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ENDORSED BY: Stephen Beattie, Acting Director City Strategy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Council at its meeting of 22 May 2017 (Min. No. 142), resolved in part:

4. THAT Council coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-Line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA.

5. THAT Council allocate funds to the campaign.

7. THAT the community engagement portion of the submission be completed and reported to the July Council meeting.

This report provides an overview of the North Sydney’s Transport Future community engagement/campaign recently undertaken in response to the above mentioned resolution. It details the engagement process, including the promotion and awareness activities undertaken, the feedback mechanisms used and the level of community participation of the community in the process as well as the collated outcomes.

The Engagement Outcomes Report (Attachment 1) has been prepared by Straight Talk, an engagement specialist employed to assist with elements of this engagement and to ensure the neutrality of the analysis of the findings and subsequent reporting. Straight Talk assisted with recruitment and facilitation of the focus groups and the focus group and survey question design as well as collation and analysis of all feedback received.

It should be noted that due to the timing constraints allocated by this resolution that the engagement period was very short, it was 19 days duration. That being said the engagement process was as much about raising awareness of the State Government’s proposal, as it was about ascertaining community attitudes/feedback because it is acknowledged that at the time the consultation was conducted little in regards to specific details about the project were publicly available about the proposal by the State Government.

The Outcomes Report will be used to inform the preparation of Council’s submission to the NSW Government regarding its proposed Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The estimate cost of this engagement was $67,715.26 (inclusive of GST), not including Council staff costs. Some costs were paid for from the 2016/17 budget, whilst the majority of costs occur in the current financial year.

This estimate costs associated with complying with resolution Item 4, 22 May 2017 that Council’s submission to the State Government, include expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise as well as traffic flows, is $200,000.

Comment by Responsible Accounting Officer:

The engagement costs outlined in this report will be funded from additional general revenue and reported in the September Quarterly Budget Review. Should Council wish to proceed with the expert reports the costs associated would reduce the funds available for capital works in 2017/18.


The Guidelines have been considered in the preparation of this report and are not applicable.

RECOMMENDATION:
1. THAT the North Sydney’s Transport Future - Engagement Outcomes report be received.
2. THAT the estimated engagement cost of North Sydney’s Transport Future be noted.
3. THAT the estimated costs of obtaining expert reports to inform its submission be noted.
4. THAT Council determine whether it wishes to prepare the submission to the RMS as outlined in Item 4, 22 May 2017 (Min.No.142).
5. THAT should Council resolve to preparation a submission to the RMS, that its preparation be delegated to the A/General Manager, for the submission to be prepared in accordance with the Council’s current policy position.
LINK TO DELIVERY PROGRAM

The relationship with the Delivery Program is as follows:

Direction: 2. Our Built Environment
Outcome: 2.5 Sustainable transport is encouraged
2.6 Improved traffic management

Direction: 5. Our Civic Leadership
Outcome: 5.4 Community is informed and aware

BACKGROUND

Council at its meeting of 1 May 2017 resolved (Min. No. 93):

1. THAT a downloadable version of the petition placed on the council website (in PDF form).
2. THAT information about B-line issues be placed prominently on the Council’s website home page.
3. THAT Council continue to circulate information and any relevant correspondence from the RMS Project Team about the proposed B-line project in Council newsletters and emails as appropriate.
4. THAT a hard copy of the B-line petition be placed at Council’s Customer Service Counters and Stanton Library in a prominent place with appropriate signage.
5. THAT the Mayor write to Mosman Council requesting them to adopt the same or similar initiatives.
6. THAT Council urgently write to the Premier, with a copy to the new local State Member for North Shore, asking that the proposed B-line be halted until such time that a holistic and integrated transport plan which addresses the on-going congestion on Military Road and the Spit bridge, in the context of the newly announced Northern Beaches Tunnel both now and into the future, is developed and a comprehensive community consultation/engagement process is implemented.

Council also resolved on 1 May 2017, in part (Min. No. 104):

1. THAT Council write to the Premier; the Minister for Transport; the Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight; the Member for North Shore; the Greater Sydney Commission and Infrastructure Australia expressing its concerns regarding the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link projects, and recommend that work on both projects be suspended until the Greater Sydney Commission, in collaboration with Transport for NSW, undertake a robust options assessment that considers all possible solutions to the transport problems afflicting the Northern Beaches and the flow on effects on the Lower North Shore. That the letter include a submission that the Government undertake a formal options assessment to address a holistic transport plan for the capacity issues from the Northern Beaches through to the Harbour Bridge.
2. THAT Council maintain an information site on Council’s website, in tandem with the information on the B-line, and include any correspondence and relevant information that Council may have or acquire in relation to this project and circulate such information to all Precinct Committees.

Council at its meeting of 22 May 2017 resolved (Min. No. 142):

1. THAT Council seek a meeting with the Premier to reinforce Council’s view that a holistic transport plan be developed for northern Sydney.
2. THAT Council ask the Premier to release detailed plans of the proposal, including details of which properties are to be acquired and what, if any, parks or other open space will be affected by the proposal.
3. THAT Council ask the Premier to halt the project until meaningful community consultation about the whole project is undertaken and before any expressions of interest or tenders are let or contracts signed.
4. THAT Council coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community
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attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-Line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA.

5. THAT Council allocate funds to the campaign.

6. THAT any interested Councillor be permitted to observe any focus groups held.

7. THAT the community engagement portion of the submission be completed and reported to the July Council meeting.

8. THAT Council’s website include a reference to this project on the front page and that Council establish an email subscription facility to inform and update interested community members and all Precinct Committees.

9. THAT Council refer this resolution to Mosman Council and invite Mosman Council to work with Council in relation to all of the matters outlined above.

10. THAT this resolution be referred to Lane Cove and Willoughby Councils.

Council also resolved on 22 May 2017, in part (Min. No. 143):

21. THAT Council specifically include the B-Line as part of its community campaign in respect of the proposed Western Harbour Tunnel.

