

Community and Stakeholder Engagement Report

Improving connectivity from Curl Curl to Freshwater (Stage 2 of 2)

Impact level: 2

Consultation period: 17 November to 15 December 2021

Contents

1.	Summary.....	2
1.1.	Key outcomes	2
1.2.	How we engaged	3
1.3.	Who responded.....	4
2.	Background.....	4
3.	Engagement objectives	5
4.	Engagement approach	5
5.	Findings	6
	Appendix 1 Verbatim community and stakeholder responses	16

1. Summary

This report outlines the outcomes of community and stakeholder engagement as part of a revised proposal to improve cycleway connections between Curl Curl and Freshwater between 17 November and 15 December 2021.

Initially we sought comment on a proposed new 2.5m shared path from Curl Curl to Freshwater Village along Oliver Street in Freshwater and Bennett Street and Park Street in Curl between 23 August and 19 September 2021. We received 317 responses which strongly reflected community support for improving walking and cycling connections along the proposed route.



Feedback requested us to consider a separated cycleway along this route. This alternative would also address any potential conflicts between walkers and people riding bicycles, particularly those travelling at higher speeds.

Based on these comments and associated benefits, we explored the idea of a separated cycleway further and asked the community for their feedback on additional options before making a final decision.




This report reflects that feedback, which indicated a high level of support for an improved cycling connection between Curl Curl and Freshwater. Responses were mixed in relation to Options 1A and 1B with some supportive and others not supportive of these proposals.

While over half of the respondents supported either a separated cycleway, separated cycleway narrowed to retain parking, or shared path, a quarter of respondents did not support any proposal. Reasons cited included the proposal would have adverse impacts on car parking, access to their property or that safer cycling infrastructure was not needed.





1.1. Key outcomes

 Total unique responses	681*	
 How responses were received	Online Your Say comment form Written responses (email/letter)	Completions: 667 Number received: 14


* Not every respondent made a comment in addition to answering the sentiment question

 <p>Online sentiment question: Which proposed option do you prefer?</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Option 1A - Separated cycleway ■ Option 1B - Separated cycleway (narrowed to retain parking) ■ Option 2 - Original shared path proposal ■ I do not support any of the above <p>Total responses = 667</p>	
 <p>Feedback themes</p>	<p>Overall support</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>Parking related concerns</p>	<p>Cycleway not required</p> <p>Amenity</p> <p>Quality infrastructure</p>

1.2. How we engaged

 <p>Have Your Say: visitation stats</p>	<p>Visitors: 2,230</p>	<p>Visits: 2,834</p>	<p>Av. time onsite: 5m20s</p>
 <p>Print media and collateral</p>	<p>Letterbox drop: 2096</p> <p>Site signs:</p>		<p>Distribution: 313 property owners and residents</p> <p>15 signs displayed</p>
 <p>Electronic direct mail (EDM)</p>	<p>Community Engagement (fortnightly) newsletter: 1 edition</p> <p>Council (weekly) e-News: 1 edition</p> <p>Stakeholder email: 6</p>		<p>Distribution 22,000</p> <p>150,000</p> <p>219</p>
 <p>Key stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>Meeting: 1</p>		<p>Attendance: 10</p>

1.3. Who responded¹



2. Background

The Northern Beaches Bike Plan identified Oliver Street, Bennett Street and Park Street as a future connection in the Northern Beaches Safe Cycling Network. In 2021, we received funding through the Federal Stimulus School Infrastructure Program to provide improved connectivity for people to walk and cycle to Harbord Public School and St John the Baptist Catholic Primary School Freshwater, as well many other destinations.

We initially proposed a shared path, however based on feedback the proposal was reviewed and two additional separated cycleway options to connect Curl Curl to Freshwater were put forward. These were exhibited between 17 November and 15 December 2021.

The project’s impact level two Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan was devised on a single stage approach, however following community feedback a further stage of engagement was initiated. This report identifies what we heard in the second stage of engagement for Stage 2: Separated Cycleway Proposal (additional two options).

¹ Demographic data was gathered by request only. The data represented only includes those respondents who provided this detail.

² Respondents identified as being from 40 different areas. Only the predominant area of response is only recorded here.

Feedback received during Stage 1: Shared Path Proposal can be found in the Community and Stakeholder Engagement Report, November 2021 available on our [your say project page](#).

3. Engagement objectives

Community and stakeholder engagement aimed to:

- provide accessible information so community and stakeholders can participate in a meaningful way
- identify community and stakeholder concerns, local knowledge and values
- seek out and facilitate the involvement of those affected by or interested in a project.

4. Engagement approach

Community and stakeholder engagement for improving connectivity between Curl Curl and Freshwater was conducted over two stages.

Stage 1: Shared Path Proposal exhibition period was conducted from 23 August to 19 September 2021 and considered the proposed shared path on the western side of Oliver Street and northern side of Bennett Street.

Stage 2: Separated Cycleway Proposal exhibition period was conducted from 17 November to 15 December 2021 and presented alternative separated cycleway designs for consideration; Option 1A and Option 1B.

During Stage 1: Shared Path Proposal consultation, several community members asked if we could consider a separated cycleway along this route to provide a better cycling facility. Many community members raised concerns about potential conflicts between walkers and people riding bicycles, particularly those travelling at higher speeds.

Based on this feedback we explored the idea of a separated cycleway further and developed two alternative options, these were exhibited in Stage 2: Separated Cycleway Proposal.

The engagement was planned, implemented and reported in accordance with Council's [Community Engagement Matrix](#) (2017).

A project page was established on our have your say platform with information provided in an accessible and easy to read format. An options comparison table was provided to outline the key differences in each proposal including cycleway width, parking availability, environmental and social considerations.

The project was primarily promoted through our regular email newsletter (EDM) channels and site signs.

Feedback was captured through an online comment form embedded onto the have your say project page. The form included a question on option preference.

- Option 1A – Separated cycleway
- Option 1B – Separated cycleway (narrowed to retain parking)
- Option 2 – Original shared path proposal
- I do not support any of the above
- Neutral / prefer not to say

An open-field comments box provided community members a space to explain or elaborate on their option selection as well as any other feedback they wished to contribute.

Email and written comments were also invited.

We asked participants a uniform set of questions. Results provide responses across a spectrum of demographics.

Letters were sent to residents and property owners along Oliver, Bennett and Park Streets informing of alternative options on exhibition.

Emails were sent to inform local stakeholders about the alternative option being exhibited. These were sent to the following stakeholders:

- Harbord Public School (Administration and P&C)
- St John the Baptist Catholic Primary School
- Friends of Freshwater
- Curl Curl North Public School
- Northern Sydney Local Health District.

Council staff attended a meeting held by Friends of Freshwater to discuss and answer questions on the proposals.

5. Findings

The majority of respondents supported improved connectivity for active transport between Curl Curl and Freshwater. Of these, most respondents were supportive of Option 1A Separated Cycleway. Many felt that option 1A was preferable as it provided a safe facility that would encourage cycling transport and provide for future uptake of active transport. Many were also pleased to see Council proposing a high-quality separated cycleway and saw this proposal as a positive step forward for cycling transport as opposed to the typical shared paths on the Northern Beaches.

There was strong opposition to Option 1A from a large number of residents adjacent to the location of the proposed path. This was mainly due to the loss of parking on Oliver and Bennett Streets, that would result from the installation of the separated cycleway. Feedback reflected these residents felt that on-street parking was essential and that removal would negatively affect their lives and property values. Some residents were also concerned about the inconvenience and safety issues of crossing the proposed cycleway when entering and exiting their properties.

Nearly half of the of respondents favoured Option 1B (Separated cycleway narrowed to retain parking and Option 2 (Original Shared Path) as they felt this would be a compromise between providing active transport infrastructure and maintaining parking in the area.

Table 1: Issues raised and response

Theme	What we heard	Council's response
<p>On-street parking related issues</p>	<p>Loss of on-street car parking was the biggest issue for respondents who did not support Option 1A.</p> <p>Many residents adjacent to the proposed cycleway felt that the loss of on-street car parking directly outside their property would negatively affect their lives and property values.</p> <p>Many residents felt that loss of on-street car parking would negatively affect surrounding areas as more people would be parking in side streets.</p> <p>Some respondents felt that car parking was essential as the area is close to the beach and sporting fields.</p> <p>In contrast to the opposition about loss of parking some respondents felt the removal of on-street car parking was essential to providing a quality cycleway and to help modal shift in transport.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges that car parking is an important issue for residents, however, we will work to balance that need with the importance of providing improved walking and cycling connections.</p> <p>The Move Northern Beaches Transport Strategy aims to make walking and cycling the first choice for short transport trips within our community. To achieve this, we must look at all the needs and consider the best use within the road corridor.</p> <p>The Transport for NSW Road User Space Allocation Policy considers all road users; however, we also need to consider the local residential requirements for parking.</p> <p>A key principle of the policy is to allocate road user space in order of walking (including equitable access for people of all abilities), cycling (including larger legal micro-mobility devices), public transport, freight and deliveries, ahead of general traffic and then on-street parking.</p> <p>Through the design stage, we will work to minimise the removal of parking where possible.</p> <p>By providing a high-quality cycleway we would encourage cycling for transport and fulfil goals of our Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy.</p> <p>However, to achieve this would result in the removal of several parking spaces that residents rely on.</p> <p>Removing car parking also provides disincentive towards car use reflecting positively to increase those using active transport.</p>

Theme	What we heard	Council's response
	<p>Other feedback on parking indicated that caravan and trailer parking in the area caused congestion in the area.</p>	<p>We will investigate and consider options for restricting parking of non-motorised vehicles prior to implementation of this proposal.</p>
<p>Safety concerns</p>	<p>Concerns were raised about pedestrian and bicycle rider conflict as well vehicle access to driveways.</p> <p>Reasons cited noted users would not be able to see path users. Some respondents were also concerned that they would need to look out for cyclists approaching in both directions and this would make entering/exiting properties more difficult.</p> <p>Of those that supported the separated cycleway option, feedback reflected it provided the safest option for all users.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that traffic speed in the area was too fast and that the areas of Bennett and Oliver Street could benefit from additional crossings.</p>	<p>This concern is often raised regarding shared paths.</p> <p>Transport for NSW Centre for Road Safety released a discussion paper on shared paths in 2015, noting that shared paths represent a relatively low safety risk.</p> <p>When designing shared paths, they are done so to be as safe as possible with adequate width.</p> <p>Austrroads guidelines state that 2m is the minimum desirable width for a two-way cycleway.</p> <p>Driveway crossings are potential conflict areas. Path users must take care; however, the onus is on the person driving across the path to ensure they do so safely.</p> <p>The position of the separated cycleway would create a safer environment as it would move bicycles further from property boundaries and hence offer more visibility.</p> <p>Option 1A also offers benefits of greater visibility as there are no parked vehicles obscuring views adjacent to the cycleway.</p> <p>Council will review traffic count and speed data for this location and liaise with TfNSW on any suggested change to the posted speed limit.</p> <p>Options 1A and B provide a new crossing at Park Street. The pedestrian crossing near Johnston Street will be upgraded as part of the Federal Stimulus funding.</p> <p>Currently, Council is not considering any further pedestrian crossings in this location.</p>

Theme	What we heard	Council's response
Safety - Car door zone	<p>Safety concerns were raised in relation to path and car door zone width with some respondents questioning whether intended widths were wide enough.</p>	<p>Locating the cycleway between the kerb and parked cars provides a buffer from moving traffic. Option 1B does not provide a large buffer for the door zone, however the design complies with required standards for this type of path. The accident risk is reduced as riders travelling close to parked vehicles are approaching in front facing view of drivers and hence more likely to be seen, thereby reducing the likelihood of injury.</p> <p>There is adequate visibility for all users to share space when required.</p>
Quality infrastructure	<p>Respondents felt we needed to provide a quality cycleway (Option 1A) over other options, citing it would ensure the best possible uptake to active transport.</p> <p>Manly felt that the usual option of shared paths is no longer adequate to provide for cycling within our community.</p> <p>Quality infrastructure was seen as being more important due to the growing popularity of E-bikes.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges that Option 1A would deliver the best outcome for cyclists, concerns from residents relating to the removal of on-street carparking spaces has resulting in Option 1B progressing to design stage.</p>
Unsupportive of proposal	<p>Some respondents felt that a cycleway is not suitable for children and that children can use the existing footpaths.</p> <p>Other comments that argued the suitability and need for the cycleway proposal noted that bicycle infrastructure or lanes overall was not generally used. Citing that these options were built for only a small minority of the community and a waste of Council money.</p> <p>The route proposed was questioned with some residents suggesting that cyclists use the beachfront route of Carrington Parade, and it would be</p>	<p>The cycleway is designed for all ages, including children, as it is separated from both vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>The proposal also involves new pedestrian and cycle crossings at Soldiers Avenue, driveway next to 23 Oliver Street, Wyndora Avenue and Brighton Street that will provide a safer environment for school aged children.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing in Oliver Street, near St John the Baptist, will also be upgraded.</p> <p>Active transport connections like this one are outlined in our Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy.</p>

Theme	What we heard	Council's response
	more worthwhile locating the cycleway there.	<p>Providing quality cycling connections helps to increase the number of people choosing to cycle for transport and provides an alternative to car travel.</p> <p>With the noticeable uptake of cycling and E-bikes on the road, current bike lanes may no longer be considered suitable cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>This proposal is to provide a safe cycling route connecting Harbord Public School and St John the Baptist Catholic School offering local residents a safe cycling transport option.</p> <p>Carrington Parade is not in the vicinity of these schools and is not being considered as a cycle way.</p>
Impact on the locality	<p>Some resident feedback indicated the proposed cycleway would negatively affect the area due to loss of parking, disruption and property value.</p> <p>Others felt the cycleway would benefit the feel of the locality by reducing car numbers and offering a safe cycling facility.</p>	<p>We acknowledge our community's opinion differs regarding cycleways and their impact on streetscape and value to the community.</p> <p>However, the cycleway is seen to offer an overall benefit to both the local and wider community by offering safe transport options.</p>

During the consultation Council received a number of questions either through direct contact or within feedback received.

Table 2: Questions³ and Council's response

Question	Council's response
Can other traffic calming devices be added to slow the flow of traffic?	Once the cycle way has been completed, Council will monitor traffic and may consider additional traffic calming in the future, subject to funding.

³ Questions, Verbatim from the online comments, typographical errors are as inputted by respondents.

Question	Council's response
Segregated path all the way from Dee Why to Manly perhaps?	Two separate safe cycling network routes are proposed between Dee Why and Manly (subject to funding). This is illustrated in the Northern Beaches Bike Plan.
Why, if the cycleway is following the main thoroughfare along Oliver Street, which for vehicles allows priority and on-going travel when crossing side turning intersections, do you wish to divert the cycleway users into the side roads to use the 'crossings' - as if they are lesser road users?	We follow the Austroads Guides, which inform the design, construction, maintenance and operation of the road network in Australia and New Zealand. This approach is referred to a "bent out" treatment at intersections. It allows a vehicle to wait to enter Oliver Street without blocking the cycleway.
Why do you think it is ok to remove all the parking for minimal number of pushbikes that will use the cycle way?	Providing a high-quality cycleway (which involves removing some parking) would best encourage uptake of cycling for transport which are goals outlined in our Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy.
There are more ratepaying residents who drive cars than ride bicycles. Why upset the roads?	Council's Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy has highlighted that there needs to be higher uptake of active transport to keep our community moving. Our community has told us through engagement completed for Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy that they want to ride bikes in a safe environment away from vehicle traffic.
The road does however have lots of parked cars by the schools and nearer Freshwater village centre. I'm not sure if these are just for school pick-ups, houses not using driveways or visitors and where they would park instead?	If Option 1A proceeds, parking would be available on the opposite side of Oliver and Bennet Streets. Residents have the option to park vehicles on their own property or where on-street parking is available in the surrounding area. Providing better transport options would result in some people choosing to cycle or walk rather than using a car.
WHY CAN'T YOU PEOPLE AT COUNCIL JUST LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE ???! WHY START CHANGING ALL THIS TRAFFIC FLOW ?	As population grows our roads are becoming more congested. It is important that Council provide transport options for our community, so people have the choice to travel safely by walking, bike riding or driving a car.
If the concept works, could it be continued up and over the hill to Dee why?	This option has been outlined in the Northern Beaches Bike Plan which proposes a future connection along Adams Street and Griffin Road to Dee Why. This future proposal is subject to funding and further community engagement.
Whilst on the subject of bike lanes, is it possible to put a bike path between Dee Why and Long reef that runs alongside the main road but just inside the fence?	The Northern Beaches Bike Plan proposes a future connection along this route. This project is subject to funding and further community engagement.

Question	Council's response
Why don't you leave it as it is and save ratepayers money?	As population grows our roads are becoming more congested. It is important that Council provide transport options for our community, so people have the choice to travel safely by walking, bicycle or by car. This is 100% funded through the Federal Stimulus – School Infrastructure Program.
I notice that "future cycleway extension" points toward Curl Curl beach. Does this mean that future plans are to remove ALL on street parking on the southern side of Bennett Street and Adams Street (to Carrington Pde), and on the Eastern side of Oliver Street? Are you seriously considering the removal of 130+ on street car spaces that are pretty much fully occupied each day?	The Northern Beaches Bike Plan proposes a future connection along Adams Street. Council will explore options for the design of this cycle way when funding becomes available and engage with the community. Based on feedback relating to parking for the Oliver Street proposal, Council will aim to minimise the removal of on-street parking.
If all of our parking spaces are being TAKEN away will we receive a reduction in our rates ???	Rates will not be reduced on reallocating space currently used for on-street parking. On-street parking is on public land that belongs to the whole community. If option 1A proceeds, space currently used for car parking would be repurposed to provide the community a on-road cycleway.
How will I drop my kids off at school each morning if parking is removed or restricted?	There will still be drop off options available for people who choose to drive to school. The intent of the on-road cycleway is to offer transport options for our community and allow people the choice of different transport modes. This cycleway would see an increase in the number of people riding a bicycle to school and hence help reduce demand for car parking.
Why is car parking on the street (ie storage of private property on public land) even given consideration?	Council works to balance the needs of all road users and recognises the importance of on-street car parking in residential areas. Although change in travel behaviour is needed, Council acknowledges that local residents have been parking on the street for many years.
Why is people's safety (somebody trying to get from A to B on a bicycle) considered less important than car parking?	Option 1A is the most desirable option from a cycling aspect. However, Council needs to also consider and balance resident needs in relation to parking, access and visibility needs
where would our bins go?	If option 1A proceeds, bins will still be able to be placed on the nature strip and there would be enough space for the collection truck to use the cycleway. This process has been managed

Question	Council's response
	successfully in other Council areas within Sydney.
Where do you propose residents park their cars when parking is removed from the eastern side ? Where do propose visitors will park their cars ? What affect will this have on parking in side streets ? Are you assuming that each house only has one car ?	If Option 1A proceeds, parking would be available on the opposite side of Oliver and Bennet Streets. Residents have the option to park vehicles on their own property or where on-street parking is available in the surrounding area. Providing better transport options would result in some people choosing to cycle or walk over using a car.
Have you studied how many cyclists even use the road and/or footpath ?	We carried out traffic count data in 2021 which shows that the Oliver Street and Bennet Street corridor is used as cycling route. However, the purpose of this project is to provide a safe cycling route that connects to Harbord Public School and St John the Baptist Catholic School offering local residents a safe cycling transport option.
Why not just upgrade the cycling lane that is already there? Paint it bright green, freshen up the lines, more lights to make it safer, etc.	The existing lanes are in the “door zone” for parked vehicles. This situation is no longer considered acceptable cycling infrastructure. We will phase these bike lanes out over time and provide alternatives.
What problem for the community as a whole is this solving? What risk for the community as a whole is it mitigating? What value for the community as a whole is it serving?	One of the goals of this project is to offer transport options for our community and allow people the choice of different transport modes. This project would increase the uptake of people riding a bicycle to school and hence help reduce demand for road space and car parking.
I don't understand why you are encouraging cyclists to use a main road? Surely you can install them in the back streets which lead to the same destination?	To encourage active transport, facilities should be placed in the most desirable location. In this case the transport corridor between Oliver and Bennet Streets provide a direct and relatively flat route that connects to Harbord Public School, St John the Baptist Catholic School and surrounding areas. People may still choose to ride on local streets if they wish.
Has anyone actually counted the parked cars, caravans, trailers , boats ? What about delivery drivers? Tradespeople? And bin night ??	<p>Almost every property fronting the cycleway proposal has a driveway and off-street parking. Parking is also available on the opposite side of the road and in surrounding areas. If Option 1A goes ahead Council will investigate parking restrictions for non-motorised vehicles and better access for trades people and deliveries.</p> <p>If option 1A proceeds, bins can still be placed on the nature strip and there would be enough space for the collection truck to use the cycleway. This</p>

Question	Council's response
	process has been managed successfully in other Council areas within Sydney.
Why the necessity to change what is already functioning for all stakeholders?	<p>As population grows our roads are becoming more congested. It is important that Council provide transport options for our community, so people have the choice to travel safely by walking, bicycle or by car.</p> <p>The current bike lanes that are in vehicle door zones are no longer considered suitable and to better encourage bicycle transport a safer solution should be provided.</p>
Wonder if there is any plans to chance/improve Griffin Road crossing?	This crossing has been identified for upgrade subject to funding and approval. However, it is not in the scope of the current proposal for the improved connections between Curl Curl and Freshwater.
The idea of constructing concrete barriers as protection for cyclists presents another set of problems as well. Vehicles attempting to park can ruin mag wheels and hubcaps if reversing onto these at the wrong angle. Is the Council prepared to be held accountable for the damage?	<p>A person driving a motor vehicle must be aware of their surroundings and take responsibility for their actions.</p> <p>If concrete barriers are used as part of the cycle way, Council will ensure that they meet all safety and design standards.</p> <p>Driving into a stationary object would most likely be considered the fault of the driver.</p>
Does Council have any figures on accidents involving bikes in the Freshwater, Curl Curl and Dee Why areas?	<p>Transport for NSW Centre for Road Safety provides crash data displaying 218 crashes involving cyclists across the Northern Beaches over the past five years. However, the information is not available at a suburb level.</p> <p>Unfortunately, many incidents involving bicycle riders go unrecorded due to no police involvement or hospitalisations.</p> <p>The aim of this proposal is to encourage more people ride a bicycle for transport by providing a facility that more people would feel comfortable riding on.</p>
Has Council considered reducing the speed to 40km/h like Dee Why?	Depending on which option Council proceed with, changes to speed limits and speed control devices could be considered as part of the project.
Cannot understand why the cycle way cannot be diverted from Oliver St into Bennett St west & north into Stirgess St	The option of the suggested route may still be used by people cycling; however, this project is proposed along Bennett Street towards Adams Street as it forms part of the proposed future

Question	Council's response
to connect into the existing shared path/cycleway @ Weldon Reserve?	network as outlined in the Northern Beaches Bike Plan.
Has Council considered construction of a Round About @ Oliver & Brighton Sts as well at the intersection of Oliver & Bennett St to slow the speeding traffic along this section of road, with Traffic Calming Devices installed as well?	The upgrades of intersections to roundabouts are out of scope of this project. However, depending on which option Council proceed with, changes to speed limits and speed control devices could be considered
Cyclists deserve to share the roads and they already have bike lanes on both sides of the road. Why the changes?	The existing lanes are in the door zone for parked vehicles. This situation is no longer considered acceptable cycling infrastructure. We will phase these bike lanes out over time and provide alternatives.
Have you also considered a reduced automobile speed to increase safety?	Depending on which option Council proceeds with, changes to speed limits and speed control devices could be considered as part of the project.
If people wish to use a cycle path then there is a route from Curl Curl to Freshwater along the coastal road, ie: Carrington Parade , why couldn't this be extended ?	This proposal intends to provide a safe cycling route that connects to Harbord Public School and St John the Baptist Catholic School offering local residents a safe cycling transport option. Carrington Parade is not in the vicinity of these schools.
was the option of routing the new bike track left instead of right at the end of Oliver, then promptly right into Stirgess and passed Weldon Oval, ever canvassed?	This suggested route may still be used by people cycling; however, this project is proposed along Bennett Street towards Adams Street as it forms part of the proposed future network as outlined in the Northern Beaches Bike Plan.

Appendix 1 Verbatim community and stakeholder responses*

Number	Comment ⁴
1	Great plans and informative details provided. Will be a great initiative for active travel if project was to proceed.
2	Great proposal. A quality separated cycleway will be beneficial for transport within the community.
3	A separate cycle way is a fantastic idea but must be accompanied with a plan to slow/calm the traffic along Oliver Street, especially the straight section between Harbord School and Brighton Street.
4	Love it! So good to hear that your listening to feedback regarding the segregated cycleway. Why only concern with option 1A is that the carriageway is also widened, which will cause vehicles to drive faster. Can other traffic calming devices be added to slow the flow of traffic? Otherwise, such a great outcome and looking forward to this being rolled out more broadly across the northern beaches – a segregated path all the way from Dee Why to Manly perhaps?
5	This is a great idea and long overdue. House residents should park in their driveways and not on the street.
6	Love the idea & safety of a separated cycleway (option 1A) so that kids in particular can ride to and from school (Harbord PS, St Johns, and also to Freshwater High + Manly Selective). Loss of car parking will be felt by residents that own multiple cars.
7	I do not support removing the parking on the southern side. Parking is already scarce due to multiple bus stops on parts of Bennett St. My second choice after option 1B would be the original concept of shared path.
8	I believe there are always many cars parked along these roads so getting rid of a whole lane of parking will cause some people/ families/ elderly mobility issues having to park further away from houses/ shops etc. I believe a specific 2 way cycle path is safer for all involved esp cyclists. My daughter who is 10 would like to cycle from Curl Curl to Harbord Public and this path would make that much safer for her so it can only be a positive.
9	Maintaining the parking for locals is important and the narrower cycleway is quite satisfactory.
10	Important route. Separate cycleway is afe
11	1A is best: most encouraging for local traffic to choose safe active travel. 1B is second best: compromise if Council cannot deal with the loss of parking spaces outcry. Council will need to be gutsy, one step at the time, to shift the car paradigm to active travel. Every step will increase the uptake of active travel, so at some point the momentum will become on the active travel side and the Council will be regarded heroic and visionary.
12	I like option 1A the best. Having wider bike paths will be safer and will encourage more people to use them.
13	Let's do it properly. Houses along this route have off street parking anyway. Car users should be dissuaded from parking in and around the school in any event and there's no retail along this route that could claim to be adversely affected. A proper cycle way will be a fantastic piece of infrastructure for children to ride to school and get into the village from the netball courts area of Curl Curl. Great for older people to use e-bikes and normal bikes as part of their short trips to the village too: my wife would use it whereas she wouldn't now where she's exposed to traffic risk.
14	Option 1A without a doubt. This will improve cyclist safety, and also over time encourage more people to get on their bike instead of sitting in their car. Great to see we're finally moving away from the car-centric 1950's towards a healthier future.
15	Residents who don't have on-site parking at their homes will still need to park their vehicles, so on-street parking is their only option. It doesn't seem fair to those residents to remove their parking spots outside their homes. When they bought their property, parking was probably a consideration. Option 1B is the most equitable.

*Personal details and inappropriate language have been redacted where possible. Spelling and grammatical errors have been amended only where misinterpretation or offence may be caused.

⁴ Not everyone who answered the sentiment question provided a comment.

