





GOLDEN PLAINS SHIRE

# FOOTPATH STRATEGY 2024





GOLDEN PLAINS SHIRE




# Footpath Strategy

June 2024



# Contents

Executive Summary	3	Recommendations	15	Supporting Infrastructure	36
Introduction	4	• Bannockburn	16	Standard Footpath Details	37
Levels of Service Framework	7	• Teesdale	18	Maintenance Programme and Method	39
Gaps Analysis	8	• Inverleigh	20	Appendices	40
Community Consultation	9	• Haddon	22	A - Site Analysis Maps	
Issues Paper	10	• Smythesdale	24	B - Issues Paper	
Determining Priority Footpaths	11	• Lethbridge	26		
		• Batesford	28		
		• Meredith	30		
		• Smythes Creek	32		
		• Linton	34		



This report has been prepared by the office of Spiire, Level 6, 414 La Trobe Street.

Issue Date	Rev No	Title	Author
05 / 04 / 2024	1	Draft	Spiire
31 / 05 / 2024	2	Final	Spiire
06 / 08 / 2024	3	Final	Spiire

© Spiire

The information contained in this document is intended solely for the use of the client named for the purpose for which it has been prepared and no representation is made or is to be implied as being made to any third party. Other than for the exclusive use of the named client, no part of this report may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of Spiire.

Golden Plains Shire spans the Traditional lands of the Wadawurrung and Eastern Maar Peoples. Council acknowledges them as the Traditional Owners and Custodians and pays its respects to both Wadawurrung and Eastern Maar Elders past, present and emerging. Council extends that respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People who are part of Golden Plains Shire.

# Executive Summary

The following document sets out a strategy for the Golden Plains Shire to deliver, upgrade and maintain its formal footpaths within the Shire over the next ten years. In response to changing population needs the Shire wishes to plan for growth, upgrade and maintain its footpath network and create a document to assist in the prioritisation of resources toward footpath improvements.

The following document sets out the process by which existing conditions were assessed, the community were engaged and opportunities prioritised in the planning of future works. To enable this, a 'levels of service framework' and a 'priority matrix' have been developed to provide rigour to the next steps.

The Strategy is based on the current conditions and known changes, but allows flexibility for changing situations over the course of its intended lifespan, enabling council to be proactive in meeting the needs of its residents.

The top priority new paths or upgrades to existing paths have been identified for each of the 10 largest townships in the Shire by population at the time of undertaking.

The top priority for each town is listed below with further explanation and priorities captured in section 9 of this document.



## Priority Works

Town	Road/Street
Bannockburn	Geelong Road
Teesdale	Teesdale-Inverleigh Road
Inverleigh	Hamilton Highway
Haddon	Taylor's Road
Smythesdale	Glenelg Highway (North of Heales Street)
Lethbridge	Midland Highway
Batesford	Midland Highway
Meredith	Staughton Street East
Smythes Creek	Glenelg Highway
Linton	Glenelg Highway (South of Gillespie Street)

# Introduction

The purpose of this Strategy is to allow Golden Plains Shire Council to plan improvement and ongoing maintenance of the pedestrian footpath network across the Shire. A previous Strategy reached the end of its useful life and the intent is that this version will serve to guide decision making for the next 10 years.

In developing the Strategy, a process of desktop analysis of the existing conditions and infrastructure was undertaken and followed up with fieldwork to ground truth the findings and assumptions from the desktop study. Following this fieldwork, the findings were presented to the community at a series of community consultation workshops. These were seen as the opportunity for the community to have their say on what the priorities and needs were. Further desktop analysis also included the review of supporting strategies and documents that tied into this project.

Issues identified from this first phase of information gathering were presented back to council's project steering group to help shape the next phase of the project – the development of the Strategy.

Figure 1 shows the process in developing the Strategy and the intended outputs.



Figure 1: Components of the Strategy diagram


## About Golden Plains Shire

Golden Plains Shire (GPS) is positioned between two of Victoria's most prominent regional cities, Geelong and Ballarat, spanning 2,702 square kilometres. According to the 2021 ABS Census data, the Golden Plains Shire has a population of 24,985 residents distributed across 56 rural communities.

Golden Plains Shire Council is recognised for engaging with its communities to build community spirit, plan for growth and future facilities and services. Looking to the future, Golden Plains Shire residents have shared their vision and priorities for the next 10-20 years. They identified the need to plan and manage the competing interests of a growing population whilst maintaining the Shire's highly valued rural character, meet community service and infrastructure needs and maintain and improve the Shire's extensive road network. (Council Plan 2021- 2025, Golden Plains Shire)







The 'Victoria in Future 2016' report by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), placed Golden Plains Shire as the fourth fastest growing regional area in Victoria.



As per the GPS Council Plan 2021-2025, the GPS anticipates an annual population growth rate of 2.6%, projecting a population of 42,193 for 2041. This projection especially highlights robust growth expectations in Bannockburn.





# Golden Plains Shire LGA and Townships

## LEGEND

-  Golden Plains LGA
-  LGA Boundary
-  Locality Area
-  Township
-  Water Body
-  Roads



NTS 



## Supporting Documents

### Council Plan 2021-25.

The council plan identifies 5 primary themes of the community vision - Community, Liveability, Sustainability, Prosperity and Leadership. The plan itself is informed by the Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan and the Golden Plains Community Vision 2040.

The Plan sets a number of objectives aligned to the themes including the development of this Strategy to provide more footpaths under the theme of Liveability and the Health and Wellbeing priorities. It is hoped that this Strategy will facilitate increased walking and cycling within the Shire, contributing to improved social and health outcomes and reducing reliance on vehicles.

### Growth and Structure Plans

Golden Plains Shire has already undertaken a series of growth and structure plans. Each of these plans provide a framework on how each town can facilitate the expected increase in both living and working populations. Given the proximity of these growth areas to the existing major hubs in Ballarat and Geelong, this footpath strategy prompts consideration of these future connections, providing opportunity for active transport links routes from, to and between these growth areas.

