

Councillor Freeman - QoN - Cycleways – Pop Up Event – Stakeholder Engagement

Tuesday, 27 October 2026
Council

Council Member
Councillor Eleanor Freeman

Public

Contact Officer:
Tom McCready, Director City Infrastructure

QUESTION ON NOTICE

Councillor Eleanor Freeman will ask the following Question on Notice:

'Regarding the "Cycleways – Pop Up Event" report presented to the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee on 20 October 2026, can the Administration confirm:

- The individuals and organisations referred to by the statement "recent engagement with interstate practitioners and South Australian based stakeholders recommended that trials should be in place for at least twelve months", and the manner in which they were engaged, and when.
- Whether these individuals and organisations provided any feedback to the proposed 3-week trial on Wakefield Street during the Tour Down Under as recommended by the Administration, and if they provided any endorsement or opposition to this recommendation.'

REPLY

1. The Administration undertook engagement with the following key stakeholders, individuals and organisations.
2. Stakeholder Meeting held with South Australian based stakeholders on Wednesday 12 August 2026
 - 2.1. Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)
 - 2.2. Walking SA/City of Unley
 - 2.3. RAA
 - 2.4. Bicycle SA
 - 2.5. Bike Adelaide
 - 2.6. Bike Adelaide/Norwood Payneham & St Peters Bicycle User Group
 - 2.7. Burnside Bicycle User Group
 - 2.8. Active Transport Mitcham
 - 2.9. Transport Action Network.
3. Stakeholder Meeting held with interstate practitioners on Wednesday, 19 August 2026
 - 3.1. Manager Cycling Strategy at City of Sydney

- 3.2. Director, Eukai
- 3.3. Senior Strategic Transport Planner, City of Melbourne.
4. The following themes emerged when discussing cycling infrastructure, trials and connectivity.
 - 4.1. Connectivity should be a high priority. Stakeholders strongly favoured infrastructure that closes genuine network gaps and connects into existing routes rather than isolated sections.
 - 4.2. Evaluation should extend beyond cyclist counts. Suggested measures included vehicle movements, surrounding street impacts, gender participation, intercept surveys, new cycling trips and broader travel behaviour.
 - 4.3. Pedestrians and PMD/e-scooter users need to be considered.
 - 4.4. Lower traffic speeds may support both safety and feasibility.
 - 4.5. Community support needs careful interpretation. Current cycling mode share should not necessarily determine the weighting given to cycling infrastructure.
 - 4.6. Potential future cyclists are difficult to capture through consultation. External evidence and evaluation may be needed to represent people who would cycle if safer infrastructure existed.
 - 4.7. Some impact on traffic, parking or road operations should be expected. Stakeholders recommended acknowledging and monitoring these impacts rather than promising a zero-impact intervention.
 - 4.8. Parking and cycling should not automatically be framed as competing outcomes. Increased cycling may reduce demand for parking elsewhere.
 - 4.9. Budget should not necessarily determine the preferred route for a trial. Stakeholders suggested identifying the best outcome first and considering supplementary funding where necessary.
 - 4.10. The project should contribute to a broader network. Several participants cautioned against assessing individual routes in isolation from Council's longer-term cycling network objectives.
 - 4.11. A trial should be long enough to demonstrate behaviour change. There was strong support for a trial of approximately 12 months to account for seasonality and allow new users time to adopt the route.
5. Specific comments or feedback on Wakefield Street were not sought as the intention of this pilot was to align with the TDU event as a short term pilot which provides an opportunity to deliver a section of a quick build cycleway on Wakefield Street to capitalise on the number of cyclists coming into the City.
6. Further discussions on a longer-term trial will be presented to the Infrastructure and Public Works Committee in November 2026.

Staff time in receiving and preparing this reply	To prepare this reply in response to the question on notice took approximately 6.5 hours.
--	---

- END OF REPORT –