	It's unlikely there will be gigantic volumes of cyclists, which would necessitate wider cycling lanes. Realistically, the narrower lanes in the 1B proposal will be sufficient, and car users will be placated with minimal loss of parking. 1B is the most equitable option for all road users.
16	Proper bicycle lane, encouraging more members of community to use it
17	You cant take on street parking away especially near schools. Not going to be safe with any of the options that have been put forward. Nothing wrong with the way it is now and kids can continue to use the footpath as they have always done. Leave the road for the adult bike riders.
18	We would LOVE the safest option for our children to ride to Curl Curl reserve.
19	This is an excellent proposal. This will encourage active transport, especially for commuters and school children. I am a very timid cyclist and would only consider cycling in a very safe separated cycle path and this may encourage me (and others like me) to cycle for transport which would reduce traffic.
20	1A Because, it allows bikers to have a wide narrow path that is separate to people walking. Which is important for safety.
21	I believe option 1A makes everyone safer: cyclists, pedestrians and motorists (wider roads always help). I'd strongly support it.
22	<p>A question - Why, if the cycleway is following the main thoroughfare along Oliver Street, which for vehicles allows priority and on-going travel when crossing side turning intersections, do you wish to divert the cycleway users into the side roads to use the 'crossings' - as if they are lesser road users?</p> <p>One of the reasons that many cyclists (especially commuters) do not want to use these paths to get anywhere, is that they have to consider their status for crossing every side street - Side street motorists should yield for any traffic that is continuing on the main thoroughfare (as strongly indicated by street lines and signs) and pedestrians. Vehicles of any kind, turning off the main thoroughfare into a side street should give precedence to any road or cycleway users travelling straight on. It is the law that Pedestrians should have right of way to cross a side street, but many motorists do not think they have that right - because they are not on the road! If you keep weaving cyclists off the main track/road to a pedestrian crossing, and back again at every junction you are demeaning their authority on the road. This is a problem everywhere - is the cyclist afforded the same rights as vehicular traffic on main thoroughfares or are they sometimes a 'vehicle' and sometimes a 'path user'.</p> <p>As a regular cyclist, on the road, I would not use this cycleway. We have the difficulty if we slow down for each crossing of getting going again, cars and other motorised vehicles do not have that issue.</p> <p>The only exception to this would obviously be at roundabouts because of the flow direction and the nature of the junction to give priority to one direction and keep traffic moving.</p> <p>In many other countries and major cities around the world, the cyclists have priority over other vehicular road users. Their cycleways are not 'diluted' to a 'half road/half path' status, They are given priority boxes at the front of traffic queues at lights, to allow them to get started easily, which actually helps to control the dominance of cars. Separation to a dedicated cycleway with narrow 2-way flow is a good proposal for all users, but keep it on the main road with good visibility and signage. With adjacent footpaths and crossings, children and lesser experienced cycleway users can divert off to use the crossings if they feel intimidated to stay on the main thoroughfare. Being given the priority to stay on the main thoroughfare at all times will help with building cyclist confidence as road users, and make motorists consider them as equals.</p>
23	Would prefer the option to have a cycle path via carrington parade into freshwater that way
24	If the cycleway is too narrow, it won't be safe. I strongly support option 1A. The option with parking (1B) also has the issue of cyclists being within "door reach" of motorists. I think this proposal is a great example of modern urban planning! Well done!
25	Well done team, Option 1A is an AWESOME plan. So much safer for families getting to and from school and cyclists getting around.

	<p>Option 1B too dangerous with car door issue still existing (eg kids in back seat opening door would have very little visibility / awareness of oncoming cyclists), and narrow road width creating issues.</p> <p>Thankyou!</p>
26	<p>I regularly cycle along these routes and often have concerns about my safety with the volume of traffic. There are three speed categories for transport options - low (walking), medium (cycling) and high (motor vehicles). When either of these mix, the speed difference poses a risk so separate footpaths and roads have been provided. However, there is still a risk when cyclists use either of these options. Separated cycleways provide a significantly safer option for cyclists and also pedestrians (compared with a shared path). Cycleways adjacent to parked cars still pose a great risk to cyclists from car occupants opening doors without looking. Roads are built at great expense for transport and should only be used for private parking on main transport routes when the amount of traffic flow and safety considerations allow it.</p>
27	<p>This would provide ideal support for greater bicycle usage in this important corridor.</p>
28	<p>Having a cycleway next to parked cars is a disaster waiting to happen. Car doors are opened and cyclists knocked off. Many cars are parked carelessly and into the cycleway.</p>
29	<p>Much safer for bike riders of all ages, good for the environment, health and well being.</p>
30	<p>Please consider a round-a-about at the intersection of Brighton and Oliver streets and a pedestrian crossing across Oliver Street near Brighton Street as part of this plan. I notice there is a pedestrian crossing in the plan on the eastern side of Brighton Street which is great but it is already difficult and dangerous to drive across Oliver Street from Brighton Street and having the distraction of a crossing would make it even more problematic. Crossing Oliver Street on foot is also very dangerous as vehicles see no need to slow down when coming around this corner from the East.</p>
31	<p>I travel by bike along Oliver St regularly and find it a dangerous experience. Option 1A will provide the safety and sight lines for all road users at the expense of parking spaces which I think is a good thing for most people in the community. It also delivers riders directly to the town centre. Option 1B looks as dangerous as current due to bikes in door zone. I was worried about shared path options as we all know they do not mix in this environment due to the grade/speed of cycle traffic. Well done for seeing a better option for the CC to Freshie link - highly supported</p>
32	<p>However, I would prefer it to be on the other side of the street (i.e western side), if I had a choice.</p>
33	<p>Thank you very much for reconsidering and sharing a new proposal for separated cycleways. This is really much appreciated, as it would make this safer for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers alike.</p> <p>I strongly prefer the option of having no parking next to the cycle path as parking right next to a cycle path always makes me anxious when cycling as drivers or passengers can open doors without first looking and if this happens at a bad time there's no chance for cyclists to avoid the open door leading to serious injury. This is an issue with the existing bike lane markings, but also an issue with the shared path concept and concept 1B. Option 1A would make for a safer and more relaxed cycling experience.</p> <p>There's still a concern about sharing the path next to Harbord School but that's acceptable. It would be good if there are clear markings on the path so that students know not to wait there or at least move aside when they hear a bell.</p> <p>It would also be good to consider how to enter the separated cycle path from the western part of Bennett St as that's a good short route when continuing North through Curl Curl Lagoon towards Northern Beaches Secondary College.</p>
34	<p>Optimal system for ensuring cyclist safety and reducing emissions footprints. Separated cycleways are the gold standard for urban/suburban road infrastructure. Hopefully this will be further rolled out across adjoining precincts pending it's success.</p>
35	<p>Separated cycle paths reserve public space for a small (but vocal) elite who will only use it in good weather. A shared path accommodates multiple users including the disabled.</p>
36	<p>Safety cycling and encouraging outdoor activity. Less parking will also encourage this movement</p>
37	<p>This is showing a truly progressive council attitude. Firstly because you listened to feedback about moving the path from the west to the east side, and secondly because you've possibly put a whole community before a few private owners of cars. Keeping parking on the east side would</p>

	<p>benefit say 20 car owners a day, but a bike path would benefit say 150 cyclists per day and that will only increase as people feel safe on the seperate bike path. I'm very excited and most encouraged.</p> <p>I have 2 seperate neighbours who used to ride to the city for work, but both were knocked off their bikes along Oliver Street in seperate incidents; one was 'car doored', the other just knocked off at an intersection so neither ride any more, so hoping this action will increase safety in our community.</p> <p>Might need to put a speed limit on the bike lane, as I've noticed motorised scooters and bikes doing well over 40-50km/hr, so that small kids feel safe on the bike lane. I'm prioritising school transport here.</p> <p>I prefer option 1A as ideal because there will be no 'car door' issues but am also happy with 1B. I've been along the bike paths in Redfern and they work well.</p> <p>Thanks also for setting a precedent.</p>
38	<p>Option 1A is the best option for providing safe 2 way cycling along the proposed route. The width of a 2 way cycleway is critical to safety when bicycles are passing each other travelling in opposite directions. This is particularly important when children are using the cycleway because they may not be as "in control" and less able to maintain a straight line when passing. The fact that the bicycle lane will give access to the primary school increases the need to take into account the likelihood of the route being used by younger less experienced riders. In relation to the loss of street parking, I note that the residences along the route overwhelmingly have driveways and off street parking.</p>
39	<p>Safer for cyclists on the inside of parking and traffic, keeps parking as we never seem to have enough and that will not improve in future</p>
40	<p>This is very much needed. All you have to do is look at best practice cases such as the Netherlands to see the wonderful environmental and social impact separated cycling lanes have.</p>
41	<p>Great! I often ride this route and it is not enjoyable. A shared path is not the answer if you want the greatest number of people to choose their bike over their car.</p> <p>Although Option 1A would be the most desirable option to improve the safety for people who choose to ride their bicycles, the backlash from local residents over losing the ability to park their private property on public roadways makes Option 1B a good compromise. Well done to council for researching a separated cycleway option instead of the deficient "shared path" option.</p>
42	<p>Option 1B is a good option for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sharing with pedestrians is not an option for me (I ride a road bike, too fast to be safe) - Sharing with cars is far too dangerous, most don't respect the '1 meter matters' (which BTW is mandatory in some European countries) - Raised buffer is critical so cars do not invade cycling zone or doors do not open suddenly on the path - We need to retain / increase vanishing parking space. In more and more zones one can no longer park a trailer or time has become very restricted
43	<p>Definitely seems to work better with parking kept to one side only.</p>
44	<p>Removing street parking would have a considerable adverse impact on residents' amenity. If the cyclists' amenity can be improved by a narrow separation whilst maintaining current parking it is a win-win.</p>
45	<p>Wrong to remove all parking from one side of the street, when there are times no cycling occurs: i.e. especially late nights when residents and their families need safe entry to their homes from street parking outside their own homes. Also other times: emergency vehicles, deliveries, etc. Cycling ability on either side of the street is essential for diversity of user's needs. Reduce the speed limit in this section of the street to ensure safety due to reduced road width and increased use by all forms of movement.</p> <p>Separated cycleway is excellent because there is the hope of increasing cyclists in the future & many commuter cyclists go very fast. Footpaths are still able to cater for the wary / inexperienced and more careful, tentative slow cyclist.</p>
46	<p>Until cyclists are registered, pay for the privilege of using the roads and display appropriate understanding of the fact that they need to comply with road rules, they should not be given up to a third of the road for their leisure activity.</p>

47	A separate cycleway at optimum width would be preferable with the number of electric bikes rapidly increasing on the Northern Beaches and therefore higher speeds that cyclists are travelling at. The wider cycleway will also be more attractive to more experienced cyclists and hopefully encourage them to move off the roads.
48	This is the best option by far for commuting. The retention of parking in 1b is dangerous because a) passenger side car door opens into the cycle way (there were problems with car footing on the passenger side with similar treatments in Bourke at Surry Hills) and b) pedestrian as coming in between cars to get to footpath not visible to riders so potential for injury to riders and pedestrians. The crossing in Bennett st would need a reduced speed limit as cars go fast along this strip. The crossing treatments in the side streets are great.
49	This is crazy, the amount of bikes that will use it is minimal. what is wrong with the current cycle path. There is a lot of homes along the way, where are they all meant to park. roads were made for the motor vehicle and are maintained through income from rego payments. why do you think it is ok to remove all the parking for minimal amount of pushbikes that will use the cycle way? I don't live along there however I am certain anyone making these decisions dont live along those roads either. when is council going to do things for the majority instead of minority groups.
50	This looks like it will be safer for cyclists and also for care drivers as the car lane is wider. I am pleased to see that policy indicates that car parking on the street has the lowest priority with pedestrian safety the highest priority. BRING this on!
51	If council is determined to go ahead with an option, having the wider parking and wider carriageway of Option 1A should mean a safer parking and driving experience for cars, and safer driving experience for buses, and a safer journey for faster bike riders who will continue to use the road over any new cycleway.
52	A seperate cycle way is the safest for cyclists and will encourage more people to ride and be active. I would happily ride with my young kids on option 1a and 1b but not the original proposal (which is I better than the existing).
53	This is a great idea a separated path will provide much more safety when I am riding with my children. Preference would be 1A due to the additional width which helps with kids whose balance and direction isn't the best. But would also support 1B as it achieves the main outcome of separation from pedestrians and driveways.
54	Fantastic initiative
55	1A would be preferable in an ideal world but removing all the parking along the route seems unfair to the existing residents.
56	Yes! This is so badly needed, it's currently not possible to safely cycle from curl curl to freshwater. Current bike path is completely unsafe for kids, especially with speed limits of 40-50km. Please please also include Adams street in this. Together with safe crossings across Adam street/ Bennett street to curl curl park land
57	Full width segregated cycle lanes are best practice 1A is the best option. Thank goodness NB council has finally woken up to their folly of shared paths which serve neither riders or pedestrians. Please build a full network of segregated cycle lanes on the Northern Beaches to encourage healthy exercise, non polluting transport and promoting local business by getting people out of their cars and genuinely interacting with their suburbs. Build 1A asap.
58	should continue this up the beaches especially around Narrabeen park pde Warriewood
59	I'm open to either Option 1A or 1B. What is important, in my view, is to separate cyclists from pedestrians. I think it is extremely dangerous to have shared paths, accommodating both bicycles and pedestrians on the same path is just asking for an accident. We are keen walkers and have experienced a number of near misses with bikes; the enjoyment of walking has been diminished by having to be constantly alert to cyclist racing past without warning.
60	Street Parking is already very limited and whilst we strongly safe bicycle ways it is vital that parking be retained.
61	gives motor vehicles the greatest space
62	We can significantly reduce road traffic noise, pollution and agitated drivers by allowing space for more dedicated off-road bike paths throughout and all the way up the Northern Beaches.

	<p>Electric bikes are becoming more accessible and this makes travelling by bike easier than by car! Even with kids.</p> <p>Cycling on the beaches is the way of the future BUT we need proper infrastructure and more safe bike paths to make this happen.</p> <p>I used to use my bike like a car all the time at the 3 past homes I have lived at in and around Manly (Wood Street Manly East, Innes Rd Manly Vale, Eurobin Av Manly). This is because I could access bike paths that are off-road AND on the other side of the parked cars and traffic. This is so good for our community!</p> <p>Since moving to North Manly I find it stressful cycling along roads that just have a bicycle painted on the road. It's not clear what this means for the car, the parked car person or the cyclist. What's the difference really between painting a bike on the road and not painting the bike? The bikes painted on the road don't ensure safety from parked cars or traffic. Lines are a little bit better but still not reassuring.</p> <p>Because it doesn't feel safe, my twice a day drive from North Manly to Curl Curl and back is either by car or (on the rare occasions when I have lots of time) by foot. Sadly, my bike which I used to use instead of the car now stays home more and more since the move to North Manly.</p> <p>I work on the northern beaches too and I would cycle to work from where I live in North Manly to Elanora Heights if it was safer.</p> <p>If it doesn't feel safe, it doesn't feel like it's worth the risk and the car becomes the choice.</p> <p>Off-road cycle paths and plenty of them, safety barriers in dangerous places such as the bridge by the Manly Lagoon on Pittwater Road that has no safety barrier between that narrow path and the cars rushing past at speed mean more people choose the bike over the car. This reduces pressure on the roads, improves air quality, reduces noise pollution and increases quality of life both directly and indirectly for residents.</p> <p>Come on Northern Beaches Council! We can become a council with lower car traffic and a high percentage of cycling. This makes sense for the increasing sensitivity the population have towards climate change, for how our environment feels to live in and for the health of our community.</p>
63	Just do the math. There are more ratepaying residents who drive cars than ride bicycles. Why upset the roads? What a mess at Dee Why. A classic example of the wide chasm between theory of the few and its practice on the majority.
64	I strongly support a seperate bicycle path. Being elderly it can be quite frightening walking on a shared path. Not as sprightly as I once was & can no longer jump out of the way bikes.
65	<p>Council is to be commended for responding so positively to resident feedback. The new proposals are thoughtful and well developed.</p> <p>While 1A is my preference I am well aware of the power of the car lobby and the fevered reaction whenever any parking spaces are recommended for removal. 1B would therefore be my 2nd best option, if the loss of car parking proves to be too contentious an issue.</p>
66	Cycling and walking are high priorities for obvious reasons. Car usage will be less if attractive alternatives exist. Parking for private vehicles on public roads should be of the lowest priority. Taxpayers money should be spent on the greater good for all, not used for private benefit.
67	THE BIKE TRAFFIC DOES WARRANT A SEPERATE BIKE LANES.A GOOD EXAMPLE IS THE SHARED PATH FROM SOUTH CREEK TO DEE WHY BEACH IT WORKS WELL.
68	Second preference is Option 1B
69	Walkers have rights, too. More walkers than cyclists! Walkers have a right to walk on a designated path at walking speed with being hammered by speeding bikes. Parking is hard enough near the beach with removing more.

70	<p>There are so many young kids in the Freshwater area I think these bike lanes would be used quite heavily. Any narrower and I don't think they would be used as much as the kids would just the paths rather than bump into other cyclists.</p> <p>The road does however have lots of parked cars by the schools and nearer Freshwater village centre. I'm not sure if these are just for school pick ups, houses not using driveways or visitors and where they would park instead?</p>
71	<p>I really support the separated bicycle path for rider safety. This option would enable me & other retirees to cycle more as it would feel a lot safer.</p> <p>It's probably good to retain parking on both sides of the street too.</p>
72	<p>As an unconfident cyclist I need additional space to cycle safely. Lots of kids ride to school and they would also benefit from separated cycle lanes that are wide enough to pass another cyclist safely</p>
73	<p>WHY CAN'T YOU PEOPLE AT COUNCIL JUST LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE ???! WHY START CHANGING ALL THIS TRAFFIC FLOW ? JUST LOOK AT THE MESS YOU GUYS HAVE CREATED IN THE STRAND AT DEE WHY - ITS OUTRAGEOUS !! DO YOU KNOW HOW MUCH YOU HAVE INCONVENIENCED PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC TRYING TO GET HOME FROM NORTH SIDE TO FRESHWATER / MANLY !!??</p> <p>JUST LEAVE THIS TRAFFIC FLOW AS IT IS PLEASE . DO YOU HAVE EXCESS MONEY IN YOUR COUNCIL BUDGET TO BURN OR SOMETHING ? GO WIDEN MONA VALE ROAD . IMPROVE PARKING IN DEE WHY . IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW IN DEE WHY . DECREASE HIGH DENSITY HOUSING IN DEE WHY . DEE WHY IS A DISASTER ZONE WITH THOSE MERITON SKYSCRAPERS !! REDUCE RATES \$\$ REDUCE TAXES \$\$ DON'T BURN YOUR BUDGET EXCESS \$\$ Thank you for your time and attention .</p>
74	<p>As a bike rider I am supportive of separate cycleways, particularly on busy roads such as Oliver st. However I own a home there and there is already insufficient parking so car parks on the eastern side must not be removed! Several houses along the street have no parking or only 1 space for several cars so we are already struggling to park near the house and often have to drive around the block in search of a park. Schools and Jacka park also bring extra vehicles. Not everyone is able to ride or catch a bus to where they work!</p> <p>Option 1b is preferred but the buffer between bike and cars, and the width of parking spaces are too narrow and will possibly result from damage to cars from passing vehicles or bikes. If the bike path is built at the height of the existing nature strip, some of the nature strip should be able to be included without needing to remove trees. This would allow a wider space for parked cars. Alternatively put one direction of bike lane adjacent to the footpath and onto the nature strip inside the tree line and the other direction onto the road on the outside of the trees. This allows wider parking and vehicle lanes.</p>
75	<p>I live at XX Oliver Street, Freshwater and street parking is already a major struggle most nights due to most resident not having any or adequate driveway space. Add to that the endless stream of renovations happening along Oliver street during the day and drop off at multiple schools along Oliver Street and you're going to create a parking nightmare that will spill onto proximity streets which I'm certain will anger those residents.</p> <p>I and my neighbors are strongly against any proposal that results in a loss of street parking.</p> <p>I am all for cycling safety but don't punish the residents and rate payers that live along Oliver street.</p>
76	<p>Thanks for listening to our feedback about moving the path from the west side of Oliver St to the east side.. & prioritising our larger community before a few private owners of cars. A safer bike path would benefit many cyclists per day and that will only increase as people feel safe on the separate bike path.</p>

	<p>I'm very grateful & feel this action will increase safety in our community. It would be a good idea to put a speed limit on the bike lane, as I've noticed motorised scooters and bikes doing well over 40-50km/hr, so that small kids feel safe in the bike lane.</p> <p>I prefer option 1A as ideal because there will be no 'car door' issues but am also happy with 1B.</p> <p>We would feel happier with our children cycling to sports on their own now, in the afternoons.</p> <p>Thanks for listening to our community and taking safety seriously.</p>
77	I am using the Bourke St cycleway every day and have experienced and seen many accidents and near misses, mainly caused by the parking cars right next to the cycleway. The block visibility and pose a thread through opening car doors.
78	<p>The loss of on-street parking could be compensated by:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Banning the on street storage of boats, caravans and trailers. These increase in number every year and the sooner it is made clear that you can't buy a boat and expect public space to be made available to keep it, the less people will be upset when something finally has to be done about the disappearing road space. Public roads should be for transport not (private) toy storage. 2. Require all future commercial and residential developments to incorporate genuinely adequate off-street parking. Over time this will reduce the need for on-street parking
79	<p>1 A is preferable. There is sufficient off street parking in this area to ensure that safety of cyclists is prioritised. There should be appropriate separation - some sort of barrier, to stop cars from straying into the bike path. Current arrangements where bike paths are between busy traffic and parked cars is dangerous and drivers do not respect the bike lanes, parking cars in the lane, narrowing the space further.</p> <p>Shared footpaths will not encourage more cycling. People will not cycle on the roads with children unless there is better protection including space and barriers. The ride from Curl Curl to Freshwater should be a no brainer for families, but it is currently too dangerous. Another option would be to take parking off Carrington Parade. There is always space in the car parks.</p>
80	Retains residents' parking, separates different traffic types, facilitates faster bike commuting
81	No one uses the bike paths in the city or Dee Why. Stop taking away our roads and parking options!
82	I hate riding in the shared zones as I am scared someone will open their door and drive out onto the road. People forget to look for bikes coming, I have forgotten to look in the past, it's easy to do. It was great riding during COVID lockdown as few cars on the road
83	<p>Environmentally and safety wise the best option. The northern beaches is a difficult place to cycle and separation of cars, bikes and pedestrians will make it so much less anxiety inducing.</p> <p>Removing car parking is a downside. But on balance still feel option A to be superior.</p>
84	<p>For Option 1 I would be concerned about the safety of car doors and drivers exiting and entering their cars adjacent to the bike lane.</p> <p>Whilst addressing this can you also consider a roundabout at the intersection of Oliver and Bennett. This is a very difficult crossing for all to negotiate particularly children as cars travelling to Freshwater from Curl Curl come around a largely blind turn. In addition all 4 intersections take regular traffic with left and right turns, again making it difficult for kids to negotiate.</p>
85	I'd like some parking to be maintained but a separated cycle way as I walk my dog and sometimes cyclists expect right of way and travel at speeds which are not safe for pedestrians.
86	Wider cycleway will encourage more people to cycle as it is safer when bikes pass each other and allows more room for less experienced cyclists. Car parking option is unsafe when opening car door to incoming traffic.
87	Either 1A or 1B would be preferable to option 2 from a bike rider's perspective.
88	<p>I think 1B would be best for a couple of reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a buffer between moving traffic and the bike lane • The residents don't lose parking outside their houses <p>If the concept works, could it be continued up and over the hill to Dee why?</p>

	Whilst on the subject of bike lanes, is it possible to put a bike path between Dee Why and Long reef that runs along side the main road but just inside the fence? You could still protect the bush by building another fence on the other side of the path.
89	<p>either 1A or 1B look great though i prefer 1B as it has the added separation of bikes to the driving traffic.</p> <p>This definitely needs to be done on Griffin Road hill between Pitt Rd and Headland Rd with safer bike crossing at the top of headland road.</p> <p>thanks</p>
90	I prefer the original option. There are a number of unit blocks and two schools along Oliver Street so retaining as much on-street parking is a priority over the need for cyclists to cycle fast along the path. If they feel the need to cycle faster, there is no reason why they can't use the road as they do now. I think the original shared path is an adequate solution.
91	<p>The shared pathway would be great for young children cycle to and from School and allow parents to walk alongside as well.</p> <p>If cyclists want to cycle at a fast pace they can use the road instead</p>
92	Reduces chance of car door opening from park cars and colliding with cyclist. Cycle paths need to be continuous to promote safe usage. Ability to ride safely to Manly and city is paramount to promoting cycling exercise and good health, reducing future health costs and reduces pollution and traffic. It's a win win
93	The route via the primary school, and the connection with Freshwater Village is likely to be heavily used, and the safety and health benefits outweigh the reduction in parking.
94	separted cycleway is safer than a shared path. If there is a safe infrastructure more people will use a bicycle what will decrease the use of a car and car space
95	<p>I think the proposed cycle way is excellent and will provide an excellent opportunity to ride bikes to sporting events in Curl Curl.</p> <p>I've voted for option 1A as although I realise parking is limited, my concerns lie around people parking cars and opening doors meaning cyclists will have to veer around. The parking also means people will be getting out of cars and crossing the cycle path. The decreased size of the cycle path will make this more hazardous.</p> <p>I anticipate that the more cycle paths that are provided, the more they will be used. More people will take up cycling. With this one, there is only a little more that would be needed to be added to provide an excellent cycle path from Freshwater to Dee Why.</p> <p>More and more kids are out on bikes - this is an excellent way to make it safer for them.</p>
96	<p>Hi, I've reviewed, I think the revised concept 1B is a suitable compromise, with all stakeholders being considered.</p> <p>My children aged 11 ride along over street consistently to go to the park, netball courts and football games, it is a real thoroughfare. The separated barrier between the bike path and parking will help - perhaps make it higher than 0.2m.</p>
97	<p>If Council was to support losing a lane of parking, then please consider introducing a reduced width uni-direction separated cycleway path on each side of the road, with bike traffic following same direction as road traffic (Danish-style).</p> <p>This is superior to a two-way cycleway on one side of the road, for two key reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoids having 'contra-flow' bike traffic, and the 'surprises' this can bring. 2. You can provide parking on alternating sides of the road (first 50m of parking on west side, then switch over to provide 50m parking on east side, repeat etc...) - which is better than removing parking entirely from one side. As a result driving lane will need to 'snake' along between alternating parking lanes - which will have a traffic calming effect. <p>Thank you for considering.</p>
98	As both a driver and bike rider I think that it will be largely unused and inefficient for the road. A shared path is safer. I think that removing the parking is highly inconvenient! Parking is already difficult in these streets- I think it would be silly to get rid of it. Additionally, I think the shared path would be best as it is a lot of young primary schoolers who walk/scooter to school along these paths who would not be on the road.
99	I am totally against both Options 1A and 1B.