Additionally, Council resolved 26 June (Min. No. 197) in response to a Notice of Motion regarding the Proposed B-Line, Transport Infrastructure and Traffic Flows in the North Sydney LGA:

1. THAT in relation to the resolution of Council from 22 May 2017, Min No 142, Point 4: THAT Council coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA. The report also include the impacts in relation to safety (pedestrian and traffic) pertaining to the proposed traffic changes being considered to accommodate the B-line.

2. THAT in particular, the report investigate and address the safety issues arising from: i) the removing of the safety fencing along the centre of Military Road, which deters pedestrians (including school children) from crossing Military Road at locations other than at traffic lights ii) obstructed sight lines for bus drivers iii) the ability of pedestrians (especially school children) to safety access and use the footpath at peak times when commuters are waiting for buses to arrive (erg: will pedestrians be forced to walk on the road to by-pass commuters waiting for a bus?) iv) lack of safe and weather-proof cover for commuters waiting for buses to arrive v) insufficient pedestrian crossing time on Military Road.

3. THAT the report to Council also note alternative transport options to the B-Line such as a train line from Dee Why to Chatswood via Frenchs Forest to meet the new metro line and electric trams (refer article below).


4. THAT Council write once again to the Premier, the Minister for Transport and our Local Member asking them to halt and review works on the B-line until such time that a holistic traffic and transport plan for the Northern Beaches and the North Shore is developed and proper community consultation and engagement is undertaken. That the letter express Council’s view that in the context of the Western Harbour/Northern Beaches link tunnel the B-line in its current form is now redundant.

5. THAT Council write to the RMS and the Minister for Transport noting the inconsistency and conflict in their dual role as proponents of the B-line (designed to increase capacity of Military Road) and the Western Harbour/Northern Beaches link tunnel (designed to decrease capacity of Military Road) and request that they urgently undertake an independent safety audit of the proposed B-line and such audit be carried out by an independent suitably qualified Traffic Safety Engineer, i.e., not the RMS.

CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

Community engagement is not required.
SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The sustainability implications are of a minor nature and did not warrant a detailed assessment.

DETAIL

1. Engagement Implementation Overview

Items 4 to 8 of the Council resolution from 22 May 2017 (Min. No. 142) directed the scope of this engagement. An Engagement Strategy was prepared in accordance with Council’s Community Engagement Protocol. The Engagement Strategy was designed to target the following community stakeholders (not listed in any priority order):

- Local residents
- Local businesses, their staff and customers
- Precincts Committees
- Schools/education institutions

It should be noted that the reporting deadline set by the Council resolution from 22 May 2017 (Min. No. 142) meant that the consultation period was shorter than our usual 28 day minimum period and that it coincided with school holidays.

The Engagement Strategy and timing/timeframe implications were communicated to all Councillors via the weekly Councillor Bulletin prior to and during the duration of the consultation period, and were detailed at the Councillor Briefing held 27 June 2017.

1.1 Inform Level of Engagement

Encouraging and enabling stakeholders to take part in this consultation was very important. The awareness and promotion methods employed were designed to inform stakeholders of the range of consultation opportunities offered in order to encourage the greatest level of participation possible. The ‘inform’ part of the Engagement Strategy included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target Stakeholders</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webpage(s)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media release</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1 issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements local papers (various)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2 adverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media - Facebook</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2 posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media - Twitter</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1 tweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNewsletter(s)</td>
<td>Existing Subscriptions</td>
<td>3,218 subscribers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New subscribers (Keep Informed eNews)</td>
<td>103 subscribers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct System</td>
<td>Combined Precincts Committee</td>
<td>17 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Precinct Committees</td>
<td>17 committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information stall at markets/ (x6)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>unquantified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emails</td>
<td>Schools (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>18 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Parent Groups (P&amp;Cs)</td>
<td>13 contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>1,348 contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following related articles were published in the local papers:

- Anonymous opposition to tunnel, page 3, North Shore Times, 29 June 2017
• B-Line may ‘devastate’ businesses, page 5, Mosman Daily, 29 June 2017
• Foley slams tunnel plan, page 8, Mosman Daily, 29 June 2017
• Online battle over tunnel intensifies, page no. unknown, North Shore Times, 6 July 2017
• No details on tunnel until 2018, page 18, North Shore Times, 13 July 2017
• Unearthing tunnel alternative, page 3, Mosman Daily, 13 July 2017
• Fuming mad, page 1, Mosman Daily, 20 July 2017
• Worry stacks up over pollution, page 8 and 9, Mosman Daily, 20 July 2017
• Residents air smokestacked fears, page 5, Mosman Daily, 20 July 2017

The following section of this report details the main ‘inform’ methods used:

1.1.1 Website

The purpose of the project specific page on Council’s website, as well as related ‘Latest News’ items (via the Home page) was to provide background/context to the State Government’s project and Council’s position to date (in accordance with Council resolutions), including documents and links detailing where additional information can be found/external opportunities for comment i.e. direct via RMS. Council’s web page and News Items directed traffic to the portal supporting the online engagement methods. The following table provides an overview of the web traffic related to this engagement for the period 21 June to 9 July 2017, showing public access only, figures are not inclusive of staff access:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page Views</th>
<th>Average time on page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects &amp; Infrastructure/State Government Projects/Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>03.26 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects &amp; Infrastructure/State Government Projects/B-Line Northern Beaches</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>02.61 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An external engagement platform (Engagement HQ) was used for this consultation to manage the online consultation elements. This platform enabled customers to complete the survey and submission form online, to place ‘pins’ and comments via interactive mapping tool and to self-nominate for the focus groups. A portion of the annual subscription fee is costed to this project. During the engagement period 21 June to 9 July 2017 there were 786 page views and 239 visitors were ‘engaged’, meaning they contributed via a consultation method e.g. survey; 386 visitors were ‘informed’, meaning they accessed information e.g. downloaded a document, visited the key dates page or visited the FAQ page; and 585 visitors were aware i.e. they visited the project’s main page. The maximum visitors per day was 131.

