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## 1. BACKGROUND

### 1.1 CONTEXT

Transport for NSW is developing plans for a ramp at the northern end of the Sydney Harbour Bridge Cycleway, and a two-way separated bike path linking the ramp with the existing bike network on Middlemiss Street, Milsons Point. These plans are part of a broader mission to encourage cycling within the city.

This project hopes to increase mode shift from cars to bikes and make cycling safe and accessible for a wide range of ages and cycling abilities, while maintaining heritage and amenity within the area.

### 1.2 PURPOSE OF ENGAGEMENT

Extensive community engagement on this project by Transport for NSW has revealed broad community support for this development, however local residents and some stakeholder groups, including North Sydney Council, have expressed concerns regarding local amenity, open space and heritage.

The project has now progressed to design, and as such it is important to seek community and user input to the design development process. To support this, Transport has established a Community and Bike User Group (CBUG).

The key objectives of the CBUG is to advise TfNSW on how the linear ramp design and Alfred Street bike path can contribute to public amenity, encourage cycling and assist in the development of solutions to resolve potential conflicts between cyclists, pedestrians and other public space users.


### 1.2 CBUG WORKSHOPS

Two workshops with the CBUG were held in May 2022:

- Workshop 1 - Saturday 14 May 9am - 1 pm
- Workshop 2 - Saturday 21 May 9am - 1pm

The workshops were held over two consecutive weekends which allowed enough time to present the CBUG with information, listen to initial feedback and questions and allow the group to deliberate between the sessions.

The workshops were structured in a way to maximise opportunities for feedback while still providing enough information and context for participants to make informed contributions.


CBUG members were provided with information about the project and proposed designs

### 1.2 CBUG PARTICIPANTS

The CBUG was randomly selected to represent local community and bike users. The selected group consisted of 15 people, with eight female participants and seven male participants.

Prior to the first workshop one female participant withdrew. Following the first workshop, a second female participant withdrew due to a clash with family commitments. The final CBUG consisted of 13 people, 7 male and 6 female.
The age range was as follows; one participant in their 70 's, two participants in their 40's and two in their 50's. Three participants were in their 20's, Three in their 60's and four participants in their 30's. There were 10 people in the local area (postcode 20602061) and three from the wider local community.

The participants were asked about their bike type and how often they ride. Six people said they do not ride a bike, four people use E or cargo bikes and five people regular bikes. Regularity of riding ranged from daily to never, with four participants who use their bike daily, four who said they use their bike a few times a week and another four riding a few times a year. Three group members said they rarely or never use a bike.


CBUG demographic and bike usage data

'Getting to know you' activity

## 2. ACTIVITIES \& OUTCOMES <br> 2.1 CBUG WORKSHOP 1

The first CBUG workshop was held on Saturday 14 May from 9am to 1 pm . There were 13 members attending in person and 1 online via MS Teams.

The workshop was designed to share information about the project and define scope and purpose of the CBUG, which is to gain feedback on the Cycleway design from local residents. The workshop also sought initial feedback from the group.

The session was delivered in two parts, starting in the meeting room and moving to site for the latter part of the workshop.

Workshop Activities

| ACTIVITY | DESCRIPTION \& PURPOSE |
| :--- | :--- |
| Designing for Place | Participants were asked to recount a memorable day at <br> a place where cyclists, vehicles and pedestrians interact. <br> The purpose of this activity was to get an idea of what <br> people like about other spaces, and what they didn't <br> like. |
| Testing initial <br> reactions (site visit <br> activity) | CBUG was given a background presentation about the <br> project from TfNSW at the proposed cycleway site. Key <br> places on site relating to the proposed cycleway were <br> identified to participants, including two design options <br> under consideration and links to cycleways and <br> pedestrian paths. Groups were invited to walk unguided <br> around the site in groups and answer 3 questions: |
| - What do you like about design elements you have |  |
| - Ween so far? |  |
| - What could be improved? |  |$|$| Individuals and small groups answered the questions on |
| :--- |
| their activity sheet. This was followed by an informal |
| whole-group discussion. |

