



8.5.2 SHIRE OF DENMARK BIKE PLAN

File Ref:	COMM.PATAC
Applicant / Proponent:	Shire of Denmark
Subject Land / Locality:	Paths and Trails of Denmark
Disclosure of Officer Interest:	Nil
Date:	6 October 2015
Authors:	Erica Sayer, Engineering Administration Officer Dale Stewart, Chief Executive Officer
Authorising Officer:	Dale Stewart, Chief Executive Officer
Attachments:	8.5.2a – Bike Plan 8.5.2b – Schedule of Submissions

Summary:

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 16 June 2015 Council resolved to advertise the draft Bike Plan for public comment. Advertising of the Bike Plan was undertaken, with one (1) submission received.

Background:

Through Regional Bicycle Network Funding from Department of Transport, Shire staff applied for funds to create a comprehensive Bike Plan to be integrated into the Path Development Plan 2007, which is a document used to assist the Infrastructure Services Directorate and the Paths and Trails Advisory Committee (PATAC) with recommending to Council priorities for current and future needs for the Shire of Denmark's Paths and Trails.

The Paths and Trails Advisory Committee played an active role in ensuring the current and future needs of Council were addressed when creating a scope for the successful consultant to address when compiling the plan.

Several workshops were held with the first being in September 2012 to address what PATAC and local stakeholders wanted to be addressed within the Community for future planning. As there are opportunities for funding annually from external sources PATAC felt the need to have a plan in place to assist the PATAC and staff with future planning and application for funding.

The PATAC, following extensive community engagement at the time, resolved at its meeting of 9 June 2014 as follows;

“That the Paths and Trails Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the Bike Plan jointly funded by Council and the Regional Bicycle Network and created by Greenskills be accepted and adopted by Council and integrated into the Paths and Trails Development Plan 2008.”

At the meeting held on 16 June 2015, Council resolved as follows (Resolution No. 120615);

“That Council note the extensive community engagement undertaken by the consultant and the Paths & Trails Advisory Committee during the documents preparation and now advertise the Denmark Bike Plan for general public comment for a minimum period of 60 days.”

This action took place via advertisements in the local and regional newspapers and contact of stakeholders by means of a mail out inviting feedback and comments on the document.

Consultation:

In developing the Scope for the Shire of Denmark Bike Plan Committee Members and Council Staff worked closely with several stakeholders including but not limited to Munda Bidji Representatives, Department of Parks and Wildlife staff and Greenskills. The membership of PATAC also ensured a diverse group were in constant consultation to enable a broad view on the needs of the Community.

Feedback was received from the general public via stands and stalls set up in various locations during the draft period of the Shire of Denmark Bike Plan and comments and ratings from the Residents and Ratepayers 2012/13 Community Needs and Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

Council noted that extensive community engagement was undertaken by the consultant and the Paths & Trails Advisory Committee during the documents preparation and then moved to advertise the Denmark Bike Plan for general public comment for a minimum period of 60 days. This action took place via advertisements in the local and regional newspapers on the Shire Website and contact of stakeholders by means of a mail out inviting feedback and comments on the document.

At its meeting held on 20 July 2015, the Paths & Trails Advisory Committee (PATAC) resolved as follows;

“That PATAC recommend that Council amend the Bike Plan to include the following modification:

The proposed path at Berridge Park should run alongside the Norm Thornton Reserve car park, go south under the western side of the South Coast Highway traffic bridge, then go back up the hill in a south westerly direction to link into the existing footpath along Hollings Road.”

One (1) submission was received (refer Attachment 8.5.2b).

Statutory Obligations:

There are no Statutory Obligations with respect to adopting this document.

Policy Implications:

The Plan proposes the following Strategic & Policy Recommendations;

5.1.1 Town Planning Scheme 4 - Incorporate requirement for bicycle path and bike lane provision in relevant sections of the Town Planning Scheme.

5.1.2 Requirements for Bicycle Parking Provisions in Town Planning Scheme - Include provisions for the supply of bicycle parking as well as on-site car parking.

5.1.3 Continue to take regard of WAPC DC Policy 1.5 Bicycle Planning - requiring that new subdivisions provide for safe cycling conditions within the subdivision and linkages to the bike plan network as outlined in this plan.