	<p>Option 1A - The removal of so much on street parking in Bennet St and Oliver Streets as described on Option 1A is simply unacceptable. As a resident and ratepayer in the area we already struggle for on street parking every single day, especially in the evenings and on weekends. We do our part by parking all of our vehicles on our property whenever we can as getting on street parking is already impossible at times. I notice that "future cycleway extension" points toward Curl Curl beach. Does this mean that future plans are to remove ALL on street parking on the southern side of Bennett Street and Adams Street (to Carrington Pde), and on the Eastern side of Oliver Street? Are you seriously considering the removal of 100+ on street car spaces that are pretty much fully occupied each day? This will greatly inconvenience hundreds of residents as well as hundreds of residents in neighbouring streets.</p> <p>Options 1A and 1B - I strongly object to two-way cycleways being on the same side of the road. Reversing out of a driveway on a very busy road is already difficult (particularly in peak and school hours). Adding the hazard of having to also look for cyclists coming from two directions (a number of which will believe and act as if they have total right of way) is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>Please do not create another Dee Why Strand nightmare on our streets.</p> <p>Option2 - Is also not ideal as it has some of the problems of 1A and 1B, plus mixing pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>In my view the current situation of cycle lane on both sides of the road has worked well for many years. If you really want to spend some money paint the cycle lanes green.</p> <p>I support safe cycleways, but Griffin Rd, Adams St, Bennett St and Oliver St are major transport thoroughfares and the vast majority of users are, and always will be, the residents and vehicle traffic, so how about you give the majority of users priority. If you seriously want safe cycle ways then as a minimum the East/West portion (including any "future cycleway extension") should be located through John Fisher park.</p> <p>While you are at it, can you please fix the bicycle and car mingling chicane on Griffin Road (near the skate park). 99% of cyclists disobey the sign asking them to deviate onto the footpath and then back onto Griffin Road (or arrange for Police to monitor and book any cyclist that does not follow the signs).</p>
100	I support the shared path option as it has the least effect on parking.
101	Why don't you leave it as it is and save ratepayers money ? I have seen the ridiculous farce you have created at Dee Why beach front and see no good coming from allowing you to fiddle with Freshy streets .
102	Dee Why Beach has been ruined supporting a minority. Dont ruin other roads!! Cyclist are rude and have no time for cars or pedestrians. They are silent and deadly. Dont take away parking.
103	Option 1A appers safer for cyclist
104	Keep it safe and promote healthy and environmentally friendly transport
105	Shared paths do not work, unless the rider is under 10 years of age, and they can ride on the current paths anyway. No need for option 1A if parking can be retained.
106	Unfortunately, the locals will never go for removal of any parking so i am going for option 1B. Please do not construct a shared pathway (option 2) they are a waste of money and both cyclists and pedestrians hate using them. Shared pathways drastically reduce or remove the grass nature strip. This prevents street tree planting & the environmental and aesthetic benefits they provide and the concrete increases water run-off to roads/drains. Shared pathway are a "cop-out".
107	<p>We would prefer option 1B as it separated bike and pedestrian and yet retain much parking.</p> <p>What with the new electric bike on the footpath and the danged because of speeding the pediatrician needs protection</p>
108	Great proposal, glad to see the council is listening and acting on community feedback! Anything to promote increased cycling and less reliance on cars is a good idea and should be pursued.
109	1B sounds like a great compromise. Thank you very much for coming up with some alternatives

110	<p>I regard the shared path proposal safest for cyclists - particularly for young people and others who do not currently use on-road cycleways, noting that the proposed path would link Freshwater with the sporting fields at Curl Curl. There is significant space in that area to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>If a separated cycleway becomes necessary, option 1A is preferable as it provides a wider, and hence safer, cycleway, although the loss of parking will impact on people who currently park in the area. Option 1B is in my mind not sufficiently safe. It will be far too congested.</p>
111	<p>I wouldn't generally use a shared path, because they are just too slow and dangerous when cyclists are riding at 'normal' fairly modest speeds but are still actually trying to get somewhere. A fully separated cycleway would be amazing though - very forward looking and a genuine infrastructure asset. Great to see council pushing forward with active transport in this way.</p>
112	<p>The future of transportation means less cars and parking spots and more room for bicycles. Bicycles require their own cycleways just like they have in Europe, especially now e-bikes are becoming very common in Freshie.</p> <p>Bicyclists and pedestrians should not be sharing the same pathway, the speed difference is too large. Pedestrian paths are not suited for bikes (too bumpy, not wide enough, risky to slalom around pedestrians, especially with small kids around).</p>
113	<p>I don't think you can compare The Strand or Bourke St cycleways where there are no driveways crossing the proposed cycleways - cars entering and exiting the road across the cycleway is dangerous. I don't support 1B as there is already very poor vision using my driveway to enter Oliver Street, you would not be able to see around the parked cars to see if it is safe to enter the road without blocking the cycleway. I don't support 1A as Oliver St is already full of parked cars that are not going to disappear, they need to park somewhere.</p>
114	<p>Hi,</p> <p>We think option 1A is great. We moved to the Northern Beaches approx 2 years ago (and love it). However if you suffer too many complaints about the parking removal (which I encourage you to ignore), 1B is our 2nd favourite.</p> <p>We previously lived on Bourke St Redfern loved the Bourke St cycleway. Due to that great cycling route in Redfern and beyond we did use our bikes significantly more frequently than we do now (as there are significantly fewer safe cycling routes). Ie from approx 4-5 times per week, down to once per fortnight.</p>
115	<p>Option 1B seems like the most sensible and safe option. It separates pedestrians from cyclists, keeps cyclists away from cars, allows for continued parking on both sides of the road and means we don't have to worry about cyclists speeding down the shared footpath as we reverse out of the drive and can't see what might be approaching on the shared path. The prospect of a kid getting hurt by not paying attention, not being able to stop in time and so slamming into the side of a car was our biggest concern. Thanks for taking all views into account and we'll keep our fingers crossed that Option 1B is the one that pulls through.</p>
116	<p>A good separated wide cycle way is needed. Other options are a huge compromise and do not have the same benefit. Many people would cycle rather than drive if the roads were safer and cycle ways were of adequate width.</p>
117	<p>Option 1A - The removal of so much on street parking in Bennet St and Oliver Streets as described on Option 1A is simply unacceptable. As a resident and ratepayer in the area we already struggle for on street parking every single day, especially in the evenings and on weekends. We do our part by parking all of our vehicles on our property whenever we can as getting on street parking is already impossible at times. I notice that "future cycleway extension" points toward Curl Curl beach. Does this mean that future plans are to remove ALL on street parking on the southern side of Bennett Street and Adams Street (to Carrington Pde), and on the Eastern side of Oliver Street? Are you seriously considering the removal of 130+ on street car spaces that are pretty much fully occupied each day? This will greatly inconvenience hundreds of residents as well as hundreds of residents in neighbouring streets.</p> <p>Options 1A and 1B - I strongly object to two-way cycleways being on the same side of the road. Reversing out of a driveway on a very busy road is already difficult (particularly in peak and school hours). Adding the hazard of having to also look for cyclists coming from two directions (a number of which will believe and act as if they have total right of way) is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>Please do not create another Dee Why Strand nightmare on our streets.</p>

	<p>Option2 - Is also not ideal as it has some of the problems of 1A and 1B, plus mixing pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>In my view the current situation of cycle lane on both sides of the road has worked well for many years. If you really want to spend some money paint the cycle lanes green.</p> <p>I support safe cycleways, but Griffin Rd, Adams St, Bennett St and Oliver St are major transport thoroughfares and the vast majority of users are, and always will be, the residents and vehicle traffic, so how about you give the majority of users priority. If you seriously want safe cycle ways then as a minimum the East/West portion (including any "future cycleway extension") should be located through John Fisher park.</p> <p>If all of our parking spaces are being TAKEN away will we receive a reduction in our rates ??? I am sure that won't happen. I believe this whole proposal is a waste of rate payers money and is totally unfair to all Curl Curl residents. Where are we supposed to park our cars if this goes ahead?</p>
118	Oliver st Must have parking on both sides of the road, the street is already full with parked cars and small business rely on the parking.
119	People will cycle fast down the hill. A separate cycle path makes a lot of sense. Traffic calming in Park Street will be a great upgrade.
120	Option 1A is greatly preferred. This quality contribution to safe everyday cycling for children going to school, residents going shopping and visiting friends, and locals and visitors riding to the park and the beach for exercise and fun, will make a real contribution to the health and wellbeing of the community. The width of 2.8m complies with Australian Standard requirements for such a key transport route. Making it a safe width so that children are best protected will send a clear message that Council is willing to lead for sustainable outcomes.
121	Separating cycling is very important. Great idea.
122	A wide cycleway should be built to further incentivise safe cycling for local transportation, especially with the greater uptake of e-bikes, and to reduce the demand for private car use.
123	<p>I think this is an important initiative that will allow children safe access to cycle to school as well as providing a safer environment for all cyclists - both leisure and commuter.</p> <p>Shared pathways are a poor alternative, especially for commuter cyclists who will always choose the road so that they can legally ride at more than 10km/h.</p> <p>Shared paths do not work in busy areas and put both cyclist and pedestrians at risk no matter how careful and considerate everyone is.</p> <p>Removing the parking and having a full width bike lane will also reduce the risk of dooring for the cyclist which allows cyclists to ride with more confidence and encourage less confident riders to make more trips.</p>
124	I don't feel that the road is wide enough did this to be done safely especially with the amount of buses along there. Residential parking is at a premium and to remove that would be more detrimental to residents. I vote to keep existing conditions.
125	<p>Is any change required at all?</p> <p>On street parking is already near impossible due to boats and trailers owned by people from both inside and outside the local area taking up precious parking spaces. Based on observations along the strand at dee why the bike lane is sparingly used and has caused traffic grid lock for surrounding streets.</p>
126	Traffic on the Northern beaches is already a nightmare ! To add cycleways implies "less road" for cars - where the major issue exists, and more road for bicycles, hardly needed !!!!
127	This solution reflects the high volume foot traffic but still provides safety for cyclists. The narrower cycleway sounds more dangerous.
128	More bicycles, less cars ♡
129	We need to park in Oliver street you can't take that parking away
130	Please don't remove parking around here. The beaches have such an influx of people every weekend. Please don't make it harder for residents to park their cars or have visitors. 2 meters for a bike lane is more than enough room.
131	If this cycle way was implemented I would leave my car at home when heading to Freshwater for shopping and other services. If people need to exit their property by driving over the cycle way they will have a clearer view of oncoming cyclists plus the cyclists will also have a better view of the vehicles on the driveways. In Holland drivers are taught to use their opposite hand to open their

	door. Driver would need to twist to the right to use their left hand to open the door. This puts their face in a position they could see oncoming bikes before they swing open their door. The opposite for the passenger. The only issue I see with this option is when people are reversing from their drives they could possibly have cyclists approaching from both sides which adds another layer to entering the road. My house has a single bike lane I need to cross and so for the majority of the reversing I need to concentrate on bikes approaching from the south. I also have a roundabout to the north so I also do not need to cross a bike lane and the northbound road when heading south.
132	It is crazy to even think about removing parking along that whole strip of roadway. Keep the original proposal or option 1B
133	A pedestrian crossing at Bennett St is a fantastic addition as it allows families and the elderly to cross safely. Allowing parking to remain along Bennett St and Oliver will enable weekend sport in Curl Curl to have sufficient parking.
134	Leave it as it is. I say this as a resident of Oliver Street and I have 3 kids. Removing parking on one side of the road is absolutely short sighted and no resident wants this. Where will everyone park?
135	This is an excellent idea and I support more seperated cycle lanes that prioritise bike transport as an environmentally and healthy way to travel
136	The volume of foot traffic on those pathways at certain times of the day (particularly in term time) is already heavy with joggers, dog-walkers, parents taking kids to school or pre-school. Adding in cyclists, and particularly e-bikes and electric scooters travelling at speed (as they already do), to a shared pathway would be like asking small children and mothers with prams to walk in the road with the cars. Cyclists, e-bikers etc are vehicles, and should be safely separated from pedestrians.
137	<p>I fully support a separated cycleway in 1A. We live in Soldiers Avenue with a toddler and choose to use our bikes with a child seat over our car to get around the northern beaches. As our little one grows older, we'd like her to feel safe and confident riding on the roads to the parks and school, and I believe a separated cycleway will not only help with this, but also ease the traffic that speeds along the road currently.</p> <p>There have also been a few occasions cycling that I've almost been 'doored' as drivers open their doors when cycling on the current cycle paths. A seperate cycleway or shared path would help avoid this.</p> <p>I understand there's always some vocal resistance against change (I'm noticing it already in a rallying cry on a Facebook group!), but an initiative like this is needed to help encourage a move towards cycling like other European countries, so instead of families buying a 2nd car that sits on the road, they choose a bike!</p>
138	<p>Parking on the Northern Beaches is honestly one of the most stressful experiences. The fact is there is limited parking to begin with - many visitors to our beautiful LGA and households with more than one registered vehicle, which many existing older blocks don't cater for dual parking in driveways - in particular along Oliver Street.</p> <p>As a motorist - I share the road safely with cyclists and pedestrians. A cyclist should also share the footpath with cycleways where applicable with pedestrians. This whole notion of changing everything to suit a small numbers of residents is ridiculous.</p> <p>Harbord Public School has over 1200 students enrolled at their school. Asking them all to embark onto busy Oliver and Wyadra streets to meet their parents parked miles away in side streets creates a whole other issue and safety concerns.</p> <p>The road can be shared safely as is by sensible, consciously aware motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Change is often great on paper and impractical and nonsensical in reality. Given the proximity these proposed changes have on two primary schools and two pre-schools, I don't think the risk is worth taking.</p>
139	This design can keep bike hiders and pedestrians safe while maintaining parking spots. It integrates all the interests.
140	Removal of parking on the Eastern side would be a disaster.
141	How will I drop my kids off at school each morning if parking is removed or restricted? Thinking caps please!
142	<p>I support the original proposal but none of the above.</p> <p>As a resident of Bennett Street, Curl Curl the lost of further street parking is an outrage!</p>

	<p>Our street is already congested with traffic during peak times as it's used as a "rat run" for people avoiding Harbord and Pittwater Roads from Manly Vale to Dee Why. It is littered with caravans and trailers which limit visibility when backing out of driveways without now the threat of further congestion with pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>A better alternative would be extending the already existing bike/pedestrian path from the park up through Weldon Oval and onto the western side of Stirgess Ave then onto Oliver Street.</p>
143	<p>Parking is already very difficult for residents and visitors and will make it dangerous for families crossing the road - I think the current shared path is adequate for cyclists no need to change</p>
144	<p>THINK OF THE RESIDENTS. This is not Manly corso or Dee Why beach front.. this is a residential street that doesn't have sufficient alternative parking options.</p> <p>I visit my parents here once a week with my two small children (baby and toddler).. if we can't park out the front, it would mean we'd have to cross the very busy road multiple times to unload.. and that's IF there was any space left in Surfers pde or Soldiers Ave (which there never is)</p>
145	<p>Parking already a premium, appears no thought has been put into the knock on effect in surrounding streets by removing this parking.</p>
146	<p>Please do not change the parking on Oliver street. The houses and therefore residence who live there (and pay rates) would be disadvantaged enormously. Not to mention the congestion that would occur on the surround streets that are not wide. Please do not do this.</p>
147	<p>This will create more traffic and a bottle neck and busy side streets the person who thought of this must of done DY beach front</p>
148	<p>I think it needs to remain as it is. Parking is already at its limit in freshwater and this would put in even more pressure on the parking.</p> <p>The shared path in DY has made it terrible for local residents and I fear the same will happen to Freshwater if this shared path goes ahead.</p>
149	<p>Some parking still available for residents. Less road crossings on the eastern side</p>
150	<p>We live on Adam's street and already have little street parking with beach goers parking close to our house. In addition why route more cycle traffic up Bennett/Oliver and Adam street when the more obvious route would be along the beachfront. I</p>
151	<p>Parking is already a problem for residents.</p>
152	<p>This needs to be vetoed on every level Oliver St is a congested street as it is less parking will only make things worse Spend the money on a roundabout or lights at corner of Brighton and Oliver St before another person loses their life unnecessarily That intersection is so dangerous</p>
153	<p>We do not need less available parking as this will only push congestion to the surrounding streets.</p>
154	<p>Keep the cycle lanes as they are and repaint the road way. The community can not lose the street parking</p>
155	<p>Hi! I live at XX Bennett st. (Southern side). I only support the original shared path proposal, Option 2.</p> <p>I do not support any plan, which includes the loss of parking along each side of Bennett street. We already have difficulty parking as there are lots of double blocks near us (2 family homes behind each other like Bennett XXXXXXXX and a bus stop too on both sides (Bennett 65 and Bennett 74) right next to us, clearing out parking in front of 3 houses on both sides. In some of the surrounding houses have 2 generations living in them, with having 3 cars. My next door neighbor in Bennett XXhas 3 cars and since there is a bus zone in front of his house, one permanently parks in front of my house and hasn't moved since July!!! Opposite to me on the North side, Bennett XX has 3 cars too, they also park across the road, in front of my house.</p> <p>It is very hard to park even further up the road, closer to the beach on Bennett South side as there are 3 double blocks in the next 100 m (with I assume 4 cars per double block at Bennett XX, XXXXX and there is no parking allowed in front of the Church .</p> <p>As you can see I have been having trouble parking and with the recently extended bus zone with the loss of 2 spots, it is almost impossible to park in front of or anywhere close to my house. My visitors can never find parking either, makes dropping and picking up kids really hard. They often park across the pedestrian walkway on my driveway.</p>

	<p>I also do not support any plans with a bright green bicycle path. It stands out too much and ruins the ambience of the area. I also do not support any plans, where grass and trees have to be removed. There are not many trees along Bennett st., and we really need to reserve the ones we already have.</p> <p>I have 13 and 10 year old boys, they both ride bikes to the beach and to the netball courts. My older son uses the recent bike path on the road. The younger one uses the pedestrian walkway. My husband is a rider and he only rides on the road. It is very convenient and practical to have separate bike lanes going in to different direction on the road.</p> <p>So if you accept my suggestion, it would be to make young kids cycling safer, a shared bike path is the best solution. Older kids and adult riders will use the road as it is much quicker anyway (dont have to stop in every intersection) .</p> <p>However there is a lack of pedestrian crossings. We need safer crossings to Bennett-Park streets and Brighton-Oliver streets.</p> <p>I am willing to collect signatures from my neighborhood to stop Option 1A proposal. (involving removing parking on the road). Please feel free to call me, if you need to talk. Best Regards,</p>
156	I work in freshwater and the parking is already a problem on these streets
157	This will cause chaos for residents and make parking even more difficult for myself and colleagues who work locally. It is too busy and area for this to be safe.
158	Come on Council - start thinking about all the residents, rather than just a few on a bike. Your thinking on matters like these just screams of someone trying to justify their job.
159	You must retain parking in this area
160	<p>Based upon the inner city cycle way driven by Clover Moore outcome, (loss of parking, loss of businesses, very few users for an extraordinary amount of investment), I actually disagree with all proposals, however given the push to try and turn Sydney into Amsterdam, the least of all evils is Option 2. There does need to be individual driveway assessments to determine where mirrors should be installed due to visibility constraints by walls, trees etc.</p> <p>There are already parking shortages on Bennett St due to the number and size of bus stops, and children should not be riding on the road close to cars anyway as they do not possess the necessary skills in the event of an incident such as a tyre blowout etc.</p> <p>So in my opinion Option 2 is the safest, of these undesirable options.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
161	This will cause major safety issues for the childrsn
162	I live on Oliver St and think this is a fantastic initiative by Council. Yes, some people will whinge about parking loss but the reality is there will never be enough parking which is why we need alternative transport. Cycleways! Why is car parking on the street (ie storage of private property on public land) even given consideration? Why is people's safety (somebody trying to get from A to B on a bicycle) considered less important than car parking? The long term outcome of option 1 A will be amazing for the area and turn Oliver street into a much nicer place.
163	I and many of my colleagues work on Oliver street. We all park on either Oliver st or Wilson st. It is already overloaded and getting harder every day to find a park in this area. The council car park is limited hours so not an option. When are council going to start thinking more about working and travelling residents over a few people who want to ride their bikes. Travel time to and from Freshwater has already increased with the ridiculous closure of The Strand in Dee Why and this would now increase time finding a park for the many many people who work in the community every day not to mention the packed surrounding residential streets. It seems it is becoming more important to look after the people who are not working than the workers keeping our communities running and prosperous. Also many people park in these streets to commute on the bus to the city. Do you want more cars on the road because they can't find a park close to their local bus stop? Please can we have some common sense in these ideas.
164	My main concern with this is backing my car out through my gate if there are many more bikes riding past right up next to my fence with no buffer. My fence is high so I can't see who is coming until I am already partly out the opening. Installation of a wide angle mirror on my fence would help this. Hopefully faster moving bikes will stay on the road. I am strongly against option 1a as parking is already an issue particularly in netball season.
165	Great to see Northern Beaches Council trying to improve cycling facilities. Separated cycleways are the best option for all parties; as a cyclist, you always feel you're in the way on either a shared path or the main road. It's safer for cyclists and pedestrians, and car drivers are happy not getting

	stuck behind a cyclist anymore. The separated cycleways in Cremorne and the Inner West are a joy to ride. And this is a great time to do it, with so many people (back) into cycling due to COVID.
166	<p>I strongly support improving active transport options - my children attend Harbord public school and we walk to and from school with a pram and children on foot; bikes coming past is a constant hazard so a separated pathway would be ideal. I have supported removing parking due to the risk of car door opening on children on bikes - this may also encourage local families to walk/cycle if it is harder to park!</p> <p>I will be thrilled to have a safer option at road crossings especially intersections of Wyndora/Oliver and Soldiers/Oliver where it is nerve-wracking trying to juggle a pram and small children</p> <p>Thankyou for you consultation and action</p>
167	Just upgrade the current bike lane
168	This will make School pick up an absolute nightmare!
169	<p>I do not support any of the above for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - parking is already a premium in Freshwater. To remove any street parking would have serious negative consequences for traffic follow and congestion both on Oliver/Bennett street and surrounding streets. It is already difficult to get parks on side streets due to the amount of apartments and increasing development in Freshie village - to remove parking would be a disaster. - a shared footpath pedestrian/cycle footpath would be dangerous. Teenagers on bikes ride fast and are constantly looking for jumps/ bumps to make it's a 'mountain bike' experience. There would be an increase in accidents with a shared pathway - particularly with the increase in electric bikes. (Younger children are fine and already can use the footpath anyway) - there is already a bike path on the road - make better visibility of this path and encourage use. <p>- I have children who ride bikes and I can see absolutely no benefit in creating a shared cycleway for them to use.</p>
170	<p>1B deals with the fundamental problem with original proposal - the mixing of pedestrians and cyclists (Option 2). Given the number of cyclists incapable of showing any consideration at all for pedestrians – in the morning, many of whom are parents with young children – mixing is insane. NBC would be sued through the courts – deservedly so – for the consequences of Option 2 if implemented.</p> <p>Option 1A solves the mixing problem – which is vital – but at the cost of losing 50% of our on-road parking. I appreciate the road is public property, but we have enjoyed customary usage forever and would like to keep it. Tell you what, it would be an absolute bunfight If we did lose the parking on our side of the road. And where would our bins go?</p> <p>Option 1B seems best. And, before motorists start whingeing about how tight the lanes are, you can tell them it'll be no worse than much of Manly. You could also drop the speed limit to 40 to keep everyone safe.</p>
171	The parking is already a nightmare in the whole suburb. This is ridiculous.
172	<p>This plan is flawed and short sighted. The mass disruption to so many for the benefit of a few is just ridiculous.</p> <p>The parking on these Streets it already at an absolute premium. People already use their carports and garages, but most households have more than one car these days.</p> <p>This would mean that all those residents' cars (not to mention the boats, caravans and trailers parked in prime parking spots) will need to find somewhere else to park. Same goes with all the tradies and delivery vehicles constantly parking/driving in the area. They are all going to try to park on the western side, but there won't be any spaces, that's for sure! Elderly will need to park on the other side of the street then brave crossing.</p> <p>The quieter off shoot streets will become a lot busier with all the displaced cars.</p> <p>Kids will continue to ride on the footpath like they already do (not sure I'd want my primary school aged child on the road, no matter if there was a cycle lane).</p> <p>It's a really busy area as it is, especially during peak travel times. How on earth can you propose having buses, cars and bikes all sharing a 12m wide street? The number of bikes that ride up and</p>

	<p>down this street per day is minimal anyway. It's mostly the school kids that are on bikes and parents don't want them on the road anyway, regardless of if there's a designated bike path or not.</p> <p>How have they not considered that all the displaced residential parking/school parking/visitor parking/church parking are going to have to go somewhere else.....they're not just going to vanish into thin air!</p> <p>All these vehicles will be forced into the already jammed off shoot streets like Wilson, Soldiers, Surfers, Johnson, Wydnora, Wyuna, Wyadra, Robert, Brighton, etc.</p> <p>There's also a place being built on Oliver Street with 12 apartments, but only 6 car spaces.</p> <p>Why not just upgrade the cycling lane that is already there? Paint it bright lime green, freshen up the lines, more lights to make it safer, etc.</p> <p>I definitely DO NOT support this proposal.</p>
173	<p>This is a massive loss of parking with no comprehension of the imminent developments in the future. We already struggle to park in this area. I am PRO CYCLE, my whole family is, but the balance between the community and cyclists is hugely skewed in the cyclists favour at the expense of the long term residents.</p> <p>I will NOT support this proposal.</p>
174	<p>F you remove parking it will put many residents and their family and friends at risk of being hit by cars and buses as they cross the road to get to their vehicle. Shared cycleqay with pedestrians os completely adequate. Most people cycle and walk along the beach front to get from curl curl to freshwater. A seperate cycle lane would not be utilised enough to warrant the changed</p>
175	<p>1A is the only way forward. It is vital for both health and the environment to encourage people out of cars and into bikes. Many are reticent due to traffic. The problem with retaining car parking, 1B, is the issue with cars moving in and out and, even more dangerous, drivers flinging car doors open into the path of the cyclist. This is a surprisingly common occurrence as any cyclist will verify.</p>
176	<p>A seperate cycle way would remove too much parking</p>
177	<p>Most ridiculous idea I've heard in a long while. For once listen to the people who live here. A cycle way is not needed. More available parking is.</p>
178	<p>I am so glad this is being proposed! A separated cycleway is a critical asset for the community and one that promotes healthy and envrionmentally sustainable lifestyle choices - a strong reflection of the people who live in these neighbourhoods. Finally a sensible proposal to support and encourage the wonderful long term benefits of cycling for families, great excercise and a sense of connection with our environment and community.</p> <p>For far too long, the cycling infrastructure available for cyclists is horribly dangerous and discouraging to all but the foolhardy.</p>
179	<p>You have identified the affects on pedestrians, bicycle riders, vehicle drivers, buses and heavy vehicles BUT not the people this affects the most ... the residents. Where do you propose residents park their cars when parking is removed from the eastern side ? Where do propose visitors will park their cars ? What affect will this have on parking in side streets ? Have you studied how many cyclists even use the road and/or footpath ? Are you assuming that each house only has one car ?</p> <p>Clearly this is Government going out of its' way to affect the lives of people for the sake of it, with very little positive outcomes for anyone. A Current Affair loves this sort of Government heavy handedness. A disgraceful proposal that will disrupt lives and property values with minimal gain.</p>
180	<p>This option will best accommodate parent afternoon pickup from the schools as parking during this period is at a premium in Oliver Street and in the adjacent cross streets. It will also allow close to the existing car parking for residents & visitors. The car park lane on the eastern side will also provide effective protection to the cyclists from the traffic. I strongly objected to the original design but fully support Option 1B.</p>
181	<p>Although it would be preferable to have wide lanes parking is at a premium.</p>
182	<p>Avoiding the door zone as a cyclist to mitigate the risk of serious accidents, whilst maintaining car parking where possible to retain amenity for local residents and visitors, is by far the best</p>

	compromise for all stakeholders. As an experienced cyclist, I have no issues with the narrower option.
183	Thanks for the consideration! I believe a wider cycle way and higher boundary to the vehicle lane is key to ensure safe biking for children, elderly and in peak times. With the local schools, beaches and parks being in proximity from many streets in curl curl and freshy, it is key that we open this bike path to the young and elderly, and not only the very proficient road/ race bikers. We will see an increase of bikes with more affordable e bikes, e scooters and skateboard, so space is key. This may also further reduce the need for 2 car households and therefore parking requirements. This proposal also significantly reduces the risk of a crash between a biker and the sudden opening of a drivers door
184	We are residents of Adams Street with children at Harbord Public. The widened footpath would provide safer options for our children to go to school. If the existing parking is decreased it will further exacerbate the issue of parking and an already busy street. Parking on weekends with sports at Curl Curl park is already a major issue which will not handle a reduction in spaces already available. Option 1a and 1B is NOT by request from the local community.
185	Please don't remove off street parking ! Please consider safety for all users of common shared road and pathway areas ! Option 1b will have more issues with vehicle doors causing accidents, vehicles exiting driveways and waste collection companies collecting garbage bins. Please consider residents living in these affected areas, yes we have heard all the resident complaints coming out of inner Sydney, especially Glebe. Besides that we are fully supportive of improvements to infrastructure that does not waste council funds, is common sense for all and in the best interests of all (residents living in these properties, walkers & cyclists)
186	Definitely 1A. Pedestrians will be safe and not sharing with cyclists, and cyclist will be safe and not getting hit by car doors. The better the cycle path the more likely a lot of people will use it, to the benefit of their health, the local community, and the environment.
187	As a resident of the streets proposed, it already is with great difficulty to park. Especially on weekends with all the sports in the area, football, netball , cricket. Taking away parking on one side is a real disadvantage for us. With the increase of family members such as kids living with us for a longer period of time now we have more cars that Need to park on the street. I like the idea of cycle lanes but why not have that shared on the footpaths and make them wider, it's also safer for the younger community. Please don't take our parking, life has been difficult the last 2 years with Covid please don't make it even harder for the locals that live in these streets.
188	As a home-owning resident I strongly oppose the proposal for any removal of street parking along Oliver Street.
189	I have lived on Oliver street for 20 years and I support bicycle lanes but do not support the proposed removal of any on street parking
190	I am a home-owner on Oliver street since the 1990s and I am fearful of the street parking being removed as I do not have driveway access to my property and at age 62 this is a strong concern of mine. I do not support any proposed bicycle lane.
191	Separation from traffic but no risk of injury to pedestrians. Parking retained in an area where there is a lot of transporting kids and families.
192	I live in Adams st, the traffic and parking is bad enough now as a result of that debacle at Dee why beach. Don't make us suffer for someone's "clover" moment for a minority group.
193	'I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THE ABOVE' The parking on these Streets it already at an absolute premium. I read on a post yesterday someone saying that these residents should just use their driveways or carports rather than park on the street. This statement could only have been made by someone who doesn't live on these streets. People already DO use their carports and garages, but most households have more than one car these days. This would mean that all those residents' cars (not to mention the boats, caravans and trailers parked in prime parking spots) will need to find somewhere else to park. Same goes with the tradies and delivery vehicles constantly working in the area. They are all going to try to park on the

