



14 January 2025

[burnie@burnie.tas.gov.au](mailto:burnie@burnie.tas.gov.au)

---

## Burnie City Centre Urban Plan

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Burnie City Council's city centre plan.

Bicycle Network provided an email comment on the draft of the plan in July 2024, providing guidance on what secure bike parking should look like and pointing out that the bike lane in the drawings was not compliant with best practice guidelines.

It's disappointing to see that advice was not acted upon and the final plan still includes non-compliant bike lanes.

The Tasmanian Government cycling infrastructure guidelines recommend only using painted lanes when traffic volumes are less than 400 vehicles in the busiest hour and moving at speeds of 30–40km or less.

If traffic conditions meet the low-volume, low-speed bar then bike lanes should follow the City of Melbourne painted lane guidance which is a 1.5–1.8m wide bike lane and painted chevron buffer between parked cars and the bike lane of 0.6–0.8m. This is similar to the Austroads guidance.

In contrast to this guidance, the Burnie plan proposes lanes on the City Loop that are only 80cm wide and next to parked cars with no buffer space. That's 130cm short of the minimum space required.

The "operating envelope" width for a standard bicycle is 1m and for a cargo or trike bike it's 1.2m, so the proposed bike lane width doesn't cover a moving bike let alone providing enough space to avoid debris or defects, account for wind buffering or pass another rider.

The proposed designs for the City Loop provide a standard traffic lane width of 3.5m and parking bay width of 2.5m. Other cities have reduced travel lane width to 3m on low-speed streets that don't accommodate heavy vehicles and parking bay width of 2.1–2.3m.

By narrowing traffic lanes and parking bays there would be more space – this would allow a painted lane on one side of the street, or on both sides of the street if some of the street furniture space was also reduced.

This needs to be rectified as the current proposal puts bike riders in a dangerous position on the road, making them vulnerable to a parked car door knocking them off their bike and into traffic.

The plan should also provide more detail on what the several “green links” marked on the map will look like.

They are described in the plan as shared paths but there is no detail on how wide these would be and the cross-section diagrams for “city streets” in the plan doesn’t include them, only mentioning a “pedestrian space” of 2.5m.

While 2.5m widths can be used on long stretches of shared path with low use, in city streets which see frequent visitation that would be too narrow.

To be useful as transport options, shared paths would need to be at least a clear 3m wide in busy areas and in very busy settings with a lot of pedestrians, widths should be increased and/or people walking should be separated from people riding or scooting.

The Tasmanian Government had Cycling Infrastructure Design Guidelines to help local councils with these sorts of projects:

[https://www.infrastructure.tas.gov.au/policy\\_and\\_advice/active\\_transport](https://www.infrastructure.tas.gov.au/policy_and_advice/active_transport)

These guidelines also reference the City of Melbourne Bike Lane Design Guidelines for painted lanes: <https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/cycling-lanes-and-routes>

And for shared paths, traffic lanes and parking bays the Austroads guidelines can be used.

Yours sincerely



**Alison Hetherington**

Public Affairs Manager, Tasmania

**TAS:** 210 Collins St Hobart 7000. (03) 8376 8804 **m.** 0475 817 435