5.1.4 Develop a long-term Integrated Transport Strategy - In the longer term, the Shire of Denmark should develop a more comprehensive and integrated Sustainable Transport Strategy. The Shire's status as a high growth, coastal community means that the whole range of future transport options, including bicycles, needs to be considered in an integrated way.

5.1.5 Providing for safe on-road cycling - the needs of on-road cyclists should be incorporated into regular road building and maintenance and into the Local Planning Strategy.

Budget / Financial Implications:

The Bike Plan has a number of recommendations that will need to be considered and prioritised by the PATAC and subsequently adopted by the Council. These priorities would then be incorporated into the Long Term Financial Plan and considered with other Budget priorities from year to year. Total costs associated with the various recommendations in the plan total \$1,045,000 (refer page 96 of the Plan).

Strategic Implications:

The report and officer recommendation is consistent with Council's adopted Mission and Vision and assists achieve the following specific adopted Strategic Objectives and Goals.

SOCIAL GOAL

Recreation: ...monitor all forms of recreational and cultural facilities and services, and take careful account of the level of community support for those in determining the improvements or new facilities to be supported together with their relative contribution to personal and community well being.

ECONOMIC GOAL

Tourism: ...acknowledge the importance of tourism to the region, and, by innovative policies, practices and partnerships, facilitates and encourages the greater year-round sustainability of tourism, whilst monitoring and managing its impacts.

Sustainability Implications:

➤ **Governance:**

There are no known significant governance considerations relating to the report or officer recommendation.

➤ **Environmental:**

There are positive environmental implications with respect to encouraging cycling and improving cycling infrastructure and networks which include reduced air and noise pollution and land use efficiency.

➤ **Economic:**

One of the objectives of the plan is to incorporate eco-tourism opportunities into bicycle planning and states, “with the Munda Biddi Trail, local trails and the planning WOW trail, Denmark is well served by a variety of off-road trails for recreation and cycle tourism. Ensuring the end of trip facilities and other supporting facilities are in place is important to serve these growing group of cyclists.” Another objective of the Plan is to further develop the townsites of Denmark, Nornalup and Peaceful Bay as cycle friendly destinations.

➤ **Social:**

There are many social and health benefits to recreational cycling as stated in the Plan which states, “cycling combats physical inactivity, a major contributor to ill-health, and is also effective in reducing depression and anxiety. A daily 30 minute cycle halves an individual’s chance of becoming obese or diabetic.” Increasing and improving networks and connectivity has the potential to encourage more people (residents and visitors) to choose cycling (and walking) as their first choice of transport.

➤ **Risk:**

Risk	Risk Likelihood (based on history and with existing controls)	Risk Impact / Consequence	Risk Rating (Prior to Treatment or Control)	Principal Risk Theme	Risk Action Plan (Controls or Treatment proposed)
That the Council subsequently adopts the Plan and is unable to meet community expectations in funding its implementation in a timely manner.	Possible (3)	Minor (2)	Moderate (5-9)	Not Meeting Community expectations	Accept Officer Recommendation to advertise the Plan and with its subsequent adoption ensure that PATAC is tasked with the challenge of recommending to Council the prioritising of its implementation.

Comment/Conclusion:

The Plan has a number of strategic and policy recommendations which will require consideration with its final incorporation into the Path Development Plan, which is a document that encompasses and outlines priorities for footpath, dual use and trail development within the Shire.

Planning & Sustainability Services comments, supported by the Chief Executive Officer, on the Bike Plan are as follows:

