired outcomes.

9. Path is of cultural / heritage / environmental value
   E.g. The path adds to the preservation or enhancement of indigenous heritage or the greening of the area.
12. Review of the Walking and Cycling Strategy

A review process is important to ensure the strategy remains relevant and up-to-date. It is important the principles and actions included in the strategy reflect the changing needs and priorities of Council, the community and other stakeholders.

The Walking and Cycling Strategy will be reviewed:

- **Annually**
  This will provide the opportunity to reassign priorities, if necessary, based on resourcing availability, changing priorities, additional research and needs assessment and emerging issues that were not apparent during the development of the strategy.

- **3 years**
  An internal review of the strategy will be completed in year 3 to identify high priority projects that have not been completed and to reschedule these in view of other priorities.

- **5 years**
  A comprehensive review of the strategy, including full community consultation process, will be undertaken in year 5.
13. Action Plan
This section outlines the key actions for the next 5 years required to address the issues identified in the document. The first year of works will commence in the 2010/11 financial year.

- TABLE 1 - Planning and management actions.
- TABLE 2 - Path development and significant upgrade projects for which Council is responsible.
- TABLE 3 - Path development projects for which other agencies will be responsible (e.g. Parks Victoria and VicRoads).
- TABLE 4 - Remedial works to paths that will primarily be the responsibility of Council.

TABLE 1 – Planning and Management Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Path hierarchy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Adopt the path hierarchy outlined in this document as the framework for future path planning and development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Path development working group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Establish an inter departmental working group to:&lt;br&gt;- ensure a co-ordinated approach to the planning and development of the path network&lt;br&gt;- establish a process for incorporating all existing and proposed paths (on-road and off-road) are documented and mapped&lt;br&gt;- establishing a process for altering the status of paths (e.g. proposed to complete) and referring these to the path maintenance program&lt;br&gt;- ensure a co-ordinated approach to seeking partnerships and external funding of paths&lt;br&gt;- ensure a consistent approach to the development of different classification of paths.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Review of provision standards</strong>&lt;br&gt;Review Council’s provision standards for paths and associated infrastructure taking into account best practice provision. The review should address provision standards relating to directional and interpretative signage, provision of water, built and natural shade, vegetation and landscaping, seating, access to toilets, fencing, car parking, bike storage facilities (e.g. railway stations) and bike parking facilities (e.g. commercial and recreation centres) and other requirements as identified through path planning processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Criterium Track</strong>&lt;br&gt;Make application to Sport and Recreation Victoria for funding to conduct a feasibility study to determine the need for a criterium track in Hume City.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Path development priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Current provision audit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Gap audit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Centralising of path network information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>Path maps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Increasing participation in walking and cycling activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Path development priorities**
   Adopt the criteria in section 11 of the Walking and Cycling Strategy as the criteria that will guide the path development priorities.

6. **Current provision audit**
   Complete a Current Condition / Provision Audit (via electronic means GIS) of all paths to:
   - ensure all existing paths are recorded
   - ensure paths included in Precinct Structure Plans are recorded
   - identify risk management issues
   - identify current levels of provision (e.g. path surfaces and width, seating, access to water, directional and distance signage and landscaping) and condition.

7. **Gap audit**
   Identify all new and upgrade works and infrastructure required to bring paths up to Hume City provision standards (through GIS mapping as above)
   Based on the information provided through the proposed audit of paths (included in project 6), identify additional infrastructure requirements to ensure paths comply with Council (and other relevant) development guidelines.

8. **Centralising of path network information**
   Identify requirements for enabling Council to record and centralise all information necessary for the effective planning, management and development of the path network.

9. **Path maps**
   Provide an annual allocation for the production of new (for areas not covered by existing maps e.g. Travel Smart Maps) and updating of existing information.