### Tracks and Trails

The Tracks and Trails Strategy (adopted Feb 2024) outlines the existing recreational tracks and trails network within Golden Plains Shire and identifies recommendations for new trails and missing links. This strategy typically presents connections at a district level and pairs neatly with the footpath strategy which provides more local scale connections. Consideration of the links between these two strategies will ensure a cohesive shire approach to both recreational and active transport connectivity.

### Climate Emergency Plan

The Golden Plains Shire Climate Emergency Plan identifies 5 key themes focused on reducing the impact on the environment into the future. Theme number 5 in this document focuses on sustainable transport and travel by providing and increasing the active transport offering across the shire. This plan also highlights the need to consider innovative materials to minimise the carbon impact these new amenities may have.

### Environment Strategy 2019-2027

The Strategy will help to shape the Golden Plains Shire by: connecting the community to their environment, supporting environmentally sustainable economies, protecting and enhancing thriving ecosystems and providing well-designed built environments. The Strategy also identifies ways Council can provide and support the transformational change required to maintain a healthy environment and liveable Golden Plains Shire.

### Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Action Plan 2021-2025

A guide to working with the community to enhance health and wellbeing outcomes. Specifically under the theme of livability, and Objective 2.1 - Connected and accessible roads, crossings, paths and transport to support an active lifestyle through 2.1.2 Advocating for safe pedestrian, cycling and recreation paths and trails that reduce reliance on vehicles.



# Levels of Service Framework



## A Hierarchy Of Quality Standards

To assist in the assessment and prioritisation of footpaths as well as cataloguing assets and prescribing maintenance resources, a service level framework needs to be implemented.

Within the GPS Road Management Plan 2021-2025, there already exists a Pathway Hierarchy as follows:

Identifier	Name	Explanatory Notes
FC	Commercial	Footpaths in commercial/business areas and/or adjacent to schools
FT	Township	Footpaths and/or bicycle paths within townships
FR	Rural	Footpaths and/or bicycle paths in rural areas

As this Footpath Strategy is predominantly focused on the ten largest townships, under the above classification all new or upgraded footpaths will fall under the identifier FT.






# Gaps Analysis

Initial investigations of existing infrastructure and site conditions across the 10 largest townships have identified where both opportunities for new footpaths and upgraded footpaths exist. Refer to Appendix A of this document. These opportunities highlight the gaps in the Service Levels Framework and together with the Footpath Priority Matrix and Recommendations of this Strategy, will allow Council to plan the most effective way of narrowing down these gaps in the current service offering.

Whilst each of the townships have their own unique requirements, there were some consistent themes that emerged in relation to the existing path network:

- Connections missing between newly completed land subdivisions and adjacent main roads or community facilities.
- Missing links between recreation trails, parks and reserves and residential areas.
- Key connections missing between major community infrastructure and amenity (schools, shops, parks, community centres etc).
- Commonly, paths that had been specifically requested for upgrade by the community scored highly in other prioritisation assessment criteria, thus supporting the community demand.



# Community Consultation

In August 2023, three Community Consultation sessions were carried out as follows:

1.

Friday August 18th

10:30am - 12:00pm

1st session in Smythesdale.

Venue

Multipurpose Room-Well  
19, Heales Street, Smythesdale

2.

Friday August 18th

1:30pm - 3pm

2nd session in Haddon.

Venue

Haddon Community Learning  
Centre  
396 Sago Hill Road, Haddon.

3.

Monday August 21st

5pm- 6.30pm

3rd session in Bannockburn.

Venue

Bannockburn cultural centre,  
Barwon Water Room, 27  
High Street, Bannockburn.

The purpose of these sessions was to get community input, insight and feedback on the initial consultant assessment of gaps in the existing footpath network. The sessions were held in a way that presented analytical assessment of the footpath network in each township on large maps, and community members were invited to review, comment and mark up the maps with where they believed the priority gaps were. The sessions attracted a range of stakeholders and garnered the desired local perspectives to inform the future Footpath Strategy. Local understanding of the townships was the missing piece of information from the desktop and field analysis of the consultant team, and so this part of the process formed a key role in completing that understanding so that the final strategy addresses the needs of those with the greatest stake in it.




# Issues Paper

The *Golden Plains Shire Footpath Strategy 2023-2033: Issues Paper, Spiire (October 2023)*, was completed post the analysis phase of the project and summarises the outputs from the Desktop Research, Field Analysis and Community Consultation, including the online 'Have Your Say' portal. The Paper summarises what were considered the most important opportunities to improve the pedestrian network within each of the largest ten townships.

Following completion, the Issues Paper was presented to Council's Project Steering Group to update them on the process to date and discuss how the information derived would inform the development of the Strategy.

The Issues Paper can be found in Appendix B of this Strategy.



# Determining Priority Footpaths

Following the gaps analysis, community consultation and council feedback the next step in the Strategy is to understand what the priorities are for immediate action, and what may be medium to long-term actions.

## Key Considerations

The following drivers were considered to inform this Strategy:

- Network Priority: what function does this footpath play within the network?
- Pedestrian Demand: is there a significant number of residents already using this route? Have there been a significant number of requests made for a new footpath already? Does an alternative footpath already exist? Are certain user groups more reliant on accessible footpaths to access community assets.
- Road Safety: are the current conditions creating a hazardous environment for pedestrians?
- Topography: how does the immediate environment affect people's ability to walk?

## Priority Matrix

A key component of this Strategy is to identify initial priority footpath improvements. This needs to be done in an objective way to ensure fair assessment of competing projects. This allows resources to be allocated over a given timeframe so that council can plan the delivery and communicate intended actions to stakeholders. This objective methodology should be able to be used in an ongoing capacity to routinely assess the priorities against changing situational factors. In addition to the initial recommendations, the Strategy will cover the next 10 years and so the identification of priorities needs to also cover the medium to long term.

A Priority Matrix was developed in consultation with Golden Plains Shire to identify and rank priorities. The Matrix allows all potential new and upgraded footpaths to be scored against a list of criteria. The total score of each potential footpath installation or upgrade can then be ranked against other footpaths to determine a priority ranking.