- *As this is to be a Shire of Denmark document, it should have the Shire of Denmark logo on the front cover and a reference (either on front cover or on page 2) when adopted (or received or whatever Council resolves to do with it).*
- *Executive Summary: Background (page 4) – 1st three bullet points in last paragraph should read:*
 - *Strategic Community Plan – Denmark 2031*
 - *Local Planning Strategy (2011)*
 - *Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 28: Settlement Strategy for Denmark*
- *Executive Summary: Background (page 4) – recommend the following additional policy and planning documents be added to the list in the last paragraph:*
 - *Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 15: Townscape Policy*
 - *Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 26.1: South Coast Highway Commercial Developments*
 - *Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 31: Commercial Strategy*
 - *Council Policy P110310: Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail*
- *Executive Summary: Process (page 4) – should read “.. Paths and Trails Advisory Committee....” (NB: numerous other similar references throughout document that need correcting as well).*
- *Executive Summary: Denmark Priority Bike Network Plan (page 4) – third paragraph references that cycling easily outperforms walking or drive and park for short trips to town; consider this is an assumption by the authors thus should read “where cycling has the ability to outperform walking....”*
- *Executive Summary: Recommendations – pages 5 & 6; needs overall review to ensure consistency with all recommendations in Sections 4 – 6 that are supported.*
- *Section 1.1: Local Planning Strategy (page 8) – noting that the four goals referenced relate to the Shire’s previous Vision and Goals which are now no longer relevant given the adoption of the Strategic Community Plan – Denmark 2031 and that the Local Planning Strategy is dealt with in detail in Section 1.4 (page 11); recommend that this entire section be deleted as serves no purpose.*
- *Section 1.2: Bike Plan Development (page 9) – recommend dates of ‘2014’ be added to this section given the timeframes between compilation and final consideration.*
- *Section 1.4: Policy & Planning Context (page 11) – this whole section is in the wrong area noting that there is a Section 1.7 titled Policy & Planning Context as well which deals with Federal, State & Regional and then should incorporate the Shire context which is currently referenced in Section 1.4. Recommend this section be deleted and incorporated into current Section 1.7; noting re-numbering needs to occur accordingly if this section is deleted.*
- *Current Section 1.4: Shire of Denmark (page 11) – heading should read “Local Planning Strategy (2011)”.*
- *Current Section 1.4: Shire of Denmark (page 11) – under the Strategic Community Plan-Denmark 2031 heading there should be a lead-in as to where this quotation has come from; noting was a commentary statement compiled from review of comments made through the process, known background and/or issues on the topic. If keeping this quotation, from a preliminary review of the Strategic Community Plan report there are some others that deal with this matter as well that could be referenced also (e.g. comment on bottom of page 25 re: trail hub). As it currently stands in the document it is obscure and has no context/relationship about how it relates etc. Noting that earlier references to the Strategic Community Plan only provide commentary about the vision*

and objectives, it would be appropriate that this section now deal with relevant goals that relate to this matter, being Recreation, Development, Transport & Tourism.

- Current Section 1.4: Shire of Denmark (page 11) – heading should read “Town Planning Scheme Policy No. 28: Settlement Strategy for Denmark”.
- Current Section 1.4: Shire of Denmark (page 11) – noting reference under comments in relation to ‘Executive Summary’ that additional policy and planning documents should be added to the list they should also be referenced here accordingly with associated commentary.
- Current Section 1.4: Shire of Denmark (page 11) – under the section titled ‘Policy Implications’ there is reference to the Shire’s Local Tourism Strategy; the Shire does not have a local tourism strategy so not certain what this is referring to here – needs review accordingly.
- Section 1.5: Future Growth (page 12) – heading should read “Local Planning Strategy (2011)”.
- Section 1.5: Future Growth (page 12) – Local Planning Strategy paragraph needs lead-in to ensure there is some context to the references, with review of overall paragraph to ensure is correct with references as current wording is confusing.
- Section 1.5: Future Growth (page 12) – should be ‘Millars Creek’ not ‘Millers Creek’.
- Section 1.5: Future Growth (page 12) – Current Council Policy paragraph should read “..require developers of urban residential land to construct and/or contribute to, the pedestrian and cycle network having regard to WAPC Development Control Policy 1.5: Bicycle Planning, Liveable Neighbourhoods and the Shire’s Guidelines for Subdivision and Development of Land”.
- Section 1.6: Demographic Profile (page 13) – the census was held on 9 August 2011 so not certain what reference is to census day 2010.
- Section 1.7: WAPC Liveable Neighbourhoods Design Code section (page 14) – this section should be re-titled to read “Western Australian Planning Commission - Liveable Neighbourhoods”; noting draft document is currently out for public comment recommend section be amended to include reference to current documents provisions referenced as well as the draft 2015 provisions accordingly.
- Section 1.7: Main Roads – Policy for Cycling Infrastructure, WA Bicycle Network Plan and Our Bike Path – A Strategic Framework for Cycling in WA (pages 14/15) – these references need to come under “State” heading (where currently sits in document looks like are regional documents); there is a need for a lead-in to the Main Roads Policy document reference as not clear if what is documented is a policy objective, strategy, implementation action or what?
- Section 1.7: WA Bicycle Network Plan (page 15) – noting that the Shire has recently received funding for 2 paths under this program they should be referenced here accordingly, being Golden Hill Steiner School path (assume under this funding) and Denmark Ag College path.
- Section 1.8: Overview (page 16) – not certain that the Shire or PATAC would classify Kwoorabup Community Park as an important cycle trail.
- Section 2.1: Previous Community Consultation (page 18) – first bullet point references cycling survey undertaken by Shire of Denmark PATAC member Andi Adams – should be referenced as an endorsed survey by Shire/PATAC for clarity.
- Section 2.1: Previous Community Consultation (page 18) – given 2014/15 community needs survey results are now available these should be included/referenced as well (noting were not available at time of draft report prepared by Greenskills but are available now at time of final consideration by Council).
- Section 2.1: Previous Community Consultation (page 18) – references Appendix 1 whereas the referenced material is currently located in Appendix 2; noting however this is the first reference to Appendices should retain reference of Appendix 1 and ensure that Appendix 1 is corrected to reflect this reference and not the current Appendix 1 material (being the survey questions which is referenced in Section 2.3 (page 21) of the document).