Activity 1 - Designing for Place

| Group 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Your place | Barangaroo |
| When was this? | Saturday 7 May |
| Describe the place | Large public park with multiple users |
| What were the details that made it special? | Different users can use same space |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? |  |
| What was good? |  |
| How did you feel? | - |
| Why did it work? | Well separated areas for different users |
| What could have been better? | Visual way to separate different users |
| Group 2 |  |
| Your place | Centennial park |
| When was this? | 2022 |
| Describe the place | Large open parklands with space for cars, bikes and pedestrians |
| What were the details that made it special? | Wedding, enough room, beautiful nature |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | Vehicles travel slowly, allocated spaces, wide roads, respect for people \& bikes |
| What was good? | Easy access \& no stairs, enjoy the parklands, quiet \& serene, nice to exercise \& lots of place to explore |
| How did you feel? | Relaxed, happy, appreciative of nature |
| Why did it work? | Respectful shared space, slow speed, well integrated, nature \& nice views, wide roads |
| What could have been better? | When it's open, busy on the outside, lack of signs |
| Group 3 |  |
| Your place | Coogee boardwalk by beach |
| When was this? | 6 May 2020 |
| Describe the place | Beachfront, multi-use, lots of food/drink, multi-activity, picnic |
| What were the details that made it special? | Sun, sea, friends |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | No clashes + not particularly competing for space |
| What was good? | Big open space |
| How did you feel? | Very relaxed |
| Why did it work? | It was a perfect day \& the water was warm. I was with friends. |
| What could have been better? | It was perfect |
| Group 4 |  |
| Your place | CBD Cycleway |
| When was this? | - |
| Describe the place | Main straight cycleway that runs along Kent St |


| What were the details that made it <br> special? | It is busy but flows, separated. Safe. Long. |
| :--- | :--- |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and <br> vehicles interact? | They are all separated and flow smoothly. |
| What was good? | Straight line. Safe separated dedicated <br> cycle path from pedestrians \& cars. Wide <br> enough to overtake if required. |
| How did you feel? | Safe. Flows well. Straightforward. <br> Why did it work? <br> Cycling is clear, safe, well-organised. <br> Cycleway doesn't impact cars. Bikes have 2- <br> way lanes. Cars only flow one way in some <br> sections. Flat. |
| What could have been better? | The cycleway made so it could bypass <br> lights, elevated to enable quick transit |
| instead of stop/start. Drainage to be |  |
| designed so no water pools and becomes a |  |
| hazard. If the lights line up so you didn't |  |
| have to stop. |  |

Activity 2 - Testing initial reactions - feedback summary

| What do you like <br> about the design <br> elements you have <br> seen so far? | What could be <br> improved? | What do you need <br> to know more <br> about? | Other comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Accessible | Connectivity and <br> future extension <br> Unobtrusive <br> streets/cycleways <br> Making <br> 'pedestrian' and <br> 'cyclist-only' areas <br> more clearly <br> signposted <br> Ensuring <br> adequate warning <br> is given at <br> pedestrian/cyclist <br> intersection <br> points | Ramp dimensions, <br> gradient and colour <br> How pedestrians will <br> be warned to not <br> walk up the ramp <br> Who else is allowed <br> to use the ramp, <br> other than <br> cyclists/skaters? | Night lighting of the <br> ramp <br> how the space <br> under the ramp will <br> be effectively <br> utilised |
| Overall traffic <br> impacts + impacts <br> of narrowing the <br> the floor to <br> delineate <br> bike/pedestrian <br> walkways are <br> visually unappealing | Area needs greater <br> lighting |  |  |
| Good site lines - difficult to cross <br> the road in this area <br> Adding signage <br> on the ground <br> plane as that's <br> where everyone <br> looks | Participants wanted <br> signage on the floor |  |  |

### 2.2 CBUG WORKSHOP 2

The second CBUG workshop was held on Saturday 21 May from 9am to 1 pm . There were 13 members in attendance.

The workshop was designed to build on discussions from the first session, confirm scope and purpose of the CBUG, seek input on designing for Country and explore detailed feedback on the proposed designs.

The workshop was delivered in two parts, continuing the site visit conducted in Workshop 1 by starting at the Foxie statue in Bradfield Park North, near Lavender Street roundabout. Participants then moved to the meeting room for the majority of the workshop.

(left) Lavender Street roundabout, at the northern end of Bradfield Park where the site visited was conducted. (right) Project team responding to CBUG questions

## Site visit

The workshop commenced with a short site visit to the Lavender Street roundabout where participants were given a short verbal presentation from the design team and had the opportunity to ask questions.