1.1.2 Social Media

Council’s social media accounts were used to promote the consultation opportunities. The following table details the Facebook posts and the number of people reached and/or who responded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Reactions/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 June - (inclusive of paid boost) - Have your say</td>
<td>19,126</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June - Have your say at Northside Produce Market</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to, the above data, of the 19,126 people reached via the first Facebook post there
were 1,092 post clicks. Issues raised via the initial 33 comments (as at 13 July 2017) are listed below, these are unquantified and not in any property order:

- level of information from RMS - in general
- level of information from RMS - where the ventilation stacks will be located
- air quality/pollution
- electric cars
- personal efforts to reduce private vehicle use/increase use of public transport
- inconvenience construction will bring to the North Sydney area
- dissatisfaction with government

The following table details the Twitter post and the number of people reached and/or who responded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Retweets</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 June - Have your say</td>
<td>192 following 2,800 followers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 eNewsletters

A ‘Keep Informed’ eNews subscription was set up in accordance with the resolution from 22 May 2017. The Keep Informed List has 126 subscribers as at 20 July 2017. The first issue was sent 7 July 2017 to the then 103 subscribers; and a PDF version made available from Council’s website. 73% of recipients opened this issue with 15% clicking on the links contained within.

Existing eNews subscriptions were used to promote the engagement opportunities and encourage subscriptions to the Keep Informed eNews. Numerous people subscribe to more than one eNewsletter and subscriber demographic details are not kept. The following table details the number of subscribers per existing eNews subscription as indication of the number of people who received information about this engagement via this mechanism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription</th>
<th>No. Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council eNews</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct eNews</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business eNews</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Network Events</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPAS Keep Informed List</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.4 Precinct Committees

The North Sydney Community Precinct System is an important avenue for informing Council of community opinion and maintaining two-way communications between community members and Council staff and Councillors/the governing body. Precinct Committees greatly assist Council’s to disseminate information to geographical areas. Precinct Committees have strong local knowledge and are good for planning/consultation on regional and/or specific geographical area.

Council’s Director City Strategy presented to the Combined Precincts Committee (CPC) on 20 June, providing an overview of Council’s position to date and the engagement opportunities, requesting that these be promoted to their respective Precinct members. This meeting was attended by 17 people, representing 11 Precinct Committees - Bay, Bennett, Brightmore, Hayes
Review of the minutes and attendance sheets of recent Precinct Committee meetings (submitted to Council by 20 July 2017) show that the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project has been discussed by several Precinct Committees. The following table indicates the Precinct Committees whose minutes indicate the project was discussed this matter and the number of attendees at these meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct Committee</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverton</td>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milson¹</td>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtermann</td>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightmore</td>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby Bay</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayberry</td>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry - campaign sub group</td>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry - general meeting</td>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milson</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverton²</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Meeting - Bay and Plateau³</td>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that a combined meeting of Hayberry, Registry, Plateau and Bay Precincts is to be held on 20 July 2017, from 6pm to 8pm, to which RMS project staff are attending as guest speakers, but this meeting had not occurred by the report deadline.

1.1.5 Information Stalls

Council staff held stalls at local markets and other locations on: Saturday 24 June, Kirribilli Markets; Saturday 1 July, Produce Markets in Civic Park (Miller Street) and Cammeraygal Place, Cammeray; Saturday 8 July, Stocklands Cammeray and Ernest Place, Crows Nest; and Sunday 9 July, Kirribilli, Art Design & Fashion market. Numerous people stopped to find out more about the proposed project and consultation opportunities, take the survey or make a submission (on the spot via iPad or hard copy) or provided verbal feedback that was treated as a submission. Information provided to the public at the stalls was the RMS Information Sheet June/July 2017 and Council’s Position information sheet. RMS was advised prior of distribution of their publication. The costs associated with the information stalls included staff hire fees, pull-up banner, A5 flyer printing and staff wages.

---

1 RMS staff were guest speakers
2 RMS staff were guest speakers
3 Council staff were guest speakers
1.1.6 Information Sheet - distributed to all households

Between 8 and 14 July 2017 a double sided A4 information sheet was distributed to approximately 36,000 households across the local government area. The purpose of the information sheet was increase awareness of the proposed project and Council’s resolved position (to date). In addition to including contact details for Council i.e. website, email and phone number, the back page included a “call to action” to subscribe to Council’s Keep Informed eNews and/or to contact local state Member of Parliament. It was not considered appropriate to include the RMS web address for this project. The cost of printing and distributing the information sheet was approximately $0.29 per household.

1.2 Consult Level of Engagement

The following table details the active consultation methods employed and the level of participation. It should be noted that a participant may have provided feedback by more than one method as was permitted consistent with past practice, for example someone may have completed the survey and also have been randomly selected for a focus group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target Stakeholders</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups x 6</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>57 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>161 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>60 submitters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Tool</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>55 pins with comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist with the implementation of the Engagement Strategy and to ensure independence in the analysis of all feedback received, Straight Talk, was engaged to facilitate the workshops and to collate, analyse and report the consultation findings (Attachment 1).

It should be noted that after the consultation period closed the following occurred:

a) the majority of North Sydney LGA residents should have received the information sheet referred to in Sections 1.1.6 and 2.2 of this report.

b) further information about the State Government’s proposal was made publicly available via media reports (citing leaked NSW Cabinet Documents) on 16 and 17 July 2017 that advised the State Government’s supposed locations for the ventilation stacks within the North Sydney LGA. Council staff contacted the RMS project team for clarification, the following response was received (17 July 2017):

“...the project is still in the concept design stage and no decisions have been made about topics such as ventilation sites. Feel free to reiterate this message in your conversations. The project team remains on track to provide a reference design in mid-2018 that will contain a detailed project alignment, including ventilation stacks”.

