

## Roads

There have been some mistakes made in redesigning streets and footpaths for pedestrian access and traffic flow. One notorious example is the corner of Barrack and Bathurst St, which actually became worse after redesign to the point where now motorists routinely break the rules for the sake of easing traffic flow and safety – that intersection would improve from reverting back to its previous form. Another mistake was limiting Liverpool St to one lane a decade or two earlier than appropriate. One-laning Liverpool St to coincide with the RHH redevelopment was the worst possible timing, and would now be financially irresponsible to change back to two-lane, only to change back to one-lane in a decade or two from now.

Thankfully Hobart council area has mostly not resorted to the widespread humps and traffic islands of neighbouring councils in order to slow traffic. The more effective technique for traffic management not fully utilised, is traffic-calming techniques: using street furniture and community engagement to force more pedestrian awareness on motorists unconsciously.

Another mistake is putting bicycle paths on the roads: separated bicycle paths are the gold standard advocated by bicycle lobby groups, and yet our own bicycle lobby somehow opted for on-road bicycle paths as if their children would ride on them, or as if the lycra cyclists need them. The lycra mob have no trouble keeping up with the 40-50 kmph traffic speed: within inner suburbia they don't need bicycle path for motorised traffic to overtake them. The current bicycle paths make no sense, the only reason they were built was to appease the (at the time, growing) green vote. As long as they're not currently taking space necessary for other traffic flow (such as on Argyle St), they don't need to be removed immediately, but certainly should be upgraded to the separated cycleways as a matter of uniformity, to help make traffic safer. The remaining impediment with separated cycleways at the moment is the current state of the footpaths.

## Footpaths

There has been some great work done improving the footpaths at the centers of some suburbs, e.g. Sandy Bay & Lenah Valley. There could have been some money saved on those streetscape upgrades, but by and large they look good and that seems most important to residents and visitors. The most important improvement with those footpaths, was the resurfacing and the smooth cambers, meaning that a cyclist is no longer at risk of blowing a puncture simply by riding across a sidestreet back onto the footpath, a mum pushing her pram no longer gets the wheels stuck in a rut, and a wheelchair-user is not prevented from remounting the footpath and forced to ride in traffic on the road until the next driveway where they can remount the footpath. We could have saved some money (and still can) on streetscape designers and spent it on more resurfacing and smooth cambers beyond the central shopping areas of suburbs favoured by specific alderpeople factions. It's almost as if alderpeople pretend that wheelchairs, prams, and bicycles get used around the shopping areas but not in between them.

Some pedestrians might worry about a bicycle, pram, or wheelchair knocking them over on the footpath: this is easily addressed by a simple and cheap white line painted down the middle of the footpath, separating wheeled pedestrians from well-heeled pedestrians. It's also the bicycle path solution that would have already saved millions for better purposes, and works extremely well in many other countries, such as Finland where I grew up.

## Parking

Moving bicycle paths onto the footpaths would marginally improve parking. Another improvement would be more effective policing of the permit parking in inner-city suburbs like Glebe and West Hobart currently getting hammered by commuters avoiding the parking fees inside the city.