During the site visit at Bradfield Park, CBUG members had an opportunity to make notes on their clipboards. On return to the meeting room a facilitated discussion was held between CBUG members and the project team to talk about the project as a whole. The tables below capture the feedback from the written notes and facilitated discussion

Summary of feedback from early part of Workshop 2
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { Theme } & \text { Summary of Participants response } \\
\hline \text { Safety and Security } & \begin{array}{l}\text { By far the most reoccurring theme gathered from } \\
\text { participant feedback related to the safety and security } \\
\text { impacts of the design. Safety and security issues were } \\
\text { raised by attendees related to the impacts of the ramp } \\
\text { on traffic flows, anti-social behaviour and concerns over } \\
\text { the impacts on an already complex intersection. }\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{l}\text { Traffic Flows } \\
\text { Safety and security predominately revolved around } \\
\text { impacts on traffic. Participants identified that having } \\
\text { the ramp feed into the roundabout would negatively } \\
\text { impact drivers and cyclists. They cited numerous } \\
\text { reasons for this position: } \\
\text { - An already complex and confusing roundabout } \\
\text { - Lack of clear existing indicators and signage } \\
\text { Use of the bike path by less experienced cyclists } \\
\text { such as children and the elderly }\end{array}
$$ <br>
One participant offered a potential solution in adding <br>
an additional crossing to allow cyllists to cross the road <br>
south of the roundabout on Alfred Street to reduce <br>

roundabout congestion.\end{array}\right\}\)| Anti-Social Behaviour |
| :--- |
| Some participants were concerned with the anti-social |
| behaviour that may be abetted by the ramp, including |
| concerns about graffiti. |

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { Theme } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Summary of Participants response } \\ \hline \text { Infrastructure } \\ \\ \hline\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Participants expressed feedback on infrastructure } \\ \text { changes that should or should not go ahead as part of } \\ \text { the project. } \\ \text { Lavender Street Roundabout } \\ \text { Building on from the safety and security concerns, one } \\ \text { participant suggested the roundabout needed to be } \\ \text { redesigned if cyclists were to be safely incorporated } \\ \text { into traffic flows. They cited the lack of signage and } \\ \text { visibility at the intersection as a key concern. }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Road Adjustments } \\ \text { One participant expressed opposition to adding } \\ \text { additional parking spaces, citing that the project } \\ \text { should not impact the bus stops in front of Milsons } \\ \text { Point Station and the existing shared paths should not } \\ \text { be altered. They claimed there were more personnel } \\ \text { accessing the bus stops and train stations than bike } \\ \text { riders heading south, and that infrastructure should be } \\ \text { proportional to demand (i.e bike infrastructure should } \\ \text { not interfere with existing public transport } \\ \text { infrastructure). }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Aesthetic Appeal } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Participants requested further information on how the } \\ \text { design of the ramp and subsequent landscaping would } \\ \text { blend into the existing environment. Participants }\end{array} \\ \text { expressed a preference for the ramp to fit into the } \\ \text { current aesthetic of Bradfield Park alongside being } \\ \text { environmentally friendly. } \\ \text { Participants also requested further information on how }\end{array}\right\} \begin{array}{l}\text { Country will be implemented into the design. } \\ \text { Participants expressed a preference for unique and } \\ \text { visible cultural references. Participant suggestions } \\ \text { included: } \\ \text { - Implementation of totems into the style and } \\ \text { design of the pillars and columns that support } \\ \text { the ramps. Example included carving crocodile } \\ \text { and the long-neck turtle into the pillar or } \\ \text { column. Engravings underneath the ramp to reflect }\end{array}\right\}$

## Designing for Country

The CBUG was placed in small groups and asked to consider the following questions:

1. Think of a time you have seen recognition of First Nations people reflected through design. What did this look like? How was it done? Why did you like it?
2. Do you feel Country can be acknowledged appropriately through design in this project? What do you see as the opportunities and constraints?