	<p>western side, but there won't be any spaces, that's for sure! Elderly will need to park on the other side of the street then brave crossing.</p> <p>The quieter off shoot streets will become a lot busier with all the displaced cars. Kids will continue to ride on the footpath like they already do (not sure I'd want my primary school aged child on the road, no matter if there was a cycle lane).</p> <p>It's a really busy area as it is, especially during peak travel times. How on earth do they propose having buses, cars and bikes all sharing a 12m wide street? The number of bikes that ride up and down this street per day is minimal anyway. It's mostly the school kids that are on bikes and tbh, no parents I know want them on the road anyway, regardless of if there's a designated bike path or not.</p> <p>How have they not considered that all the displaced residential parking/school parking/visitor parking/church parking are going to have to go somewhere else.....they're not just going to vanish into thin air!</p> <p>All these vehicles will be forced into the already jammed off shoot streets like Wilson, Soldiers, Surfers, Johnson, Wydnora, Wyuna, Wyadra, Robert, Brighton, etc.</p> <p>Why not just upgrade the cycling lane that is already there? Paint it bright green, freshen up the lines, more lights to make it safer, etc.</p> <p>There's also a place being built on Oliver Street with 12 apartments, but only 6 car spaces. I'm bamboozled (now there's a word!) by the short-sightedness of whoever thought this was a great idea. The council have already made a complete mess of the The Strand at Dee Why.</p>
194	<p>What is wrong with you idiots?</p>
195	<p>My driveway is steep and requires reversing out. It's difficult enough to see pedestrians as it is despite how safely you go, it really concerns me that cyclists might suddenly appear around the bend causing a collision.</p>
196	<p>I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY PROPOSAL THAT REDUCES OR ELIMINATES PARKING IN MY STREET AND CREATES SERIOUS SAFETY RISKS FOR THE RESIDENTS.</p> <p>IT IS UNPRECEDENTED IN SYDNEY TO IMPOSE THIS UPON RESIDENTS. YOUR EXAMPLE GIVEN OF TAKING ALL PARKING AWAY WAS FOR PUBLIC BEACH FRONT NOT IN FRONT OF HOUSING!!!!!!.</p> <p>YOU CREATE PARKING FOR LARGE DEVELOPMENTS ON THE NORTHERN BEACHES BUT THREATEN TO TAKE PARKING AWAY FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS!</p> <p>YOUR PROPOSAL HAS NO TRAFFIC SAFETY STUDY BEHIND IT AND PUTS THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF STREET RESIDENTS AT SERIOUS RISK.</p> <p>IF PUSHED THROUGH I WILL BE STARTING A CLASS ACTION LAW SUIT REPRESENTING THE STREET RESIDENTS AGAINST YOU TO DISCOVER AND EXPOSE ALL INTERESTED COUNCIL PARTIES THAT HAVE TRIED TO FORCE THIS THROUGH WITH NO REGARD TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY OF RESIDENTS.</p> <p>KNOWING YOU HAVE ALREADY GOT FUNDING FROM GOVERNMENT SHOWS THIS WAS A PREPLANNED ASSAULT ON THE RESIDENTS OF BENNETT & OLIVER STREETS WITH YOUR FEIGNED CONSULTATION ONLY BEING FOR SHOW!</p> <p>THE CURRENT CYCLEWAYS IN THE STREET ARE USED EVERYWHERE IN SYDNEY AND ARE SUFFICIENT FOR THE VERY SMALL CYCLE TRAFFIC IN OUR STREET.</p> <p>BENNETT & OLIVER STREETS ARE USED 99% FOR CAR, BUS & TRUCK TRAFFIC WHICH DRIVES UPWARDS OF 60 KMS AN HOUR. THE NARROWING OF THE STREET OR FORCING RESIDENTS TO PARK IN CONGESTED PARKING ON ONE SIDE AND RUN ACROSS THE BUSY STREET WITH CHILDREN TO THEIR HOUSE IS OUTRAGEOUS AND AGAINST PUBLIC SAFETY. THIS WILL RESULT IN SERIOUS ACCIDENTS AND DEATH!</p> <p>YOUR PROPOSAL IS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE MAJORITY OF THE RESIDENTS IN THE STREET AND ONLY SERVES OUTSIDE INTERESTS.</p>

	AS AN INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIAN I AM WELL AWARE OF MY LAND RIGHTS AND HOW THE GOVERNMENT HAS CONSTANTLY TRIED TO OPPRESS MY PEOPLE. I WILL NOT STAND FOR YOU TAKING THIS ACTION FOR THE INTERESTS OF A SMALL SECTION OF THE NORTHERN BEACHES THAT DOESN'T LIVE IN THE STREET AND IS NOT AFFECTED BY YOUR GOVERNMENT OVERREACH.
197	<p>The separated cycle way is clearly the safest option for cyclists and pedestrians. As a driver (for 40 years) and a recreational road bike cyclist for the past 15 years, I can see both sides of the argument.</p> <p>As a cyclist, the problem with cycling between traffic and parked cars is:</p> <p>a) Cars don't always park close to the curb, and so stick out</p> <p>b) Many people open their driver's side doors without looking</p> <p>I and many of my friends have had very close calls as a result.</p> <p>From a driver's perspective, some cycles are inconsiderate of both pedestrians and drivers - cycling at high speeds, without indicating when they pull out, giving cyclists a bad name. It just takes one cycling hothead with a normal driver and a safety-conscious cyclist with one petrol head to meet on the road and you have accidents waiting to happen.</p> <p>But when you create a separate cycle way it minimises the risks considerably.</p>
198	<p>I do not support parking next to a cycleway as driver are not educated nor cautious, therefore open their doors before checking if a cyclist is coming. Unless this is preventing by a door space between the parking and the cycleway, option 1 is the only viable option. Please do not have cycleway for road intersection on a pedestrian path. It's too dangerous. Treat the bicycle as a car, the path should continue along the road. Design a stop for car coming from a different street into the main road to protect the bicycles. Thank you for taking the necessary steps to encourage people to use their bike instead of the car!</p>
199	<p>Hello</p> <p>It is critical to retain parking on both sides of the street, for visitors, trade workers, to accommodate for weekend sports in curl curl Parc.</p> <p>So whatever is done, retaining parking is my absolute priority.</p> <p>Therefore the original shared path proposal would work best.</p> <p>Many thanks,</p>
200	<p>It's critical to have parking on both sides of the road. In summer it gets very busy and beach car parks get full so our road parking spots are needed as well as for the sporting ground. Bennett street is quite a busy road, parking on both sides is essential as it's dangerous to cross when visitors come.</p>
201	<p>My preference is actually option 2 or option 1B. If option 2 is deemed dangerous for pedestrians then option 1B is best. Whatever the solution is, it should definitely not result in the removal of on-street parking on one side of the street for residents of Oliver St and Bennett St. That would be a blatantly unfair outcome.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
202	<p>Great chance to get families on their bikes with greater safety</p>
203	<p>I would happily support either 1a or 1b. I do not support option 2. It is already too dangerous with cyclists riding too fast on the footpath. Thank you :)</p>
204	<p>I do not support any of the proposals but want to make it clear that if there MUST be a cycle way then Option 2 is the only option for change that is acceptable.</p> <p>The Griffin Rd, Adams Street, Bennett Street and Oliver Street route is a very busy arterial road. It is still the main route from / to Dee Why Beach to Manly and the City. The traffic will still proceed at 50 to 60 kms per hour. We have a bicycle area on these roads at present and groups of cyclist do not use these. The bicycle riders will be in greater danger. Option 2 keeps the more inexperienced, young, fragile bicyclists a bit further away from the road and provides a physical barrier (parked cars) for them.</p>

	<p>Any proposal to reduce parking is vehemently opposed. We live on Adams Street and often have to park 80 - 200 metres from our property at night time. Adams and Bennet Streets are parking lot at night and on weekends. Where will we park our vehicles if parking is removed? Where would visitors to houses along Adams Street Park and Bennett Street Park. People live in this area!</p> <p>Perhaps you could do something about the number of boats and caravans parked along the route.</p> <p>You should think more about what you are proposing. If a bicycle track is so important, then there are many more options including:</p> <p>(i) making Adams and Bennett Streets one way (northbound) and diverting southbound traffic via Carrington around to Freshwater Village.</p> <p>(ii) the Cycle Way could go along the Griffen Road / Carrington Street along the beach and past the Diggers and up to Freshwater Village.</p> <p>(iii) No allowing through traffic on Bennett and Adams Street and then putting in the bicycle way.</p>
205	Current setup is sufficient but we definitely need pedestrian crossings at Oliver and Wyndora and Oliver and Soldiers Ave
206	Full separated cycleway will promote more bicycle use, less car use, and associated benefits.
207	Would be happy with option 1A to be constructed. I was joust on holidays up the far north coast and they have terrific mixed use facilities in place. We need this right across the district.
208	<p>Thank you for considering these additional options. They move towards providing a number of societal benefits, such as improving the environment through reduced vehicle movements and emissions, improving healthy transport and exercise outcomes, recognising (and encouraging) changed social norms in favour of greener transport options and commuter preferences, and contributing to climate change action by reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>I would favour Option A as being the option that most effectively moves towards these beneficial outcomes, although Option B would be a valuable improvement in the event that increased recognition needs to be given to the concerns of local residents and car owners.</p> <p>The amenity and liveability of our Northern Beaches will be improved by this scheme. I encourage your organisation to consider implementing similar projects widely to provide a continuous and connected network of cycleways for both exercise and non-polluting transport requirements, and as soon as possible.</p>
209	<p>Option 1B appears to be a satisfactory compromise to separate pedestrians from bicycles and retain parking spaces. Deleting parking on one side of the road would NOT be a satisfactory option in my opinion as parking is an issue in many streets anyway, especially in summer time.</p> <p>As the roads are relatively wide reducing the lane width for the bicycle lane would not be an issue.</p>
210	<p>How does Option 2 effect the nature strip etc? My only concern here is for driveway access if this option increases the current traffic. I do suspect not as you note faster riders will stay on the road.</p> <p>The removal of the existing bicycle lane will make it safer for cyclists on the road. Currently cyclists are running in the 'door opening zone' and cars along Oliver street do not take kindly to cyclists giving themselves space (away from the doors) because they say there is a lane you should be in so ignore the requirement to be 1.5m away (this behaviour would happen to me at least once every 15 rides - I ride to work daily along these roads). So if you are on the edge of the lane they will brush past you thinking that is fine because they are 'outside' the lane. I know you can not solve their ignorance for road rules, but the existing lane makes them think this is ok.</p> <p>I would add the suggestion that Oliver street could do with traffic slowing measures. However, the islands/narrowing sections such as those along curl curl beachfront are a danger to cyclists because you suddenly squeeze the traffic together.</p> <p>Overall I think this is the best option.</p>
211	If the strand at dee why is anything to go by then this would be a big fat NO from me! What the council has to done to dee why beach is an absolute disgrace! The traffic now all pushed into Avon pde. It's a complete nightmare and so will Bennett street be if it goes ahead!
212	No parking

213	The problem along this road is that it is too fast. This route needs to be slowed down, for example, with speed bumps. The zebra crossing near Park Road, requires cars to be slowed down well in advance of this. If traffic is slowed down a cycle way would not be as needed. There are cycle ways and paths on both sides of the road already.
214	Parking in the northern beaches is already a nightmare. This proposal only makes it worse. As a parent this bike path has zero value as I wouldn't let my children ride in the street, especially with extremely frustrated drivers roaming around looking for parking spots. What problem for the community as a whole is this solving? What risk for the community as a whole is it mitigating? What value for the community as a whole is it serving? If there are not clear answers to these questions, that can be articulated for all to understand, then the idea is a bad one that serves only a fraction of the community, and that's not good enough. Hold yourself to a higher standard please.
215	<p>I cannot support any of the proposals, especially 1A. You cannot seriously consider removing parking from one side of Oliver street. Parking is already very difficult especially at school time. Where do the parents drop off the kids at Harbord public school? We're already having our driveway blocked at drop off and pick up time.</p> <p>Option 1B is too dangerous to consider. Car doors opening into traffic and into cyclists. When kids get out the passenger side they don't look to see who's coming up on the inside. The road is nowhere near wide enough for this.</p> <p>Option 2 is impossible to implement because the path is too narrow. All the trees would have to be removed and several properties in Bennett street are below road level with steps already in place. We have already witnessed several incidents that may have had a much worse outcome if not for a little luck.</p> <p>I don't understand why you are encouraging cyclists to use a main road? Surely you can install them in the back streets which lead to the same destination?</p> <p>It's obvious that whom ever put forward these proposals don't live anywhere near the area.</p> <p>I consider the only way out is to leave it as it is but paint the current cycle path green so motorists are aware of it. A plan to educate drivers by council may also help. I can see why we're getting letters from concerned residents in our letter box. All your proposals would be disastrous.</p>
216	<p>Option 1A -This is not a good idea as parking in this area is in very short supply and will require residents to park a fair distance from their residents. Also there are two schools in this proposed area making parking even more restricted. Just because it works in Redfern doesn't mean it will work here</p> <p>Option 1B -This option is the most dangerous as children and adult passengers will be alighting their vehicles into the proposed cycle way. I have also cycled on the new cycle way at Dee Why beach and it is way to narrow. This almost caused an accident with an on coming cyclist. Serious cyclist on training rides would be reluctant to use this cycle way and still ride on the road.</p> <p>Option 2 Is apparently dead in the water.</p> <p>My suggestion is to use and improve the existing cycle ways in Oliver and Bennett Streets. This will save a lot of money.</p>
217	<p>Hi! I live at 78 Bennett st. (Southern side). I support Option 2 - the original shared path proposal. I do not support any plan, which includes the loss of parking along each side of Bennett street or loss of vegetation. We already have difficulty parking as there are lots of double blocks near us (2 family homes behind each other like Bennett 74a/ b, 84a/b, 88a/b, 94 a/b) and a bus stop too (in front of Bennett 65 and Bennett 74), clearing out parking in front of 3 houses on both sides. In some of the surrounding houses have 2 generations living in them, with having 3 cars. My next door neighbor in Bennett 76 has 3 cars and since there is a new bus zone in front of his house, one of his car permanently parks in front of my house and hasn't moved since July!!! Opposite to me on the North side, Bennett 71 has 3 cars too, they also park across the road, in front of my house. It is very hard to park even further up the road, closer to the beach on Bennett South side as there are 3 double blocks in the next 100 m (with I assume 4 cars per double block at Bennett 84a/b, 88a/b, 94a/b) and there is no parking allowed in front of the Church . Imagine living in a family house, where you and your visitors can't park in front of/ or nearby, just hundreds of meter away. This could affect the value of our houses, which is a big concern.</p> <p>As you can see I have been having trouble parking already.</p> <p>I also do not support any plans, where grass and trees have to be removed. There are not many trees along Bennett st., and we really need to reserve the ones we already have.</p> <p>I have 13 and 10 year old boys, they both ride bikes to the beach (Dee Why, Curly and Manly) and to the Netball Courts. My older son, 13 y, uses the established bike path on the road. He prefers it as there is no driveway or crossing to slow him down, he moves with the traffic. My 10 year old son</p>

	<p>uses the pedestrian walkway, I think all kids under 10 will benefit from this shared path. My husband is a rider and he only rides on the road, he also won't use the 2 way bike path or the shared path. It is very convenient, practical and safe to have a wider road with separate bike lanes going into different direction on the road.</p> <p>So if you accept my suggestion, it would be to make young kids cycling safer, a shared bike path is the best solution. Older kids and adult riders will use the road as it is much quicker anyway (dont have to stop in every intersection) .</p> <p>However there is a lack of pedestrian crossings. We need safer crossings to Bennett-Park streets and Brighton-Oliver streets. This would also slow the traffic down in the band, where cars are flying past at the moment.</p> <p>Would you be so kind to send updates to me on general feedback and developments. I'd like to make sure, whatever it takes that Option 1A proposal is never going ahead (involving removing parking on the road).</p> <p>I am happy to compromise with Option 1B, if safe pedestrian crossings are included in the plan. It would be great if moving the bus tops (Bennet 65, Bennett 75) to near Brighton street intersection would be considered, where kids could cross the road safely (at the moment school kids and neighbors are running across the band, right where the bus stop is, not bothering walking all the way to Brighton street or Park street to cross.. Please feel free to call me, if you need to talk. Best Regards,</p>
218	<p>I am an enthusiastic supporter of a separated cycleway along this route, preferably option 1A.</p> <p>Option 1A is the change that best supports the Northern Beaches Council's goal of increasing cycling's share of trips and limiting the growth of private vehicle usage. Separating cyclists from pedestrians allows cyclists to move faster, making cycling more attractive. Removing road space that is currently used for storage of private vehicles will act to decrease car use.</p>
219	<p>None of these options are viable due to the loss of space for parking which has major issues for house owners along that strip of road - which I am one of. It will also increase danger for people opening car doors directly into traffic. This proposal is incredibly concerning and we strongly do not support.</p>
220	<p>It is ridiculous to think that taking parking away will encourage more people to cycle. Much like the Dee Why beach front ridiculous removal of parking spots (reduction on western side of the Strand) and addition of a RARELY used 2-way cycle path....was that not a lesson for you Council?</p> <p>What a joke! NO NO NO. Leave it as is.</p>
221	<p>Hello. I am very strongly against any of these proposed options.</p> <p>It's obvious you are trying to shove this scheme through as quickly as possible without any care for the local residents.</p> <p>Option 1A: 50% of on-street parking removed! This is outrageous. We have bought (incredibly expensive) homes here under the conditions of having on street parking, you can't then just remove this. Without adequate parking, desirability of purchasing a home here plummets, and many residents will be left in a highly precarious negative-equity situation. How do you propose to help them?</p> <p>It's not possible to always park outside our own house as it is, if you take away 50% of on-street parking where do you think our cars are going to go? A lot of these houses don't even have driveways. By removing the cycle lanes either side you are also making it very dangerous for people to open car doors on the driver side. This will be very dangerous.</p> <p>Option 1B: Whilst keeping parking on both sides at least, your proposal removes the cycle lanes on either side that protect drivers from getting out of their street parked cars. This will be incredibly dangerous. All you've done is take the existing cycle lane system that works on either side of the street, and change it to a two-way system on one side, that has a smaller total width? Makes absolutely no sense.</p> <p>Option 2</p>

	<p>Even this least egregious scheme is badly flawed. By widening the path to a two lane option you're removing the much needed space out of the front of peoples houses. If you looks at the photos, in particular "proposed – photomontage 2" it's very clear that someone walks out of their dwelling and straight into a cycle track. People already whizz along the pavement on bikes and we have to be careful. If you make it a two lane pathway people are going to get rammed into. Surely thats the point of having a cycle lane on either side like we have right now. Young kids and families use the pavement currently and obviously that's perfectly safe as they're not racing along in groups of 10 out on their training runs. If you make these proper bike tracks there will be issues.</p> <p>Take the park for instance, it is a two-way path, cyclists and pedestrians combined. This doesn't mean it's free flowing by any means. People walk along whilst across the whole width, as do groups of cyclists. We just have to co exist, but don't think a two-way path improves anything. Looks good on paper maybe.</p> <p>Another thing that hasn't been considered is the netball courts and sports fields. Your proposed route is used heavily for sports parking on Saturdays and Sundays. As a resident I don't mind parking being more tricky if I know it's so kids can play sport over the weekend. If you remove more parking what is everyone going to do then? It's as if nobody has considered any of these issues.</p> <p>The most mind boggling part about all of this is that a few years back when we moved here we were concerned about the safety of our kids because the traffic was so fast. Locals tried to get action, nothing complicated, a digital slowdown sign, one raised crossing. Your transport department refused any consideration based on this stretch of road being a 'feeder road' essential to traffic flow and were actually quite rude about it. James Griffin MP also got involved to no avail. Now you're proposing 3 ideas that add nothing to the users of this road?!</p> <p>Driving my child to St Lukes school this morning I noticed you can't even keep the existing cycle track's white lines in decent condition, it's invisible in places. Get the basics right at least!</p> <p>It's also interesting to hear that Phillip Gray, Transport Project Officer for this is on record as saying that 'residents of this street are his lowest priority'. Very upsetting and totally confusing, presumably these schemes are meant to be FOR the residents so this makes no sense.</p> <p>So, in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking is essential – otherwise you're pushing us onto neighbouring side streets and it will cause issues for residents there • Big decrease in house prices leads to negative equity – you will put many families in jeopardy over this (including mine) and the fall out will be catastrophic • Cycle lane is needed both sides, for the cyclists and for parked cars on this essential 'feeder' road (your words not mine, I have the correspondence) that needs traffic to flow. • Families and kids happily use the pavement already, nobody would expect them to be cycling directly alongside traffic? They can happily ride to the schools already. • Wasting valuable tax payers money on something nobody wants or needs • Can't even keep existing white lines on cycle lanes painted so they're visible <p>It already seems there is a potential class action law suit against it. Hopefully you will reconsider.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
222	<p>Hi, As a resident in Oliver street we are already struggling to find parking within a 1-2 blocks of our house. In summer it is very difficult. As a cyclist around freshwater I feel the other existing shared pathways work well. Even with covid lockdown the traffic on the walking traffic on path ways along Oliver St are low compared with dee why waterfront and around dee why lagoon. I support a shared pathway & retaining parking over the existing cycle ways as nicer for cyclists. There are some driveways along oliver st that no longer exist so vurn could be fixed to allow more parking</p>
223	<p>Terrible idea to remove ANY of the parking on either side of the street. Parking is already at a premium around these streets. Most residents have 2 cars with only 1 space in driveway/garage. Plus the units don't have enough parking for residents.</p> <p>But I do believe there is a need for a safer walking and cycle path. Option 2 please.</p>

	I live by the busy intersection at 96 Oliver St and see near pedestrian/car accidents DAILY around school times. Removing the parking will only exacerbate this. Speed humps by the intersection by Harbord public would be great to prevent cars from running the red lights here too. Plus a proper crossing at Penny Lane where the island currently is would be good. I've seen several cars have to slam on brakes from hitting kids crossing here (including one of my boys) Kind Regards,
224	I think 1A is by far and away the best option. It's better for the environment, safer for cyclists, pedestrians and cars. I strongly support plan 1A. Losing some street parking is of little consequence. May I also please suggest adding a crossing across Oliver st at the Brighton street corner. There's already a quasi-crossing there but this has done little to prevent some nasty collisions and near misses in recent history. Many thanks,
225	There already is very limited parking, no more should be lost
226	More safe cycleways are needed to link the suburbs to encourage cyclists. Separate and wider cycleways are preferred if space allows. I am not in favour of shared pathways as there is a risk of collision; they are dangerous for pedestrians, especially for children and parents with prams.
227	Parking through this whole area is already at a premium. There aren't enough spaces for residents as well as all the people using the beaches and sports fields. Reducing parking is not an option. Improving footpaths would be amazing, including upgrading to a shared path. Existing footpaths in our region are too narrow for prams or to be Covid safe. Wider paths on both sides of the street are a welcome addition. In this area, many families cycle together, so shared paths are preferable to cycle lanes. Cycle lanes are scary with small kids on bikes. It's much better for families to have shared paths off the road.
228	Just like the recent Dee why shared spaces the removal of parking for local residents just adds more stress and compresses living in an already very populated area. While you reconsider this also think broadly about the massive problem being created with never ending units, one way traffic, reduced parking and generally less attractive area for visitors and residents alike.
229	please continue building a cycle network that gets people on it... narrow paths or shared ways will not work for the commuter that you want to get out of the cars...
230	Urban consolidation has resulted in increased population densities and overcrowding which means adding pressure on existing space. Parking is at a premium and to remove parking for a cycleway will only create more problems. This is a classic example of how a solution ends up becoming a greater problem. The planners need to think like the residents of the streets and understand the nightmare of putting in a cycleway where it is not needed. Has anyone actually counted the parked cars, caravans, trailers, boats? What about delivery drivers? Tradespeople? And bin night?? The whole thing is unnecessary and unwanted. A waste of rate payers money
231	Is the only save options for cyclists, stop wasting space for parking lanes.
232	Less cars the better
233	Parking is a premium as it is.
234	Do it properly. Separated cycleway is the way to go. 1A is preferred, then 1B but a shared path is a real challenge with footpath collisions. Get the parked cars off the main road. Very excited to see this link John Fisher Park to Freshwater Village. Would love to see a future extension through freshwater to the beach
235	We do not need anymore cycle paths. We need parking
236	I walk every day from Freshwater to Curl Curl and rarely see a bike. The only time there are bikes around is 20 minutes before school and 20 minutes after school. The proposals to alter parking and road lane size seem ridiculous given there really are so few bike riders. If consideration is given to this project then I don't understand why crossings outside Harbord Public School are unable to be considered- on the basis that they are only needed for a few minutes each day. Please don't disrupt the lives of many residents and businesses for a very small number of cyclists- most of whom are under 12 and will still cycle on the pavement anyway.