In compiling the criteria to be used in the Priority Matrix studies were undertaken to review similar matrices in Footpath Strategies from other councils around Australia. The findings were remarkably similar, and with some minor tweaks to make this specific to the GPS, the below Priority Matrix was devised with input from council and is proposed as the main tool in assessing the priority of footpath projects throughout the Shire for the term of this Strategy.

The Matrix comprises 11 criterion which fall under 5 categories.

The 5 overarching categories are: Safety; Connectivity; Accessibility; Negative Impact and Strategic.

It is considered imperative that ALL pedestrians are able to move SAFELY within the Shire.

Under Connectivity, consideration is required of the broader network and whether improvements in certain locations would facilitate a much wider onward connection. This also applies to whether alternative pedestrian links already exist that may reduce the priority of a given footpath.

It is considered imperative that ALL users can access shire wide facilities and services, and that no one is excluded on the grounds of age, mobility or disability. Accessible and inclusive public space is a key value of the Shire Strategy 2021-25. Furthermore, what is the demand for the footpath? Have residents requested it, and how many will directly benefit from the potential project?

Negative Impact refers to the offset of undertaking a footpath upgrade. Often the greatest risk in this regard is environmental, with the removal of trees required.

The Strategic category looks to consider links with other council policies for a holistic approach to development of the Shire.

The criteria are broken down into further types and these are given score values where applicable. The intent is for any given user to apply a new or upgraded footpath scenario to the Matrix to objectively determine a total score for the project. The higher the score, the higher the priority thus allowing council to have a clear priority list of projects to programme into their capital works or seek funding for.



Category	Criterion	Justification	Type	Score	Scoring guide
Safety	Road Type	Road type, setting and specifically traffic speed, affects safety for pedestrians	Arterial	8	
			Link	6	
			Collector Urban	4	
			Collector Rural	3	
			Local Access Urban	2	
			Local Access Rural	1	
	Sight distance	Visibility affects safety	Restricted	1-5	1 represents a minor restriction i.e. 10% of view for 100m of the carriageway is compromised, 5 is major restriction i.e. >50% of view within a distance of 100m along the carriageway. This assessment will need to be applied to the majority of the proposed path given the changing conditions along the course of a potential pathway
			Unrestricted	0	Clear sightlines for 100m in either direction
	Terrain	Steep slopes and loose ground is a hazard and can exclude some user groups	Flat and stable ground	0	Grade of footpath is 1:30 or gentler in the longitudinal direction and surface is stable and even
			Undulating, steep batters or slopes and loose uneven ground	1-5	Where 1 represents a 1:30 incline or gentler but with some loose components or a stable path that is between 1:21 and 1:30, and 5 represents a ramp steeper than 1:14 and/or a path that is very uneven or loose underfoot
History	Previously reported incidents indicate real risk	Level of previous incident (death, serious injury, multiple near misses etc.)	1-10	10 equates to any fatalities, 8-10 applies to any serious injuries. 5-7 represents minor injuries, 3-4 represents multiple near misses and 1-2 represents an isolated near miss. The severity of injury or potential risk of injury or death determines the score within each band.	





Figure 2: Priority Matrix

Category	Criterion	Justification	Type	Score	Scoring guide
Connectivity	Proximity to services/ facilities/ infrastructure	Community assets attract wider user group and thus more beneficiaries	School or kindergarten within 800m	10	Select all that apply  Note: Streets receive a score if any portion of them falls within the walkable catchment radius as illustrated on the accompanying maps.  Note: From a planning perspective, 400m is considered approximately a 5 minute walk, and 800m approximately 10 minutes for a healthy adult.
			Shops, Neighbourhood Activity Centre within 800m	8	
			Childrens playground within 800m	6	
			Health facility within 800m	6	
			Community facility within 800m	6	
			Commercial development or Employment precinct within 800m	4	
			Bus stop within 400m	5	
	Alternate access	Does alternate path exist?	No	5	Select one
			Existing path in same location but safety and accessibility issues with it	1	
			Existing useable path in same location	-5	
Existing useable path on other side of road			-4		
Existing useable path in adjacent street(s)			-2		
Broader links	Would footpath link existing paths including connection to the Principal Bicycle Network (PBN)	Yes	3		
		No	0		
Accessibility	Demand	Has a member of the community identified the need	Person(s) who will be most impacted are mobility impaired	4-5	4 for individual affected, 5 for multiple individuals.
			Multiple requests from separate households	1-3	Suggested bands for scoring i.e. <5 = 1 point, 5-20 = 2points, 20+ = 3 points
	Population	Higher density areas will benefit more people	High density of residents	5	>25 persons per square kilometre
			Medium density of residents	1-4	6-25 persons per square kilometre
			Low density of residents	0	<5 persons per square kilometre

Category	Criterion	Justification	Type	Score	Scoring guide	
Negative impact	Environmental	Path would require disturbance to natural systems	Significant impact vegetation removal required	-8	Mature trees (non-invasive or environmental weeds), threatened species, high value habitat	
			High impact vegetation removal required	-6	Any indigenous vegetation, semi-mature trees or moderate value habitat	
			Moderate impact vegetation removal required	-4	Juvenile trees, low value habitat	
			Low impact vegetation removal required	-2	No habitat value, likely ornamental planting of exotic species	
			No vegetation removal required	0		
Strategic	Policy	Does the proposed path align with other council policies and strategies? (Teesdale Structure Plan 2022, Inverleigh Structure Plan 2019, Smythesdale Urban Design Framework 2006, Bannockburn Urban Design Framework 2011, Bannockburn Growth Plan 2021, Bannockburn South East Precinct Structure Plan, Bruce Creek Master Plan 2009, Northern Streetscapes Project, Moorabool River reserve Master Plan)	Yes	1-5	Where a score of 1 reflects close ties to one strategy and a score of 5 reflects multiple values and strategic aims across multiple policies and strategies	
			No	0		
			Is the path already referenced under the tracks and trails strategy?	Yes		2
			No	0		



# Recommendations

The following section reviews the main gaps, opportunities, and recommendations by each of the ten townships included in the Strategy.