## Responses

Question 1: Think of a time you have seen recognition of First Nations people reflected through design. What did this look like? How was it done? Why did you like it?

| Design | Summary of Participants response |
| :--- | :--- |
| Darling Harbour | Participants cited the footpath at Darling Harbour that <br> incorporate indigenous designs. The harbour side walk <br> is a 9km walk that celebrates Indigenous culture. |
| Barangaroo | Participants cited the Barangaroo Archway that <br> incorporates Indigenous artwork into its design. |
| Highway Murals | Sound barriers on the edge of highways provide <br> inspiration to incorporate Indigenous design. |
| Balls Head | Participants cited Uncle May's walk at Balls Head. |
| Wellington Dam, <br> Western Australia | Participants cited the work prepared for the <br> Department of Water in Western Australia regarding <br> the social impacts of the Wellington Dam on <br> Indigenous communities. |
| Lane Cove | Participants cited the Mindarie Lane Cove children's <br> playground and its name which has celebrates <br> Indigenous culture. |


| Design | Summary of Participants response |
| :--- | :--- |
| General | The feedback in this section covers notes participants <br> made that did not directly answer the question may still <br> be considered. Participants expressed the following <br> ideas: <br> - Utilising Indigenous artwork and stories to <br> convey experiences |
| Displays that incorporate visual as well as |  |
| audio elements to highlight local Indigenous |  |
| culture, including culture during pre-European |  |
| arrival |  |

Question 2: Do you feel Country can be acknowledged appropriately through design in this project? What do you see as the opportunities and constraints?

| Design | Summary of Participants response |
| :--- | :--- |
| Murals | Participants across groups citied multiple ways to include <br> murals within the design. Participants suggested murals <br> could be used in the following way: <br> Symbols in visible areas to represent Indigenous <br> culture <br> Murals on the walls and pillars of the ramp. <br> Inspired by the murals in the underpass of Flat <br> Rock Drive cycleway and walking path. <br> Murals on the floor of the ramp, inspired by the <br> use of Indigenous art on the floor out the front of <br> Parliament House. |
| Yarning Circles | Participants in one group identified the use of seating <br> configured based on yarning circles. This option would <br> allow for seating options as well as an acknowledgement <br> of Indigenous culture. |
| Lighting | Participants also acknowledged the importance of lighting <br> and its symbolic illumination power. Participants expressed <br> support for lighting to be integrated into the indigenous <br> design element, to highlight indigenous culture during the <br> night. |

## Activity - Reflecting on design

The CBUG were provided with large format images of the site printed on A0 paper. They were asked to provide feedback using post it notes, visual aids (small photos) and markers. The project team was available to listen to the feedback as it was recorded and answer questions.

## Overview

Participants provided wide ranging and constructive feedback during this activity. The comments below have been summarised to capture the key and prominent themes. These themes emerged as safety and security, infrastructure adjustments, Country and aesthetic appeal.
Summary of comments - verbatim comments are found in the Appendix section

| Location | Street View | Participants Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 Alfred Street, looking South |  | 1) Please do thorough traffic study of Alfred St. Including buses, school buses, out of service buses, before narrowing road width. This is one of the two access points for Kirribilli peninsula - High St + Clark Rd the other. Please don't stuff up both for the local residents. High St. is going to be stuffed-up by WHT + BL access from High St. <br> 2) What is the current width of the road? Lane - should not be narrowed! <br> 3) Bike path colours to blend in with environment |


| Location | Street View | Participants Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96 Alfred Street, looking East |  | 1) Signs not on poles but on road and footpath surfaces <br> 2) Too many signs <br> 3) Power available to charge ebikes/scooters/etc <br> 4) Rotunda can be moved to other space - or use it as the break between cyclists and pedestrians around it <br> 5) Rotunda can be moved but should not be discarded <br> 6) Great idea to retain the trees that are on the grassy part of the park <br> 7) Scrappy poplars along the railway viaduct are less important \& can be removed |



| Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Street, |
| looking |
| North East | Participants Comments



| Location | Street View | Participants Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Middlemiss Street, looking South |  | 1) This small slipway into Middlemiss Street is useful and should be retained. |

User feedback on ramp design and landing area interface



1) Crossing location for safety and convenience
2) Suggestion: Road space instead of trees.
3) Currently a dark overshadowed location. Use low level trees.
4) Install barrier to stop cars from overtaking buses and risking the safety of pedestrians
5) Plant climbing fauna on columns
6) Design the area underneath the ramp for homeless people.
7) Uber pick up and drop off at bus bay

8 ) is there an opportunity to keep the shared path?

## 3. CONCLUSION

The first two workshops of the CBUG achieved the objective of bringing together a collection of bike and community representatives to consider and provide input on the Harbour Bridge Cycleway Access Project.