10. **Increasing participation in walking and cycling activities**
    Develop a program of path related promotional and activity initiatives that aim to:
    - ‘get Hume active’ in walking and cycling
    - encourage commuter cycling
    - encourage the use of paths
    - increase community participation in the development of paths

---

**Note:**

- 1 = Year 1
- 2 = Year 2
- N/R = Not Required
- Annual = Annual Allocation
- $50,000 = $50,000 Budget
- $35,000 = $35,000 Budget
- $10,000 = $10,000 Budget
- N/R = Not Required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PATH / WORKS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUBURBS</th>
<th>PATH CLASSIF'N</th>
<th>PRIORITY (1-5)</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>EST. COST TO COUNCIL</th>
<th>FUNDING / PROPOSED YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage installation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of destination and interpretive signage for paths</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Council $45,000-10/11, $10,000-13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Creek Reserve / Salesian College connection</td>
<td>BCR5</td>
<td>Missing links from Elizabeth Drive to Sunbury Town Centre via Salesian College, and upgrades to existing pedestrian path</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Council $125,000-10/11, $300,000-11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlink</td>
<td>Mead 1</td>
<td>Seabrook Reserve through BM CAD, Johnstone Street and link with Western Ring Rd Bike Path</td>
<td>Broadmeadows</td>
<td>D - R / S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>TBD - Subject to a report to Council. Funds not currently allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Ponds Creek Trail</td>
<td>MPC1</td>
<td>From traffic signals at corner of North Circular Drive &amp; Broadmeadows Rd to link to Moonee Ponds Creek Trail</td>
<td>Westmeadows</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>Council $8,000-10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigieburn Railway Trail</td>
<td>CRT1</td>
<td>Extend sealed path from Limpopa Square to train station Roxburgh Park Craigieburn</td>
<td>Roxburgh Park Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>VicRoads part funding, Council $180,000-11/12, $220,000-12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken Creek</td>
<td>AIC3</td>
<td>From rear of 24 Eastgate Rd to Melbourne Water Pipe Track (existing path just stops)</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>VicRoads part funding, Council $25,000-11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Creek</td>
<td>MaC1</td>
<td>From west side of Sydney Rd (heading east) between existing Malcolm Creek Trail to Amaroo Rd &amp; Hume Freeway Trail</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Council $205,000-12/13, $395,000-13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek - connections</td>
<td>MeC3</td>
<td>East west Greenway corridor along the water pipe track between Roxburgh Park and Mt Aitken and Aitken Creek</td>
<td>Roxburgh Park Craigieburn</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>TBD - Subject to a report to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spavin Drive Lake</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>From Spavin Drive to lake and around lake</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D - R / S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Council Funds not yet committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nook</td>
<td>TN1</td>
<td>Path to Salesian College-follow recycled water pipeline (part of Missing Links submission)</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Council, DPChD (Creating Better Places)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 1 PROJECTS** $4,123,000 $2,023,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PATH / WORKS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>WORKS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUBURB/S</th>
<th>PATH CLASSIF'N</th>
<th>PRIORITY (1-5)</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>EST. COST TO COUNCIL</th>
<th>FUNDING / PROPOSED YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek</td>
<td>MoC1</td>
<td>Craigieburn Rd to join with Hume Freeway trail</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Council Funds not yet committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 2 PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,925,000</td>
<td>$2,825,000</td>
<td>Funds not yet committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attwood Creek</td>
<td>AtC1</td>
<td>Along Attwood Creek between Palomino Valley Crescent and Chisholm Avenue * refer to Pipe Track alignment and link to existing</td>
<td>Greenvale Attwood</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attwood Creek Reserve</td>