1.2.1 Survey

Respondents were given the option of completing the survey online or in hard copy. The majority of 161 respondents were completed online and 20 hard copies were received. The findings of the survey are included within Attachment 1.

Attachment 1 makes reference to response by residents of Cammeray being over-
representation, reasons for this can be attributed to Precinct Committees in Crows Nest and Cammeray actively campaigning about this project, and this has included distribution of their own leaflets within their Precinct areas, Facebook pages and keep informed email groups. Some Precinct Committees have convened special meetings with and without RMS staff as presenters. These activities additional to Council’s promotion, likely increased awareness of Council’s consultation in this area.

1.2.2 Submissions

A total of 60 submissions were received; of these 51 (85%) were submitted online (via Engagement HQ) and 9 were received via Council either as hard copy or email, with 2 of these being submissions by Precinct Committees. Cumulatively, the most common theme/category raised in the submissions was pollution/environmental issues, nothing that online submissions noted environmental impacts without most nominating health impacts. As noted in Attachment 1, these submissions were concerned with air and noise pollution from additional traffic or the tunnel ventilation stacks.

1.2.3 Mapping Tool

55 “pins with comments” submissions were received online (via Engagement HQ). Comments were categorised by theme with the most common category being an objection to air pollution (34.5%), followed by traffic modification suggestions (20%) and objections to the proposed projects on the basis that it will increase local traffic (16.4%).

1.2.4 Focus Groups

A total of 57 people participated in the focus groups. No Councillors attended the focus groups as observers. Staff attended the focus group sessions as observers.

To ensure a demographically representative participant sample per zone, participants were recruited in two ways: a) 48 participants were randomly recruitment first 4 sessions with the expectation that on average a minimum of 10 recruits would attend, this was done by telephone coordinated by Straight Talk, with the aim to recruit a representative sample; and b) 20 participants from the self-nominations i.e. 10 participants per session. It is noted that no everyone who was recruited/selected did attend. On-the-night registrations were not accepted, as the venue details were only disclosed to confirmed participants.

In regards to self-nomination, 111 nominations were received, with five of these being non-North Sydney LGA residents and therefore ineligible. As advertised, nominations received were listed by Council by date/time order. Nominees were asked provide the following details consistent with that required by the randomly recruited participants. Following the close of the deadline 3 July 2017, the nominee list (106 persons) was provided to Straight Talk who selected 10 participants for the first session on 6 July 2017, selection was based on gender, age and geographical spread (suburb nominee resides in). An additional session for self-nominees was agreed to in response to the high level interest. All nominees who were not selected for the first session were advised and asked to confirm their availability for the additional session, people who did not respond to email were removed from the nominee list was provided to Straight Talk, who again selected 10 participants, from 56 nominees, for the second session on 10 July 2017, based on gender, age and geographical spread.
A focus group specifically for local businesses was advertised but cancelled due to low level interest. While disappointing, a number of participants in the focus groups also owned and operated businesses within the LGA and 48% (78) of survey respondents were business owners, rather than or in addition to, being residents of the North Sydney LGA; therefore the local business community is represented in the feedback received.

The following table indicates the number of participants (total and per type):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Randomly Recruited Participants - all ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Randomly Recruited Participants - all ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Randomly Recruited Participants - all ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Randomly Recruited Participants - young people 18 to 35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Self-nominee Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Self-nominee Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To encourage participation, an $80 gift card incentive per participant was offered, this amount is consistent with current market research rates/past payments made by Council to workshop participants for the NSOP Phase 2 consultation (2015) and TAPAS consultation (2016). Note: not all participants accepted.

A short participant evaluation was conducted by Straight Talk at the conclusion of each session and this feedback has been incorporated in Attachment 1.

2. Engagement Outcomes

2.1 Engagement Findings

A summary of the engagement outcomes is not included in this cover report as collation and analysis of the consultation feedback was outsourced to Straight Talk to ensure neutrality in the reporting of the findings. Refer to Attachment 1.

2.1.1 Validity of Engagement.

As indicated earlier in this report the engagement occurred over a shorter time frame that what is ideal. However, given the comprehensive nature of the engagement it is considered to have validity and is indicative of the community’s position on this issue.

2.2 Response to Information Sheet

Council has received correspondence from 13 local residents in response to this distribution, as detailed in section 1.1.6 of this report. The correspondence has been summarised and reported to Council under separate cover. It should be noted that in the majority of correspondence Council was not the direct recipient but copied in on emails to external contacts including local State members of parliament and media. All correspondence marked attention to Councillors was distributed individually to Councillors as per usual practice via email by the Document Management Services Department. Further, it should be noted that such correspondence has not been included in the feedback collation and analysis by Straight Talk, as it was received outside the close of the consultation period, and not necessarily directly relating to the...
advertised consultation. However basic analysis of the feedback shows the following levels of support for or against Council’s resolved position to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Council’s Position</th>
<th>Opposed Council’s Position</th>
<th>Neither/Nor (Not Stated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Cost

The estimate cost of the above outlined engagement is outlined in the following table; Council staff costs are not included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement software licence (fee pro rata)</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees (estimate - final invoice pending)</td>
<td>$51,709.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$13,755.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$67,715.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some costs were paid for from the 2016/17 budget, whilst the majority of costs occur in the current financial year.

3. Next Steps

3.1 Keep Informed eNews

As a result of the information sheet distribution there was an increase in the subscriptions to the Keep Informed eNews. As noted in section 3 of this report, the number of subscribers increased from 103 as at 7 July 2017 to 126 as at 20 July 2017. Subsequent eNews issues will be sent periodically. A PDF version of all subsequent issues will also be placed on Council’s website.