Anecdotal feedback from the CBUG indicated they enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to participate and take part in the workshops. As evidenced from this Report, the group spent considerable time and energy understanding the complexities of the design and asked poignant and relevant questions of the project team.

Convening the group over two consecutive weeks allowed time for participants and the project team to reflect on the information and questions being asked, culminating in high quality input from the CBUG in the second workshop.

Participants overall had positive sentiments towards the engagement process, with one-word responses to the day including "excited," "inclusive" "diversity," "inspired," "genuine engagement" and "well considered." Other comments included "micro focused," "expanded travel area" and "surprised that there's still much to settle."

The CBUG has indicated a willingness to re-convene as the design progresses. The project team has committed to considering the feedback provided by the CBUG as the designs progress.

## 4. APPENDIX <br> CBUG WORKSHOP 1

9am-1pm Saturday 14 May 2022
The first workshop was held to test design assumptions with the randomly selected CBUG, inform the CBUG of the project context and design status and to seek informed feedback from the group regarding the design assumptions.

Activity 1 - Designing for Place

| Group 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Your place | Barangaroo |
| When was this? | Saturday 7 May |
| Describe the place | Large public park with multiple users |
| What were the details that made it special? | Different users can use same space |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | - |
| What was good? | - |
| How did you feel? | - |
| Why did it work? | Well separated areas for different users |
| What could have been better? | Visual way to separate different users |
| Group 2 |  |
| Your place | Centennial park |
| When was this? | 2022 |
| Describe the place | Large open parklands with space for cars, bikes and pedestrians |
| What were the details that made it special? | Wedding, enough room, beautiful nature |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | Vehicles travel slowly, allocated spaces, wide roads, respect for people \& bikes |
| What was good? | Easy access \& no stairs, enjoy the parklands, quiet \& serene, nice to exercise \& lots of place to explore |
| How did you feel? | Relaxed, happy, appreciative of nature |
| Why did it work? | Respectful shared space, slow speed, well integrated, nature \& nice views, wide roads |
| What could have been better? | When it's open, busy on the outside, lack of signs |
| Group 3 |  |
| Your place | Coogee boardwalk by beach |
| When was this? | 6 May 2020 |
| Describe the place | Beachfront, multi-use, lots of food/drink, multi-activity, picnic |
| What were the details that made it special? | Sun, sea, friends |


| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | No clashes + not particularly competing for space |
| :---: | :---: |
| What was good? | Big open space |
| How did you feel? | Very relaxed |
| Why did it work? | It was a perfect day \& the water was warm. I was with friends. |
| What could have been better? | It was perfect |
| Group 4 |  |
| Your place | CBD Cycleway |
| When was this? | - |
| Describe the place | Main straight cycleway that runs along Kent St |
| What were the details that made it special? | It is busy but flows, separated. Safe. Long. |
| How did pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles interact? | They are all separated and flow smoothly. |
| What was good? | Straight line. Safe separated dedicated cycle path from pedestrians \& cars. Wide enough to overtake if required. |
| How did you feel? | Safe. Flows well. Straightforward. |
| Why did it work? | Cycling is clear, safe, well-organised. Cycleway doesn't impact cars. Bikes have 2way lanes. Cars only flow one way in some sections. Flat. |
| What could have been better? | The cycleway made so it could bypass lights, elevated to enable quick transit instead of stop/start. Drainage to be designed so no water pools and becomes a hazard. If the lights line up so you didn't have to stop. |

Activity 2 - Site visit - testing initial reactions

| Participant | What do you like about the design elements you have seen so far? | What could be improved? | What do you need to know more about? | Other comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Damien | Prefer concept B closer to the structure. The less the gradient the better noting aging population. Better for families. Removal of trees for concept B is acceptable. | How the walkway and bikes will cross paths. | How pedestrians are going to fully know not to walk up the ramp. How is this going to be prevented? | Would like to see how the use of space under ramp to incorporate a space out of weather. |
| Aurelie | Seems like it's been very well thought about on all aspects cyclists, pedestrians, structure, historical, design, users, trees? | I'm not sure, awareness of the new project so pedestrians \& cyclists know it's a shared zone. <br> Signs of where to find the other cycling ways when you're off the ramp. | Not sure - night lighting of the ramp. | Good group diversity |
| Sean | Probably best design l've seen - it integrates well with existing structure |  | Just the gradients(?) | Do I still need my passport |