<td>AtC2</td>
<td>Rear of 16 Maxwell Court to Gatehouse Drive/ Stonebridge Way</td>
<td>Atwood</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksons Creek</td>
<td>JaC1</td>
<td>Extend path to the north, Sunbury Town Centre to Emu Bottom, following the line of the creek</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Developer, Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksons Creek / Maribyrnong River</td>
<td>JaC2</td>
<td>Sunbury to Brimbank Park</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>4 *</td>
<td>TBD following feasibility study</td>
<td>TBD following feasibility study</td>
<td>Parks Vic, Council, Brimbank CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksons Hill</td>
<td>JaH1</td>
<td>Path from Circular Drive to Belleview Drive / York Place</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlynston Creek Corridor</td>
<td>MrC1</td>
<td>Connection from Kingston Gardens to Northcorp Business Park</td>
<td>Broadmeadow s</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Mt Aitken to Pask’s Providence Estate to west side of Greenvale Reservoir - link into the reservoir to be negotiated</td>
<td>Greenvale Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Reservoir bund link to Aitken Boulevard</td>
<td>Greenvale</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Mickleham Rd Drainage Reserve to Somerton Rd</td>
<td>Mickleham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve at end of Powlett Street</td>
<td>PoS1</td>
<td>Between end of Powlett Street through to Station Street</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek – Northern Section</td>
<td>MoC4</td>
<td>Between Malcolm Creek and Amaroo Rd</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 3 PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Council Funds are not committed for the following projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hume City Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PATH / WORKS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUBURBS</th>
<th>PATH CLASSIF’N</th>
<th>PRIORITY (1-5)</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>EST. COST TO COUNCIL</th>
<th>FUNDING / PROPOSED YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek Park linear trail</td>
<td>MeC5</td>
<td>Between Mahoney's Rd and Craigieburn Rd</td>
<td>Campbellfield Craigieburn</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Parks Vic, Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Ponds Creek Trail</td>
<td>MPC2</td>
<td>Extend to Woodlands and then onto Bulla township</td>
<td>Greenvale Bulla</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek - connections</td>
<td>MeC2</td>
<td>East/west along Patullos Lane</td>
<td>Roxburgh Park</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Airport</td>
<td>MeA1</td>
<td>Upgrade link from Woodlands Park to the airport. Some of the trail will be 'on-Rd'.</td>
<td>Greenvale</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Melbourne Airport, Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken Boulevard</td>
<td>Ait</td>
<td>Somerton Rd to Mt Ridley Rd</td>
<td>Greenvale Roxburgh Pk Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Various stages</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Council, Developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 4 PROJECTS** | **$8,779,500** | **$4,329,500** | Council Funds not yet committed |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PATH / WORKS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUBURBS</th>
<th>PATH CLASSIF’N</th>
<th>PRIORITY (1-5)</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>EST. COST TO COUNCIL</th>
<th>FUNDING / PROPOSED YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek Park linear trail</td>
<td>MeC5</td>
<td>Between Mahoney's Rd and Craigieburn Rd</td>
<td>Campbellfield Craigieburn</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Parks Vic, Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Ponds Creek Trail</td>
<td>MPC2</td>
<td>Extend to Woodlands and then onto Bulla township</td>
<td>Greenvale Bulla</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merri Creek - connections</td>
<td>MeC2</td>
<td>East/west along Patullos Lane</td>
<td>Roxburgh Park</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Airport</td>
<td>MeA1</td>
<td>Upgrade link from Woodlands Park to the airport. Some of the trail will be 'on-Rd'.</td>
<td>Greenvale</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Melbourne Airport, Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken Boulevard</td>
<td>Ait</td>
<td>Somerton Rd to Mt Ridley Rd</td>
<td>Greenvale Roxburgh Pk Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Various stages</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Council, Developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 5 PROJECTS** | **$4,700,000** | **$4,050,000** |

