

## Doncaster Hill Draft Pedestrian and Cycling Plan

Feedback Form Results, August 2009

A total of 28 feedback forms were received. The following is a summary of those responses:

### Distribution of Doncaster Hill Pedestrian and Cycling Plan and brochure

Placed on Manningham City Council and Doncaster Hill websites	
eNewsletter	- 197 subscribers
Doncaster Primary School	- 375 brochures
Display in foyer	- 50 brochures
Plan at Counter	- 20 copies of Plan (approx)
Interested Individuals	- 153 brochures
Community Groups	- 40 brochures
Local Developers	- 22 brochures
Issues Forum Members	- 38 brochures
State Government Stakeholders	- 22 copies of Plan and brochures

### 35 Submissions Received

27 feedback forms  
8 written

### Demographic information:

Where responses came from  
21 from Doncaster  
3 from Doncaster East  
1 from Lower Templestowe  
1 from Hawthorn  
1 from Donvale  
8 unknown

Age of respondents  
0 were aged under 25  
2 were aged 25-34  
5 were aged 35-49  
3 were aged 50-59  
10 were aged 60-69  
6 were aged over 70  
9 unknown

## 1. How regularly do you participate in:

### 1.1 Walking

Every day	10
4-6 times a week	6
2-3 times a week	4
Once a week	1
Once a fortnight	0
Once a month	2
A few times a year	1
Less often	1
Never	1

### 1.2 Cycling

Every day	1
4-6 times a week	1
2-3 times a week	2
Once a week	3
Once a fortnight	0
Once a month	1
A few times a year	7
Less often	1
Never	10

### 1.3 Public transport

Every day	2
4-6 times a week	1
2-3 times a week	0
Once a week	1
Once a fortnight	4
Once a month	3
A few times a year	10
Less often	2
Never	4

## 2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Plan encourages, and caters to the needs of:

### 2.1 Pedestrians

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree 3 (13%)	Agree 16 (70%)	Neither agree nor disagree 1 (4%)	Disagree 2 (9%)	Strongly disagree 1 (4%)

**Ave ranking: 2.22**

#### Comments included:

- Pedestrians and cyclists need to be kept separate, paths need to be safe
- Need entrance at Westfield for pedestrians not going through food court
- Proposals such as boulevard more cosmetic than functional
- Safety of walk from Lawford Reserve to Doncaster Primary – no safe, direct path provided by Westfield
- Pedestrian crossing outside Municipal offices is dangerous

### 2.2 Cycling

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree 3 (12%)	Agree 12 (50%)	Neither agree nor disagree 5 (21%)	Disagree 4 (17%)	Strongly disagree 0 (0%)

**Ave ranking: 2.42**

#### Comments included:

- Minimal cycle paths shown
- Cyclists tend to choose their own routes when to their destination
- No need to increase walking/cycling traffic through Lawford Reserve – should stay off lead area
- Bike paths should extend to Koonung Trail
- Baird Street North is very steep – route down Whittans Lane is preferred
- Shopping centres and Council offices on top of a hill not likely to be destinations for cyclists
- No cycling routes within Manningham to access Box Hill from the North-east that avoid pedestrians who ignore stated rules or conduct
- Place speed limits on all major pedestrian and cycle paths

## 2.3 Public transport

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree 2 (9%)	Agree 10 (45%)	Neither agree nor disagree 9 (41%)	Disagree 1 (4%)	Strongly disagree 0 (0%)

**Ave ranking: 2.41**

### Comments included:

- o Getting better all the time
- o Trams required to connect to Box Hill and Balwyn, and easier access to CBD
- o 20 per cent of trips on public transport is a ridiculous dream
- o Bus service still insufficient and Park and Ride exceeding its capacity.
- o Railway system, though expensive, should remain on the agenda
- o More signalised intersections will make bus trips slower
- o Additional signalised intersections on Doncaster Road will improve safety for catching bus
- o Parking for another Park and Ride
- o Minibus to meet every second 48 Tram and do a loop between North Balwyn and Doncaster
- o Bus lanes exclude bicycles despite that in normal use buses tend to move at much the same speed as a moderately fit cyclist over a few kilometres.

## Overall Response to Plan

1	2	3	4	5
Very satisfied 2 (8%)	Somewhat satisfied 12 (50%)	Neutral 2 (9%)	Dissatisfied 7 (29%)	Very dissatisfied 1 (4%)

**Ave ranking: 2.71**

### Comments included:

- o This is not a 'network', how does it link with other paths?
- o Shared paths dangerous
- o Lawford Reserve does not need cycling paths as an off lead park, dogs are scared of and will chase bikes
- o Overall Melbourne public transport not up to scratch and does not cater to shift workers and those not going to city, and is unsafe at night
- o Park and Ride should not be free. Doncaster residents should get subsidised use.
- o Introduce a strategy to educate walkers on shared paths to keep to the right and work with bicycle groups to implement this
- o Bus services must be seen as quick fix. Vision is unlikely be realised without trams or trains.
- o Good to see Council encouraging pedestrians and cyclists
- o Opposed to path through Primary School – security - and along south side of Berkeley Street no safe access to Westfield
- o Disappointing – no long term vision for cyclists. No bicycle lanes on major roads or safe routes to cycle to Doncaster Hill.
- o Why are roads being restricted by adding bus lanes – they only provide minimal advantage to buses but cause traffic congestion
- o Any consideration of pedestrian and cyclist's needs are welcome
- o What about 'hiring a bike' facilities
- o Not suitable due to steep gradients

## Written submissions summary of comments

- Bike track needs to join track from Doncaster near the freeway – track around Doncaster Hill is excellent idea but goes nowhere

- Include cycling paths in any redevelopment of Eastern Golf Course, to connect to Doncaster Hill and Koonung trail
- Continue proposed walking track from Doncaster (south of Doncaster Rd) to the Park and Ride and make it a pedestrian and cycling path
- Does not acknowledge that Doncaster Road should have Principle Bicycle Network (PBN) bike lanes
- Plan should be modified to recommend formal bike lane on Doncaster Road as there doesn't seem to be any convenient east-west route close to and parallel with Doncaster Road
- Potential conflicts with buses and cyclists sharing the same lane along Doncaster Road
- Making Doncaster Road a no-go area for bikes is ridiculous and unenforceable. Doncaster Road follows a major ridge line and as such is the most logical route for cyclists travelling east-west
- Bicycle usage is growing rapidly – faster than car usage – and Doncaster Road needs a full bike lane along its total length and good connecting routes to the secondary, intersecting routes
- Need to separate pedestrians and cyclists for safety
- Council seems to be focussing on the shopping centre and drawing more cars to that point. Great big reserved bus lanes down a good part of Doncaster Road excludes bicycles, despite the fact that buses tend to move at much the same speed as a moderately fit cyclist over a few kilometres
- Lack of focus on cycling and completely omits existing government plan for Doncaster Road to be a preferred cycling route by alluding to possible development of an alternative preferred route
- Deviation from Doncaster Road means more hills, side streets and other obstacles
- Require a safe network of paths linking the western side of Precinct 1 with the eastern side as part of the site's redevelopment
- Concerns about the planned cycling route identified in Precinct 2, with its steep gradients – safety issues, particularly for juvenile riders
- Cost issues associated with resurfacing, kerb alignment and drainage relocation, reduced road width impact on traffic and parking, and the path's ultimate use
- Area in adjacent municipality is more attractive and people leave Manningham to use these great open spaces