The intent is that the Priority Matrix be applied to all 56 townships over the course of the Strategy's lifespan as required to build a true picture of needs within the Shire.


The conditions surrounding each prospective project will change, and council will need to regularly review the given priority to any project against alternative ones as various factors impact overall score.

Maps are shown with two circles around key community infrastructure - a 400m, or approximately 5 minutes walk radius, and a 1km, or approximately 15 minutes walk radius.

Council currently has an annual budget of approximately \$200,000\* for new footpath installations or upgrades so not all priority projects will be able to be delivered in sequence. It may be that a project deemed higher priority than an alternative has to wait until the next financial year to be able to be delivered under a new budget. The notion of priority does not change if a project costs more or less than another, rather this is a determination of a separate metric: Specifically, financial feasibility.

Council will retain the right to allocate resources to maximise delivery of the Footpath Strategy as it sees fit to ensure optimal benefit can be delivered to the community within the constraints of available resources. Feasibility may also consider other barriers to works happening under the Strategy, such as agreement with other stakeholders, site conditions, timing or alignment with other Council Strategies where alternative goals and objectives are being sought.

*\*Annual budgets subject to change*





# Bannockburn



Population 7,754 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
B1	Geelong Rd	6	0	0	-	41	-5	3	1	5	0	0	51
B2	Midland Hwy	8	0	0	-	10	5	3	1	5	-4	0	28
B3	Bannockburn-Shelford Rd	8	0	0	-	4	5	3	1	5	-6	0	20
B4	Charlton Rd	2	0	0	-	0	5	3	1	5	0	0	16
B5	Lowndes Rd	2	0	0	-	16	5	3	0	5	0	0	31
B6	Stevenson Rd	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
B7	McPhillips Rd	2	0	0	-	10	5	3	0	5	0	0	25
B8	Clyde Rd	2	0	0	-	31	-5	3	0	5	0	0	36
B9	Yverdon Dr	2	0	0	-	0	5	3	0	5	0	0	15
B10	Middleton Dr	2	0	0	-	0	5	3	0	5	0	0	15
B11	Garonne Dr	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
B12	Knights Park Cres	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
B13	Byron St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	3	0	5	0	0	43
B14	Moore St	2	0	0	-	35	-4	3	0	5	0	0	41
B15	Pilloud St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	-4	0	43
B16	Harvey Rd	2	0	0	-	4	-2	0	0	5	0	0	9

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Through the site analysis undertaken at Bannockburn, it was largely observed that new areas of development have considered pedestrian connectivity, though their relationship and footpath connectivity to older parts of the town and key community assets were lacking. These gaps were due to aspects such as, existing paths deteriorating, being insufficient for accessibility, or a lack of a path connection altogether.

Broadly, Bannockburn's proximity to Geelong and the future planned employment precinct in Gheringhap provides opportunity for active transport to those wishing to take a more active commute. Locally, the existing path network provides a great framework to increase the walkability and catchment of its main community assets and destinations simply and efficiently. It is also worth noting that the Bruce Creek Masterplan proposes the provision of active travel along the eastern side of the open space corridor providing additional commuter and recreational opportunities.

## Recommendations

The following priority works have been identified from the matrix:

**Road B1 - Geelong Road** posted a score of 51 with its main contributing category being connectivity. This was mainly down to its proximity to local amenity and the need for a better path to provide greater accessibility and connection to these community assets. Whilst an existing path is present, this road has received previous community demand for upgrade (criterion 8).

**Road B13 - Byron Street** posted a score of 43 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Whilst it scored negatively due to available alternative access via adjacent streets, its proximity to community assets makes this a priority path for Bannockburn.








**Road B15 - Pilloud Street** posted a score of 43 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Whilst it scored negatively due to potential impacts on vegetation, its ability to provide connectivity between community assets makes this a priority path for Bannockburn.

Notable other roads that could be considered are Moore Street (B14) and Clyde Road (B8) which were identified for upgrade.

# Bannockburn

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Rail
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

Population 2,308 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score	
		Safety				Connectivity			Accessibility		Negative Impact			Strategic
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
T1	Bannockburn-Shelford Road	8	0	0	-	41	-4	3	0	5	0	0	53	
T2	Shaws Road	4	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	-4	0	47	
T3	Bruce Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	0	0	49	
T4	Learmonth Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	-8	0	41	
T5	Willis Street	2	0	0	-	36	-2	0	1	5	0	0	42	
T6	Pyke Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	0	0	49	
T7	Tolson Road	2	0	0	-	16	-2	3	0	5	0	0	24	
T8	Todd Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	0	5	-8	0	40	
T9	Sutherland Street	2	0	0	-	35	5	3	1	5	0	0	51	
T10	Russell Street	2	0	0	-	23	-2	3	0	5	-6	0	25	
T11	Mercer Street	2	0	0	-	10	5	3	1	5	0	0	26	
T12	Red Gum Drive	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12	
T13	Tulla Drive	2	0	0	-	0	-2	0	1	5	0	0	6	
T14	Bakers Lane	1	0	0	-	0	-2	0	0	5	-4	0	0	
T15	Stones Road	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12	
T16	Ware Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	0	0	49	
T17	Leigh Street	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	-6	0	43	
T18	Barker Street	2	0	0	-	41	5	0	0	5	-8	0	45	
T19	Teesdale-Inverleigh Road	2	0	0	-	41	5	3	1	5	0	0	57	
T20	Mercer Terrace	2	0	0	-	36	5	0	1	5	0	0	49	

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Teesdale is spread out with large rural style housing lots making up the majority of the town. New housing development is occurring on the eastern and south western areas where footpaths are provided to connect residents to existing paths along Bannockburn-Shelford Road which forms the main spine of the town. At the heart of the town where majority of the community amenity is featured is where these links break down. Connections are also missing to key opens spaces where footpaths may promote increased and broader demographic use. The existing path network provides a great framework to increase the walkability and accessibility to these community assets.