**TOTAL** | **$20,677,500** | **$13,377,500** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PATH</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUBURBS</th>
<th>PATH CLASSIF’N</th>
<th>PRIORITY (1-5)</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>EST. COST TO COUNCIL</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadows Valley Park</td>
<td>BVP1</td>
<td>Access across Somerton Rd from both sides of the creek from Clare Blvd &amp; Lynton Crt to the Reservoir and into R1</td>
<td>Greenvale Meadow Heights</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>VicRoads; $100,000-Path; $50,000-Ped Isl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Creek Reserve</td>
<td>BCR2</td>
<td>North side between Killara PS (pedestrian bridge) and Phillip Drive</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fed Gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 1 PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken Creek</td>
<td>AIC1</td>
<td>Craigieburn Rd to Northern Arterial</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upfield Train Line Path</td>
<td>UpT1</td>
<td>Extend trail all the way along the railway line</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 3 PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadows Valley Park Linear trail</td>
<td>BVP4</td>
<td>Between Glenmore Place and Somerton Rd</td>
<td>Meadow Heights</td>
<td>R / S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigieburn Rd</td>
<td>CRd1</td>
<td>Highlands Lake to E14</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer (Stockland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigieburn Rd</td>
<td>CRd2</td>
<td>E14 to Dorchester (North side)</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer (Bovis Land Lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martynston Creek Corridor Linear trail</td>
<td>MC2</td>
<td>Dallas Drive to Barry Rd</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Creek</td>
<td>MC2</td>
<td>Craigieburn Blvd to Mt Ridley Rd</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N / D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 4 PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitken Creek</td>
<td>AIC2</td>
<td>West into DeMaria (VicUrban) land</td>
<td>Craigieburn</td>
<td>N / D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Creek Reserve</td>
<td>BCR3</td>
<td>North of Phillip Drive along Blind creek, towards Mt Holden</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksons Hill</td>
<td>JaH2</td>
<td>Railway Reserve - Shields Street to Wangnu reserve</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 5 PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF PATH</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>SUBURB/S</td>
<td>TRAIL CLASSIF’N</td>
<td>PRIORITY (1-5)</td>
<td>COST ESTIMATE</td>
<td>COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td>FUNDING SOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Salesian College and Sunbury Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>BCR6</td>
<td>This completes works proposed in the ‘Missing Links’ submission</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>N / D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>Council Funds not yet committed to the following projects, DPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Ponds Creek Trail</td>
<td>MPC3</td>
<td>Pedestrian bridge at Jacana Reserve to Carrick Dve</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kismet Creek Path</td>
<td>Kis1</td>
<td>Racecourse Rd to Elizabeth Drive</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway between Swinton Way and Barymore Rd</td>
<td>Sw1</td>
<td>Barymore Rd to Swinton Way / Swinton Way to Palomino Valley Ct</td>
<td>Greenvale</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewarts Lane Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Stew1</td>
<td>Between 3 &amp; 5 Allen to 8 &amp; 10 Dalkeith</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL FOR PRIORITY 5 PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$580,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$380,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,555,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Detailed Definitions of Paths
### Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Path</th>
<th>Name of Path</th>
<th>On/Off Road</th>
<th>Description &amp; Design Characteristics</th>
<th>Typical Cross Section</th>
<th>Picture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PEDESTRIAN PATH | Footpath | Off-Road | - For exclusive use of Pedestrians  
- Allow Cyclists only under 12 years-old  
- HIGH degree of separation  
- All roads should have footpaths  
- Width: 1.5m – 2.0m (Planning Scheme) | ![Footpath Cross Section](image1) | ![Footpath Picture](image2) |
|             | Pedestrian Trails | Off-Road | - For exclusive use of Pedestrians  
- Cyclist only under 12 years-old  
- Run along water bodies, linear tracks and in a nature environment  