- Section 2.2: Stakeholder Engagement (page 19) - what is meant by a “small community meeting”? 2nd bullet point in second bullet point list should read “...PATAc and Councillor meeting...”
- Section 2.2: Stakeholder Engagement (page 19) – question: did we as a Shire or PATAc decide not to keep printing the Trails Map brochure (noting is on our website as a document still)? May be a correct statement by Lenore in this section but maybe needs a post-script note that this statement is not correct.
- Section 2.3: Community Cycling Survey (page 21) – refer comments above in relation to Appendix 1, resulting in this Appendix being modified to ‘2’; noting needs changing in the appendices section as well.
- Section 2.3: Community Cycling Survey (page 21) – in first bullet point should read “predominantly”.
- Section 2.3: Community Cycling Survey (page 21) – it is noted that document references 195 responses yet only 143/144 respondent references on the 3 graphs on page 21; acknowledge sometimes respondents do not complete sections of a survey but maybe should reference this somewhere given is such a variance.
- Section 2.3: Community Cycling Survey (page 23) – number of respondents referenced does not correlate with respondent numbers on page 22 (eg. reference that 27 respondents cycle daily for recreation whereas table on page 22 references in order of 38); review possibly needed and a reference about variances as well.
- Table on page 24 seems out of place with this section on Community Cycling Survey - needs review accordingly to determine appropriate point in document for table to be.
- Section 2.4: Community Survey (page 28) – 1st sentence under graph should read “.. less common than cycling ...”.
- Section 3.1 (page 32): Layout of this page makes inference that Peaceful Bay Ring Road and Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail are ‘neighbourhood connector roads’, which they are not; review needed to determine relevance where these comments should be if considered needed.
- Section 3.1: Peaceful Bay Ring Rd section (page 32): if retain this reference in some form in the document (noting comment above) should be updated to reflect path construction finalised; 2nd paragraph in this section is not complete and does not make sense in this section anyway – recommend delete.
- Section 3.1: Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail (page 32): if retain this reference in some form in the document (noting comment above) should include reference in here that Munda Biddi Trail does cross paths with the rail trail.
- Section 3.2: Community Consultation Outcomes (page 33) – in this section there are ‘suggestions’; from my first review of the document it appeared these may have been suggestions by the author of the document however upon reviewing the survey questions it is apparent are suggestions from respondents to the survey – this should be made clearer to the reader as to where the suggestions have come from in this section (noting that overall section title is Review of Existing Bike Network and there is minimal review of the existing situation undertaken by Shire/author at all; moreso relies on community review). Assuming they are suggestions from respondents to the survey, it should be noted that no consideration/commentary has been made in relation to the suggestions.
- Section 3.2: (page 33) – figure legend needs to be enlarged so that is legible to interpret the colours on the figure (NB: this comment is relevant to all figures on the following pages as well).
- Section 3.3: Secure Bike Storage (page 44) - paragraphs 1 and 3 in this section currently explain importance of secure bike storage and recommendations for consideration of provision of such whereas this section is to deal with review of existing facilities therefore needs modifying to reference there are currently no secure bike storage areas in the Shire.
- Section 3.3: Secure Bike Storage (page 45) - 1st sentence has number missing however is considered whole sentence is not needed as duplicates reference on page 44; noting comment above that some references from page 44 may be appropriate to be referenced in this section.

