



# Mt Barker & District Residents' Association Inc.

PO Box 19 Mount Barker, South Australia 5251

*For the Community*

---

11 February 2024

Andrew Stuart, CEO Mt Barker District Council

Dear Andrew

## **RE: Paech Road upgrade**

The Mt Barker & District Residents' Association appreciates the opportunity to respond to the draft designs of the Paech Road upgrade. We are most supportive of an upgrade of this major connector road. It cannot come soon enough.

Our members are concerned about any tree loss. We note on the plans that there is only one dead tree to be removed. This is pleasing. There is a further comment that no 'high quality vegetation' will be removed. We question what 'high quality' means? How is this measured? We note two narrow sections of the road where any widening is impossible without removing some trees. Does this mean that once the upgrade begins you will come to these 'pinch points', have someone assess that the tree's health is 'not of high-quality vegetation' and they will then be destroyed? We would like greater clarity about this matter and a commitment that trees will not be destroyed with this upgrade. We are aware of your investigation into the use of 'tree-sensitive' road pavement design at such 'pinch points' and see this as a most desirable development for the whole District.

1. The pedestrian/cycling crossings along Paech Road have varying descriptors: ie
  - Hartman Road, Heysen Boulevard precinct: *pedestrian refuge within solid median to DIT standard detail*
  - At the 1125 mark: *New pedestrian crossing and path connection*. Will this be to DIT standard detail?
  - At the 1400 mark there is no definition of the crossing. Will this be to DIT standard detail?

At the Heysen Boulevard roundabout there are four crossings which are in the immediate vicinity of the roundabout. As this will be an extremely busy roundabout we question the safety of people crossing here. Is this the usual location for a pedestrian/cycling crossing near a roundabout?

We note the planned future pedestrian crossing adjacent the eastern side of the Adore Estate development opposite the School.

2. At the 1050 mark you have the shared path reduced to 1.5 metres and precariously close to the road. We think this is unsafe and feel an alternative route to the opposite side of the tree should be developed. We appreciate avoiding the removal of trees but to put people's

lives at risk is also not appropriate. Can an alternative route for this section of path be considered? Alternatively, a fence or barrier should be erected at this point if the path cannot be changed.

3. Will the properties along Paech Road with driveway access be required to have internal turning bays so they do not have to reverse out onto Paech Road?
4. We are pleased to see the shared use path along the complete length of road from Emerald Way up to and including Glenlea Boulevard. Surely with all of the development on the northern side of Paech Road, up to Potts Road, a shared path is warranted? We would like to have this pathway extended up to Springvale Estate, with a crossing over Potts Road, via Glenlea Estate to avoid the intersection. We note that the intersection design is still being investigated and we strongly urge that you consider pedestrian and cycling access around this intersection and into Springvale Estate.
5. As Brooks Road is currently an unused road, what are the plans for this other than keeping it closed off from Paech Road access? Could it become a walking/cycling trail to link the estates? It is currently blocked off and appears to be an unused roadway, so we question why it is added to the draft design.
6. What vegetation will you be planting along the shared paths to beautify the road and soften the edges? We ask that Council be cognisant of the important revegetation work that has previously been carried out on nearby roads, particularly Yungkunga and Harper Roads, and the potential adverse impact further housing developments and road widening activities will have on the wildlife and biodiversity in those areas.
7. We understand from members that attended the consultation session at Aston Hills, that this is a 5 – 10 year plan. We are concerned that the lack of an adequate shared use path from Aston Hills to a connected path into the town centre is creating unsafe and hazardous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. If this is a 5-to-10-year plan, we strongly recommend that you prepare a staged implementation and focus on this section in the first and immediate stage. We would like to see something for pedestrian and cyclists built here in 2024.

We hope you consider our ideas and questions and look forward to seeing the next iteration of your plans.

Kind regards

*Douglas McCarty*

**Douglas McCarty**  
**Chairperson**