3.2 Council’s Submission

Council staff have commenced discussions with RMS staff to better understand the project development as it evolves. It is important that this process continues in order that Council has access to the most up-to-date information possible and that rapport is developed with the RMS project team as the process develops.

As previously stated, Council previously resolved to:

...coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-Line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA.

The expert reports have not yet been commissioned. As no budget has been allocated for this process, work can commence on addressing this resolution once the matter of the supporting budget allocation is resolved. Indicative costings suggest that this process will cost in the order of $60,00-$80,000 for the export reports. Further, the air quality monitoring that Council has previously resolved to undertake, is likely to cost in the order of $80,000-$120,000, depending on the duration of the program.
The submission will include the matters resolved by Council in the context of Council’s vision for North Sydney generally and the CBD and neighbourhoods in particular, as well as assessment of national and international transport policy best practice.

4. External Engagement

4.1 Roads and Maritime Services (RMS)

Prior to the above mentioned consultation undertaken by Council, RMS had commenced their own community engagement on this project regarding the proposed route and next steps. The RMS website notes that three actions will take place over the next year to allow the NSW Government to make an informed decision in moving forward. These are:

1. Field studies, including geotechnical tests at up to 235 sites along the length of the preferred route between Rozelle and Frenchs Forest. View or download the geotechnical notifications across the preferred route.
2. An interactive market sounding program to gain world’s best practice knowledge from the construction industry and to test the appetite of the finance industry for the delivery of a project of this scale; and
3. An ongoing community engagement program, including Community Feedback Sessions, to gain community perspectives and to help better inform the decision making process.

RMS project staff advised Council staff on 5 July 2017 that of the approximate total 2,000 people that had attended their feedback sessions to date, 530 of the attendees participated in the five information sessions held within the North Sydney LGA. Approximately 1,400 people subscribe to their keep informed eNews, 350 were from the North Sydney LGA. And approximately 40 written comments received from the North Sydney LGA, in addition to the comments made via their online mapping tool. This information is provided for content to the volume of feedback Council received during its 19 day consultation campaign.

RMS staff also advised, similarly as indicated in section 1.1.1 of this report, that their second phase of engagement is expected to commence in late 2017 and be completed in mid-2018; and that this phase will include developing a reference design, confirmed final project costings, funding strategy including tolling options and private sector involvement, and construction timeline including start and completion dates.

4.2 Local Campaigns

In addition to engagement by Council and/or RMS, several local campaigns are underway including some related to Precinct Committees. For example, Hayberry Precinct has formed a sub-group called STOP - Sustainable Transport Options & Plans which is active on social media as well as on the ground information distribution; and Registry Precinct held a special meeting in May 2017 instigated by concerned residents who were not necessarily active Precinct members. The meeting was promoted by a letter box drop informing residents about the proposal and the impact on their Precinct area and has led to active social media campaigning. These campaigns focus on specific issues pertinent to each Precinct area. At least one pro-tunnel campaign is underway called Stand up for your M8.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Straight Talk was engaged by North Sydney Council (Council) to design and deliver community engagement activities relating to the proposed Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project.

At its meeting of 22 May 2017, Council resolved to undertake community engagement on the proposed project in order to inform its response to the NSW Government. See Appendix A for details of the resolutions.

The purpose of the engagement was to seek community attitudes and views about the proposal generally, and in the context of the proposed B-Line, and the LGA’s traffic infrastructure and traffic flows.

1.2. Engagement challenges

A consistent challenge in all engagement processes, is designing and delivering activities that allow those with an interest in a topic to participate while also ensuring that a representative sample of the affected community are involved.

Generally, most people who ‘self-select’ to participate in engagement processes, such as open online surveys or community meetings, do so because they are negatively motivated. That is, their opposition to the proposal, topic or issue under discussion drives their interest in being involved and sharing their views.

For this reason, ‘self-select’ participants are rarely demographically representative of their local community. Most often they are over-representative of older people and under-representative of younger people, although inconsistencies in other demographic markers, such as gender, cultural and linguistic background, educational levels and geographic spread, are usually also evident.

As a consequence, the outcomes of processes that only include ‘self-select’ opportunities to participate will not be reflective of the views of the community, but only of those in the community who feel strongly about and/or are opposed to the issue.

1.3. Engagement undertaken

To mitigate this challenge, Straight Talk’s engagement with the North Sydney community consisted of both randomly selected and self-selected approaches. Activities undertaken included:

1. Focus groups
2. An online survey
3. Online mapping tool (pins and comments) and submissions.

Community members were also able to make a submission in two ways: directly to Council and online via its engagement webpage.

Engagement with the community was undertaken from 21 June until 9 July 2017, and this report contains the outcomes and key findings from the engagement.
2. METHODOLOGY

To ensure an effective outcome, Straight Talk designed an engagement approach based on the following principles:

- **Neutral information** - we provided simple and clear information about the proposal, as the foundation for all discussions, without implying or suggesting a position on the project.
- **Deliberative process** - within the limits of the time available, we provided a focus group process that allowed participants to genuinely consider the issues, and their implications as much as possible, before they provided comment.
- **Focused process** - we designed the engagement to focus on the critical issues, so that all feedback collected was useable and outcomes from different methodologies could be easily compared and contrasted.
- **Random selection of participants** - we randomly selected a valid cross-section of the community, especially younger people, to participate in focus groups so that outcomes were genuinely reflective of the views of residents in the North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA) and not just those who are negatively motivated to participate or who have strongly held views.

2.1. Engagement promotion

Council undertook a range of promotional activities to raise awareness of the engagement process and the opportunities to be involved.