- Link neighbourhoods into the existing walking and cycling networks  
- HIGH degree of separation  
- Footpath width: 1.5m – 2.0m (Planning Scheme)  
- Minimum width of 2.5m for shared path, see specifications below | ![Pedestrian Trails Cross Section](image3) | ![Pedestrian Trails Picture](image4) |
## Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PATH</th>
<th>NAME OF PATH</th>
<th>ON/OFF ROAD</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>TYPICAL CROSS SECTION</th>
<th>PICTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shared path (Nature environment) | Off-Road | - Pedestrians and cyclists share the path, bicycle users must give way to pedestrian path users  
- Path can be lined marked or not  
- Paths would be signed  
- Run along parks, rivers, railways, etc  
- HIGH degree of separation of separation of pedestrians/cyclists from vehicles, but MEDIUM degree of separation between pedestrians and cyclists  
- Width: 2.5m – 4.0m (Cycle Notes No.21) | ![Typical Cross Section](image1.png) | ![Picture](image2.png) |
| Shared path (Built-up environment) | Off-Road | - Pedestrians and cyclists share the path, bicycle users must give way to pedestrian path users  
- Paths would be signed as shared paths  
- HIGH degree of separation of separation of pedestrians/cyclists from vehicles – care must be taken at intersections and designed to minimise vehicle crossovers (driveways)  
- MEDIUM degree of separation between pedestrians and cyclists  
- Width: 2.5m – 4.0m (Cycle Notes No.21) | ![Typical Cross Section](image3.png) | ![Picture](image4.png) |
# Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Path</th>
<th>Name of Path</th>
<th>On/Off Road</th>
<th>Description &amp; Design Characteristics</th>
<th>Typical Cross Section</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Separated Path | Separated One-way or Two-way path | Off-Road | - Pedestrians and cyclists are separated  
- Paths would be signed as shared paths  
- HIGH degree of separation between pedestrians and cyclists  
- HIGH degree of separation of separation of pedestrians/cyclists from vehicles – care must be taken at intersections and designed to minimise vehicle crossovers (driveways)  
One way: Separated footpath and bicycle path  
- Minimum width total: 3.0m  
- Desirable minimum width footpath: 1.5m  
- Desirable minimum width bike lane: 1.5m (Austroads Part 6A)  
Two way: Separated footpath and bi-directional bicycle path  
- Desirable minimum width total: 4.5m  
- Desirable minimum width footpath: 2.0m  
- Desirable minimum width dual bike lane: 2.5m (Austroads Part 6A) | ![Typical Cross Section](image1.jpg) | ![Example](image2.jpg) (bi-directional bike path adjacent to footpath) |
### Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PATH</th>
<th>NAME OF PATH</th>
<th>ON/OFF ROAD</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>TYPICAL CROSS SECTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BICYCLE PATH| Separated Bike Lane | Can be either On-Road (separated by buffer), or Off-Road | • For exclusive use of Cyclists  
• One-way bicycle traffic  
• Requires minimum 0.5m buffer zone from traffic  
• HIGH degree of separation  
• Desirable Width: 2.0m – 2.50m, includes buffer 0.5 (Cycle Notes No.7) | ![Typical Cross Section](image1.png) | [Swanston St, Melbourne](image2.png) |
| BICYCLE PATH| Separated Bi-Directional Bike Lane | Can be either On-Road (separated by buffer), or Off-Road | • For exclusive use of Cyclists  
• Two-way bicycle traffic  
• Requires minimum 0.5m buffer zone from traffic  
• HIGH degree of separation  
• Desirable Width: 3.0m – 3.50m (Cycle Notes No.7)  
• Width: 2.5m – 4.0m (Austroads Part 6A) | ![Typical Cross Section](image3.png) | [Fitzroy St, St Kilda](image4.png) |
## Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PATH</th>
<th>NAME OF PATH</th>
<th>ON/OFF ROAD</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION &amp; DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>TYPICAL CROSS SECTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BICYCLE PATH | Exclusive Kerbside Bike Lane | On-Road | - For exclusive use of Cyclists  
- One-way bicycle traffic  
- HIGH degree of separation  
- Desirable Width: 1.7m – 2.50m (Cycle Notes No.7) | ![Typical Cross Section](image1.png) | ![Example](image2.png) |
| BICYCLE PATH | Exclusive Bike Lane with Parking adjacent | On-Road | - For exclusive use of Cyclists  
- One-way bicycle traffic  
- HIGH degree of separation  
- Desirable Width: 1.7m – 2.50m (Cycle Notes No.7) | ![Typical Cross Section](image3.png) | ![Example](image4.png) |
## Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Path</th>
<th>Name of Path</th>
<th>On/Off Road</th>
<th>Description &amp; Design Characteristics</th>
<th>Typical Cross Section</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BICYCLE PATH | Widened Parking Lane          | On-Road     | - Cyclists ride next to parked cars and share a wider left traffic lane with them.  
- MEDIUM degree of separation  