237	All for a properly built cycle lane. If there is better connectivity between spots less people will drive, parking needs decrease. People need to embrace proper bike lane infrastructure. With the popularity of e-bikes hills are no longer a problem.
238	Please do not clog up these roads ! There is a sporting facility close by that does not have enough spaces for cars. The streets are already busting at the seams every weekend and during summer every day. Why not do up the ones you have or connect one via the parks ! Common sense tells everyone this is not what everyone wants or needs
239	There are already cycle lanes on this route. Why the necessity to change what is already functioning for all stakeholders? I live in Brighton Street and parking is already extremely challenging (increasingly so) along the route proposed and in the many side streets adjacent to the route proposed. To remove parking spaces is short sighted and diminishing the requirements of many residents for the satisfaction of a small volume of cyclists who utilise the route.
240	Parking is a limited at best. People from outside the area , dump their caravans, trailers and boats preventing homeowners and renters the ability to park near their residence. Not to mention, outsiders coming to the beach in summer and parking in side streets to avoid paid parking. Banning all parking for a bike lane is ridiculous. There are plenty of quiet streets cyclists can use to avoid the busier roads.
241	Cycleways are a waste of space. There is already nit much parking i. The area.
242	Parking is already at a premium in those areas thus would just clog up surrounding streets with cars, I believe it is l'll-advised.
243	Why put in a cycle lane for the minority when the majority are cars etc that use it is council stupid who makes such dumb decisions
244	We have 3 teenage children We currently have 3 cars We have 2 more children who will eventually need to park on the street also. You can not take away the residence parking
245	I don't agree with losing any parking but would like to see greater access for bikes, prams, wheelchairs and pedestrians that is safe. Maybe upgrade the existing pathways. So far the shared path proposal is best, but whatever you do, make it last into the future, to be a great model for generations and one that other councils may wish to adopt. Don't just do something for the sake of it and negatively impact on our suburbs.
246	Would be a great change for people who enjoy riding bike in the afternoon or weekends
247	Shared pathways are problematic (personal experience around Narrabeen Lake) and fewer car centric developments should be undertaken
248	Parking is a real problem for all residents. The minority of cyclists are treated as a priority. Councillors need to rethink the future of parking issues for the residents of our LGA. ALL Street parking should be left as it is.
249	Council and government have gone too far for bike riders, block sizes have decreased, density has increased as has cars, it's time to stop catering to the noisy minority
250	We are struggling for parking as it is don't take more away look at dee why bea ch front traffic is an absolute mess since taking away south and beach front access
251	We are having a bog problem with traffic, and it looks like we are not prepared for it. We need to improve, but bring the car parking on the area down in number it's gonna create another big problem much more complex and embracing! My modest opinion.
252	A lot safer for cyclist along this road due to heavy large traffic coming from industrial areas
253	Parking is already SHOCKING around that area.... As a resident of about 15 years in that area I know how busy it can be.. There are only minimal bikes that ride the street. Why not just upgrade the cycling lane that is already there? Freshen up the lines etc . Most residents have 2 cars and most eg units only allow 1 car space. What about elderly etc. What about tradies trying to do their jobs, Carers, Meals on Wheels etc for elderley trying to make deliveries. I for one who pays almost \$2000 in council rates for privilege of owning a home if no parking on street you cant even use WHOLE section of your drive as you can be fined for blocking verge access... Look at what council has done to Dee Why Strand.. I unfortunately came along that way other day and traffic back to back.. only thinking if a car broke down here I am stuck in this traffic and with

	<p>those stupid plant boxes you cant even get round to keep traffic moving... Business has surely lost customers... as if no parking why would you bother to park miles away... Parking in DY is also shocking. My son recently moved to DY and only because they were lucky enough to get a 2 car parking on premises.</p> <p>We recently had a pathway installed along our street... the neighbourhood kids LOVED it as they started to use it as a skate ramp... think some neighbours put a stop to that.. the constant noise was disruptive.</p>
254	<p>You a already made a mess of Dee Why beachfront and you want to do similar here? Ridiculous notion....</p>
255	<p>A shared path is preferred as it gives a good walking option and retains the existing car parks which are well utilised by residents and visitors.</p>
256	<p>As the roads become more congested with traffic, both vehicular and non-vehicular, I believe its important to maintain the safety of both by creating a separate cycleway. This will help to reduce vehicular traffic going forward if there is a safe dedicated bike land that people of all ages and abilities would feel safe using. Particularly with the link to the local schools more parents may feel more confident to let their child ride their bike rather than drive them to school, thereby further reducing traffic.</p> <p>At the moment, with the bike lane along the park cars I have had a few near misses where cars pulling out of driveways or opening car doors have not seen me.</p>
257	<p>Between Dee Why and Freshwater generally it is a bit unsafe to cycle currently as it is on road. The Manly area is a good model for how to do this well with off road paths. Seperate cycle path is ideal and next best option is combined with pedestrians</p>
258	<p>I own 4 cars and I think more bike path construction is a great thing. I also cycle as much as possible especially when travelling around the beaches. We need more safe dedicated bike paths on the beaches so that cycling can be a safe alternative to driving. People can find somewhere else to park their cars and maybe walk a bit further? If you can't walk, I'm sure people can still come and pick you up.</p>
259	<p>Good width for cycling and cars. Wonder if there is any plans to chance/improve Griffin Road crossing? Would be good to highlight it some how. Can take a long time across road safely.</p>
260	<p>I do not support any of the proposed changes!! There is room for bicycles to ride comfortably on this road already!! Don't ruin it! What a joke</p>
261	<p>While I understand the initiative to get bikes off the road, this can't be at the expensive of parking Doing this, will affect more than us living on this stretch of Oliver Street but every resident in every side street As an Oliver Street resident for almost 40 years, I know it's near impossible now, to park near my home, at certain times of the day. Our 10 metre wide block allows for only 1 off street parking spot now and we'd need to remove our whole front fence to fit two cars off street. Absolute NO to OPTION 1A</p>
262	<p>I prefer the environmental aspects of this option. I did not support a shared pedestrian/cycle path, the increase in hard surface area causes higher levels of heat, less water retention in the ground, and typically has less shade, and the radiant heat can be unbearable. It also creates more storm water runoff. I also do not feel safe as a pedestrian when sharing a path with bicycles - I haven't had an actual issue occur, but it is stressful when bicycles zip past, and I find their courtesy ring of the bell as they come up behind to be aggressive even though I know it is just meant as a warning. The creation of a cycle way will encourage greater use of active commuting. I like that heavy vehicles will have more width and thus easier access as needed. I do not believe residents should automatically expect there to be public land for them to park their private property on. I would encourage council to install dedicated disabled parking along the street to cater for those affected with a genuine need to park close to home. I would encourage council to make the remaining parking a "no parking - motor vehicles excepted" zone so that parking is not taken up by trailers, boats and caravans as so often happens.</p>
263	<p>Anything that gets more bicycles on the road safely is a win for everyone. Fewer cars, less traffic, less pollution, safer for kids, promotes exercise, etc.</p> <p>And anything that makes cycling less hazardous in Sydney, like dedicated lanes, is a must. I constantly see cyclists getting buzzed by aggressive drivers.</p>

	<p>I live in Newport and am horrified by the car dependency. I can't leave my house without getting in a car. I'd much rather have a cycle lane out front of my home, or even a pedestrian pavement, rather than street parking. Any. Day.</p> <p>All first-rate cities are prioritising non-car transport. It's time Sydney did too.</p>
264	This dedicated cycle path is an unnecessary load to the parking spaces in an already built up area. It will just push extra parking load onto other side streets.
265	Ridiculous to consider prioritising bikes in such a high density area.
266	Fantastic idea and really like your push towards active transport. Separation as you know is the the best option for bike riders.
267	Our parking is precious, and already not enough of it. I don't want to be struggling to find parking in my street for the sake of a few cyclists that will use it occasionally
268	No parking for school teachers as well S residents!
269	Any extension to DY to be diverted through John Fisher park and Flora Reserve in the future.
270	Parking is at a premium now, loss of parking for a few cyclists per day is ridiculous!!!!
271	Parking issues are horrendous here, Harbord public school area is especially bad. We don't need more congestion by reducing parking areas. We need more parking. What a waste of space a cycle lane would be.
272	Oliver street is full of families and kids. I have a 3 year old daughter. Bikes are equally as dangerous zooming past our front driveway as cars. Even more so because kids will not be looking out for bikes and at the speed ppl with ride the bikes can hit and kill a child.
273	So sick of this cycle paths. They do not pay for the roads like car users do, they slow down and cause traffic.
274	<p>Intersection crossings should be raised to the same level as the footpath and made cyclist priority. I'm very, very pleased to see this has been included in the design.</p> <p>I strongly support the removal of parking as an effective way of discouraging unnecessary motor vehicle use, reducing traffic density on our roads, and therefore improving the amenity of this corridor.</p> <p>The wider path option provides a safer environment for riders, and supports Government policy around promoting more efficient use of road space and discouraging private motor vehicle use.</p>
275	NO I do not agree with any of the above proposals. Please have consideration for the residents of these streets. Where do you think they'll park their cars if one of the above proposals goes ahead. Most homes have more than one car and need to park on the street.
276	<p>When making these grand plans you need to have a look at the full picture.</p> <p>In all areas of the northern beaches we are struggling for parking and instead of trying to make it better you want to spend money to make it worse.</p> <p>There are bike paths already throughout the northern beaches and do you think they get used no, the bike riders choose the road so they get in the way of the buses and cars and slow the traffic down. Why are we spending more money for them to ride when they are not using what has already been provided and you can't tell me what they already have is unusable.</p> <p>Maybe focus your attention and money on things to address the existing problems before creating additional ones or making them worse.</p> <p>People would be more acceptable of these types of ideas if you come up with plans that works for everyone not just a small component for example ppl drive cars, bike riders drive cars so everyone will need to park their car somewhere so we need to find a way to increase parking for the area before we take parking away.</p> <p>Parking stations and forcing developers to have a minimum of 2 parking spaces per household which will reduce the requirement of ppl needing to park in the street.</p> <p>Everything costs money but you should use it for plans that will work not make it worse or just because someone high up in the council likes to ride their bike.</p>
277	Parking is scarce already.
278	<p>Please do not go ahead with this proposal. Parking in our area is hard as it is.</p> <p>Residents at the Strand Dee Why have been inconvenienced, hopefully we won't experience the same.</p>

279	A lot of NIMBY's will not support this, but 1a it is a fantastic proposal to support mode shift and encourage active transport
280	This will avoid conflict between riders and walkers compared to a shared user path. It also provides cyclists with a safe travel option.
281	I fully support the separated cycleway. I ride my bike often on these roads and feel many drivers either drive dangerously (often drive too close) or display road rage with hurling abuse. The separate cycle way ensures the road is separated with riders and drivers designated their own section. Option 2 is a concern as it can be quite dangerous with the potential of car doors hitting cyclists. How do we embrace efforts to combat climate change, reduce emissions and improve the health of our community? Start by supporting a safe
282	Safer cycleways would encourage more riders
283	Dee Why roads already stuffed up now you're taking parking away that is much needed, for the random few cyclists. What is seriously wrong with you lot?
284	Cycle paths next to streetside car parking can be dangerous with cars quickly entering/exiting parking spaces
285	Shared paths sounds safer for children and as this is a grant for school infrastructure I think that one is most appropriate.
286	Road is very busy at peak. Option A will encourage more families and kids and deliver greater health and collateral benefits.
287	It'll create a parking nightmare for residents.
288	Safest option
289	Taking away parking in this area is beyond ridiculous and not possible.
290	I live on Oliver Street and street parking is already a nightmare. Also a lot of busses drive on Oliver and so the roads need to be as wide as possible.
291	Shared path is safest option for young children who will be predominant users of path, riding to one of the local schools. Removing any parking is not ideal as it always hard enough to find a spot already.
292	A separated cycleway is certainly a safer alternative for cyclists and I support it strongly. Living at Manly as I do, I often use Oliver St to access the safe bike/pedestrian pathways around Curl Curl lagoon, On occasions I continue further to Dee Why to access the pathway from the beach to Fisher Rd thence South Creek Rd and the Narrabeen Lagoon circuit. This is an excellent shared pathway. Coming back to Oliver St, the section of streets including Oliver, Bennett and Adam together with the route up Griffin Rd is the most potentially unsafe way to reach Dee Why. I suggest that an alternate route by-passing most of Griffin Rd by crossing at the skate park and entering Dee Why via Surf, Pitt, Robertson and Headland Rds thence Ozone and Monash Parades into Oaks Ave be considered.
293	I can't believe the council is even wasting time on this and can be this short sighted, the community said no the first time and now you are proposing the same idea but on the opposite side of the road thinking we would change our minds Council have stuffed up the strand at Dee why and put in a bike lane no one wanted or actually uses. The increase traffic up Clyde and Avon streets has meant these roads have started to deteriorate, pot holes and road braking up due to increased traffic. Weekend traffic is an absolute nightmare with everyone trying to find free parking on the streets rather than pay the massively overpriced parking fees at beach parking. Council could admit they wasted money and got it wrong. Parking is already difficult enough for residents without council taking away more options. Having lived in Dee why for the past 15 years I have seen an increase in families who have multiple cars

	meaning they must find street parking, sometime it can take me up to half an hour depending what time I get home, taking away more parking options would fail to understand the community needs.
294	The impact on parking on Bennett st, Oliver St and the surrounding side streets will be horrendous, particularly in summer when it is already congested. This cycle Lane will primarily be used by primary school aged children who will not be comfortable riding in the road (even on a seperate cycle way) and will use the path anyway.
295	Cycling is a great way for people to get to beaches such as Curl Curl, where there is limited parking. The parking on Oliver Street largely does not serve business needs, therefore parking would not impact businesses. The cycleway could in fact promote local business activity as it's easier to stop on cycles as seen with the Bourke street cycleway in the City of Sydney. Having a narrowed cycleway with parking will remove amenity from pedestrians and cycle users as cars take up significant space for a limited efficiency form of transport.
296	Keeping cyclists separated from pedestrians is always preferable and safer if practically possible.
297	This would suit both walkers (including prams and dogs) and cyclists. It is good practice to keep apart groups travelling at widely different speeds. ,
298	As someone who uses my bike for local journeys I feel much safer on a separated cycleway. If council is serious about its commitment to safe cycling Option 1A is the only option in my eyes.
299	I use this section of road regularly and would love the safe option 1
300	Most cyclists are motorists too. Although when a motorist I appreciate having good parking options, as a cyclist the use of a narrow cycleway close to parked cars is a recipe for serious accidents with opening doors. They are absolutely no joke.
301	Option 1 - for cyclists and especially this with young children, to feel safe whilst cycling.
302	Council has done a great job with the design, including rider priority at cross streets to bring it up to best practice standards. I am a keen cyclist and enjoy the existing paths, but this separated cycleway would greatly improve the cycleways around the Beaches
303	A much safer option for all concerned. And less parking means more people will need to cycle, which is what we'd like,
304	Option 1a offers the best outcomes for increasing active travel and contributing to creating a really good regional bicycle network. The retention of a few parking spots is not worth it to please a few NIMBYS. I and the community as a whole have full support for the proposal. We need to ensure we have a sustainable future and we need to promote and encourage sustainable transport.
305	I fully support the separated cycle way. Having lived in a country where this is the norm, it gave my kids so much more freedom to be able to get out and about safely and less worry for us as parents. That's not including all the benefits of creating safe continuous seperated infrastructure to help connect communities and keep cars off the road. When completed this will also be a fantastic connection to places like warringah mall where people can change to the B line. Let's hope TFNSW builds some decent bike locking infrastructure there too. Great work NBC
306	The current safe riding path requires you to go all the way to Pittwater Rd. It's like riding 2 sides of a triangle to get to Manly.
307	Full width cycleway, but instead of widening traffic lanes, widen grass verge.
308	Bike infrastructure is incredibly important. This would help to alleviate parking and congestion by reducing the need to drive to the beach and would make it safer for kids and less confident riders to get around. The existing lane is awful, I've had doors opened onto me several times and been put in hospital.
309	This is what we need to encourage for genuine action on climate change. The only way to make cycling a viable transport option is to have safe cycling infrastructure. A narrower path in a car door zone isn't sufficient for safe cycling.
310	Option 1A is the only real option. It is a separate lane that protects both the safety of cyclists and drivers. Research shows the majority of trips are short enough to be taken by bike, and there is a large population ready to replace car trips with bikes if separate, safe bike lanes are installed. Option 1A is not a nice to have; it is a necessity to unlock all those potential trips and get us all towards a carbon-free world quickly.
311	I'm much more likely to cycle when I feel safe, and a narrow cycleway doesn't offer this safety. Shared paths create conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, and are unsuitable for main routes like this one. I don't live on the Northern Beaches but I do visit people there, and it's important that there are safe cycle routes.

312	It is imperative that parking is retained. Parking is hard enough as it is
313	<p>Pedestrians should have safe space to walk in, as should people on bikes.</p> <p>Proper separated cycle lanes are much more popular and will be used by people of all ages</p> <p>I don't live in the area, and never visit, but would visit and spend money at local shops if the cycle infrastructure were better.</p>
314	No one even uses the bike paths so I believe this is just going to create more congestion. Even the one on dee why beach is not used at all and only creates more traffic.
315	You need to consider the people who live on the affected streets
316	This madness needs to stop, building cycleways like this , just alienates all other users. This is not the way to do it. And I would be asking who approves a development for 22 residences, with half of them without parking. Council really needs to have a good hard look at itself.
317	This option is safer, reduces congestion and helps people travel to the beach on bikes.
318	<p>Definitely not separated cycleway. The loss of parking is a bad result for residents and not appropriate road for cycle path. The Allambie road designated lane is dangerous as an example. The cyclists likely will not stick to a narrower lane so loses the point.</p> <p>Alternate shared routes off main could be considered. Why would the path not detour through the lagoon park area.</p> <p>Strongly disagree with options 1</p>
319	<p>Safe cycle routes with adequate space for all road and path users to be separate will encourage more cycling and reduce the need for cars and therefore parking. This is a good outcome for health and fitness and reduces noise and air pollution.</p> <p>A shared path may create conflict and safety concerns for pedestrians and would lead to slower speeds for cyclists. If people are going to use bicycles for transport then a separated lane allows more efficient travel, which is more competitive time wise with a car.</p> <p>A safe separate cycle lane makes riding accessible to more people including families with children, women, older people and those with less fitness who may feel unsafe travelling with traffic in car lanes. A wider cycle lane will better accomodate cargo bikes, tricycles and recumbents, and also allow for cyclists travelling at different speeds to overtake each other.</p>
320	Seems like a good compromise. Thanks.
321	I don't support any of the above. There are way more car users than bike users. Available parking spaces also attracts visitors and boost local economy.
322	As a regular rider with the Northern Beaches cycle club it is time the cycling facilities reflected the greatly increased number of cyclists and the danger posed by having to compete with cars. As a driver it is safer for all concerned with not having to worry about cyclists on the road.
323	It is time for environmentally friendly modes of transport to be prioritised over cars. I am in favour of a separated cycle lane as the safest option for riders.
324	The only way to reduce the horrible parking situation on the northern beaches is to make not using a car a real choice. Option 1a is the only option that properly progresses this!
325	Seperated bike lane will allow parents & guardians to cycle to school, given the path passes in front of Harbord PS. Will also faciliitate across to the high schools in Brookvale. Let's do it.
326	It would be great to have a good separated bike lane, hopefully it can help reduce congestion around school times by getting more kids to school on bikes!
327	Provides room for all pedestrian cyclists and residents parking. As parking is always in short supply in particular Summer.
328	If we're going to survive the climate changes, we need to start prioritising active transport and deprioritising cars.
329	A separated cycleway is the safest way to encourage active transport for all ages and all abilities. Simple as that.
330	I like to encourage safe, easily accessed bicycle riding, especially as the pathway joins 3 primary schools. I also think it essential that parking is retained on both sides of the road. Thirdly, I think that, however possible, the bike lane needs to be aesthetically bounded with greenery, perhaps even with verge garden slimline pods planted with indigenous herbs/ flowers. I am certain a landscape architect can come up with a beautiful idea.
331	So important to have a separated cycle way to encourage more people to enjoy safer cycling
332	Firstly, bicycles and pedestrians should not be allowed to mix on pathways.

	<p>Parking provisions for vehicles are at a premium now, in most suburbs especially Freshwater. If those spaces are removed to provide for bicycles, it will be at a considerable disadvantage to residents, who are actually paying to use the roads through registration and fuel excises. Bicycles are not registered and contribute nothing to these costs. In the case of accidents, where pedestrians suffer injuries, the rider in most cases, cannot be identified and held accountable, as there is no form of identification in place as with vehicle registrations. Bicycles should most definitely NOT be permitted to share pathways with pedestrians for this reason. So although it may help environmentally, with a simpler form of transport and village access, I don't believe that bicycles should be prioritised over vehicles or their parking spaces.</p> <p>The idea of constructing concrete barriers as protection for cyclists presents another set of problems as well. Vehicles attempting to park can ruin mag wheels and hubcaps if reversing onto these at the wrong angle. Is the Council prepared to be held accountable for the damage? Secondly, vehicles leaving their driveways to turn left, will be forced out into oncoming traffic with a steep right angle turn, to avoid hitting these same concrete barriers, or the vehicles which will be parked even further out, past the cycleway.</p> <p>Therefore, if the road access is to be changed at all, Option 1B is the most preferable of a bad selection. There are critical factors from a road safety perspective and vehicle access entitlement that need to be carefully considered before any of these changes are made. However, the safer crossings at intersections is a great idea, particularly at the Wyndora Avenue and Oliver Street roundabout, where vehicles tend to speed down the street past Jacka Park.</p> <p>Yes, the project will help to beautify the streets and make them safer for the minority who choose to use the cycle ways, but at what cost? I do not believe that the enormous cost of catering for bicycle enthusiasts, should be taken from the school infrastructure grant. Most schools struggle for funding and could do considerably more towards providing education resources and opportunities for their students, with that same allocation of funds, as opposed to catering for a minority of road users who pay nothing by way of monetary contributions and seem to be gaining momentum in the entitlement stakes.</p>
333	<p>A properly separated cycleway will massively increase the number of people cycling, and remove conflict with pedestrians. Over time, it will also significantly reduce traffic, as people gradually get used to cycling places that they would previously have driven (so many trips are 1-5km which are easy to do on a bike. This key area will also make it much easier for kids to ride safely to school. While the narrow separated cycleway would fulfil many of these criteria, the parking needs of local residents will reduce over time, as people start to ride their bikes, so I encourage council to go all the way with cycling infrastructure. Thank you for listening to feedback, and creating something that is safer for pedestrians as well as cyclists!</p>
334	<p>But the driving lanes are too wide. Should narrow them to slow traffic, this extra space could then be used to widen the cycleway to 3m which is much more comfortable and safe for a bi-directional cycleway.</p>
335	<p>With more people than ever riding electric bikes, a separated cycle way is the safest way to mix electric and normal bikes. Separated cycleways, in my opinion, offer a greater encouragement for people to buy and use bikes.</p>
336	<p>It's the safest option especially for young and inexperienced riders.</p>
337	<p>We need the parking</p>
338	<p>If the proposal is being funded by Federal Government- Schools Infrastructure Program, why not build school classrooms or play areas in schools because schools are lacking play areas. Most parents do not ride with their children on cycleways, they drive. Most residents prefer available parking in their streets. Please do not create another cycle way mess as has been done at Dee Why Beach. The cross streets in Dee Why have become a grid locked mess.</p>
339	<p>Shared cycleways have created congestion in traffic and disturb parking for homes have experienced this and shared pathways are dangerous to mothers with children and old people my aunt was knowledgeable over on a path by a cyclist who kept going dangerous should be licences to protect people in these cases what price to pay for the amusement of a few. I quite happily cycle on the road and always have.</p>

340	<p>NO dedicated cycleways should be installed almost anywhere on the beaches as there is already inadequate parking and more issues to arise as developments are approved with less than two - and in some instances less than one - parking space per residence.</p> <p>If there must be cycleways for the very small minority of people who need or choose to road cycle, then options that do not reduce parking should be the only ones considered so as not to further disadvantage the majority of residents and visitors.</p> <p>Council and state government have already provided excellent tracks, parks and shared walks along the peninsula for recreational cycling</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
341	<p>Having examined the various proposals, I have strong reservations about options 1A and 1B. Specifically, with regards to Option 1A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The elimination of over 100 car parking spaces will place enormous pressure on an already-existing parking shortage in the area. Beachgoers and visitors to local sporting fields already absorb the majority of on-street parking. To drastically reduce parking options will leave local residents with practically no parking options at all. <p>With regards to Option 1B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placing the bike path on the passenger side of vehicles presents an inherent risk of danger for both cyclists and car passengers. Vehicle passengers will inevitably open doors into the bike path without looking, creating a high likelihood of collision with either oncoming cyclists, or those overtaking within the shared path space. <p>Of the options presented, Option 2 (the original proposal) is the only option that adequately addresses these concerns. This option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserves the limited car parking currently available to local residents; • Separates the shared bike path from the traffic, ensuring the safety of both cyclists and vehicle users; and • Seamlessly links with the existing shared path, via Park Street. <p>In the event that a shared bike path is to be constructed, I believe that Option 2 will clearly create the most positive outcomes for all stakeholders.</p>
342	<p>The extra safety buffer will open this cycleway to more people. Option 2 in effect means that most young people will not feel safe. Cars travel quickly on Oliver and the extra danger will result in a lot less cycle traffic, more cycles on footpaths etc.</p> <p>The added risk of car doors opening generally results in most riders travelling off the shared cycleway and in the car lane instead.</p>
343	<p>At the moment there is bike lanes in both directions on the road. These lanes are used by commuting riders and experienced riders. Realistically they will not use a bike lane on the wrong side of the road. Kids going to school will use a mixed path.</p> <p>Could you not put a mixed path on both sides of the road?</p> <p>It's extremely hard to park at the best of times and you think of losing more spots??</p> <p>Netball, soccer, hockey players all park on this street. Are you increasing other parking areas to take over flow?</p> <p>Bennett, Park Adam intersection pedestrian crossing is actually on the wrong side of the intersection.</p> <p>Dangerous line of sight is minimal, eastern side would be better.</p> <p>Do you make all the curbing rounded so cars can park off the road more enabling more room for existing bike paths on the road and shared path as originally planned.</p> <p>Corolla Street steps could do with a ramp and then you have joined more paths to the network.</p> <p>Is there usage statistics and predictions of usage?</p> <p>If not successful, do you rip it up?</p> <p>If you have more money to spend, fix and concrete the path at Curl Curl dog park. A lot of people use that every day and don't like getting shoes dirty, so hence why worn out grass areas everywhere.</p> <p>That would improve amenities</p>
344	<p>I strongly object to the shared cycleway. We cannot afford to lose the parking spaces which are already in desperate shortage.</p>
345	<p>Don't take parking away</p>
346	<p>Love giving people a safe way to enjoy a bicycle ride!</p>
347	<p>Not good allocation of council funds where cycle lanes will not be used often. Street parking is extremely important where it is clear they are always fully utilised 24/7. Most houses have multiple cars which will now have nowhere to park, perhaps even congesting over nearby small streets</p>