These promotional activities included:

- **Website** (project specific web page and Latest News item on Homepage)
- **Project specific webpage via Engagement HQ**
- **Media release**
- **Advertisements in local papers**
- **Facebook, including paid boosts**
- **Twitter**
- **E-Newsletters** (various subscriptions including Council eNews, Business eNews and TAPAS Keep Informed eNews)
- **Presentation to the Combined Precincts Committee and individual Precinct Committees as requested**
- **Email to Precinct Committees**
- **Email to local primary and secondary schools** (encouraging them to promote via school newsletter)
- **Email to parent groups e.g. P&Cs**
Information stalls held:
- 24 June at Kirribilli Markets
- 1 July at North Sydney Produce Markets and Cammeraygal Place, Cammeray
- 8 July at Cammeray Stocklands and Ernest Place, Crows Nest
- 9 July at Kirribilli Art Design and Fashion Market.

2.2. Focus groups

Focus groups provided the opportunity to delve deeper into the views of the community, and their underlying drivers, and to seek detailed qualitative feedback from specific demographic segments of the community.

A total of six focus groups were undertaken: four with randomly selected participants, and two with participants who had nominated to be involved.

2.2.1. Randomly selected participants

Recruitment of randomly selected participants was undertaken by our project partners, Jetty Research. Jetty Research works with government bodies at local, state and national levels to assist in their understanding of stakeholder needs, behaviours, satisfaction and priorities. The bulk of their work lies in the creation and management of telephone, online and paper-based surveys, random recruitment for focus groups and workshops, data entry and analysis, and reporting of findings.

Residents living in the LGA (identified by postcode) were randomly contacted, through a research industry-specific database of random valid telephone numbers. To ensure the participation of appropriate numbers of younger participants (under 35 years of age), targeted Facebook recruitment was also undertaken.

Potential participants were only advised that the focus groups were about an "important local issue" (Jetty Research was not advised of the topics the focus groups were discussing) and that they would be paid a stipend of $80 in recognition of their time. Participants were then selected from those who were interested so that they were broadly representative of the community in the LGA in terms of age, gender and geographic spread.

A total of 38 community members participated in the randomly selected focus groups.

2.2.2. Self-selected participants

Interested community members were also invited to nominate for focus groups. Council collected the details of all nominees; a total of 106 local residents or business owners nominated their interest to participant. Straight Talk then selected participants for the two 'self-select' focus groups, based on age, gender and geographic spread. When selected participants were unable to attend on the available dates they were replaced by other self-selected participants with a similar demographic profile.

A total of 19 community members participated in the self-selected focus groups.
2.2.3. Focus group process

Straight Talk facilitated and recorded the six focus groups across two weeks, from Tuesday 27 June until Monday 10 July 2017.

Generally, all six focus groups followed the same structure to ensure that the qualitative feedback captured was robust and comparable, although some variations arose as a result of the views raised by participants. The focus group participants discussed the following points:

- Their preferred mode of transport in Sydney
- The Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link Project:
  - Their awareness of the proposal
  - Initial views about the two components, and the potential benefits, drawbacks and concerns
  - The level of support/opposition each component attracted
- The B-Line project:
  - Their awareness of the project
  - Views about it
  - Implications of B-Line when considering the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal.

The outcomes of the focus groups are detailed in section 3.1 Focus Groups.

2.3. Online survey

The online survey questions were constructed collaboratively by Straight Talk and Council. The questions focussed on participants’:

- Current transport preferences
- Level of support or otherwise for the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal and the factors underlying that view
- Thoughts about, and level of support or otherwise for, the proposed B-Line.

Participants demographic information was also captured to allow an analysis of how demographically representative survey participants are of the community within the LGA.

The online survey was hosted using the platform EngagementHQ, via Council’s website, and was available from Wednesday 21 June to Sunday 9 July 2017. Hard copies of surveys were also made available for those who preferred not to do the survey online, and these were processed into the online functionality by Council staff.

A total of 161 online surveys were completed. For survey outcomes, please see section 3.2 Online Survey.

2.4. Online mapping tool and submissions

The mapping functionality of Council’s engagement portal was used to collect pins and comments from community members. A total of 49 pins/comments were provided. Online submissions were also collected through the engagement portal. A total of 52 online submissions were collected. For details of feedback
received via these two methodologies, please see sections 3.3 Online Mapping Tool and 3.4 Online Submissions.

2.5. Other submissions

Community members were also able to provide submissions to Council about the proposal. A total of nine submissions were received. A summary of key points raised in submission is provided in section 3.3 Other Submissions.

Note: No limits were placed on self-select participants in relation to the extent of their participation. It is possible for one participant to have undertaken all self-select activities: completes an online survey, provided a pin/comment, made on online submission, provided a written submission, and nominated, and potentially been selected, to participate in one of the self-selected focus groups.
3. OUTCOMES

3.1. Focus groups

3.1.1. Focus group demographics

Gender
In terms of gender, male focus group participants were generally slightly overrepresented (52.6% compared to 48% in the Census) and female participants were slightly underrepresented (47.2% compared to 52% in the Census).

Age
Younger focus group participants (18-35) were slightly overrepresented, and older participants (56+) were slightly underrepresented. Participants aged 36-55 were representative of the LGA.

Location
Focus group participants came from a variety of suburbs within the North Sydney LGA. However, there was a slight overrepresentation of participants from Cammeray, Wollstonecraft and North Sydney, and an underrepresentation of Neutral Bay and Cremorne.

Other suburbs represented throughout the six focus groups include:
- Waverton
- Crows Nest
- McMahons Point
- Milsons Point
- Cremorne
- St Leonards
- Kirribilli
- Neutral Bay
- Lavender Bay.

Suburbs which were not represented are Cremorne Point and Kurraba Point.

3.1.2. Focus groups outcomes - randomly selected

Transport modes
An overwhelming majority of participants indicated that they use a combination of car and public transport when travelling in Sydney. The most commonly used public transport was the train, followed by the bus and taxis/Uber.
Public transport was the preferred mode when there was a direct connection to where participants were travelling or transferring was quick and easy. Most often public transport was used to get to work, especially in the CBD/south of the bridge.