## Recommendations

The following priority works have been identified from the matrix:

**Road T19 – Teesdale-Inverleigh Road** posted a score of 57 with its main contributing category being connectivity. This is due to its proximity to local amenity and the need for a path to provide greater accessibility and connection toward these community assets. This road also has had previous community demand, verifying it's justification for increased provision.


**Road T1 – Bannockburn-Shelford Road** is the main road through Teesdale and posted a score of 53 due to its typology and ability for connectivity. Whilst an existing path is present, there are apparent gaps where service roads are relied upon for access limiting full accessibility. Priority is within the main township where an additional footpath on the south side of the road would increase safe access to amenity and services.

Notable other roads that could be considered are Ware Street (T16) and Mercer Terrace (T20) which were identified for their proximity to local community assets and previous community demand.

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Inverleigh



Population 1,746 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
I1	Cambridge Street	2	0	0	-	35	-2	3	1	5	0	0	44
I2	Hamilton Hwy	8	0	0	-	35	5	3	1	5	0	0	57
I3	Park St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40
I4	East St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	3	0	5	0	0	43
I5	McCallum Rd	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	48
I6	Railway St	2	0	0	-	35	5	3	1	5	0	0	51
I7	Napier St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40
I8	Savage Dr	2	0	0	-	35	5	3	0	5	0	0	50
I9	Cemetary Road	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
I10	Newman St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	3	1	5	0	0	44
I11	Rankin Road	2	0	0	-	35	5	3	0	5	0	0	50
I12	Newman Street	2	0	0	-	35	-2	3	1	5	0	0	47

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

The town of Inverleigh is based around a town centre situated along the Hamilton Highway which forms the main spine of the town. Parallel to the highway are service roads on the north and south providing relief from through traffic and a safety buffer to the community amenity. Existing paths provide good connection along the length of the town though broader connections to residential areas are lacking. New development is occurring to the north of the town with some consideration the path network evident, though the staggered nature of the development has resulted in some missing links.

To the north of the town is the Leigh River with the Barwon River bordering the east. These natural features present opportunity of a recreational loop, supporting efficient pedestrian access to the town (as opposed to streets) and community amenities.

## Recommendations

The following priority works have been identified from the matrix:

**Road I2 – Hamilton Highway** posted a score of 57 due to its typology and ability for connectivity. Whilst an existing path is present for majority of the highway through the town, there are apparent gaps to the east and west where extension of existing paths would provide connection for the residents living north of the town.

**Road I6 – Railway Street** posted a score of 51 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Located at the western end of the town, this road offers ability to connect existing residents to the reserve and provide future connection for residential expansion to the south. This road also has previous community demand, verifying the community need for increased provision.

**Road I11 – Rankin Road** posted a score of 50 with its main contributing category being connectivity. New developments to the east have been provided with footpaths, with Rankine Road being identified as an opportunity to create connectivity with Common Road to the north. This road would need to be considered alongside a footpath on Savage Drive (I8) in order to facilitate a successful connection to the north. Savage Drive also scored highly as its southern section is within the 1km radius of several community assets, although the northern part of the road is quite removed from the township.

# Inverleigh

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Golden Plains LGA Area
-  Existing Rail
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Haddon



Population 1,276 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
H1	Racecourse Road	2	0	0	-	35	0	0	1	5	0	0	43
H2	Taylor's Road	2	2	0	-	35	0	3	0	5	-2	0	45
H3	Ross Creek - Haddon Road	6	0	0	-	35	-4	0	0	5	0	0	42
H4	Bothe Place	2	0	0	-	30	0	0	0	5	0	0	37
H5	Thomas Road	1	0	0	-	8	0	3	0	5	0	0	17
H6	Haddon School Road	4	0	0	-	35	0	0	0	5	0	0	44
H7	Taemore Close	2	0	0	-	35	0	0	0	5	0	0	42
H8	Wonger Lane	1	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	5	-8	0	-2

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

The town of Haddon is located west of Ballarat along the Smythes Creek. Its small community is largely spread out with large rural style lots and farmland though the concentration of residents is predominantly around the main town. The main town area hosts key amenity such as the pre and primary schools, community centre and CFA with residents predominantly living within a 1km radius of these amenities. This concentrated population provides great opportunities for increasing the walkability of the town which also attracts tourists to its campground, bush reserves and the Ballarat – Skipton Rail Trail.

Existing paths provide good connection along the main road (Sago Hill Road) though broader connections to residential areas are lacking.

## Recommendations

The following priority works have been identified from the matrix:

**Road H2 – Taylor's Road** posted a score of 45 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Whilst it scored negatively due to potential impacts on vegetation, its ability to provide connectivity to key natural features in the Ballarat Skipton Rail Trail and the Haddon Common Bushland Reserves highlights this road as key candidate for improved access in Haddon.

**Road H6 – Haddon School Road (northern section)** posted a score of 44 with its main contributing category being connectivity both from a local and tourism perspective. Situated at the south west of the town, this road hosts the main camping area as well as the general store. This road also has previous community demand.


Notable other roads that could be considered are Ross Creek-Haddon Road (H3), Racecourse Road (H2) and Taemore Close (H7) which were identified contextual opportunities to better connect residents to community amenity and provide recreational opportunities via walking loops.

# Haddon

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 



# Smythesdale



Population 1,189 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
S1	Garden St	2	0	0	-	31	5	0	0	5	0	0	43
S2	Heales St	6	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	51
S3	Glenelg Hwy N	8	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	54
S4	Glenelg Hwy S	8	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	54
S5	Sebastopol-Smythesdale Rd	6	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	52
S6	Clyde St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	48
S7	Loader St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S8	Ireland St	2	0	2	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	50
S9	Pascoe St	2	0	2	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	50
S10	Browns Rd	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S11	Elizabeth St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S12	Johnsons St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S13	Anderson St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S14	Brandys St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
S15	Lynch St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	1	5	0	0	48

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

The Town of Smythesdale is located along the Glenelg highway which forms the main spine of the town. Although there are some footpaths provided along this main strip where the predominant concentration of community facilities is found, the broader footpath connections to residents and open spaces is significantly lacking.