Limitations:  
Cyclists can feel squeezed and there is often not enough of a buffer zone between cyclists and car doors. Employ a wider width to allow more room to clear the “door zone”.  

- Desirable Width: 4.0m – 4.50m (includes parking requirement) (Cycle Notes No.7) | ![Typical Cross Section](image1.png) | ![Example](image2.png) |
| BICYCLE PATH | Wider kerbside Bike lane      | On-Road     | - Cyclists ride in a wider left traffic lane sharing with vehicles.  
- LOW degree of separation  

- Desirable Width: 4.2m – 4.5m (Cycle Notes No.7) | ![Typical Cross Section](image3.png) | ![Example](image4.png) |
### Appendix 1: Walking & Cycling Networks – Path Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Path</th>
<th>Name of Path</th>
<th>On/Off Road</th>
<th>Description &amp; Design Characteristics</th>
<th>Typical Cross Section</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BICYCLE PATH| Shared Bike / Parking lane | On-Road | - Cyclists ride in the parking lane, but are forced into the traffic lane when a car is parked in the lane  
- LOW degree of separation  
Limitations:  
- Parked cars take up the bike lane forcing cyclists merge into traffic lane  
- These do not meet best practice standards as drivers might not be expecting cyclists to merge into traffic lane.  
- Width: 2.0m (Parking lane width) | ![Typical Cross Section](image) | ![Example](image) |

*NOT ACCEPTABLE*
The Principal Bicycle Network (PBN) is a network of cycle routes that provide access to key destinations within the Melbourne metropolitan area.

The PBN was primarily concerned with on-road bicycle infrastructure (mostly bicycle lanes on arterial roads), however, the PBN is currently under review and now has a focus more on:
- increased use of local roads
- increased use of off-road paths (in some cases utilising the MTN, railway corridors and nature reserves)
- more 'destination-focused', connecting activity centres, Central Activity Districts and the CBD to their cycling catchments
- design principle of maximising separation between cyclists and motorists, as well as other priority treatments

VicRoads
(Council to identify projects, plan and advocate)

The Metropolitan Trail Network (MTN) is a network of recreational routes in metropolitan Melbourne, largely consisting of shared pedestrian bicycle paths.

The majority of routes on the MTN are off-road, but there are a number of short sections of on-road routes that link sections of off-road paths.

While the primary function of the MTN is to provide for recreational use, there are a number of routes that are popular with commuter cyclists as well. These routes can serve an arterial cycling function. The MTN is also integrated with the Principal Bicycle Network.

Parks Victoria has the primary responsibility for coordinating the development of the MTN

VicRoads and local councils may fund and implement MTN projects on land they manage.

Local Networks
Consist of local routes that link neighbourhoods, these can be on or off-road. They provide access to parks, schools, housing, jobs and link into the PBN and MTN networks.

Council
Appendix 2 – Existing and Proposed Paths in Hume City Council
Appendix 3 - Key Reference Documents

The following table lists the key policy documents that have been taken into account in the preparation of the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Australian National Cycling Strategy 2005-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Greenhouse Strategy 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victorian Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Melbourne 2030, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Victorian Cycling Strategy, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Victorian Transport Plan, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth Area Authority Precinct Planning Guidelines, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking People and Spaces, Parks Victoria, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing for Pedestrians: Principles and Guidelines for Improving Pedestrian Access to Destinations and Urban Spaces, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Victorian Trails Strategy 2005-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hume City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hume City Plan 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hume Council Plan 2009-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open Space Strategy 2010-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated Land Use and Transport Strategy (currently being developed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development Principles - Recreation and Community Facilities (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leisure Strategy 2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport Priorities Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal Public and Community Health Strategy 2007-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadmeadow Transit City – Access and Mobility Strategy (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Various township plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following documents are of particular relevance to the Hume Walking and Cycling Strategy:

**Document - Planning for Community Infrastructure in Growth Areas** (Municipal Association of Victoria, 2008)

This document details planning and provision standards for community facilities and infrastructure including sport and recreation facilities and paths in growth areas (includes the Hume City).

The document highlights the need for off-road paths, on-road lanes, wide left lanes and bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities. The provision model for growth areas recommended a connected on and off road path network which allows for bike and pedestrian use and links key facilities in the development areas (schools, parks, commercial areas, recreation facilities, cultural facilities and transport nodes. It is also recommended that paths should be through and around active and passive parks which link facilities in parks and connect to the main path network (page 110).

In planning for these facilities the document recognises the need to cater for both commuter and recreation a / fitness walking and cycling (page 80) and to incorporate the following key design requirements – sealed paths which are disability accessible, sufficient width to accommodate cyclists and walkers, good sightlines, suitably shaded and lit rest areas and bike parking facilities on the path network.