	where the same problem occurs and again there is not enough parking. There have been rarely any complaints of cyclists and pedestrians sharing the pathways and there is already an existing cycling lane.
348	Stupid idea !!! Where do you think all the cars will go
349	This plan is causing a lot of distress and panic to all residents in which the path is planning to be built. The local residents are upset at the lack of regard for essential parking on our streets that we have been heavily relying on for many many years. Bottom line is, is that you have to way the costs and benefits of the proposal. The proposal clearly causes more hardship and upset than the benefits. Where will we park our cars? Most of us have families where there are two to three cars owned and obviously need space to park. There are plenty of family and friends that come to visit and where will they also park? No one has the budget or the space on their property to fit a three carpark space on their land. It is also predicted that the many many cars that are affected will need parking and will have to go onto other streets, now where will those residents park their cars? We have no b-line or ferry or train, the buses only travel to local areas so cars are very much an important part of our lives. There have been minimal complaints of pedestrians and cyclists and there already is an existing bike lane that doesn't really get any use. Why make an even bigger bike lane when it's clear the already existing one is never used? Come at any time of the day, any day and it's obvious that the street is full of cars, it's very much needed no question about it, ask any of the residents that have to deal with all the heartache and consequences of this inefficient use of funds. This plan is 100% guaranteed to make the residents who have poured their livelihoods, families and hard earned money into their homes in gorgeous Freshwater very distraught and feel very uncared for.
350	no please no
351	As a resident living on Oliver Street I would like to see more connectivity between bicycles and the road and people being able to travel safely by bike to school or the village. However I am concerned about parking - especially if council approves the boarding house development that presently allocates 6 car parking spaces to an 11 unit building. Therefore all overflow parking will impact Wilson Street, Soldiers Ave - an already very tight congested thoroughfare - and Surfers Pde. I think the Redfern cycles works because they have been able to retain car parking - as most terraces along that stretch only have on street parking anyway. Therefore as a compromise between bike and car, I like the option of 1B.
352	Having a dedicated cycleway will encourage more residence to use non-automotive options to travel. Also, option 1A will have a positive affect on visibility of children walking to and from school by means of less cars parked along the road. Finally, having the Eastern side use makes mor sense given that the primary school is on this side of the road - less need to cross Oliver street, and side streets.
353	I would support painting green the existing dedicated on-road cycle lanes in each direction. I do not support the proposals to reduce or remove parking due to the impact this would have on all neighbouring streets, which are already full. When the new Harbord School building was built on approx 15 parking spaces, there was an impact on parking on side streets. Also, additional street kerbs/blocks to separate the proposed cycleway are an unnecessary use of man-made materials (eg concrete) and would cause further trip-hazards for children, pedestrians, those with impaired vision and vehicle drivers. I disagree with a two-way cycleway because the street is a busy bus-route and thoroughfare and to restrict the width of other lanes could have a negative impact on the general flow of traffic. Has Council considered reducing the speed to 40km/h like Dee Why?
354	The safety of road users and encouraging active transport is more important and beneficial than private motor vehicle parking.
355	Better safety for cyclists
356	I ride my bike often from Brighton St, along Bennet and Oliver sts and across the park. Would love a separated bike lane, no parking. Fully support this.
357	we want to encourage more cycling amongst our residents and making it as safe/(eg: wide) is optimal
358	I think 2m is plenty wide enough for bikes to pass and the retaining of parking would be good for keeping the car community happier, so they don't get (more!) annoyed by bike paths.
359	Parking is very scarce in freshwater so think option 1B is important for this reason. Otherwise those card will end up parking on other already clogged streets.
360	With the current trend of wider vehicles, the width of the driving and the cycling paths need to be desirable for all vehicles. Parking loss could be unpopular, but it is important to have both safe

	paths for walking and for cycling, and also provide enough space for cars to safely pass each other. There are too many narrow roads around where it is just horrible if someone is coming in the opposite direction. So to narrow the driving lanes on a new project is just not sensible.
361	Option 1B would seem to be the best option for all. Minimal reduction in parking and the traffic lanes would be wider than the existing lanes.
362	The plan finds a balance between parking, cyclist speed and pedestrian separation
363	Parking is already at a premium. We can't afford to lose more parking. Why has Mounties closed off the Eastern carpark of Harbord Diggers ?
364	Properly built separated cycleways are not only a pleasure to use but also a life saver - literally
365	Great to see after 30 years and the of idea of cycling as a transport option, Northern Beaches Council is finally getting things ready, Separate cycle ways is honestly the only option when considering safe cycling infrastructure, unfortunately Council more recently have failed Sydney's cycling culture and gone backwards installing unfriendly speed humps on some local roads in the local government area.
366	Fantastic this is being done!
367	Strongly support more separated cycle ways and to be joined to longer network across Northern Beaches. Option 1A is safer for all and encourages more sustainable transport options and more and safer cycle uptake and use
368	Option 1A is safer for the bike rides and also for the car driver. I've seen a few times a parked car opening the door over the bike lane causing a worried situation for the rider. I've also seen a terrible accident like that.
369	Yes! We won't need to add to traffic congestion and pollution or take up parking spaces anymore once we can cycle to Dee Why on safe separated cycle ways. Thank you NB Council for being so forward thinking, community focused and environmentally conscious.
370	Encouraging cycling is the best idea on our streets. The Strand being made 1 way traffic only in Dee Why has improved the area significantly for pedestrians. The same will apply to this street considering the multiple nurseries and Jaka park in close vicinity.
371	Separated cycleways will really ease traffic congestion and parking issues with the added bonus of cleaner air and less noise pollution coming from our roads. It will be so nice to see more of our community out and about cycling between freshwater and curl curl.
372	Anywhere that cyclists can be separated from vehicles and pedestrians will improve the safety for all concerned.
373	I like and support the concept of the wide footpath being marked as shown in some of images (similar to a road) to show people to keep left etc. I do not think any parking should be removed. People who ride at speed should be on the road wearing a helmet and following traffic rules.
374	Yes! Thank you Northern Beaches Council for being so forward thinking, community focused and environmentally conscious. I look forward to seeing more of our community cycling between communities and feeling safer to use my bike as a mode of transport.
375	There is too much emphasis by Council to implement cycle lanes to the detriment of motorists and car parking. Most cyclist take no notice of basis road rules anyway, they come out of side streets and ride straight across pedestrian crossings, or whatever footpath or part of the roadway that they want. If they want to ride from Curl Curl to Freshwater they can take the beach scenic route without interfering with vehicles on main roads and at no cost to the Ratepayers.
376	1b or 1a preferred
377	Much greater safety. This is paramount... Separate cyclists from vehicle traffic. Encourages people of all ages to get out and cycle. Builds community, connected to schools, work, shops, parks, etc.
378	Shared paths are not fit for purpose and just cause confrontation, especially with the advent of e-bikes. The narrow option would be dangerous and not provide enough room for two way cyclists.
379	Keeping bikes away from cars is much safer for children and adults alike.
380	I do not agree with removing parking so close to the beach.
381	Living on the corner of Adam and Carrington parking is already very territorial amongst neighbours. Especially on the weekend. I have also observed over the 5 years living here that the big group of cyclists seem to go from dee why to freshie via Carrington parade (not Adam street)

382	A separated cycleway should be the solution. Reduced danger to pedestrians and less work when separated cycleways become the norm as is likely going forward.
383	The designs show bike path on pedestrian crossings It is against the law to ride across a pedestrian crossing unless they have lights for bikes Bikes are vehicles that have to obey the road rules Huge expense for a small minority
384	I prefer the existing cycle lanes remain as they are now. I live in Wilson Street and the number of bikes currently using Oliver Street does not warrant the expense and disruption that the three options would create. As for the option of creating separate cycle lanes, this is just insane. I drive to Dee Why most days to shop and have yet to see a single bike using the bike lane along the beach. Even the photos council has posted showing dedicated bike lanes do not show any bikes on them. Does Council have any figures on accidents involving bikes in the Freshwater, Curl Curl and Dee Why areas? if so, let us see them, if not, leave the roads as they are now.
385	Option B is the most equitable option for all stakeholders. It provides optimal safety for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages. At the same time it provides the best parking option for this busy beachside location. Removing parking along Oliver street would create a knock-on effect causing even greater traffic chaos around the Curl Curl sporting fields.
386	A separated cycle way will allow cyclists to enjoy the fresh air and beauty of our coastal environment safely. The pandemic has reinforced the value of open air activity like cycling for good health. And with net zero carbon target to deal with climate change, a separated cycle way will encourage more of our community to reduce their carbon footprint by using this amenity.
387	Separating cyclists and pedestrians is always a good idea. Fairlight walkway is excellent with no bikes. Shelly Beach walkway on the other hand, is a nightmare and an accident waiting to happen.
388	Please don't take away the already limited parking spots. We are a 2 car family with young children (same with our neighbours) and if parking is removed from the eastern side of Oliver st we will have to cross over busy Oliver St every school day just to get home. I can't imagine the frustration if we have groceries or if it's raining. Just for a bike lane? This will be devastating to us.
389	There should be no loss of parking in an area what is already becoming hard to park.
390	Cycleways are discriminatory and restrict majority traffic flow, so 1B is the best option. I'm an environmentalist but the Strand cycleway and one way traffic restriction is a disaster for traffic (causes traffic jams back to Freshwater in busy times) and is rarely used by cyclists, so the route from Curl Curl to Freshwater should not be subjected top the same troubles. During 45 minutes sitting at a cafe on the Strand not a single cycle used the cycleway but in that 45 minutes, hundreds of cars were forced to divert into other streets less able or safe for larger traffic flows. Why does Council display such unmerited preference to cycleways when they are rarely used? It is gross discrimination against the majority of road users (who pay to use the roads)!
391	Waste of money. Put costs into improving pedestrian access in Freshwater. Streets still need footpaths and current footpaths are unsafe.
392	Cyclists need dedicated cycleways!
393	I agree that cycling needs to be improved but as an Oliver street resident, any parking loss at all even minimal is unacceptable as parking is limited along this street as it is as well as adjoining side streets. Also in regards to backing out of a driveway on an already busy road with school children and then cyclists again this is a major hazard that I don't feel has been addressed. Thanks
394	parking is in very short supply so trying to retain spaces would be very helpful but we definitely need a safer, wider pedestrian and cycle path through here as we cycle to netball sometimes and it's really dangerous at times.
395	Already to much strain on car traffic and not enough "road flow". To restrict car flow even more by adding bicycle lanes just creates an even bigger traffic jam!
396	Totally support the idea of a separated cycleway and to reduce travel time by cyclists however I have found the new separated cycleway on the Strand at Dee Why has increased my travel times, entering and exiting this cycleway section is totally ridiculous, like it's been designed by a child.
397	I'd love to vote for the wide path but I think the narrow would be sufficient. There is a lot of cycle traffic between Curly and Freshwater but much of it travels the more scenic beachfront route so my expectation is that this proposed route would not be densely trafficked. I have no numbers for this assertion and would be pleased to be proved wrong. The wider path would be safer if children were riding to school, but I don't think that happens much now.

398	This option meets the needs of more potential users
399	Option 1A is better as it removes the risk of car doors opening onto the bike path. A narrow path with parked cars is dangerous in this respect.
400	The wide separated cycleway looks attractive, and gives a safe and environmentally friendly way to travel the areas. In particular the street crossings and safer, as is contention at driveways, etc.
401	appears to be the safest option
402	Street parking should be maintained where possible as it's getting much harder to find on the beaches. A narrowed separated cycleway ticks all the boxes, and should be the standard option going forward.
403	This route will be used for longer distance commuting. The growth in this use will see increasing use of e-bikes and e-scooters. These devices will be used at a faster speed and by people with less cycling skills/experience. Also, with the primary school in the middle of the route there will be lots of children able to ride to school on this path. A solution with extra safety margin built in will be better than a make-do solution that is compromised.
404	So the parking spaces aren't removed
405	Whilst Option 1A provides wider lanes, the loss of parking is critical and therefore 1B is preferable. On balance, either 1A or 1B is significantly safer than the Shared Path option.
406	Great idea. Shared paths are often dangerous for pedestrians as young cyclists tend to go too fast.
407	A narrower separated bike lane is preferred, as the main use will be slower users due to the need to stop at every intersection. This allows faster bike users to use the main driving lane to go down Oliver Street without worry that locals think they should be on the bike lane (due to loss of parking). This option also narrows the street, thereby removing the opportunity for drivers to speed along the Oliver Street.
408	Gives proper recognition to vehicles. The ones who pay the registration. Faster riders can use roadway. Still allows street parking.
409	My main concern is any loss of street parking. After living in Freshwater for 30 years now, there is a huge difference in the number of motor vehicles and bikes on the road. It can be impossible to find a park near your home after a night out. The current footpath seems wide enough for both foot and bike traffic and the existing bike lanes that run are good for adults. My other concern is road safety for the pedestrian and bike rider- a simple sound of the bell will alert people that a bike is approaching. I have had several near misses after getting out of my car and have nearly been run into. Also no one wears a helmet anymore ! How does that happen ? Surely those bike riders should have more brains. It astounds me that parents will allow their kids onto a bike (especially the new Electric style ones that are taking over Freshie) without any form of head protection.
410	STAY WITH THE SHARED PATH!!!! I AM TOTALLY OPPOSED TO REMOVING PARKING ON BENNETT & OLIVER ST. TAKE THE PARKING AWAY FROM RESIDENTS IS THE BIGGEST CRIME A COUNCIL COULD COMMIT SHORT OF EVICTION!
411	This option provides the most safety for walkers, runners, and cyclists.
412	Shared paths are dangerous, cyclists are too fast and pedestrians are unpredictable and aren't sufficiently aware of cyclists Most cyclists on road bikes would prefer to stay on the road with cars rather than mixing it with pedestrians I am a cyclist
413	Separated cycleway safer for cyclist. Option 1B provides too narrow cycle lanes (1.0m each direction) and too narrow separation buffer 200mm.
414	1A is the best option Improved safety and amenity for people using the footpath and cyclists.
415	This is an important link to the Harbord Public School and to Freshwater shops. A separated cycleway is definitely safer, especially for children riding their bikes. It is also more visible, subtly encouraging the normalisation of riding to school, shops, for transport or recreation, as well as reducing dependence on the private car.

	<p>It's about time Sydney as a whole caught up with the rest of the world in offering active transport facilities and congratulations to Council for supporting riding.</p>
416	<p>IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN FRESHWATER VILLAGE AND CURL CURL</p> <p>Friends of Freshwater Inc recently was closely involved with the planning for the Shared Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway as it proceeded to Freshwater Village from Manly Village via Queenscliff Road, Crown Road and Dowling St. and particularly as it passed through Crown Reserve and alongside Freshie Community Garden. This has now been completed and has become a well utilised route. The concerns that we raised at the time were resolved by effective consultation.</p> <p>This revised set of proposals seeks to continue the Pathway through from Freshwater Village to Curl Curl via the major road artery, busy Oliver St. It predominantly caters for motor vehicle traffic and pedestrians. Bicycle Traffic is more problematic especially for a younger population that seek to get to two public schools or to the Freshwater Village or Beach.</p> <p>If this initiative, in whatever form, is implemented, it will enable safe bicycle travel from Manly to Curl Curl via dedicated pathways</p> <p>In general, we are in favour of enhanced, safe and functional bicycle pathways that do not interact with local traffic or at squeeze points. This is a major government policy being implemented across Sydney whether it be in the CBD of Sydney or in suburbs and it coincides with the rapid take up of bicycle transport (including e-bikes) during Lockdown. It also coincides with ah higher injury and death rate to cyclists in interactions with motor vehicles</p> <p>In Freshwater it is apparent that there is a noticeable trend towards E bikes and to a lesser extent E-scooters.</p> <p>The Friends of Freshwater is in favour of a hybrid of both Options 1A and 1B. We do not favour Option 2 for a pathway on the western side of Oliver Street.</p> <p>The hybrid option that we propose is based on 1a with a width of 2.8m along those stretches of Oliver Street where there is no residential housing. This includes the area from the Harbord Literary Institute to the Waves building and for the area beside Jacka Park. It would also include the area of Oliver Street beside Harbord Public School and the area beside the Brighton Road shops. All other areas would have the reduced width of 2.0m and with street parking.</p> <p>This hybrid proposal would also allow for reversion to a narrow 2.0m width of bike path should the situational experience demand, or for the expansion of the width to 2.8m should that also occur.</p> <p>We note that the Street Parking concerns raised by some submissions are somewhat weakened by the presence of large caravans and trailers, that appear to be permanently parked.</p> <p>We submit this for your further consideration</p>
417	<p>Oliver Street already has a perfectly good cycle path. All options proposed will not increase the amount of people using the cycle path as almost all people use either car's, the bus or walk. No additional people will use the cycle path to get to work; no parents will use a bike to get children to school.</p> <p>This proposal is not to any degree a solution which will assist in reducing fossil fuel use. It is merely a proposal put together to promote an environmental agenda whilst offering no viable solutions. The money would be better spent on improving existing parkland and council facilities.</p> <p>You just have to have a look at other bike tracks (Dee Why on the Ocean front being a perfect example) which have been built, at great expense, which are simply not used.</p>

	As far as I am concerned council and the public servants who work for council should spend the money more wisely and come up with better ideas to suit the community rather than pursuing a bike track agenda in the name of fighting climate change. This would be funny if it wasn't such a waste of money.
418	Given a lot of cycle activity runs along the beach front, a shared cycleway should be sufficient
419	<p>I & many residences in Adams St oppose options 1A & 1B. Any parking loss would be disastrous for the residential community. Many residences rely on street parking for family members due to limited off street parking. As it is, parking is limited in Oliver, Bennett & Adams streets due to intersections & several bus stops. In the warmer months (at least 6 months) many visitors to Curl Curl beach use Adams & Bennett streets parking, which further limits availability for local residences.</p> <p>As it is there is an adequate cycle way that runs from Freshwater village to the beach & along Carrington. If anything this should be expanded as there is less affect on residences.</p> <p>Any development of a cycleway along the routes suggested by Council can only reduce the value of the properties in their path & make it potentially dangerous for residences exiting properties. As rate payers we would also be contributing to the cost of our own misfortune.</p>
420	<p>I support 1B option under reservation. Cannot understand why the cycle way cannot be diverted from Oliver St into Bennett St west & north into Stirgess St to connect into the existing shared path/cycleway @ Weldon Reserve?</p> <p>I have lived @ this address for 46 years & you can count on one hand the number of bikes using the existing cycle lane & you are lucky to see 2 use it in a day.</p> <p>Has Council considered construction of a Round About @ Oliver & Brighton Sts as well at the intersection of Oliver & Bennett St to slow the speeding traffic along this section of road, with Traffic Calming Devices installed as well?</p>
421	I do not think that walkers should share a path with bikes. I have had my stationary car damaged by a speeding cyclist and at least 2 people injured near where I live. I find it is dangerous to share a path because many cyclists do not ring their bells and speed.
422	<p>After reviewing the proposed options, I believe Option 2 is the best solution due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Option 1A will create further complications and stress in an area where existing street parking spaces are in high demand because of the beachgoers and numerous visitors to local sporting fields regularly using the majority of on-street parking. Further reduction of on-street parking will leave local residents with virtually no street parking options at all. This would be a disastrous outcome for local residents.</p> <p>Option 1B presents an increased risk of danger for both cyclists and car passengers. For example, passengers in vehicles are likely to open doors into the bike path without checking for cyclists, thus creating hazardous situations for cyclists or those who want to overtake other cyclists within the proposed shared path space.</p> <p>Option 2 (original) is the only option that is safe for all users of the road and fair for the local residents. This option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintains the limited car parking currently available to local residents at the same level; - ensures the safety of both cyclists and vehicle users by separating the shared bike path form the traffic; and - provides better continuity with the existing shared paths (that already exist in Queenscliff and along John Fisher Park) which are also separate from the roadway. <p>Thus, I believe that Option 2 offers the most positive outcomes for all stakeholders.</p>
423	Additional comment - appreciating that this is outside the scope of this proposal but the road mouths facing on to Oliver Street from the opposite side of the road (eg Surfers Parade) could really use works to make them safer to cross. At the moment the pavement curves away to make it easier for cars to enter the street which means that the area for pedestrians to cross is the widest point on the road. Cars turn into these streets very quickly whilst usually looking the opposite direction for oncoming cars around the roundabout making it very unsafe for pedestrians. The whole Freshwater area could do with pedestrian crossing/ pavement upgrades to improve walkability. It would be a very walkable area if some improvements were made.

424	shared cycle paths are more of a win win for many - disabled (wider widths), pedestrians (smoother footpaths) and avoid road-users getting upset (due to limited parking)
425	Maximises the opportunity for sustainable transport
426	<p>There are so many hours of the day when there is no cycling occurring and to remove the parking from these residents' areas seems completely out of proportion.</p> <p>The bus stop still has to exist and block cyclists on the Sth side of Bennett, even if you remove all parking.</p> <p>Cyclists should be educated about the existence of the cycleway through the park near Weldon Oval Clubhouse. Access to this should be improved from Pitt Rd as it could directly cross the cement bridge over the lagoon, if a cycle path was installed over the unused ridge on the Nth side of this bridge.</p>
427	<p>Seems ok generally.</p> <p>Feedback is around the positioning of the traffic calming device on Stewart ave. It would be sensible and appreciated if this could be positioned as close to the curve in the road as possible (ie as close to the curve in park st where it meets Stewart ave). This is because the curve in the road does not facilitate parking at this stage so there would be no loss of parking in this high demand area. It would also mean an easier flow of traffic during the 6 months netball season where the street becomes extremely congested with 5000+ netball competitors.</p>
428	<p>Council must be very careful about what is disturbed at Park Street and its entrance to the John Fisher Park. council has achieved a good upgrade of this section and only a marked pedestrian crossing could be introduced at Stirgess Avenue and across Adams Street.</p> <p>Importantly Council should urgently include funding and mapping of proposals that recognise the importance of attending to the unfinished section of the existing shared cycleway which begins between Weldon Oval and The Harbord Bowling and Recreational Club and travels North over the cement bridge which crosses Glendale Creek. This pathway needs completing by continuing directly from the bridge in a straight line Northwards over the immediate unused ridge and travels directly to the Abbott Rd entrance of carpark and Bus Shelter near the corner of Pitt Rd, Curl Curl.</p>
429	<p>I believe that none of the options provided by council address the most important issue concerning the stretch of Oliver St in the designs. This issue is the speed of vehicles and is concerning me greatly. I live at 140 Oliver St and have witnessed many accidents, near misses and tragically 1 fatality outside our property.</p> <p>Vehicles MUST be slowed down.</p> <p>To now add bikes (many traveling at speed), across the proposed new crossings is totally irresponsible planning.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the proposed crossing at Brighton St. This intersection is extremely busy at all times, even more so at peak times. There are many scenarios if the plans went ahead that will lead to accidents at this crossing. I don't need to spell them out as they are so obvious.</p> <p>Please consider the above.</p> <p>Cyclists deserve to share the roads and they already have bike lanes on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Why the changes? PLEASE PROVIDE A PLAN TO SLOW DOWN THE TRAFFIC</p>
430	<p>I strongly don't support any of the planned suggestions for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most importantly I completely oppose to a pedestrian crossing on the corner of Brighton street and Oliver street. - This corner (which I live on) has seen numerous, including fatal accidents and countless near misses (which you would not be aware of). One of our neighbors, right where the pedestrian crossing is being proposed has only just finished repairing his front wall when 2 cars collided forcing one to spin and leave the road and completely knock down his solid brick wall and gate. I also helped to look after a dying man recently killed on this corner due to the speed of a driver coming around the corner not leaving enough time for a pedestrian to spot the car and safely cross. - When traffic is heavy, especially in the morning, late afternoon and Saturdays, it is really difficult for drivers traveling on Brighton street wanting to cross over Oliver. These drivers are having to look for the few breaks in traffic to be able to cross. - Their view is also compromised by the parking on Oliver street (which has already been restricted recently). You don't see the cars coming from either way, in particular coming around the corner from the East, until the very last minute.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added to this is the speed of the cars, often zooming around that corner at over the speed limit, even if traveling at the speed limit it still leaves very little time to make a safe decision whether or not to cross. - So now we add a pedestrian crossing into the mix with children on bikes (who wont stop at the crossing to wait for cars to stop for them). The driver now has a fourth risk to consider in split seconds.. -If the cars have to stop suddenly due to not being able to see a bike rider approaching (and not stopping) the car will have to stop right across Oliver street in the middle of the road, with the cars still zooming around the corner. - Also there are numerous cars wanting to park at the shops right by where the pedestrian crossing is planned. Mostly reversing out. - So where are the drivers on Brighton street, wanting to cross over Oliver supposed to look first. - The problem is the volume of traffic (at certain times of every day) and more importantly the speed. - There is no real need for a cycle path. MONEY needs o be spent on reducing speed at this corner before there is another death. - The corner of Brighton Street and Harboard road is also a death trap for similar reasons for drivers trying to turn right onto Harboard road. you should only be allowed to turn left (this would reduce some of the cross traffic at Oliver street also. - Removing parking on one side of the road is so inconsiderate of the residents living on this road. There are very few spaces already, where are they supposed to go???? - Why change something that is not a significant problem? You will be creating a bigger problem. - Who ever was doing their home work on the volume of cars and speed along this road must have done it during the last 2 years during lock down.
431	I feel this option keeps everyone happy.
432	<p>I don't support any of the options for the new bike lane. There is already a bike lane on the road for any serious riders and kids who bike to school will ride on the footpath to be away from the cars.</p> <p>If there was to be connectivity improved, the bike path should run up Bennet st and to the bowling club, Kickoff soccer fields and Cricket / AFL club to connect these facilities with the village and schools.</p> <p>The proposal seems like a solution looking for a problem and is not well thought out.</p> <p>Running the bike path along the road along Bennett to Adams would displace all the parking for houses on the south side and running along the footpath on the north side would cross a over 20 driveways. Either of these options that run into Park st don't go anywhere, it's just simply to connect into the existing bike path. This could be achieved by running near the AFL and bowling clubs just as easily without the impact along Bennet st and also provide connectivity to all the sporting facilities.</p>
433	I do not support any shared footpath arrangements. There are already too many adults cycling on footpaths in this area despite that being illegal. No one is policing this. Use of electric skateboards, scooters and bicycles is likewise supposed not to be allowed on footpaths yet Freshwater in particular has become dangerous for small children, pedestrians and pets because of the volume of high speed, motorized vehicles being risen by children and early teens. Some even have surf boards attached to the side of bikes and motorized bikes and they hurtle down the footpaths too. This too is not being policed in any apparent way - and if it is being, it's ineffective because it's better worse by the day. Pedestrian pathways are for pedestrians.
434	All of these options are catering to a small minority. The cycle way needs to join the current path through the park which is what any cyclist would do anyway. It does not need to travel down Bennet street when it could join the path near the Harbour Bowling Club. To take away the parking along the southern side of bennet street is insane as most of those blocks have two houses on them and the parking on the road is heavily utilised. In addition there is already a bike lane there which is rarely used. All proposals are not solutions and would cause severe inconvenience for residents in the area just to cater for a few cyclists.
435	It is time to turn the dial on car dependency and re-allocate road space for a wide and generous bike path that will form a key part of the Safe Cycling Network and cater for future growth in ridership. I understand that changes to parking may be difficult for residents but they have off-street parking and will adjust. I think Option 1B may be appropriate for some stretches of the route

	but Option 1A will generally provide the best outcome for active travel and all the benefits it brings for health, air quality, children's independence, household budgets and urban amenity. Go for it Northern Beaches Council!
436	It will be so brilliant to have a safe and comfortable bike path that can be used by riders of all ages and abilities along Oliver Street. There is Conway children can ride on the existing bike lane in the traffic. The route is such an important part of the local network and I'm sure it will be very well used, as it passes 2 schools and leads to shops, 2 high schools, sports fields and beaches. It is really important to provide something better than another shared path. These are inconvenient for faster cycling, awful for pedestrians and damage street trees and other vegetation. Option 1B is too much of a compromise. Just go for Option 1A and get it done. Many thanks,
437	I do not support the removal of Parking on Bennett St & Oliver St. This is a violation of our rights as home owners. An extreme council overreach!
438	I do not support the removal of on-street parking for Bennett & Oliver St. The removal of on street parking for residents is endangering residents safety.
439	Do not remove parking on Bennett St. This is the only place for my car where I live!
440	Do not remove parking for Bennett & Oliver St. This is not in the communities and residents best interests. Council is supposed to work for the residents not make their lives more difficult!
441	It is important to keep the parkings on Oliver Street. There are not enough as it is. Yes to a cycle way on the path. But not on the road.
442	Separated cycleways are much safer for cyclists and pedestrians. I'm currently struggling to find safe routes to cycle with my kids around freshwater. Having a separated cycleway to curl curl would help a lot.
443	Option 1a is the best option, especially with a 3m width and fully separated bike path in line with Transport for NSW recommendations on width.
444	A separated cycle way will be well used by locals and school children. Option 1B is the safest option for pedestrians and bike riders. The Transport for NSW Cycleway Design Toolkit indicates that Option 1A being 2m, is unsuitable as "2.0m is the absolute minimum where there is very low use, although this is not suitable for priority or commuter cycle routes". This separated cycle way, if designed so that riders and pedestrians are safe, will have high use as it connects well used sports fields with a school and shops.
445	Principally for safety reasons it makes little sense to have a bike path, frequented by young families with inexperienced riders, on such a high traffic and fast road when there are plenty of alternative and safer routes such as Brighton Street. I note specifically that there has already been one pedestrian fatality on Oliver street in the last 24 months. If the council is committed to the bike path then it makes considerably more sense to have the bike path on the other side of Oliver/Bennett St (North/West) as originally planned, noting: 1) The Oliver St approach to the beach is downhill on a very tight fast corner. The North/West side of the road is wider and therefore there is better visibility for driver's and cyclists alike. 2) There are number of smaller blocks (# 64 -74) on Bennett St that will have to reverse out of their driveways over the proposed cycleway on this blind corner placing cyclists at risk. 3) All blocks on the North/West side of Oliver/Bennett St have larger blocks with at least two car spaces making turning in driveways and off street parking an option. This is not the case on the South/East side of Oliver/Bennett St. Alternatively, Option 1B, would be the fairest outcome for all residents, and safest for cyclist, by allowing for on street parking on both side of the street and thereby removing the need to reverse out of driveways over the cycle path.