- *Section 3.4: Barriers (page 46) – in the ‘Safety Concerns’ paragraph should say “... box to the left.”*
- *Figure 3 (page 50): in relation to the recommendation for Mitchell Street and Walker Street to provide bicycle lanes, the capability of these two streets to accommodate such bicycle lanes (in particular Mitchell Street) is questioned giving car parking in these areas (for CBD usage as well as current school usage).*
- *Overall Comments from Community Consultation Survey (page 49): question relevance in this section; should be in the appropriate community consultation section (i.e. Section 3.2).*
- *Figures 5 and 6 (pages 52/53) – needs overall review to ensure consistency with all recommendations in Sections 4 – 6 that are supported.*
- *Plans on pages 56-60 may need review depending on review of other recommendations*
- *Plans (pages 56-60):*
 - *on the plans there are number references that correlate to the table of recommendations yet the descriptor in the legend contains words only whereas it should have the box and a number inserted such that it is clear what the number references on the plan relate to; noting that in the legend there is a ‘distances from CBD’ key – this key is not relevant to these plans at all and is confusing with the number references that are on the plan contained within a box thus should be removed.*
 - *noting that the plans on pages 57-60 are just blow-ups of what is contained on the plan on page 56, consider that this should be clearly referenced as such on the plan on page 56 (i.e. what areas that maps A-D (being the plans on pages 57-60) cover) for clarity.*
 - *on Plan 58 (and page 56) the alignment of the path from Wattle Way to Mt Shadforth Road should reflect what has been agreed to as part of development of No. 40 (Lot 11) Mt Shadforth Road – being usage of portion of current battleaxe leg from Mt Shadforth Road to just over Millars Creek, along the northern side of Millars Creek through to the western boundary of the lot and then utilisation of the adjoining Reserve 49637 battleaxe leg through to Wattle Way.*
 - *Plan denotations may need amending depending on the recommendation considerations.*
- *Section 4.2: Recommendations Tables (pages 61-72):*
 - *for ease of reference for the reader it is recommended that in the Map Ref column there be reference to what map(s) the path is denoted on.*
 - *need to ensure all references on plan and/or items referenced in section 6.0 are included in these tables (noting as an example #22 is on plan but not in tables in recommendations section but does appear in costings/implementation schedule).*
 - *the priority classifications are referenced in section 4.1 (summary of proposed bike network enhancements) however should also be included in this section for ease of reference for the reader.*
 - *some clarity around how the estimated cost has been calculated should be provided here rather than having to flick to page 96 to ascertain how costings have been calculated and a reference that is a 2014 figure (noting depending on construction timeframes the costs could be some 5 years old); question the figures quoted in the document noting that the footpath to the Ag College cost in the order of \$236k (albeit there was some kerbing needed to be done on South Coast Highway but this would not that substantial a cost in the context) yet the estimated cost referenced in the bike plan was \$77,600 – brings into question all other costings provided as a result of this major variance between estimated and actual in this one example.*
- *Construction of New Link Paths Recommendations:*
 - *South Coast Highway (East):*
 - *Stage 1 of the path has been completed since publication of the draft so all references should be removed now; Stage 2 is effectively now Stage*