| Participant | What do you like about the design elements you have seen so far? | What could be improved? | What do you need to know more about? | Other comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participant A | I like option B. Because it is closed to the railway, will not damage the heritage of the railway, and can minimize the impact to the green environment. Also, the pedestrian can still have enough space to walk. | I think we can try to add 1 more exit to the ramp. So there can be 2 exits along the ramp and combine both option A \& B together. | How wide \& how large will the column be built? <br> What's the colour of the ramp? | Good workshop |
| Participant B | That the ramp itself sits relatively parallel to the Bridge, so that it's less obvious | Entrance of ramp needs to have clear sign that says "bike riders only" or something to that extent. No vague diagrams or signs in inconspicuous locations. | Need to have print outs of the diagrams and plans during the site visit, and maybe so that I can annotate it with comments, etc. The document can be retrieved after the visit for confidentiality. | Need clear delineation of bike and pedestrian walkways but don't think that green markings on the floor are visually appealing. Need other subtle but still clear, way of showing a bike path e.g. the lanes marked by dotted lines etc. Need greater lighting in the area as the area is dark and shady, making it feel less open. |


| Participant | What do you like about the design elements you have seen so far? | What could be improved? | What do you need to know more about? | Other comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participant C | Appealing to a busy cyclist like the position where it is beamed to "land." | Need to give thought as to who has priority on cross-over between cyclists and pedestrians. Cyclists or pedestrian priority? Also alerts to cyclists that "pedestrians ahead" warning or similar. | Aside from cyclists/skaters etc, who else is allowed to use ramp. What happens to the pedestrians who use the cycling path/ramp? |  |
| Participant D | I like that it is minimal and that it leaves most of the park untouched. I like the design, especially how it is level with the station entrance. I also like that it is close to the bridge so that the views are not interrupted. | I would hope that the least amount of trees are affected. I think there needs to be adequate signage or floor markings to indicate shared zones and to allocate spaces between pedestrians \& cyclists. Right now, it is unclear that it is a shared zone. | -Different methods (maybe overseas or interstate) where they get cyclists to slow down for pedestrians -How to integrate references to Country -How effective it would be to allocate different spaces -How many trees need to be sacrificed -How long would it take to build and when? | -When I walk in this area, I always walk on the other side of the road because it is hard to cross the road |


| Participant | What do you like about the design elements you have seen so far? | What could be improved? | What do you need to know more about? | Other comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participant E | Great for cyclists, good forward planning |  | The visual elements of the ramp itself, other than the concrete base | How could/would the space under the ramp be better used? |
| Participant F | It ends at a convenient train stop. It's ridable for all kinds of people, like children. It takes full consideration of pedestrians and cyclists. | It ends up a heavy road. I prefer to know what's the next place that's worth to visit. It's better that there is obvious signs to tell people "another 1 km far away is Luna Park." Something like this. | What should you do with the old stairs? | Cycling is not only a habit now. People ride bikes every day for their work, like food delivery people. Not only share the space between pedestrian and cycle lines, but also should share space with car lines. |
| Participant G | Seems to be the best of the conveniences(?) of the designs looked at | Maybe look at running the cycleway all the way to Middlemiss str. Build the current one so this can happen (i.e. be extended?) | -How to deal with the cycle/pedestrian interface at the rotunda -Impact of narrowing the road | Loss of nothing spaces? <br> Bus stop areas? |
| Participant H | Lightest structure | -Ped/bike conflict <br> -May narrow road <br> -Loss of green <br> -Lavender <br> Street <br> Roundabout | Options of bigger connection to further Bike systems - to Harbourlink to Naremburn Lane Cove Bike Systems | Elevate to Middlemiss St/Anthem St to link to N.S. CBD + elevated to Neutral Bay \& Mosman -Lift @ Bowlo for those who want markets/(?) |

$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\hline \text { Participant } & \begin{array}{l}\text { What do you } \\ \text { like about the } \\ \text { design } \\ \text { elements you } \\ \text { have seen so } \\ \text { far? }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { What could } \\ \text { be } \\ \text { improved? }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { What do you } \\ \text { need to know } \\ \text { more about? }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Participant I } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Linear } \\ \text { structure, } \\ \text { separation of } \\ \text { pedestrians \& } \\ \text { cyclists }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Continue } \\ \text { elevated bike }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { paths to } \\ \text { Middlemiss St } \\ \text { at Arthur St }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { How the } \\ \text { elevated } \\ \text { cycleway to } \\ \text { Middlemiss St } \\ \text { can work }\end{array}\right]$