Significant natural features are located on the east and west of the town with various recreation trails weaving through bushland, nature reserves and rivers. The Ballarat-Skipton Rail Trail also passes through Smythesdale on the west side of the town, crossing through key open spaces such as the recreation reserve and Smythesdale Gardens. These contextual relationships present a great opportunity to improve the access and walkability more broadly within Smythesdale.

## Recommendations

The following priority works have been identified from the matrix:

**Road S3 – Glenelg Highway North** (North of Heales Street) posted a score of 54 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Evidence of existing access was evident along the western side of the road, prompting the need for improvements and connectivity to the northern end of the town. This road also has previous community demand.








**Road S4 – Glenelg Highway South** (South of Verdon Street) posted a score of 54 with its main contributing category being connectivity. Extension of this path will provide connection to residents at the southern end of the town. This extension will also provide opportunity for broader connections to natural features such as the Ballarat-Skipton Rail Trail, Streamside Reserve and Woody Yaloak River which borders the town to the west. It has received previous community demand and is identified as a priority for Smythesdale.


**Road S2 – Sebastopol-Smythesdale Road** posted a score of 52 with its main contributing category being connectivity providing community links from the east of the town to community amenity on the Glenelg Highway. Community feedback was very outspoken for this connection, with the road providing direct connection to Ross Creek.

# Smythesdale

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Golden Plains LGA Area
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Lethbridge



Population 1,181 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
L1	Tall Tree Rd	3	0	0	-	35	0	3	1	5	0	0	47
L2	Midland Hwy	8	0	0	-	30	1	3	0	5	0	0	47
L3	Goggin Rd	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L4	Quarry Rd	1	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	41
L5	Ackland Rd	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L6	Brunel St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L7	Brady Rd	2	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	42
L8	Broom Rd	2	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	42
L9	Cubbit St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L10	Russell St	4	0	0	-	35	-4	3	0	5	0	0	43
L11	Ohare St	2	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	42
L12	Tolson St	2	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	42
L13	Sutherland St	2	0	0	-	30	-2	0	0	5	0	0	35
L14	Hodges St	2	0	0	-	30	5	0	0	5	0	0	42
L15	Stephenson St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Lethbridge is a small town located along the Midland Highway. The highway facilitates through traffic and acts as the main distributor for both vehicles and pedestrians to the heart of the town on its west. New areas of development to the west and east have considered pedestrian connectivity, though their relationship and footpath connectivity to older parts of the town and key community assets were lacking.

Whilst an existing framework of paths is present along main roads within the town, it was identified that these were deteriorating, and accessibility was compromised. Building on these renewed paths, it presents good opportunity to increase connectivity for residents and promote a broader demographic use.

## Recommendations

The matrix identifies roads L1, L2, L3, L5, L6, L9 and L15 all as equal priority with a score of 47. In assessing the order of any initial works it is recommended that new or upgraded paths taking primary focus are those that link existing footpaths around the main township and key community assets. As such:

**Road L2 – Midland Highway** has a footpath for the most part, but breaks around the intersection of Russell Street.








**Road L15 – Stephenson Sreet** would contribute to increasing the broader walkability of the town.


**Road L1 – Tall Tree Road** would connect the new development to the west to the main township. There is an obvious gap here between the newly constructed footpaths and existing paths along Russell Street. This connection was identified during community consultation.

# Lethbridge

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Rail
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Batesford



Population 1,141 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
BT1	Blackhall Road	3	0	1	-	6	-5	3	0	5	0	0	13
BT2	Midland Highway	8	0	0	-	0	5	3	0	5	0	0	21
BT3	Fleurs Lane	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
BT4	Tarraford Way	2	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	5	0	0	17
BT5	Greenstone Lane	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
BT6	Tolloora Way	2	0	0	-	6	5	0	0	5	0	0	18
BT7	Yorkshire Close North & South	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	-6	0	6
BT8	Madden Avenue	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
BT9	Honey Lane	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12
BT10	Glenora Place	2	0	0	-	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	12

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Batesford is the southeastern most town of the Golden Plains Shire, located outside North Geelong on the Midland Highway where it intersects the Barwon River. The River also marks the boundary of the shire, with amenity associated with Batesford located in City of Greater Geelong boundary to the east. The main residential areas are located on the west of the River where the absence of a footpath results in a lack of pedestrian connection to key community infrastructure such as the school, sports clubs and hospitality offerings.

An existing path is present along the Midland Highway with some connections provided to the north and south. New development to the north has suitable footpath connection, however existing connections to the south (Blackhall Road – 1) are deteriorating and lacking broader connections to the adjacent residential areas.

Broadly, Batesfords proximity to Geelong and the future planned employment precinct in Gheringhap provide opportunity for active transport to those wishing to take a more active commute. Locally, the existing path network provides a good framework to increase the walkability to community amenity such as bush reserves, parks and schools.

## Recommendations

**Road BT2 – Midland Highway** posted a score of 21 with its main contributing factors being the lack of a path heading west to Gheringhap, and lack of a connection east to main community amenity. Whilst works east of the Barwon River are unable to be captured in these works due to them not being located within the Golden Plains Shire. Strategically a connection toward Gheringhap and Bannockburn is a key priority for the Shire.








**Road BT6 –Tolloora Way** posted a score of 18 with its main contributing factors being connectivity and the absence of an existing path. The main community play space is located along this street and the introduction of a path would increase accessibility and walkability of the residential area. It also provides connection to the existing footpath along Blackhall Road (BT1) which would provide a broader link back to the highway. A path in this location would benefit the community by providing a larger walkable catchment for Batesford.


Notable other roads that could be considered are Tarraford Way (BT4) which would contribute to increasing the broader walkability of the town and upgrades to Blackhall Road (BT1) which was identified for upgrade due to its deteriorating existing path.