- 1 and should be described as extend the shared use path to Springdale Beach.
- In the 'Notes' cell current references should be deleted given the referenced work has been completed and the fact that it is not path number 15a in the path development plan, with new references along lines of "a 'nib' connection to the Country Club access driveway being provided from the current path and developer has provided path in vicinity of Springdale Beach estate entrance on the southern side of South Coast Highway.
- Riverside Path Under Bridge – West: what is reference in 'Estimated Cost' cell of "see above" in relation to?
- Powley St to Scotsdale Rd:
 - Reference in 'Description' cell that this is an easement is incorrect and needs amending accordingly noting that portion of the land (approximately 1/3 of the total length with frontage to Powley Street) is Reserve 51411 which is for purpose of Right of Way with Management Order to Shire of Denmark and the remaining portion is privately owned land (Lot 67)
 - In 'Notes' cell needs to reference liaison needed with landowner of Lot 67 regarding potential access to land to facilitate development of path; also should reference that use of land for pedestrian accessway purposes is referenced in the Horsley Road/Rockford Road local structure plan (albeit not as a developer footpath requirement); reference to potential developer contributions should be amended to utilise Developer Contributions for Road Infrastructure funds to fund this construction (noting that adjoining developer will be responsible for numerous other dual use paths throughout the subdivision and local structure plan does not identify this as a path they are responsible for).
 - In terms of priority it is considered this should be modified to at least medium (if not high) for there is evidence is well utilised as a path connection currently and with the schools to the east of Scotsdale Road/Denmark River and large residential catchments in the area this connection is important – particularly if Horsley/Rockford subdivision does not progress for a few years.
 - In 'estimated cost' cell a figure should be able to be inserted here (noting should reference does not include any costs with securing access arrangements to Lot 67).
- Hollings Rd to Mt Shadforth Rd: question whether this is needed link path given the recent construction of the path on the northern side of Scotsdale Road providing such a connection and the costs associated with works referenced here.
- Wattle Way – Mt Shadforth Road Link (2nd row on page 63):
 - 'Description' cell reference should be updated to "Develop new path to link Wattle Way and Mt Shadforth Road".
 - 'Notes' cell reference amended to reference that a condition of planning approval 2014/199 for the development of No. 40 (Lot 11) Mount Shadforth Road has required the ceding of land on the northern boundary of Millars Creek and portion of the current battleaxe leg to the site to the Shire of Denmark for the purposes of providing a path in this vicinity to link Wattle Way through to Mount Shadforth Road; should also include references that timeframe for development of the path is dependent on the ceding of the land occurring and that utilisation of Developer Contributions for Road Infrastructure could be utilised to fund construction of this path.
- Ti Tree Lane path:
 - In 'Notes' cell reference it is considered should add notation that to be considered as part of road upgrading works (noting road is currently

- gravel whereas will be upgraded to bitumen seal road when sufficient developer contributions from adjoining developments are received).
- It is noted on Map Sheet A (page 58) that this is referenced as “upgrade – widening or renewing existing path”; this reference on the plan is not correct as it is not a formal path currently – should be ‘construction of new link path’ denotation as it is in the recommendations table.
 - Hardy Street path: in ‘Estimated Cost’ cell should be referenced as path to be constructed by developer.
 - Offer Street path: provision of a path in this vicinity would need support/approval by the Education Department as appears would be on their land and not in the road reserve; funding sources likely then would be grant funds and/or Education Department (which should be referenced in either the ‘notes’ cell or the ‘estimated cost’ cell such that not seen as cost to Council).
 - Ocean Beach Road to Offer Street path: question need for this path given proximity to intersection and opportunity may exist for review of road configuration in this area with redevelopment potential in the broader locality.
 - Honeymyrtle Close to Clarke Close path:
 - Description reference to read “Honeymyrtle Circuit”.
 - In ‘Notes’ cell should correctly reference that path in future Honeymyrtle Circuit to be constructed by developer; connection through adjoining Reserve 45473 (No. 12 (Lot 1088) Clarke Close) is Council responsibility. Priority of path then would correlate with development of Honeymyrtle Circuit extension – timeframe of which is unknown at this stage.
 - South Coast Highway (West):
 - Recommend reference to path could be constructed on north side be removed as this should be determined at design consideration stage and will be subject to Main Roads approval; noting path is currently on southern side of the Highway.
 - In the ‘notes’ cell should reference the actual future growth areas to ensure appropriate conditions imposed on subdivisions where relevant, being land including Lots 1 & 5 South Coast Highway (south-west of the Denmark Tavern); consider needs approval moreso than negotiation with Main Roads; portions of the path would be constructed by adjoining developer; other funding sources could be Developer Contributions for Road Infrastructure and/or municipal budget funds.
 - On-Road Bike Lanes Recommendations:
 - Walker Street:
 - Question whether we want a bike lane (or lanes as recommended here) on Walker Street as well as a shared use path (which is what is referenced in path development plan and not footpath as noted in the bike plan); or if road seal has enough width to accommodate one bike lane (let alone two).
 - Mitchell Street:
 - Question whether we (Shire) and/or Education Department want Mitchell Street one-way; review of WALGA Road Safety Around Schools Guidelines would not advocate that Mitchell Street be one-way for it references that at least one road access to a school should be a local distributor/connector road and essentially Mitchell Street serves this function thus one-way of this street would not be appropriate.
 - Ideally a 2.5m wide path is more appropriate for dual use path but could get away with existing 2.0 metres; if issue is vegetation is overgrown then this should be addressed by the Shire with the school (given vegetation is on school land).
 - Upgrading Existing Paths or Crossings Recommendations:
 - Kwoorabup Park: do not necessarily support references that the path next to the Nature Playground should be widened due to cost / need / priorities.
 - Hollings Road:

- In 'Description' cell should read "...bridge and Walker Street..."
 - In 'Notes' cell reference to link to new path being constructed on Hollings Road should be amended to link to Hollings Road (western side) path (noting has now been constructed).
- Hollings Road (near Haire Street) – this work has been done now so should be removed as a recommendation from the plan.
- Denmark High School: this path is on Department of Education land therefore is their responsibility to maintain – this should be referenced accordingly in the 'Notes' section such that is not seen as Shire responsibility.
- Ongoing Upgrade of Paths in CBD: Council position on footpaths in CBD is minimum 2.5 metre path (conditions imposed on shopping centre, Co-op, Randall Park footpath works etc) and not 3.0 metres as stated in 'Description' cell; should be amended accordingly to reflect 2.5 metre minimum.
- Improving Signage and Profile on Paths & Roads Recommendations:
 - Millar Street – consider that this could result in prolific signage; maybe just stencilling if anything and would await widening of the footpath before undertaking this work.
- Section 4.3: Recommendations Tables:
 - WOW Walk Trail (page 74) – 'notes/community consultation' cell needs updating as needs full funding (noting commentary relates to previous partial grant funds having been obtained which has now been returned as not expended); estimated costs should be able to be provided in document given is published in 15/16 budget document.
 - Lights Rd (to end of residential area): question whether this is a high priority in light of other recommendations.
 - Ocean Beach Rd (page 74) – likely future upgrades of Ocean Beach Road?
 - Inlet Drive (page 74) – likely future upgrades of Inlet Drive? Question if consideration would be given to another footpath on the other side of Inlet Drive.
 - Scotsdale Rd (page 75) – question if consideration would be given to another footpath on the other side of Scotsdale Road.
 - Lights Rd (page 76) – Lights Road is only part of Munda Biddi Route alignment until such time as WOW Trail is finalised.
 - Scotsdale Road (page 76) – was not this done (or at least considered) as part of Scotsdale Road widening works undertaken over last 2 years; if so review references here.
 - Mt Shadforth Road (page 76) – question why the shoulder seal should just be a designated bike lane noting quite a few people walk this route currently and the two could co-exist;
 - Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail (page 78) – Condition of subdivision approval has already been imposed requiring developer of Lot 5 South Coast Highway upgrade Heritage Trail for frontage of property.
 - Regular maintenance of the Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail (page 78) – recommendation in 'notes/community consultation' cell saying regular annual budget should be allocated should be amended to reflect continual annual budget allocation (with actual amount to be determined accordingly) given there is already an annual allocation (as currently worded infers this does not exist currently); question costings of \$2,000 pa to do an audit – this should be done as part of normal asset management practices by Infrastructure Services staff; recommend \$ figure included against general improvements not be listed here as this should be an annual budget consideration matter and not part of this document.
 - Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail Loop with Ocean Beach Road shared use path (page 79) – disagree that this should be the location; noting there is an existing unmade (currently) road reserve on the north-eastern boundary of No. 322 (Lot 151) Ocean Beach Road that traverses the current trail and will connect back to South Coast Highway as Lot 5 develops – this alignment is more practical as no land acquisitions needed to facilitate and is more strategic in line with other access points for pedestrians, motorists etc. rather than creating new alignment.