## CBUG WORKSHOP 2

9am-1pm Saturday 21 May 2022
The second workshop was held to re-confirm project context \& design status to CBUG, reflect on feedback received in Workshop 1, seek more detailed feedback on design options and assumptions, seek informed feedback on the Alfred St/Lavender St component of the design and to seek feedback on the approach to Designing for Country.

Activity 1 - Lavender St Roundabout Site Visit Activity

| Participant | Initial thoughts about the site visit to Lavender St Roundabout? | What further information would you like from the project team about this element of the design? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stan | -Ideas for flow of people/cyclists \& family groups <br> -You have cyclist even with cycle lanes travel on narrow roads -The underground electricity should include power pole on corner of Alfred \& Lavender west side | Security on ramp from graffiti experts - I think security cameras to hinder bad manners |
| Participant A | I think it's a dangerous roundabout. The design needs to be changed. It is because the slip length is just at its minimum required length \& there's no clear indications for a car to slow down. It's difficult for pedestrians to notice the cars are coming and take action before the cars hit them. | Homeless people: building this ramp may encourage them to live under the ramp. So need to think of the area security for this. Community Impact: The narrowing of the road may reduce the no. of customers to the restaurants - owners may not like. |
| Participant B | - | -Implementation of totems (e.g. crocodile, long-neck turtle) with the style \& design into the columns that support the ramp -Engravings under the ramp to reflect Indigenous art or parts of other culture |
| Participant C | Very busy road. <br> Complex/multiple road situation (pedestrian, bikes, cars, animals) Not very clear indicators/signs | -How is indigenous culture used in the design? <br> -How to balance the space among people, cyclists and cars? -There are a lot of new sharebike companies set up. The government/community properly be better to build up bike shelter for the share-bikes, rather than let them spread around the city. It's not a good look also it is not easier for tourists to hire. It could be better for tourist to cycle. |


| Participant | Initial thoughts about the site <br> visit to Lavender St <br> Roundabout? | What further information <br> would you like from the <br> project team about this <br> element of the design? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Participant D |  <br> we need to separate different <br> users of the roundabout - <br> pedestrians, cycle, scooter, car, <br> bus, truck | - |
| Participant E | -Having cycle lanes cross before <br> round-about is a great idea for <br> safety | -Consideration not to impact <br> south bus stop and keep current <br> shared path. More personnel <br> -Prefer road to be shortened <br> rather than parking space <br> accessing bus and station than <br> -Like the bike paths set back to <br> cater for future cyclists <br> (children/families/elderly) |
| exiting to cycle south south after <br> -How the design of the bike <br> paths use of paint or pavers that <br> blend into the environment? |  |  |

Activity 2 - Designing for Country

| Group | Think of a time you have <br> seen recognition of First <br> Nations people reflected <br> through design. What did <br> this look like? How was it <br> done? Why did you like it? | Do you feel Country can be <br> acknowledged appropriately <br> through design in this project? <br> What do you see as the <br> opportunities and constraints? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Group A | -Darling Harbour - <br> incorporated Indigenous <br> designs into the footpaths <br> -Barangaroo - archway that <br> incorporates/showcases <br> Indigenous art | Yes. <br> -Sound barriers on edge of <br> new highways incorporate <br> Indigenous design |
| Indigenous symbols to <br> represent the Indigenous <br> culture <br> Shows use to international <br> people/market |  |  |
| Constraints - n/a |  |  |