# Batesford

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Golden Plains LGA Area
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Meredith



Population 821 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
M1	McLeod St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
M2	Mercer St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
M3	Russell St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
M4	Lawler St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40
M5	Wilson St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40
M6	Staughton St	6	0	0	-	35	-4	0	0	5	0	0	42
M7	Staughton St E	6	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	51
M8	Mooney St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
M9	Read St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40
M10	Champ St	2	0	0	-	35	-2	0	0	5	0	0	40

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Meredith is small town located on the Midland Highway along the Coolebarghurk Creek. The main residential areas are located on the west the highway and bordered by the trainline to the west. An existing path network is present though sporadic, resulting in a lack of pedestrian connection from residential areas to key community infrastructure and natural features.

The highway forms the main spine of the town with key community amenity located along it. Existing paths are present along this strip though opportunities were identified to increase the accessibility and promote broader demographic use by upgrading these existing paths. Further opportunities were identified in the residential areas to better connect users to the existing pedestrian paths and beyond.

## Recommendations

**Road M7 – Staughton Street E** posted a score of 51 with its main contributing factors being connectivity. Whilst an existing path is located along the extension of Staughton Street (heading west) the introduction of a path heading east offers a strong east west pedestrian connector for Meredith. Whilst an existing path is present on the southern side of the road (providing opportunity for connection into a future trail along the Coolebarghurk Creek), this path would benefit the walkability of the town, especially for residents located to the east.








**Roads 1,2,3 & 8 - McLeod Street (M1), Mercer Street (M2), Russell Street (M3) and Mooney Street (M8)** all posted scores of 47. The weighting towards this score is the same for each as they contribute toward the general connectivity of residential streets to main streets and community amenity. Meredith would benefit from these paths being considered as one scope (particularly M1, M2 and M3) to support broader pedestrian catchment.


Notable other roads that could be considered are Lawler Street (M4) and Wilson Street (M5) which would contribute to increasing the broader walkability of the town though are less of a priority due to their proximity to community amenity and paths on adjacent streets proving some access.

# Meredith

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Rail
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 



# Smythes Creek



Population 4,230 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
SC1	Glenelg Highway	8	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	3	0	0	21
SC2	Bells Road	6	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	3	0	0	19
SC3	Hendersons Road	3	0	1	-	5	5	0	0	3	-6	0	11
SC4	Doble Road	1	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	3	-4	0	10
SC5	Waddell Road	1	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	3	2	0	16
SC6	Jollys Hill Road	3	0	0	-	15	5	0	0	3	-8	0	18
SC7	Post Office Road	3	0	0	-	15	5	0	0	3	-8	0	18
SC8	Cherry Flat Road South	1	0	0	-	5	5	0	0	3	0	0	14

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

Smythes Creek is a spread-out community with large rural style housing lots making up the majority of the town. New housing development is occurring to the North in Ballarat (east of Kensington Creek) where shared paths are currently being provided along the Glenelg Highway.

Given the expanse of the Smythes Creek township and the lack of community amenity, footpaths have not previously been provided. However, due to its relationship and proximity to Ballarat, future planning of paths along main arterials will provide the opportunity to connect into the broader shared path network.

## Recommendations

**Roads SC1 & SC2 – Glenelg Highway and Bells Road** posted a score of 21 and 19 respectively with the contributing factors being road typology, and potential for future connectivity and access to adjacent broader path networks. A path in these locations would benefit the current and future community by providing a larger walkable catchment for Smythes Creek with the ability to expand as the township grows.


**Roads SC6 & SC7 – Jollys Hill Road and Post Office Road** posted a score of 18 with main contributing factors being connectivity, specifically to the school, post-office, recreation reserve and general store located on Sebastopol-Smythesdale Road, Ross Creek. Whilst they both scored negatively due to potential impacts on vegetation, the ability to provide connectivity between community assets makes these priority paths for Smythes creek, but low priority for the shire overall.

# Smythes Creek

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Golden Plains LGA Area
-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius



NTS 

# Linton



Population 635 (2021 Census)

No.	Street	Criterion											Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
L11	York St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L12	Surrey St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L13	Clyde St E	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	-2	0	45
L14	Glenelg Hwy N	8	0	0	-	31	5	3	0	5	-8	0	44
L15	Glenelg Hwy S	8	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	53
L16	Gillespie St	2	3	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	50
L17	Jackson St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	-6	0	41
L18	Waverley St	2	0	0	-	31	5	0	0	5	-4	0	39
L19	Hamilton St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L110	Denison St	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	47
L111	Brooke St N	2	1	0	-	31	-2	3	0	5	0	0	40
L112	Adair St N	2	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	-6	0	41
L113	Linton-Mortchup Rd	4	0	0	-	31	5	3	0	5	-8	0	40
L114	Clyde St W	4	0	0	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	49
L115	Cumberland St	2	0	3	-	35	5	0	0	5	0	0	50
L116	Grant St W	2	0	0	-	31	5	0	0	5	-6	0	37

## Gaps Analysis and Opportunities

The town of Linton is located along the Glenelg highway which forms the main spine of the town. Although there are some footpaths provided along this main strip where the predominant concentration of community facilities is found, the broader footpath connections to residents and open spaces is lacking.

Significant natural features are located on the east and west of the town with various recreation trails weaving through bushland, nature reserves and rivers. The Ballarat-Skipton Rail Trail also passes through Linton on the east of the town, crossing through key open spaces such as the recreation reserve before heading north into the bushland. These contextual relationships present a great opportunity to improve the access and walkability more broadly within Linton.

## Recommendations

**Road LI5 – Glenelg Highway South** posted a score of 53 with its main contributing factors being road typology and connectivity. Existing paths are present along Glenelg highway through the main strip of the town, though extension of this path will provide connection to Edinburgh Reserve and the residents in the west, increase the walkability of the town’s main spine. A path in this location would benefit the current and future community by providing a larger walkable catchment for Linton.

**Roads LI6 & LI15 – Gellespie Street and Cumberland Street** both posted scores of 50 with their main contributing factors being connectivity and cost feasibility. Both of these streets would aid in providing broader connections for the community, linking the highway to community infrastructure such as Edinburgh Reserve and the church. Specifically, the inclusion of a path along Gellespie street also provides opportunities for north south connections to York (LI1) and Surrey (LI2) Streets through to Clyde (LI3) and Grant Streets (LI16) which have broader connections to community assets on the east of the town.