However, public transport was also used when participants were travelling to locations where parking was difficult or expensive: again, the CBD was most commonly cited. It was also widely used when participants were socialising and expecting to drink alcohol.

For those who predominately drive to work, convenience was the most commonly stated reason - whether because of the time/cost/availability of public transport; the difficulty or number of transport connections needed to get to their destination; the volume of equipment they needed to carry; or because they needed to travel to a number of different locations across Sydney.

For those who drive outside of going to work, the factors that contribute to making the car preferable over other transport choices include: where they were going; what they were doing, shopping being a good example of an activity that was easier with a car; and who they were travelling with, such as children, in particular.

Knowledge of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal

At the beginning of the discussion about the proposal, participants were asked if they had heard about it. Overall, a majority of participants had heard about the proposal, although levels of awareness varied across the four groups.

Most of those who were aware of the proposal had heard about it through the media, both mainstream and local, and via Facebook news streams, often in relation to the State bi-election. A number of participants had heard about the proposal through their personal networks, for example at dinner with friends or from other Mums at school, and a few had received a letterbox drop about the proposal, either during the bi-election or because of soil testing. A few participants mentioned that seeing banners and/or drilling made them aware of the project. One participant identified that he had previously worked at RMS, and its predecessor agencies, and had undertaken work on the proposal.

Of those who knew of the proposal, most were aware that it is a tunnel for vehicle usage. Cynicism was expressed in some groups about whether the proposal would actually be delivered, citing the proposal often being discussed during elections and being raised periodically for the past 20 to 30 years.

Initial views of the Western Harbour Tunnel

Participants were shown an indicative map of the proposal, which had been sourced from RMS (see Appendix B), and asked to consider the Western Harbour Tunnel (WHT) component. They were advised that the proposed WHT would:

- Link the WestConnex at Rozelle to the Warringah Freeway at North Sydney
- Cross underneath Sydney Harbour between Birchgrove and Waverton areas.

Participants were given a few minutes to become familiar with the details on the map and then invited to share their initial thoughts about the proposed WHT. A range of initial thoughts was expressed across the four different groups.

A number of participants expressed very positive initial thoughts about the proposed WHT. For these participants, the tunnel would prove a great relief from current traffic congestion, by removing cars from the Harbour and Anzac Bridges and the existing harbour tunnel, and would allow travel around Sydney without having to go into the city. Taking traffic underground was also seen as a positive aspect of the
proposal and the increased use of electric cars was identified by a few participants as reducing concerns about traffic fumes. Building infrastructure that supported better traffic flow was valued, and it was suggested that improved traffic congestion would free up buses going into the city.

For some other participants, their positive view of the proposal was tempered by questions about the extent of its benefits or concerns about how the proposal would affect some community members. A few of these participants identified that the proposed tunnel would reduce traffic for a while, but that in the longer-term as the population increased, it would become congested. The size of the tunnel, and a concern the government would be too short sighted to build the tunnel big enough to meet future traffic needs, was raised by some.

Other participants identified that they would need more information, especially about the cost/benefit analysis, where tunnel stacks would be situated, and how the tunnel’s effects on people could be mitigated, before they could feel more positive about the proposal. For many participants, including a public transport component, particularly a metro-line, would significantly increase the value of the proposal and their subsequent support for it.

Those participants whose initial views about the proposal were neutral often identified they would not experience any direct benefit, although there was a recognition that others would. Travelling to the inner-west outside of peak times was mentioned by a few participants as being relatively quick, raising the question of whether the cost justified the benefits to be gained.

For some participants, their initial thoughts about the proposal were more negative. Putting the money towards public transport instead, which might ease congestion and would be a more environmentally friendly solution, was raised by some. Concern that the tunnel was a short-term option that would encourage more traffic and become congested itself, and the negative impact the proposal would have on some people’s lives were also mentioned. One participant suggested the proposal would only benefit major financial institutions and was a way of ‘bleaching money out of taxpayers via infrastructure’. The need for strong control over contracting to ensure future community benefit and protect community from profiteering was mentioned.

Finally, participants raised a number of questions about the proposal. These questions related to: how much the cost of toll on the tunnel would be, with the accumulative cost of tolls being a concern especially for those travelling to or from Western Sydney; how many people would want to travel from Rozelle to North Sydney and whether this justified the cost; and whether investing in this infrastructure was worthwhile given the expected use of self-driving cars over the next 10 to 15 years’ time.

**Potential impacts of the Western Harbour Tunnel**

Participants were then asked to identify any potential positive or negative impacts they would expect from the proposal or any concerns they had about it.

**Positive impacts**

The positive impacts participants identified include:

- Easing congestion and traffic off the bridge, and easing city traffic gridlocks and bottlenecks which can affect the whole network
- Making it easier and quicker to get around and out of Sydney, linking more areas of Sydney and helping to decentralise travel
- Making the city accessible for those living further away, especially for those in the west, and making it more convenient for workers and those coming to North Sydney
Quicker access to the new airport at Badgerys Creek
Assists those who are not close to public transport and provides a choice between public and private transport
Supports the growing city and will still be required for driverless cars.

Negative impacts and concerns
The negative impacts and concerns participants identified include:

- The cost of tolls for those who have to use the road and the impact of disruptions on businesses
- Environmental impacts on the harbour and ecology during construction and due to the way spoil is transported, and from encouraging the use of more cars
- Disruption to residents caused by the construction and the placement and impact of pollution from smoke stacks
- Traffic congestion caused by construction and the effect of on/off ramps on local roads, and road changes to force people to use the toll road
- Impact to people's homes and property prices, and increasing densification through improved accessibility

Other comments
- Better ways to spend money - on social infrastructure such as health, schools, homeless facilities
- Won't affect North Sydney much
- Need to have both road and public transport infrastructure
- Detrimental effect without adequate Indigenous consultation
- Need to think outside of benefits to ourselves (LGA residents) and consider the bigger picture, and the longer term needs of a larger population.