446	I live on the southern side of Bennett Street. This proposed cycle path is extremely dangerous and unsafe. Oliver street and Bennett street are very fast and busy streets. Reversing out and pulling into our driveway across a double cycle path on a blind corner every day is an accident waiting to happen!!! It is also totally unsafe to encourage families and younger children to commute on this cycle path on such a busy main road. I certainly wouldn't allow my two young boys to ride their bikes on a cycle path with such heavy traffic flow! It is worth noting the pedestrian fatality on the corner of Oliver and Brighton streets not too long ago. Why not put the cycle path through the quite backstreets of curl curl and freshwater? Losing parking on one side of the street is also a big problem. Parking will become hugely congested on the other side of the street. Total nightmare!! There is already a single cycle path on this side of the road. The proposed cycle path is completely unnecessary. Spend your money elsewhere for the community.
447	Don't take away parking not enough parking as is It will be unsafe - to many driveways
448	Understand funds coming from elsewhere and while Option 1A or Option 1B appear reasonable has need been established? I wouldn't have thought usage generated need. Also concerned about safety risks at crossings. Would prefer bicycle crossings to be clearly signposted requiring riders to dismount prior crossing or something similar in accordance with Rule 74 Assume transport (for buses) and affected residents (who may lose street parking) have been separately consulted as impact is much greater for them
449	It is completely inappropriate to have the Option 2 cycleway running directly along the front boundaries of anyone's properties. It is not feasible to safely reverse out of a driveway with a standard front fence and be able to see a cyclist coming along at speed along the cycleway. This is especially a concern for young riders that will be even more difficult to see. All driveways on north side of Bennett St slope downhill so visibility is already a challenge reversing out. This plan is an accident waiting to happen and Council will need to take full responsibility. My understanding is that legal responsibility for safe exit from a driveway sits with the driver so adding a cycleway so close to a property is an inappropriate increase in risk. I am a supporter of cycleway allocations on roads but I do not believe that should involve losing parking for those affected residents. Parking is already a challenge for many homes so Option 1B seems a good win/win for all.
450	1B - I consider this approach very dangerous for getting in and out of cars, I put my children into their car seats and need to do this on the road side with the door open. In this instance it would be very exposed for other cars travelling along the road to hit my child, me or the door of the car as they go past. Currently the cycleway in place acts as a buffer zone. My preferred approach is Option 2, which I found to be a great balance of giving us cyclists a safe path between the schools, Freshwater village and the beach while allowing for car parking and not interfering with the bus routes. With Options 1A and 1B I raise the below concerns a) that bus stops will become even more dangerous than they currently are with kids flying along them to/from school, and if they are squeeze points then they will be dangerous for people getting on/off busses. b) Cars reversing out of their driveways will now be reversing straight onto the cycleways with no visibility of the cars. c) in provided examples for Redfern (Bourke and George st) there does not appear to be any bus services along those routes so it's hard to compare them. d) the bend of the road at Oliver St heading towards Bennett is very dangerous to have cyclists on the south side as there is much less visibility there compared to the wider Western side where the angle is less for drivers. There has already been a fatality there last year with visibility no doubt a factor.
451	There seems to be more cars using the mainly single width driveways on the eastern side of Oliver Street, due to the number of units at 29A & 25 Oliver street as well as the public car park. Even though this seems to be focused towards the southern end of Oliver St towards Lawrence Street having option 1A or 1B would not reduce the number of cars entering or exiting the abovementioned driveways and could cause delays in the flow of traffic. Even with option 1A where there is no street parking on the eastern side of Oliver Street, vehicles entering or exiting the abovementioned driveways would need to be extremely vigilant with any pedestrian traffic and in addition to cycle traffic.

	The original proposal - using the western side of Oliver St for a shared path, would encourage cyclists to maintain a safe speed when using the cycle path as there are more streets to cross and some of the pedestrian pathways along the southern side of Oliver Street have a raised level which creates a natural buffer for pedestrians using the pathway.
452	I am opposed to Removing parking on either side of the street. A Lack of parking is already an issue in the area. I am opposed to having a bike lane directly in front of properties as It would be dangerous for residents who would not have clear vision of the bike lane backing out of driveways. I think the best option would be to leave the bike lane where it is, which is on the road.
453	<p>I was one of the 317 people that commented in the negative with regard to the original proposal (now option 2).</p> <p>"It is indicated that on street parking is the lowest of priorities". Around the intersection of Wyadra Ave and Oliver St there is Harbord PS with over 1100 children and well over 100 teachers. There is no area for them to off street park.</p> <p>There is also a realestate business on the corner. On any given day there are at least five cars attached to it. There is also nowhere for them to off street park.</p> <p>For these reasons, parking is at a premium around this area. I would imagine it would be similar outside St John's school as well.</p> <p>There are far more pedestrians than bicycle use in this area. Oliver St and Wyadra Ave are also major routes for buses, on an actual run, or heading to areas to begin their route. A narrowing of the Oliver St at this intersection would cause more of a safety issue for pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicles, with the buses trying to manoeuvre around this already tight corner.</p> <p>I have lived on this corner for 30 years, and during this time, have not seen enough bicycle traffic in the area, to warrant a dedicated bike lane. Oliver St is already a very busy road with both vehicles and pedestrians. The proposed options would create further safety and parking issues within this area.</p> <p>If the Northern Beaches Council need to spend this Federal Stimulus - School Infrastructure Program in this area, perhaps it could be better spent on safety around the school. Creating a footpath along the southern side of Harbord Park could be a good start. On a daily basis I witness parents and children alike walking curb side of the cars parked along the park.</p> <p>Due to the high numbers of children at Harbord PS that use the intersection of Wyadra Ave and Oliver St, safety fencing should be implemented on all four corners to reduce the chance of people crossing the road anywhere but at the traffic lights.</p> <p>I understand that this Federal Stimulus is directed toward school infrastructure, but perhaps it could be redirected into more worthwhile ventures such as creating more footpaths in areas that don't currently have any. A prime example of this, is the section of road along the north side of Wyadra Ave between Oliver St heading west to Corrie Rd. Encompassing this area is a recently completed facility that houses short and long term accommodation as well as people who may require respite care. It is difficult for individuals on walking frames and or wheelchairs to navigate terrain without a footpath.</p> <p>There is also an unsheltered bus stop directly outside this facility. This is inadequate for anyone who may be waiting for a bus, let alone the people for whom this facility is designed for. For all above reasons I 'DO NOT' support any of the proposed options.</p>
454	Cycleways have to be safe if they are to become alternative transport.
455	Loss of street parking especially at school drop off and pick up time is a big problem
456	You cannot remove resident parking on eastern side of Oliver Street it would force residents into side streets and upset those residents, with good reason. There is insufficient bike traffic to warrant changes.
457	Dear NBC,

	<p>I write in favour of Option 1B - Separated cycle-way (narrowed to retain parking) which makes the most sense as it provides a safe separated corridor for cyclists, is safer for pedestrians, and minimises impacts on street parking necessary for the day to day functioning of surrounding residents and families.</p> <p>Option 1B appears to maximise community benefits safely with minimal compromises to all members of the community.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
458	<p>I am owner of XXX Oliver Street (opposite Freshwater Public School) and would like to express to you that parking is very difficult and sometimes impossible at my property. Oliver Street therefore needs parking on both sides of the street. Cycleway on the eastern side is by far the best option because of pedestrians traffic and young children and babies in prams all using the western side of Oliver Street. There a traffic lights at the corner for crossing to the school and the bus stop.</p>
459	<p>Cycle path must be separated from pedestrians it is far too dangerous to share especially now given the prevalence of ebikes in the area.</p> <p>The cycle way cannot be on the western side of oliver st as the area between soldiers and wilson is far too close to residents' homes, this will be extremely dangerous. Presently there is light foot traffic but if you add a dedicated lane it will make it far busier and far more dangerous for residents entering/exiting their premises.</p> <p>The path on the eastern side of the proposed pathway has far less road crossings so would be inherently safer.</p> <p>Have you also considered a reduced automobile speed to increase safety?</p>
460	<p>I strongly oppose option 2. It doesn't make sense to have it on this side of the street given Jacka Parka and the school are on the other side of the street (and the works are being funded for the purpose of schools after all). Also, option 2 presents safety risks between Lawrence and Soldiers. Even though the new plan tried to address this concern raised in the first round by saying there is already a path there so residence should already be exercising caution when reversing out of their homes, the whole point of this cycleway is to improve safety and increase cycling. I live here and notice usage of this pathway - hardly anyone rides bikes along here at present. If we see a huge uptake in cycling on this pathway, it will be a nightmare trying to reverse into the street - having to look out for a high volume of cyclists and pedestrians on this path, and then stop the car across the pathway to lookout for traffic on the road.</p> <p>I much prefer option 1B to 1A because parking is retained. I'm not sure the concept plans actually tally up the number of parking spots that would be lost with 1A but it looks like it would be a lot given the length of the proposed cycle way. If pedestrians are concerned about safety with the slightly narrower path, they can walk on the other side of the street.</p> <p>If this goes ahead - please retain trees and use this as an opportunity to plant more native plants (even just small ones). This area has fewer trees than others in the LGA and are important for wildlife and the visual amenity of the area. Please also ensure the path is visually appealing - there is so much development happening that is so ugly, it would be good to not have another eyesore in what could and should be a pretty area.</p>
461	<p>I commend the Northern Beaches for this proposal. While i dont mind shared paths a separated cycleway is definitely more preferable especially past Schools and linking to busier areas such as regional links.</p> <p>I have only ridden up to Dee Why a few times, but feel this would increase my options.</p>
462	<p>Support for Option 1B:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Option 1B provides the safest cycling path, especially for young riders, by using parked cars as a barrier to other vehicles moving on the road, provides better vision for and of vehicles exiting home driveways, and has least road crossings. 2. The 1B option of 2.0 m wide cycling path is wide enough when not shared with pedestrians. 3. The 1B option retains most roadside parking which is fairer for those properties affected.

	<p>4. The 3.2 m wide traffic lanes are acceptable considering the great benefit of separated cycleway, and should be quite adequate if traffic keeps below the 50 kph speed limit. Suggested improvements:</p> <p>5. At the southern end of Oliver Street at Waves Youth Club, take the cycleway off Oliver Street into the car-park then along the path on the eastern side of the Guides Hall, the small park and the public toilets to meet the existing pedestrian crossing on Lawrence Street and the existing cycleway to Manly. This has many benefits including keeping cyclists away from the busy Oliver / Lawrence intersection, and passes a shady park and public toilets which might otherwise have been missed.</p> <p>6. Put a full pedestrian / cycle safety crossing across Oliver Street on the northern side of the Brighton Street intersection. This will cater for cyclists going to Freshwater High and the western end of John Fisher Park.</p> <p>7. Put a full pedestrian / cycle safety crossing across Park Street on the northern side of Bennett Street. This will improve safety by directing cyclists to the crossing of Bennett Street, and protecting those cyclists from vehicles entering and exiting Park Street.</p> <p>8. In the parking lane outside the low buffer strip of the cycleway, paint lines to mark the width of the driveways so that parked cars do not obstruct driveways.</p> <p>9. Along both sides of Oliver and Bennett Streets and along all side roads to their next intersection, install parking control signs allowing motorised passenger vehicles only (No trailers, caravans, trucks or commercial vehicles etc). This will help ensure there is car parking for residents who lose roadside parking due to the cycleway construction, and trailers presently on Oliver and Bennett Streets do not move into adjacent streets where parking space is already in high demand for local residents.</p>
463	<p>Further to letters dated 23 August & 17 November in regard to the 'Proposed Cycleway – Curl Curl to Freshwater' I would like to provide feedback as below;</p> <p>Firstly I'm not sure why this proposed Cycleway was even suggested in the first place as it certainly will not decrease the amount of cars using Oliver Street. I'd have preferred to see a roundabout constructed at Wyuna Avenue/ Oliver Street where many accidents happen since cars are parked right up to the corner of Oliver Street and visibility is limited on traffic coming north bound in particular when trying to cross.</p> <p>If people wish to use a cycle path then there is a route from Curl Curl to Freshwater along the coastal road, ie: Carrington Parade , why couldn't this be extended ? If any road needs looking at closely it's Evans Street as parking both sides is an accident waiting to happen with City and local buses trying to maneuver by weaving between cars plus the additional traffic frequenting Diggers.</p> <p>The majority of houses in Oliver Street have driveways for car access. In particular the eastern side has numerous unit blocks, a busy Telstra business driveway and access to the popular public car park near the village end. The western side has a raised footpath in certain areas which is some distance away from house driveways which is a plus for safety reasons.</p> <p>The original suggestion (Option 2) of a shared path & Cycleway on the western side was a much better idea since there would be less disruption for access to houses as opposed to the eastern side where there are numerous driveways to unit blocks, more side roads and less room to construct a cycleway plus a footpath.</p>
464	<p>The proposed plans are dangerous and unnecessary. There is already a cycle path on each side of the street that is rarely used anyway. Encouraging more people especially young inexperienced riders to use this street is a safety concern.</p> <p>Planning for this shared pathway and cycle way on quieter streets in the area would be much safer.</p> <p>The plan will cause great inconvenience to not only the residents of Bennett and Oliver street with the loss of parking but also increased congestion for residents of the side streets.</p> <p>To gain access to the driveways residents will need to cross the shared path which is incredibly dangerous and the users of the path will have a false sense of security.</p>
465	<p>The wider cycle path is safer for my children to ride to school. Pleased to see more details around the crossings in this round of consultation.</p>
466	<p>I strongly support options that are best for cyclists and that disincentivise driving. The more cycleways and wide pavements and the less parking, the better.</p>

Written comments uploaded on Your Say

Comment #	Written upload attachement
467	<p>7th December 2021</p> <p>Northern Beaches Council P.O. Box 82 Manly NSW 1655</p> <p>RE: CURL CURL TO FRESHWATER – SEPARATED CYCLEWAY</p> <p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>I <u>support</u> the ORIGINAL PROPOSAL: SHARED PATH – OPTION 2.</p> <p>After discussions with many street residents and our joint law firm, should Council choose Option 1A – Separated Cycleway and remove our on-street parking we will commence an immediate class action against Northern Beaches Council.</p> <p>The removal of residents parking is unprecedented for the Northern Beaches and totally unnecessary.</p> <p>Kind regards XX Bennett Street Curl Curl</p>
468	<p>Freshwater to Curl Curl Re OPTIONS for cycling Separated cycle way (east) (Option 1B) and Shared path (west) along Oliver Street (Option 2)</p> <p><u>Re Option 1B</u> The existing bike lane (between fast moving traffic and parked cars) is not safe for cyclists. To cater for road cyclists, in my view Option 1B is the preferred option compared with Option A. Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the separated cycle way is safer between the footpath and parked cars. • Car parking is retained on the eastern side of Oliver Street. <p><u>Safety concerns re Option 1B</u> I do have some concerns re safety issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The driver side doors of parked vehicles will open into a lane with fast moving traffic. The removal of the existing on road bike lane will mean there is no buffer width to allow people to get in and out of vehicles safely on the driver's side. As noted in the FAQ, "passenger side doors are less frequently used than driver side doors". An equivalent statement is that driver side doors are more frequently used than passenger side doors. 2. The dedicated cycle way will connect with a shared path, not a dedicated cycle way, to the north and south of Oliver Street. 3. The potential use of the cycle way by a mix of ages, including road cyclists, slow (beginner) cyclists and children, will result in a wide range of cycling speed and competency. This could be frustrating for fast and experienced road cyclists. <p><u>Re Option 2 (Shared path)</u> I support Option 1B for most cyclists. However, I also support aspects of Option 2 (Shared Path) to make the route along the western side of Oliver Street safer for pedestrians and cyclists. In particular, improving the safety of crossings at side roads along Oliver Street, as this would greatly encourage active travel for all ages.</p>


Comment #	Written upload attachment
	<p>Children up to 12 and accompanying adults are permitted to ride along the existing footpath. However, beginners, slow cyclists and others who lack confidence may also prefer to use a (shared) footpath rather than compete with fast cyclists on a dedicated cycle way.</p> <p><u>Re Parking – East side of Oliver Street</u> I support the continuation of parking along the East side of Oliver Street, including: 1) Parking alongside Harbord Primary School. Reason: Parents wait for their children to exit from the school gates on the Eastern side of Oliver Street.</p> <p>2) Parking between the Harbord Institute and the Waves buildings. Reasons: This section is well used by people visiting Harbord Institute and Freshwater Village. The community car park is sometimes full and there is a lack of parking for St Marks Church (opposite).</p> <p><u>Park Street, Curl Curl</u> I would like to suggest a shared path on the western side of Park Street to connect with the shared path in John Fisher Park. Reason: It is not sufficiently safe for younger cyclists to share road space that is used by local residents. Local traffic includes vehicles travelling to and from the nearby John Fisher Park, Harbord Bowling Club and Scout Hall.</p> <p><u>Re Trees and Shade</u> I support the retention of trees and shade wherever possible. The proposed width of 2.5m for the shared bike path is quite wide, but it is not clear how many trees would be removed from the western side of Oliver Street.</p>

Comments received by Email

Comment #	Email comment received
469	<p>I just received an email for a proposed new cycle way and safety crossing. This is the best news ever! My kids and myself really struggle to cross safely to get from our house 73 Oliver St near harbord public down to Jacka park. The new proposed pedestrian crossing will be so helpful.</p>
470	<p>Dear Phillip Gray,</p> <p>I strongly oppose to the new plans of a separated pedestrian/cyclist path on one side of Oliver Street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will create massive parking issues 2. It is unsafe for kids as they already race down Oliver Street and will be even more encouraged to ride fast with a separated pathway and may get hit by cars exiting driveways 3. There are hardly enough cyclists which justifies such an expensive project. I counted 4 cyclists this morning when the sun was out going past within 1 hour. <p>Thank you, Resident of Oliver Street</p>
471	<p>Good morning.</p>

Comment #	Email comment received
	<p>I am a resident of Bennett Street.</p> <p>I refer to the above and take this opportunity to confirm my objection to any change to the existing Oliver and Bennett Streets carriageway.</p> <p>Currently they are both two-way streets with footpaths on both sides and so too bicycle lanes going each way.</p> <p>Parking is currently at a premium, subsequent to Council's continued approval of up to five bedroom residences each with numerous vehicles on typically small circa 500 m2 blocks, and further exacerbated on weekends with netball and various football codes using Denzil Joyce, Weldon, Frank Gray, John Fisher, Reub Hudson etc as there is a connecting bridge off Stewart Ave and Park Street.</p> <p>New road rules have been introduced to better accomodate cyclists on the road and you can be sure the typical, exercise focussed cyclists being the vast majority who currently ride on Bennett Street won't use the proposed cycleway as it does not allow them to ride in a peloton formation whilst playing Tour de France on our public roads.</p> <p>Therefore, they will continue to use the main vehicular carriageway making the whole separated cycleway a waste of time and money. They are fine for densely populated inner city areas where people do tend to commute, as opposed to exercise, on a bicycle.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.</p> <p>Bennett Street Curl Curl NSW 2096</p>
472	<p>Dear sir</p> <p>I am a local resident at XX Oliver Street Freshwater and have been for many years.</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposed cycle way on the Eastern side of Oliver Street for the following reasons.</p> <p>* A cycle way on the Eastern side of Oliver Street between Brighton and Park Street would have reduced visibility for the cyclist due to the shorter tighter curvature of the track on this side of Oliver Street thus increasing the likely hood of a crash between any one on the track entering or exiting their properties or walking in that area to visit shops or bus stops, I have witnessed many accidents over the years due to cars coming around that corner with reduced visibility on that tight bend. And feel that this would be the same for speeding cyclists heading North on the Eastern side of the bend.</p> <p>* It would be dangerous for pedestrians entering or exiting the shopping centre on the corner of Brighton and Oliver. Particularly near that short bend coming from Curl Curl.</p> <p>*Further South along the Eastern side of Oliver Street is the Harbord Primary School with small children entering and existing school grounds walking onto proposed wider two way Cycle ways.</p> <p>I believe the existing arrangements of the cycle paths should not be changed as this existing arrangement has had to my knowledge no problems. If its not broken then don't try and fix it.</p> <p>I would also object to the no parking proposal on the Eastern side of Oliver Street due to obvious reasons that extra parking for residents and visitors is vital.</p>

Comment #	Email comment received
	Regards
473	Please improve cycle way option 1A looks good. Thanks,
474	<p>Hi there, I saw a sign in Freshwater last night regarding some new shared paths being built/proposed, and looking for feedback.</p> <p>I am not a keen cyclist, but I ride to work (Cromer) from my home (Freshwater) and back once per week as a bit of varied exercise. I gave up riding on shared bike/pedestrian bike paths several years ago – Quite simply, bikes and pedestrians don't work for anyone other than parents with small children looking to travel at less than 10 km/hr (for that purpose they are fine).</p> <p>For people actually looking to get “from A to B”, as cyclist, the amount of abuse you get all too often takes any fun or relaxation out of the equation. Of course, 90% of people are fine, but the other 10% of people give ridiculous abuse – even looking to get physical, believing that their dog (who is often not on a leash) has far more right to amenities than you do. Others, even fairly elderly women, will abuse you for asking them to move over to let you past, as they wish to walk 4-abreast across the path at about 3km/hr.</p> <p>As a pedestrian I certainly understand how you can be “spooked” by someone coming up quickly from behind – so it's not all “one way traffic” in this department.</p> <p>I'm a 62-year old guy who rides a heavy mountain bike. I don't ride very quickly. As a motorist I am well aware of how some cyclists on the road are quite arrogant and give cyclists a bad name (again, its probably 90% good and 10% bad). Therefore it's not really surprising that some people have no respect for cyclists (rightly or wrongly). But for the 90% “good” cyclists, to get abused by people just about every time you use a shared cycle way – it's just not worth it. I'm much happier taking my chances on a bike lane on the road, as I think about 99% of motorists are pretty good (1% bad). I think you'll find that anyone other than people wishing to dawdle along on a bike will feel the same way.</p> <p>I hope the above is not seen as too negative – some dedicated cycle paths that get cyclists off Sydney's busy roads would be great – however I do recognise how difficult this is to achieve given the lack of “spare real estate” there is in our road network.</p> <p>Thanks and regards, XX Johnson St Freshwater 2096</p>
475	<p>Hello</p> <p>I prefer Option 2. I agree with the idea of a cycleway but not at the expense of reducing the width of the existing roadway. Oliver St is exceptionally busy, especially at school drop off and pick up times. If the road width was reduced, I believe that it would be dangerous.</p> <p>Also, I'm wondering how the ‘Road Crossing treatment - Raised pedestrian & Cycleway crossing and shared path on approach to crossing’ would work safely at the roundabout at Oliver St and Wyndora Ave.</p> <p>Regards XXX Wyndora Ave Freshwater</p>
476	<p>Dear Mr Brownlee,</p> <p>Please find attached feedback from Bicycle NSW on the Freshwater to Curl Curl separated bike path. We urge Council to progress with Option 1A for most of this route. As explained in the</p>

Comment #	Email comment received
	<p>submission, there are sections of Oliver Street where 1B might be appropriate, subject to detail design.</p> <p>Do get in touch if Bicycle NSW can further support Council's advocacy for a separated bike path. I am available to discuss this by phone or meet with you if preferred.</p> <p>Many thanks and kind regards, -</p> <p>Sarah Bickford Bike Planner Bicycle NSW</p> <p>Gadigal Country Tower 2, Level 20, 201 Sussex Street, Sydney, NSW, 2000 PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230 T: 02 9704 0800 M: 0431 961 520 W: bicyclensw.org.au</p> <p></p>

The policies establish a road user hierarchy that considers pedestrians first and private cars last, as shown in Figure 3.

Order of Road User Space Considerations



Figure 3:
Diagram expressing Transport for NSW's
road user priority.
(Source: Transport for NSW)

The reallocation of road space for active travel is clearly supported by Northern Beaches Councils strategies. Priority 21 of *Towards 2040 - Northern Beaches Local Strategic Planning Statement*^{tk} aims to redesign existing streets to be more efficient, accommodating more people, goods and services in a limited space and creating safer and more attractive public realm. Reallocating road space to create separated bicycle paths will reduce conflict and make it easier to walk and cycle. *Move 2038 – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy* recognises that pedestrians and cyclists should be separated. The *Northern Beaches Bike Plan 2020* strives for separated cycle paths on regional and district routes.

It is fantastic that Northern Beaches Council has initiated brave discussions with the community about reallocating road space from private cars to reflect the priorities set out in the Road User Space Allocation Policy and Council's own transport policies. In our recent meeting, the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Rob Stokes MP, stated his preference for properly separated walking and cycling infrastructure. He expressed his strong belief that **the road-related environment is a public asset** that must be shared equitably between all road users. Any inconvenience to car drivers created by reducing road space for driving and parking private vehicles will incentivise the mode-shift that Transport for NSW and Council seek, benefitting local residents with quieter streets, and less pollution, noise and through-traffic.

Our [September submission](#) sets out the reasons why **a shared path** is not appropriate for such an important section of the cycling network. These include conflict between people walking and cycling, which will get worse as population and active travel increase; the loss of verges, vegetation and, in some instances, mature trees; the uncomfortable pinch points caused by bus stops, power poles and retained trees and constant interruptions when crossing side streets where vehicles effectively have priority. Importantly, no attempt is made to change the dial on car use when bicycles are squeezed into pedestrian spaces. By leaving the road between the kerbs as the unchallenged domain of private cars, with wide vehicle lanes and ample parking, car travel is encouraged, unsafe speeds are common and the modal shift needed to meet climate, health and liveability imperatives may not occur.

Segregated bi-directional paths have many benefits over shared paths:

- People riding bikes are separated from pedestrians and vehicles, reducing conflict.
- Street trees and green verges are not impacted.
- The narrower vehicle lanes will slow traffic, reducing noise and improving safety for all road users.
- No additional asphalt is required, reducing issues with urban heat and stormwater.
- Sufficient space is created to enable a significant modal shift to active transport.