Notable other roads that could be considered are York Street (LI1), Surrey Street (LI2), Denison Street (LI10) and Hamilton Street (LI9) which would all contribute to increasing the broader walkability of the town.

# Linton

## Footpath Network Analysis Plan

### LEGEND

-  Existing Paths
-  Proposed Upgrade Path
-  Proposed New Path
-  Proposed Pedestrian Crossing
-  400m Radius
-  1km Radius




NTS 

# Supporting Infrastructure

In some instances, supporting infrastructure may be recommended as part of a footpath upgrade or installation. To facilitate a broader pedestrian network, the walking environment must be safe, comfortable, and inclusive. This means that in some instances the provision of street lighting, canopy shade and bench seats should be added to the project as part of the Footpath Strategy. Whilst their funding may come from a different source, design should be considered in conjunction with the footpath project to ensure that desired outcomes are achieved. For example, tree planting to provide shade to a path will only see beneficial results from 10 years post planting, so opportunities to plan tree planting ahead of footpath upgrade or install could be beneficial if the design (alignment) of footpaths is known and designed for in conjunction with tree planting locations upfront.

Another consideration for supporting infrastructure is the provision of pedestrian priority crossings. This will assist in completion of the pedestrian network – linking footpaths across larger roads. Opportunities to incorporate priority crossings have been highlighted on the individual township recommendation plans.



# Standard Footpath Details

To ensure a consistent finish and quality of new footpath works across the Shire, GPS should provide contractors with a set of standard details to achieve the standards set out in the Levels Of Service Framework of the Strategy. This standard should also be followed by council in its own delivery and maintenance of assets.



The following standard concrete footpath detail has been taken from the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA)'s Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM). We recommend adoption of this standard paving detail for all concrete paths within the municipality unless the in-situ soils and subgrade are of particularly poor or volatile condition that may require custom structural engineering. Where possible, low carbon concrete and any other evolving technologies are to be considered to meet councils goals outlined in the Golden Plains Shire Council Climate Emergency Plan.

As a rule it is recommended that all new paths are concrete. This is the only surface considered fully accessible. However, in some instances it may be appropriate to install new asphalt or gravel path sections, for example where they connect two other paths of the same material.



In these instances, and in instances of rectification/

reinstatement of damaged sections of asphalt or gravel paths, the typical details on the following page are recommended.

Whilst we have identified that concrete footpaths are the only truly accessible option and therefore should be the minimum standard when upgrading or installing new footpaths, there are cases where this rule may be disregarded for alternative benefits. For example, the cost of concrete paths is generally higher than asphalt. It may be cost prohibitive to install concrete footpaths in every situation, but for the benefit of providing some connectivity rather than none, an asphalt path may be deemed as an acceptable outcome. We also acknowledge that a large part of the character of GPS is the rural feel, and with this comes the notion of less formal paths. Certainly, it is not commonplace to have concrete paths on both sides of the street as is standard practice in metropolitan areas. The 'looseness' of gravel paths without formal edges certainly contributes to this rural character and in retaining this character, consideration may be given to cases where a less formal gravel path will serve some pedestrian benefit, albeit not be fully accessible. This situation should be reserved for more rural areas, reserves and is more akin to the Tracks and Trails Strategy where opportunities to tie in with those links may be extended in the streetscape network to a logical point of transition to more formal paths (likely more built-up areas).




## Standard Footpath Details




### 9.2 Pathways

#### 9.2.1 Gravel Paths

Where gravel material such as Granitic sand is used, the gravel must be stabilised. Pathway widths will vary however must be a minimum of 1500mm wide. In some circumstances timber edging will not be required.



Gravel Path Detail, City of Ballarat Landscape Design Manual 2012, Version 5.



# Maintenance Program and Method

Currently GPS council spends \$100,000\* per annum on footpath and kerb maintenance. The current model for maintenance is generally reactive and ad-hoc with council responding to customer requests for maintenance in line with the GPS Road Management Plan 2021-2025.

In the future, with a growing asset register and ageing assets, the pressure on resources may well increase, meaning council needs to have a clear maintenance/management plan to ensure footpaths do not drop below the minimum standards identified in the Services Level Framework.

Looking at neighbouring City of Greater Geelong's (COGG) inspection requirements, they identify two situations in which footpath inspections should occur: a request for service, usually when someone has identified an issue (reactive). And, the routine, programmed (proactive) inspection that should occur regardless to ensure ongoing service levels are not compromised.

Council should allow for a proportion of reactive inspections and required maintenance works, but ideally the majority of these works are programmed and forecast. To facilitate this, regular routine inspections allow council to stay ahead of potential maintenance issues.

Currently, under the GPS Road Management Plan 2021-2025, council has committed to inspecting all pathways on a 12 monthly cycle.

*\*Annual budgets subject to change*


Reactive maintenance should occur as present, when flagged by a member of the public.

It is noted that the GPS Road Management Plan 2021-2025 also sets out intervention standards for defective pedestrian paths in terms of expected response times. For this Strategy, no deviation from those timeframes is proposed, however, these response times may need to be periodically reviewed against the Service Levels Framework and available resources to service a growing asset register.






# Appendices



## Appendix A - Site Analysis Maps

## Appendix B - Issues Paper





**spiire**

| Adelaide | Albury | Ballarat | Bendigo | Brisbane | Canberra | Geelong | Gippsland | Melbourne | Shepparton |

2 Pope Street, Bannockburn, VIC 3331  
19 Heales Street, Smythesdale, VIC 3351  
PO Box 111, Bannockburn, VIC 3331

☎ 5220 7111

@ enquiries@gplains.vic.gov.au

goldenplains.vic.gov.au

#### CUSTOMER HUB HOURS

Golden Plains Civic Centre

8.30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday

The Well, Smythesdale

8.30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday

@GPSCouncilNews

@ lovegoldenplains

f GoldenPlainsShire

f GoldenPlainsMayor