**Document - Development Principles – Recreation and Community Facilities** (Hume City Council, 2006)

This document details the principles used by Council to guide the planning of recreation and other community infrastructure.
The document identifies the following requirements for pathways and landscaping in ‘district’ open space facilities and in ‘principal population centres’. That is, shared pathways should be a minimum of 2.5 metres in width, connected to facilities and residential areas; should include landscaping that reinforces neighbourhood character and design and trees that provide shade to activity areas. (pages 19, 21).

The document makes specific reference to linkages in section 7.7 (page 23) which highlights the need for recreation facilities and communities to be connected by a network of paths and access ways; for a combination of street pathway and purpose designed linkages; for a minimum standard of provision to be adhered to other than where restrictions e.g. lack of land, design limitations may prevent this; of a design that minimises risk e.g. optimising of passive surveillance, width relevant to use.

**Document - Planning For All of Melbourne** – The Victorian Government response to the Melbourne 2030 audit

Of particular reference to the Walking and Cycling Strategy is the ‘Keep Melbourne Moving Plan’ (Congestion strategy) which plans to deliver new walking and cycling infrastructure to provide more transport choice (page 14).

**Document - Broadmeadows Transit City Master Plan** (Hume City Council, 2004)

This document provides a development plan for the Broadmeadows town centre in line with Hume City Council planning objectives, the State Government’s Transit Cities Program and Melbourne 2030.

The document makes specific reference to street and pedestrian networks (page 13) including the need for better connections across the area, residential frontages to support improved circulation, especially for pedestrians so residents can better access community facilities. Notations for ‘good street design’ (page 14) makes reference to the need for maximising footpath widths to encourage social activities and improve circulation; safe road crossing points for pedestrians (e.g. good sightlines); good wheelchair / disability access; improving passive surveillance of open space facilities

**Document - Council Plan (2009-2013)**

Council proposes to adopt and implement the actions in the Walking and Cycling Strategy (page 25) in support of its objective to develop a strong and cohesive community where residents have equitable access to services and are supported to take up opportunities to actively participate in community life and realise their potential. (page 22)

**Document - Hume City Plan 2030**

This document was prepared to provide Council with a framework for achieving its key City development objectives. The document highlights Council’s plan to support the regional provision of shared pathways linking all key townships within Hume with Melbourne’s key trail network by 2030 (page 10)


This document provides a strategy for addressing key health and wellbeing issues in Hume. The plan compares a number of physical activity outcomes for Hume with general community trends. Of particular relevance to the Walking and Cycling Strategy are the following findings:

- Males and females in the North and West Metropolitan region are less likely to exercise daily compared to the Victorian population
- Ischaemic heart disease is the largest contributor towards reduced life expectancy in Hume
- Obesity is the largest contributor to burden of disease for females and the third largest for males in Hume
- General health status of school children in Hume is consistently lower than across Victoria as a whole, and lower than regional figures

To address these findings the MHWP recommends:
- the development and implementation of the Walking and Cycling Strategy, and
- the implement of projects that encourage sustained physical activity and healthy by design principles.


This document details the classification of Hume’s open space assets, principles that underpin provision of open space, objectives for each precinct, and provision standards. Provides guidelines / standards of provision for paths and associated facilities. Of particular reference for the Walking and Cycling Strategy are:

- Section 2, Part 3 – Networks and Linkages
- Section 3 – Open Space Classification System
- Section 4 – Precinct Objectives
- Section 5, Part 8 – Paths and Bicycle Facilities, page 48; Part 8 - Signage

**Document – Broadmeadows Valley Park Management Plan Summary Report 2007**

This document outlines the management and development priorities for the park in terms of conservation, landscape management and parkland management zones. Of particular relevance to the Walking and Cycling Strategy is the need for:

- Enhanced / additional recreation amenities to address the lack of park furniture (seating), park lighting, entry, destination and interpretive signage, toilets and water / drinking fountains
- Upgraded path infrastructure to address poor connectivity to the town centre, public transport and community facilities; to upgrade path surfacing, maintenance, bridge crossings and disabled access; and to improve the natural amenity of path environments (e.g. shade and environmental plantings)