(02) 9704 0800 | info@bicyclensw.org.au | www.bicyclensw.org.au
Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230
ABN 26 511 801 801

- New landscaping and important pedestrian safety features such as kerb extensions can be incorporated into the buffers and the parking lanes.
- The cycle paths can be prioritised over driveways and minor road intersections.
- Motorists exiting driveways have a better sightline to approaching cyclists, improving safety.

The new Transport for NSW Cycleway Design Toolbox^x and Austroads Cycling Guide recommend a minimum width of 3.0m for a bi-directional bicycle path. A 3.0m wide path will be comfortable for bike riders of all ages and abilities, allows for faster riders to overtake, accommodates innovative and emerging forms of micromobility such as cargo bikes and e-scooters, and caters for future growth in ridership.

As shown on the plans, the wider cycle path for **Option 1A** retains all trees and verge planting and includes a generous and safe buffer that could incorporate additional landscaping. Parking along one side of the corridor will be lost. However, all but one home along Oliver and Bennett Streets have off-street parking. On-street parking is fundamentally the storage of private property in the public domain. It makes driving easier and generates car trips. When on-street parking is prioritised over safe cycling, active transport for the whole community suffers.

Option 1B demonstrates that it is possible to fit a bi-directional bicycle path into a standard 12.8m road like Oliver Street without loss of vehicle lanes or parking. However, when buses need to pass, the resulting bicycle path is only 2.0m wide with a very minimal 20cm buffer. This is too narrow and does not meet the minimum standards set out in the Cycleway Design Toolbox^{xi}. **Option 1B is a compromise** that will limit the potential of the cycle path to attract residents to bike riding. It will not feel as safe or comfortable as the Option 1A path so parents may be less inclined to let children travel independently. Those commuting by bike will find it difficult to overtake slower riders and may cycle on the road instead, frustrating drivers.

Bicycle NSW suggested locating a separated bike path on the **eastern side of Oliver Street** and we are delighted this is reflected in the revised plans. The eastern side has several advantages over the western side:

- There are 5 side streets to cross which is easier than negotiating 10 on the western side.
- There are approximately 45 driveways to cross compared to approximately 60 on the western side.
- The cycle path would run adjacent to Harbord Public School, creating very safe access for the 1000+ students.
- The laneway opposite the end of Dowling Street could be used by bike riders coming from Manly, simplifying access from the Queenscliff shared path to Oliver Street.

In addition, we advocated for traffic calming on Park Street to create a very slow speed environment for the connection to John Fisher Park so bikes can safely share the road with cars. This eliminates the need for a shared path or cycle lane to connect with the Curl Curl Lagoon open space and sports facilities. We are pleased that a shared-street treatment for Park Street has been incorporated into the proposals.

Recommendations:

- **Option 1A is preferred, but with a 3.0m wide bicycle path.**

Option 1A will create a high-quality contribution to the Northern Beaches Safe Cycling Network. The wide bicycle path will encourage more bike riding and active travel, helping to meet Council's mode shift targets. However, we suggest adjusting the widths of the vehicle and parking lanes to create a best-practice 3.0m wide bike path with a 1.0m buffer. Figure 4 shows the configuration recommended by Transport for NSW for a 12.8m road. In Figure 5, these widths are applied to Oliver Street and presented alongside Council's proposal for Option 1A.

(02) 9704 0800 | info@bicyclensw.org.au | www.bicyclensw.org.au
Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230
ABN 26 511 801 801





Figure 4:
Optimal configuration for a 12.8m carriageway
Source: TNSW Cycleway Design Toolbox, p.32)

Figure 5:
Configuration proposed for Option 1A, adjusted to meet TNSW's recommended lane widths
(Source: Northern Beaches Council)



- **Option 1B could be considered for some sections, but with a 2.4m wide bicycle path.**

Where buses do not pass regularly, it may be possible to retain parking on both sides of the road and create an adequate bicycle path by narrowing the vehicle and parking lanes. The Cycleway Design Toolbox suggests the configuration shown in Figure 6 to achieve an acceptable 2.4m bicycle path with a 40cm buffer. Figure 7 demonstrates how Option 1B could be adjusted to create the recommended layout.

For the section of the Freshwater to Curl Curl route south of Wyndora Avenue, this treatment is worth exploring. Buses do not use the southern stretch of Oliver Street and the on-street parking is particularly valuable close to the shopping village, the weekend markets, the community centre and St John's Primary School.




Figure 6:
Constrained configuration for a 12.8m carriageway, retaining parking on both sides of the road.
Source: TNSW Cycleway Design Toolbox, p.32)

(02) 9704 0800 | info@bicyclensw.org.au | www.bicyclensw.org.au
Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230
ABN 26 511 801 801




Figure 7: Configuration proposed for Option 1B, adjusted to meet TfNSW's recommended lane widths (Source: Northern Beaches Council)

There may be short sections of the corridor further north where a bus could be expected to yield to an oncoming traffic. A stretch of the Option 1B layout, with lanes adjusted to create the 2.4m wide bicycle path, could be introduced.

A hybrid solution may allay the residents' concerns about loss of parking. The narrower vehicle lanes and slight changes to lane alignment will help reduce vehicle speeds, improving safety and amenity.

- **Undertake a parking survey for the corridor**

A parking survey will determine precise usage patterns for on-street parking and reveal how necessary the spaces are for residents. Parking requirements should be studied at different times of the day and night, and during the holidays, school term and weekends. Local side streets must be included in the survey. Parramatta Council's study of parking on Ferndale Close in Constitution Hill, part of the re-aligned T-Way cycleway <https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/t-way-cycleway>, found that 40% of spaces are used on average, all houses have ample off-street parking and side streets have excess capacity. With accurate data to reflect on, the community accepted the loss of parking on one side of the street to allow the installation of a best-practice bicycle path which benefits the wider community.

- **Consider a trial using temporary materials**

Bicycle NSW suggests that Northern Beaches Council uses pop-up methods to trial the separated cycle path. Moveable lane barriers can be installed quickly to create stretches of protected path (Figure 8) and demonstrate how unfamiliar cycle infrastructure fits into the street. Ridership can be observed over several months using electronic counters to monitor use, and any issues with parking and buses can be resolved before permanent infrastructure is constructed. If sufficient patronage is demonstrated and parking is not problematic, Council will have a mandate to retain the paths. City of Sydney, City of Parramatta and Transport for NSW demonstrated the demand for safe cycling using the pop-up bicycle paths established as a COVID-19 response. The paths will now be made permanent.



Figure 8: Pop-up infrastructure in Sydney (Source: Bicycle NSW / Randwick Today)

- **Ensure that new cycle infrastructure is inclusive**

All types of bikes should be accommodated by the cycling infrastructure, including cargo bikes and tricycles. Again, the width of the paths is critical and it is important to consider turning radii, dropped kerbs, ramps and the design of modal filters to ensure that non-standard bikes not excluded from the network. Cargo bikes will increasingly be used for deliveries and have huge potential to play a key role in a sustainable transport system. Non-standard bikes such as hand-cycles, recumbents and wheelchair bikes offer disabled people independent mobility but are a rare sight on urban streets due to barriers caused by poor urban design. Any measures enabling cycling by disabled people will support a growth in cycling by novice cyclists, children and older people, and improve conditions for those using mobility scooters^{xii}.

- **Prioritise pedestrians and cyclists at all intersections**

Traffic light phasing and sensors must favour active modes to encourage more people to walk and cycle. In line with the Road User Space Allocation Policy and other State and local strategies, small delays to vehicle traffic should never prevent the delivery of safer, more efficient and more attractive active transport infrastructure. Raised crossings at unsignalised intersections will slow cars and improve safety. Bicycle paths must continue across the raised crossings so people riding bikes are not required to dismount.

Conclusion:

Bicycle NSW supports a more inspirational vision for allocating road space and integrating transport modes based on desired future outcomes. Inserting a separated bicycle path within the existing road will demonstrate real intent by Northern Beaches to no longer prioritise the movement and storage of cars. A narrower, leafier, slower road will feel much less car-dominated and provide sustainable, equitable transport options for residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. Safe cycling facilities decongest roads, public transport and parking, reduce noise and pollution, improve public health and benefit local businesses, as people who ride bikes can easily stop at local shops en-route.^{xiii}

We feel that the Curl Curl to Freshwater link is the perfect opportunity for Council to put policy into practice and not waste money on substandard infrastructure.

(02) 9704 0800 | info@bicyclensw.org.au | www.bicyclensw.org.au
Gadigal Country, PO Box Q178, Queen Victoria Building, NSW 1230
ABN 26 511 801 801

It is exciting to see the pop-up lane in Dee Why and we hope Council will be emboldened to experiment more much widely with cutting-edge bicycle infrastructure across the LGA

We look forward to working with Northern Beaches Council to progress the delivery of bicycle infrastructure in the area.

Yours faithfully,

Sarah Bickford

Bike Planner
Bicycle NSW

ⁱ Northern Beaches Bike Plan. 2020, July. https://yoursay.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/download_file/3194/2346

ⁱⁱ Move – Northern Beaches Transport Strategy 2038.

<https://files.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/policies-register/transport/transport-strategy/transportstrategy.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ Northern Beaches Council, 2021. Community and Stakeholder Engagement Report - shared path. https://hdp-au-prod-app-nthbch-yoursay-files.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/9516/3607/7876/Curl_Curl_to_Freshwater_Shared_path_-_Community_Engagement_Report_FINAL.pdf

^{xvi} Roger Geller. (2009). Four types of cyclists. Portland Bureau of Transportation.

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/264746>

^v Bicycle NSW (2018) Our Policy, [online as at 24/2/2021] <https://bicyclensw.org.au/our-policy/>

^{vi} 70% of people when surveyed said they would ride more if they felt safe

NSW Government, Sydney's Cycling Future (2013) [Online as at 24/2/2021]

<https://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017/sydneys-cycling-future-web.pdf>

^{vii} NSW Government, Providing for Walking and Cycling in Transport Projects Policy CP21001, [Online as at 19/2/2021] www.transport.nsw.gov.au/system/files/media/documents/2021/providing-for-walking-and-cycling-in-transport-projects-policy.pdf

^{viii} NSW Government, Road User Space Allocation Policy CP21000, [Online as at 19/2/2021]

www.transport.nsw.gov.au/system/files/media/documents/2021/road-user-space-allocation-policy.pdf

^{ix} Northern Beaches LSPS - Towards 2040. 2020, April.

<https://files.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/policies-register/planning-strategies/local-strategic-planning-statement-lsps/lsp-towards-2040.pdf>

^x Cycleway Design Toolbox: designing for cycling and micromobility. Transport for NSW.

<https://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/system/files/media/documents/2021/Cycleway-Design-Toolbox-Web.pdf>

^{xi} Cycleway Design Toolbox: designing for cycling and micromobility. Transport for NSW.

<https://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/system/files/media/documents/2021/Cycleway-Design-Toolbox-Web.pdf>

^{xii} Wheel for Wellbeing. 2020. A Guide to inclusive cycling. https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/FC_WfW-Inclusive-Guide_FINAL_V03.pdf

^{xiii} Jerome N Rachele. Do the sums: bicycle-friendly changes are good for business, The Conversation [Online as at 24/2/2021] [Do the sums: bicycle-friendly changes are good for business \(theconversation.com\)](https://www.theconversation.com)

Mr Ray Brownlee
 Chief Executive Officer
 Northern Beaches Council
 council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
 10 December 2021



Dear Mr Brownlee,

Re: Curl Curl to Freshwater Cycleway Concept Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Concept Plan for the Curl Curl to Freshwater separated cycleway. Northern Sydney Local Health District Health Promotion is committed to ensuring the built environment fosters places and spaces that support the health and wellbeing of individuals and the wider community.

The proposed separated cycleway is a significant improvement on the original shared pathway concept. Separated cycleways reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflict and create safer conditions for both pedestrians and cyclists. Importantly, separating cyclists from motor vehicles encourages a greater uptake of cycling, as the potential dangers from motor vehicles are often cited as the greatest deterrent to cycling.¹

Bennett and Oliver Streets are busy thoroughfares for motor vehicle commuters from Dee Why to Manly and beyond. A separated pathway is likely to encourage recreational and commuter cyclists and also encourage children to ride to Harbord Public School, St John the Baptist Catholic Primary School and Curl Curl North Public School. Increased cycling to school has multiple benefits, including increasing children's physical activity, easing traffic congestion and reducing noise and air pollution around these schools.

Options 1A and 1B

As Option 1A does not provide for car parking on the Eastern side of the road, it benefits from a wider cycleway (2.8m) than Option 1B (2.0m). Option 1A also has a wider buffer (0.8m) than Option 1B (0.2m). It should be noted that the width of Option B's cycleway is the minimum set by Bicycle NSW for a separated two-way path². Even though Option 1B has a narrower cycleway and buffer, it may be argued that it is safer than Option 1A, as parked cars form a physical barrier between cyclists and travelling motor vehicles.

Recommendation:

That Council proceed with Option 1B as it could be argued that it is safer than Option 1A and allows for the retention of parking spaces for nearby residents.

Yours sincerely,

David Morrisey
 Healthy Built Environments
 NSLHD Health Promotion
 Brookvale Community Health Centre,
 Level 4, 612-624 Pittwater Rd Brookvale NSW 2100
 Tel (02) 9388 5289
david.morrisey@health.nsw.gov.au

References

1. City of Sydney (2011) <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/AboutSydney/ParkingAndTransport/Cycling/TypesOfCycleways/Separatedcyclewaywithparking.asp> Viewed: 3 Dec 2021.
2. Bicycle NSW. (2020). Summary of Good Design Principles for Good Bicycle Infrastructure. p.34 <https://bicyclensw.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/966-0320-Summary-of-Principles-for-Good-Bike-Infrastructure-010620.pdf> Viewed: 3 Dec 2021.

477

Hi,

In my opinion, option 1B and option 2 are better than option 1A. The loss of parking which would result from 1A is a big concern for local residents.

478

MAKE SYDNEY CYCLE SAFE

The New South Wales government has neglected cycling infrastructure and spends just 1% of its annual transport budget on active transport such as cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, compared to the UN recommended 20%.

Cycling rates have decreased while injuries are skyrocketing, and the government currently spends just 1% of its annual transport budget on active transport such as cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, compared to the UN recommended 20%.

The New South Wales government has neglected cycling infrastructure.

This isn't good enough, and we're committed to making sure this changes. Join us in calling on the government for:

1. \$250 MILLION CYCLING FUND

At least \$250 million a year, to support the construction of a network of cycle ways within metropolitan and major regional communities.

2. SAFE CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

Ensure that cycling infrastructure is mandatory in all new road and other transport projects.

3. MOTORIST EDUCATION

A greater focus on education programs, particularly the one metre passing distance on roads with a speed limit of up to 60km/h, and a minimum 1.5 metre buffer on roads with a faster speed limit.

NORTHERN BEACHES LGA


NORTHERN BEACHES LGA and many other parts of NSW are spending under the UN average standard of 20% of the Transport Budget.

So the existing Treatment with a CYCLE LANE between the PARKED CAR and Traffic Lane is EASY TO Impliment with a painted green patch, but its "Limited Safety Value" decreased the use of Cycles. The example of the Bourke Street Safe and Separated bike path has assisted in increasing bike u

But with JB Hi Fi, and MYER STORE both selling e-bikes and e-scooters, the POTENTIAL to increase use of SAFE AND SEPARATED bike paths, could lower the use of Polluting CARS locally

“

PROPOSED BIKE PATH from Curl Curl to Freshwater




Existing Treatment
Bicycle lanes within "door zone"

This POSITION of the BIKE PATH has not been "accepted as SAFE " for cyclist of varying ability. So the % of people is LOW compared with the number of cars on the road.


So to adapt to Climate Change and the 30 minute City Concept, having greater ability to travel short distances or a few km by bike or e-bike or e-scooter or e-skateboard.

Makes sense for SOME.

**In Myer Store in CBD, is for sale an e-bike, e-skateboard, e-scooter,
So where can they be used, in City of Sydney, and Northern Beaches ?
The e-bikes and e-scooters are for sale in Jaycar Stores and JB Hi Fi Stores in CBD.**




Proposed Typical Treatment - Option 1A
Two-way Separated Cycleway (2.8m wide)
Parking removed from eastern side of street



Proposed Typical Treatment - Option 1B

Two-way Separated Cycleway (Narrowed to maintain car parking)
 Retain on street parking on both sides where possible



Proposed Typical Treatment - Option 1A

Two-way Separated Cycleway (2.8m wide)
 Parking removed from eastern side of street

With BOTH option 1A and 1B the cycle lane width does not allow for a 2 cyclists in each direction in PEAK use days.

OPTION 1 C


So an OPTION that provides a wider Cycleway perhaps by removing the EXISTING TREE and Widening the Cycleway (using part of the Nature Strip ?) and FIXING the kerb (as has been done in City of Sydney in George Street for widening the walking space adjacent to the Light Rail Route).

This preserves the 2-way CAR LANE LAYOUT.(but losing a row of Street Trees which can be re-planted on the other side of Street or perhaps within the NATURE STRIP if width allows ?).

OPTION 1 D

Removing a Car Lane in 1A plus a Car Park Lane could save the LOSS of Trees on one side of the Street. (This has been done in Bourke Street, Surry Hills to preserve the trees)(But local residents objected to loss of Car-Parking Space for dwelling unable to have 2-on-site car spaces).

THIS provides circa 2.8 plus 3.4 = 6.2 m wide (for both e-bikes and skateboards and pedal bikes?). (BUT Loses the 2-way CAR LANES) (BUT circa 3m each way for Active Transport ?)
 To preserve the 2 way CAR LANES. Consider using the nature strip and felling the TREE in nature strip.



Proposed Typical Treatment - Option 1B

Two-way Separated Cycleway (Narrowed to maintain car parking)
 Retain on street parking on both sides where possible

OPTION 1 E

WITH THIS PROPOSAL consider the option of REMOVING THE PARKING LANE ADJACENT to the Cycleway and WIDENING THE CYCLEWAY to 2 cycle width in both directions.(Circa 4.1 m wide ?).

(But preserving the existing tree on both sides of Street).

To create a TOURIST ACTIVE TRANSPORT ROUTE north of Manly to DEE WHY could consider using this route (options) (and compare the Canal du Midi in France ?)



Copenhagen has created “SAFE SPACE for Active Transport”.



Above is a Copenhagen bike path
With open BIKE STORAGE adjacent.



Above is a "Shared Street in Montreal, Canada".

THE FOLLOWING COPENHAGEN, Denmark – Cycle Paths (show use of wider Cycle Paths.)



In Copenhagen the Bike Paths cater for – wider lane width cycle paths.



Cycle Lane Copenhagen style | Bisiklet



Copenhagen 2017 Even More Extras - Bike



Lower St. Lawrence

FORMULE VÉLO QUÉBEC VOYAGES

7 DAYS

In the Lower St. Lawrence, the river already feels the call of the sea, with its bays, lighthouses and tides. You will bike from Lévis to Rivière-du-Loup along the river.



Okanagan Valley

FORMULE VÉLO QUÉBEC VOYAGES

13 DAYS

From Princeton to Kamloops, pedal through orchards, vineyards, farms... in a majestic setting. One of the most beautiful regions in Canada!



Vélo Québec Voyages

AMERICA | CANADA - QUÉBEC

Gaspé Peninsula

Trip length: 10 days
July 30 to August 8, 2022
August 20 to 29, 2022

4




En liberté

AMERICA | CANADA - QUÉBEC

Chaleur Bay-Percé En liberté


Trip length: 7 days
Departure date of your choice
3 à 3+

There is a range of trips in CANADA organised by VELO QUEBEC Voyages VOYAGES in France- e.g. Canal du MIDI



Need more info?

CANAL DU MIDI



Going with the flow

Linking Toulouse to the Mediterranean, the Canal du Midi, built between 1667 and 1682, is considered an astonishing feat of 17th century engineering. Your route, looped around four stopover towns, allows you marvel at its ingenuity at your own pace. In Carcassonne, we suggest making a stop at the Medieval City, whose fortifications stretch nearly 3 km and house Château Comtal and Basilique Saint-Nazaire. Feel like something different? Narbonne invites you to visit the Horreum Museum, an underground labyrinth of ancient Roman warehouses. In Béziers, you will discover the masterpiece of the canal - the nine locks of Fonseranes. Then in Sète, bordered by Étang Thau and dubbed the *Venice of Languedoc*, the Mediterranean and its sandy beaches await you. Going with the flow is such a delight!

Another way to discover Europe

FOUR STOPOVER TOWNS: This style of travelling allows you to put down your suitcase for a while and take off at a relaxed pace. The fact that your route is looped around four stopover towns limits the number of times you move around and allows you to make the most of the places you visit. Enjoy!

479

Dear Phillip Gray,

In response to your proposed 'Shared Path and Cycleway' for the Eastern side of Oliver Street Freshwater.

I strongly oppose the 'Shared Path and Cycle Way'. The current plan is working extremely well as it has been for many years by using the current road cycle path.

As my husband and I live on a sub-divided block between Harbord School and Brighton Street (for 45yrs) there has never been any incidents with cyclists as there is better viewing for any cyclists using the current road cycle lane provided. However, many children decide to ride their bicycles on the footpath on the gradual slope down from the Harbord School riding at a fast rate where they have nearly collected our car, which we always creep out at a slow speed to check for pedestrians, skateboarders and cyclists. There are three sub-divided blocks here and most people are unaware of the driveways and the danger of children (as often allowed) to run or cycle ahead of their parents to collide with cars either reversing out (as couriers often do) or driving out front first. Either is a particular worry, particularly when there are often young boys riding full speed down the footpath because of the gradual slope of the street, let alone seeing young boys to teenagers riding their bicycles or skateboards down the middle of the road.

I strongly advise that the plan be dismissed especially as the current plan is working extremely well with no incidents to date by using the current street cycle path. Also, there have been numerous car accidents at the corner of Brighton & Oliver Sts over the years with another earlier this year on the Eastern side in the afternoon with a two car accident with a car pushed into the corner house fence.

I would strongly advise to keep to the current separate road cycleway which as I have stated before has worked extremely well and NOT to go ahead with the shared pathway.

Yours sincerely
XX Oliver Street
Freshwater 2096

480

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write in connection with the community consultation for the above bike path alternatives. At the outset, I will admit to being cynical about all the trumpeted benefits, and about the value equation as between costs, inconveniences/risks vs benefits. I am also cynical because from what I have seen elsewhere plus heard anecdotally, such new paths are often end up little used. The idea that "If you build it they will

come” does not necessarily eventuate, and people do not generally change their habits and lifestyles just because there is a new, path, even if it is safer.

It is easy to make sweeping statements to help spin ones arguments, but some of them defy common sense. For example, the lobby group, Bicycle NSW, has written that safe cycling facilities will decongest roads and benefit local businesses. How so? Making busy roads narrower and more complex, with additional calming infrastructure and right of way bike crossings can only congest them further or lead to alternative rat runs. And when fewer cars go to or passed shops, or have nowhere to park, the shops end up closing, being replaced by yet more apartments and people.

Nor can I follow Council’s claim that bike paths will facilitate transport benefits for the local and wider community. How? One sees few cyclists on these roads as it is, so few will be removed. The cyclists that do use the roads tend to be the more serious ones who ride at some pace, and they will presumably continue to use the roads.

Yes, safe bike paths will benefit and encourage some more healthy recreational riding, I do not knock that, but I seriously doubt that car usage will be reduced to any noticeable extent, or that many people will suddenly buy and use bikes regularly to go to the beach, or for doing their shopping.

For that matter, I have to also doubt that the number of walkers will increase, since those who like to walk can already do so safely on both sides of these streets, all of which brings me back to the value equation I mentioned above.

It is a fact that Oliver-Bennett-Adams-Griffin represent a very steadily used “through route”, as opposed to ordinary suburban streets, and this will remain so. It is a fact that these streets are heavily parked on at times, particularly Bennet. It is also a fact that for a variety of reasons many people need to have and use their cars regularly, otherwise they would happily make the significant savings from doing away with them. These facts cannot be simply wished away, or significantly reduced simply by building a bike path.

In summary, I don’t see that these costly dedicated bike/walk paths will bring about much change or benefit, and I do feel that the rights of local home and car owners should not be ridden roughshod over.

Whilst many houses on Bennett St do appear to have double garages, the 2nd car is invariably parked on the usually short driveway or on the street, which I presume is due to the short and tricky looking angles to be navigated between gates and one side of garages. Cars will still need to be owned and used, residents, visitors and tradies will still need to park, through traffic will continue, hence my prediction that movements will be relatively unchanged, so if parking spots are removed, that will just push the problem down the road and/or into side streets. However, if Council is set on proceeding, the compromise position of 1B appears to me to be fairest, and the path of less inconvenience and loss to residents, less risk to cyclists /walkers, less congestion for drivers, less conflict all round than 1A or 2.

There seems to be a lack of clarity around Proposal 2, but if I understand correctly, it seems to involve the removal of greenery (undesirable), the laying of yet more concrete/asphalt (undesirable), path shared by walkers and cyclists (undesirable), path right alongside fences and gates (high risk).

Most exits from houses on the North side of Bennett are uphill, making it that bit harder to exit slowly, difficult to see oncoming traffic and next to impossible to see approaching cyclists/walkers.

Passing cyclists/walkers may well have right of way, but the only way to see them behind fences and/or foliage might be to install mirrors on each gateway. Particularly cyclists will approach quicker than expected, and for mine, the risk of serious injuries through unlucky time and place incidents will be unacceptably high.

So from this point of view, a separated path on the South/East sides of Oliver and Bennett does seem safer, having less side roads to be crossed and driveways that grade downwards = more visibility for both exiting drivers and for the active movers. And if most parking can be retained, that much the better for the needs and servicing of local residents.

By the way, was the option of routing the new bike track left instead of right at the end of Oliver, then promptly right into Stirgess and passed Weldon Oval, ever canvassed? This does seem to me to have the clear benefits of getting Active Movers off the busier roads and onto the already existing, more scenic John Fisher Park tracks sooner, which in turn might attract some more recreational users. This would seem to me to be a safer option for path users, and inconvenience much fewer residents, thus a double benefit on the face of it, so it should be properly considered.

Thank you.
Resident of Bennett Street.

481

Dear Mr Gray,

Re: In response to the Proposed Cycleway - Curl Curl to Freshwater Ref: 2021/787508

I strongly disagree to the concept plan of having a new added path to the area between Curl Curl and Freshwater Village.

Currently, it is already dangerous and difficult trying to reverse out of my narrow driveway with the bus stop right next to me. I live at xx Bennett Street, Curl Curl.

As I back out I have to look over my tight left blindspot to ensure the bus has alighted all its passengers, which takes quite a bit of time during both peak hours. After that, I will need to wait a lot longer for the backlog of cars that have been waiting behind to pass by as well one by one. There is already a tree and a new pole on the council strip (inches from my driveway) obstructing my view which makes it more challenging. To have even more cyclists use the path at full speed will cause more delays as it is already hazardous. Directly across the road from my home is the bus stop on the opposing side. Impatient drivers in cars and motorbikes are overtaking the stationary bus, while dropping off passengers. There have been many near misses in recent times as I back out, where cars have gone over the dividing line and crossing over to the wrong side of the road while overtaking buses and almost hitting my car.

This particular part of the road is getting busier every year and to add to the busyness by adding more cyclists and influx of pedestrians will cause more chaos and added delays, frustration for those who live in the area as they pull out of their already narrow driveways. It will become a hazard if the idea were to proceed.

Thank you for reading my reasons as to why I oppose to the proposed addition of the cycle/shared path. I look forward to hearing your reply.

Yours faithfully,
XXX

Owner: XX Bennett Street, Curl Curl

Document administration	
Version	3.0
Date	30 March 2022
Status	Final
Related Projects	Northern Beaches Bike Plan
Notes	Community and stakeholder views contained in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Northern Beaches Council or indicate a commitment to a particular course of action.