| Group | Think of a time you have seen recognition of First Nations people reflected through design. What did this look like? How was it done? Why did you like it? | Do you feel Country can be acknowledged appropriately through design in this project? What do you see as the opportunities and constraints? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group B | -Need Aboriginal artwork \& stories to enable current society to understand. <br> -Audio of stories at the site works well <br> -Need stories of how Aboriginal lived in preEuropean area in this local area <br> -Stories of Gadigal people on the $S$ side of the harbour near Observatory Hill and stories of Cammeraygal on the N side of the bridge | Opportunities to use Aboriginal art designs as part of project like the flat rock drive underpass in the flat rock gully cycleway/walking path <br> Front of parliament house Aboriginal art used on ground. Option to use on bike ramp or under it. Lights could be used to light it up at night. |
| Group C | Walk with Uncle May - Balls Head <br> Wellington Dam - WA - real people + idea + transport <br> "There is a point of time. It is upon us. We should go to it(?)" <br> Lane cove - kids playground upgrade w/ Aboriginal name + stories | Kirribilli - "good fishing spot" <br> Include spaces where the stories can be told <br> Follow the whole story - walk with Uncle Max <br> s <br> "European + aboriginal history side by side" <br> Kids love yarning circles - we need more community seating <br> Balmoral beach whale dance + the form - representative of culture <br> Look different in day \& night "illuminate the history" |

Activity 3 - Reflecting on design


100 Alfred St - Comments

1) Please do thorough traffic study of Alfred St. Including buses, school buses, out of service buses, before narrowing road width. This is one of the two access points for Kirribilli peninsula - High St + Clark Rd the other. Please don't stuff up both for the local residents. High St is going to be stuffed-up by WHT + BL access from High St
2) What is the current width of road? Lane - should not be narrowed!
3) Bike path colours to blend in with environment


## 96 Alfred St - Comments

1) Signs not on poles but on road \& footpath surfaces
2) Too many signs
3) Power available to charge e-bikes/scooters/etc
4) Rotunda can be moved to other space - OR use it as the break between cyclists + pedestrians around it
5) Rotunda can be moved but should not be discarded
6) Great idea to retain the trees that are on the grassy part of the park
7) Scrappy poplars along the railway viaduct are less important \& can be removed


84 Alfred St-Comments

1) Yes additional community seating
2) Relocate rotunda + then need some community seats \& tables within the park
3) Table tennis - well used! Has to be able to be used - either here or back in Bradfield Plaza after TfNSW finishes under bridge
4) Yes, table tennis table is very well used - great to retain it \& add another?
5) What is the current width of footpath? (? 3.6 m . Lewis.)
6) Current path width appropriate for all the events, the pedestrian + disabled usage - should not be narrowed by much!


82 Alfred St - Comments

1) Possible path from station under Via Duct at a parallel angle to become (w) side of path by rotunda. i.e. vs the (?) - straight path
2) Keep it shared - keep bus stop location
3) Don't know how to cycle - too fast
4) Cyclists should have to be registered - e-bikes are being changed to drive at speeds of vehicles - injuries to pedestrians
5) $\leftarrow$ Disagree


## 82 Alfred St - Comments

1) Consider use of plants native to Australia
2) Positive to underground the wires + electricity
3) Cyclist should dismount in High Rd area
4) Too many signs
5) Use pavers that blend in with surrounds, not bright paint
6) Bus stop to stay. Shared bike path south
7) Retain bus stops outside Milson Point Station - very convenient location for commuters - doesn't impact cyclists too much, especially once the ramp is built. Retain existing shared path.
8) This bay is used for parking pick ups \& drop offs for uber, taxis, friends, etc
9) Buses need to stay here for (?) access off road when no TRAINS running
10) This location of bus stop has lots of space \& doesn't interfere with traffic. Moving it down the street creates the exact opposite.
11) Remove the tent
12) Benches ok but well located


Burton St - Comments

1) Can the ramp accommodate?
2) Important to have
3) Safe for dogs
4) Native plants


Lavender Bay - Comments

No comments were provided on this image.


Middlemiss St - Comments

1) This small slipway into Middlemiss St is really useful and should be retained

Activity 3 - User feedback on ramp design and landing area interface


No comments were provided on this image.


1) Need to slow cyclists down
2) Reduce cyclist speed on ramp slope
3) Yes to underground wires
4) Keep tree cover in main grassy area - don't need to retain poplars along viaduct
5) Planting/climbers on columns

6) Crossing location; safety, convenience
7) Road space instead of trees maybe
8) Dark over-shadowed place - use lob level trees
9) Barrier to stop cars overtaking buses + risking safety of pedestrians
10) Design the bit under the ramp for homeless people
11) Diagonal walking path under ramp
12) $\leftarrow$ Flow pedestrians $\rightarrow$
13) Throwscreen NO!
14) Uber pickup/drop-off at bus bay
15) Opportunity to keep shared path?