- *Lake View Place: this is actually a strategic fire break that people utilise for access; recommend that bike plan needs to reference this is the primary function of this access way but can also be promoted as an access point to DNHRT as well given should be constructed to strategic fire break purposes so could be used by cyclists etc (as off-road path as would be gravel construction); good opportunity to ensure strategic fire break signage (that also ensures pedestrian/bicycle access is available) is installed and bollards/gates as required (if needed).*
- *Denmark-Nornalup Heritage Rail Trail (page 79) – in the ‘Description’ cell the wording has just been taken from the Lake View Place cell; needs review accordingly to describe what seeking to achieve here.*
- *Section 5.1 Strategic Recommendations (page 82):*
 - *Remove 5.1.1 recommendations as this is now covered by structure plan provisions which are in the Planning Scheme Regulations.*
 - *Recommend a new strategic recommendation is review the current Path Development Plan in light of recommendations from the Bike Plan such that an overall Path Development Plan priority can be established rather than having in separate documents.*
- *Section 5.2.4 Information Hubs and Signage (page 83): recommend remove Plane Tree Precinct from list of sites.*
- *Section 5.2.5 Integrated End of Trip Facilities (page 83): do not consider Plane Tree Precinct is an appropriate site as opposed to Berridge Park.*
- *Section 5.2.7 Bike Racks & End of Trip Facilities (pages 84 & 85):*
 - *New Bike Racks at Primary School – this is actually a reference to the High School and not primary school so heading needs amending accordingly; question whether the Shire should be telling the Dept of Education where the bike racks should go – recommend reword along lines of Shire to liaise with Dept of Education regarding consideration of appropriate location for bike racks having regard to path locations etc in light of community consultation outcomes.*
 - *Upgrade Bike Racks at Primary School; question whether the Shire should be telling the Dept of Education where bike racks should go and that they require upgrading – recommend reword along lines of Shire to liaise with Dept of Education regarding consideration of appropriate locations for new bike racks and potential upgrading of current bike racks in light of community consultation outcomes.*
 - *Integrated End of Trip Facilities – corner of Mitchell Street & Strickland Street: not provided for in Plane Tree Precinct Development Concept Plan – that said provision of water fountain is appropriate and bike racks but not secure bike storage, showers etc in light of vision for the precinct.*
 - *Shire of Denmark Administration Building: bike racks have been installed at Admin building therefore this recommendation should be removed.*
 - *Riverside Club redevelopment – this should be reference to Riverside Stage 2 development in vicinity of Bandstand (as currently reads relates to Riverside Club which is leased land not public land).*
- *Section 5.3 Promoting Cycle Tourism – Recommendations (pages 86 & 87):*
 - *Recommendation 5.3.1 – in ‘notes’ cell should reference is/has been developed*
 - *Recommendation 5.3.7 – in ‘notes’ cell should read “The Shire to progress completion...”. Potential key partner is also Conservation Commission of WA given is their land that majority of the connection is to be located in.*
- *Section 5.4 Promoting Cycling in Denmark – Recommendations (page 89): in neighbourhoods where not signposted, speed limit is 50km/hour so question why need stickers that say “slow down to 50”; cost implications for Shire of doing this?*
- *Section 6.0 Costings and Implementation Schedule (pages 92 – 95): this information is primarily double up of information provided in Section 4.2 other than the “length of footpath” cell which is useful information; question if need both – if retain ensure information is the same in light of any amendments to Section 4.2.*
- *Additional Comments:*

- *It is noted that the plan objectives reference Nornalup and Peaceful Bay townsites as well – there is no mention of these townsites even having been considered as part of this process; this needs review and/or commentary accordingly.*
- *Document currently does not reference current Shire standards for path construction (noting provided for in Guidelines for Subdivision and Development of Land 2008) nor the Austroads standards etc – albeit the figures are provided in Appendix 3 but there is no cross-reference as such within the actual text. This is important criteria to be established/provided particularly noting that the Austroads documents are guidelines only and may be departed from where local conditions require (same as Liveable Neighbourhoods etc).*
- *Should be reference about funding options available – particularly the reference to use of Developer Contributions for Road Infrastructure monies that can be utilised to fund such costs of development.*

Voting Requirements:

Simple majority.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 8.5.2

That the Denmark Bike Plan (2014) be received and it, together with the suggested modifications supported by the Director of Planning and Sustainability and Chief Executive Officer, be utilised by the Council's Paths and Trails Advisory Committee as a strategic informing document in reviewing and recommending the Path Development Plan (2007) as modified to Council for adoption.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

ITEM 8.5.2

MOVED: CR WHOOLEY

SECONDED: CR SEENEY

That the Denmark Bike Plan (2014) be received and it, together with the suggested modifications supported by the Director of Planning and Sustainability and Chief Executive Officer, subject to references to developer contributions as sources of potential funding being removed, and it be utilised by the Council's Paths and Trails Advisory Committee as a strategic informing document in reviewing and recommending the Path Development Plan (2007) as modified to Council for adoption.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: 9/0

Res: 321015

REASONS FOR CHANGE

Council requested that the reference to developer contributions as sources of potential funding be removed to ensure that those involved in implementing any actions under the plan did not perceive that developer contributions could be used for works at locations other than where contributions were dedicated for.