

Byron Shire PAMP and Bike Plan

PSA response to TIAC comments on Draft PAMP and Bike Plan

1/05/2019

| BSC comment | PSA response |
|--|--|
| Add commentary on the Draft Transport Strategy (“include discussion of this work, its objectives and potential to better guide a strategic approach to development of the Bike/PAMP Plan”) – Dan to confirm if required | As discussed with D. Strzina on 29/04/19, the Draft Transport Strategy is very much still in its infancy (has not yet gone to tender) so cannot be mention with any confidence. Sentence added to Section 2 in PAMP and Bike Plan stating that each plan supports and aligns with state and local planning |
| Review/add in ‘Cape Byron Masterplan (2017)’ | As per phone call on 29/04/19, D. Strzina happy that all relevant documents already discussed in PAMP and Bike Plan. With above sentence added, no need for further reviews |
| Prepare plan integration graphic | Plan integration graphic prepared and inserted into Section 2 of both plans |
| “Expand discussion on Multi-Use Byron Shire Rail Corridor Study to make clear that study includes activation of rail within the corridor. Also note potential benefit of this more integrated model. Eg Bikes linking with and on rail transport extend the cyclists range and potential destinations. Can assist to overcome the limitations of providing bike lanes throughout rural areas by linking to urban centres” | Discussion of Multi Use Byron Shire Rail Corridor study expanded in both plans as requested |
| Amend discussion on the Casino to Murwillumbah Rail Trail Study – “the ‘rail trail’ study is a proposal for a single use of the corridor and is not consistent with Council’s commitment to the multi use study. What purpose does the reference to ‘estimated \$950 million required to reintroduce passenger services to the line’ serve for the Bike/PAMP? The study that produced the estimate is divisive and largely discredited (for example the solar train refurbishment of the line had significantly lower actual per kilometre costs)” | Discussion of the Casino to Murwillumbah Rail Trail study amended in both plans as requested |
| “Omit all references to the ‘rail trail’ as this is identified in the public mind as a specific proposal and is unnecessarily divisive for the purposes of the Bike/PAMP. Cycling and walking in the rail corridor are being considered as part of a multi use corridor and routes within the corridor would be better referred to as a multi use corridor rather than ‘the rail trail’” | All references to the rail trail removed from both plans. Replaced with multi use corridor throughout |
| Add commentary re: visitor numbers | Additional commentary re: visitor numbers and their relationship to walking and cycling added to Section 2 in Bike Plan. Specific visitor numbers by locality not available |
| Add commentary re: the importance of linking bike and pedestrian paths/routes with known and critical public transport infrastructure and stops (“Promotes increased cycling and walking as is more practical and useful”) | Additional commentary re: passenger transport and integration with walking added to PAMP under 'Passenger transport' sub-headings in Section 2 |
| Add “the integration of networks and transport modes (eg bus stops and other modes of public transport) as a strategic philosophy” | Reference is made to the integration between networks and transport modes in the design principles and the prioritisation table. Therefore no further reference added |
| Show on the plans the proposed bus terminal in Butler Street | This has not been added as the PT attractors (and other land use attractors) have purposefully not been added to the maps due to the distraction from the works packages and route priorities. Connections between Butler Street and Jonson Street (across rail line) amended to align with Railway precinct planning. |
| Prepare prioritisation graphic | Additional text, table and graphic added to section 5.2 to further outline the prioritisation process and the multiple components to it. |
| Improve clarity of prioritisation and implications (mention Climate Change, “explain that the high priorities listed may not in actual fact be the ones that get funded. Projects are primarily driven by grants, and funding sources”, “future priorities will be dynamic and change based on the development/delivery of facilities in the network”) | Additional text, table and graphic added to section 5.2 to further outline the prioritisation process and the multiple components to it. |
| Review Byron Bay prioritised routes following DM comment | Routes in Byron Bay reviewed. Connections between Butler Street and Jonson Street (across rail line) amended to align with Railway precinct planning. No change to route priorities |
| Add cost graphs from presentation to both plans | Cost graphs and additional commentary added to both plans |