Level of support of/opposition to the Western Harbour Tunnel
Participants were asked to give an indication of the level to which they supported or opposed the WHT, using a sliding scale from zero to 10, where zero is completely oppose the WHT and 10 is completely support the WHT. Through this mechanism, the majority of participants indicated they support or strongly support the proposal and just under one-third of participants were neutral, indicating they neither supported or opposed the WHT. A very small minority opposed or strongly opposed it.

Support or strongly support
For the majority of participants who support or strongly support the proposed WHT, the main reasons were:

- The future needs for road infrastructure to support the growing population of Sydney, which current infrastructure will not support. Acknowledgement this could serve Sydney for the next 50-100 years
- That it will ease congestion and improve traffic, particularly on the Harbour Bridge and the existing harbour tunnel. It was suggested that reducing congestion and improving traffic flows will have a positive environmental effect
It will provide better connections across Sydney, especially from the south to the northern beaches, and will open up access to less visited suburbs. The economic benefits of better connections for freight was also mentioned.

Will fit nicely with the proposed under harbour rail link to Barangaroo.

A number of these participants identified that their support for the proposal would be even higher if it had a public transport component and/or if they had more information.

For others, concerns about the implementation of the project and whether it would be built to accommodate long-term traffic needs were raised (the insufficient capacity of the current tunnel and the M2 was regularly mentioned throughout focus groups as examples of previous, politically motivated, short-term thinking).

It should be noted that some of the participants who are supportive of the WHT proposal identified that they would not personally benefit from it but they supported it because it would benefit others.

Neutral

For the third of participants who were neutral about the proposal, the main reasons were:

- The lack of information about the: cost/benefits of the project for users and tax-payers; how it will be funded; modelling to demonstrate traffic need (lack of need for cross-city tunnel cited); and supporting business case
- Concern about construction and environmental impacts, how sustainable the proposal is and potential densification in the local area that will result, as well as amount of Indigenous consultation that has been undertaken
- That money could be better spent elsewhere
- The benefit to others, that it will meet future needs and probably result in better connectivity
- Will increased jobs and money coming into North Sydney, and be good for the economy.

A few participants also identified a public transport component would increase their support.

Oppose or strongly oppose

The small minority of participants who opposed or strongly opposed the proposal did so because of:

- Concerns about its environmental and future sustainability, although short term benefits acknowledged, and that there are other solutions to congestion that won’t impact the environment
- Lack of evidence of economic benefit and doubt the level of time saving justifies the cost.

Initial views of Beaches Link

Participants were referred back to the indicative map of the proposal, which had been sourced from RMS (see Appendix B), and asked to consider the Beaches Link (BL) component. They were advised that the proposed BL would:

- Connect the Warringah Freeway and the Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation at Balgowlah
- Also involves an upgrade of the Wakehurst Parkway to two lanes each way, between Seaforth and Frenchs Forest.
Participants were given a few minutes to become familiar with the details on the map and then invited to share their initial thoughts about the proposed BL. A range of initial thoughts was expressed across the four different groups.

Overall, participants were considerably more positive about this component of the proposal than the WHT. For the participants that did express views that strongly supported it, the main benefit would be to address major traffic congestion and gridlocks caused by the Spit Bridge and on Military Road which significantly impact local residents and is getting worse. Participants frequently mentioned feeling sorry for northern beaches residents who have no or limited travel options, buses from the northern beaches were identified as being always at capacity.

Northern beaches residents are seen as being currently segregated from the rest of Sydney and improving the access to and from the northern beaches was valued. Better access would encourage some participants to consider moving there. The need for emergency services vehicles to get to the new hospital, and current issues with emergency services vehicles being held up by congestion, was another reason participants supported this proposal. For these participants, the BL proposal was well overdue.

A number of other participants made comments that indicated that while they supported the proposal, a public transport solution was also required, otherwise it would not be a long-term solution as traffic and congestion issues would return over time. A rail connection was most commonly mentioned in this regard, and was also seen as a way of better servicing the hospital. Extending the tunnel to Mona Vale or to the hospital, providing extra lanes in the tunnel for buses, and providing other support such as infrastructure for business parks were also identified ways to improve the BL proposal.

For the few remaining participants, there was some question about the cost/benefit of the proposal, how useful the link would be and whether the costs were justified. Concern about the cost of tolls, where tunnel entry and exit points will be and how traffic at exit points will be addressed were also raised. The suggestion of government incentives to decentralise the city, to encourage offices/employment outside of the CBD, and having park and ride options were also mentioned.

Potential impacts of Beaches Link

Participants were then asked to identify any potential positive or negative impacts they would expect from the proposal or any concerns they had about it.

Positive impacts

The positive impacts participants identified include:

- Improve access to northern beaches, making it a more attractive area to live and improving work/life balance, and giving local residents more options to support the insufficient public transport there
- Relieve congestion from Neutral Bay and reduce the disruption of the Spit Bridge and the impact if a car breaks down
- Open the northern beaches up to businesses, and making it a more thriving community through better access.
Negative impacts and concerns

The negative impacts and concerns participants identified include:

- Increases in densification through better access was a concern for one participant, although others noted that densification would occur without the WHT and Beaches Link project.
- The Government not building the tunnel wide enough to accommodate future traffic needs, due to financial short-sightedness (M5 and M5 cited as previous examples).
- The tunnel not going far enough, and creating problems further up, and an upgrade to two lanes on the Wakehurst Parkway not being enough.

Other comments

The need for better public transport in addition to BL was raised.

Level of support of/opposition to Beaches Link

Participants were asked to give an indication of the level to which they supported or opposed BL, using a sliding scale from zero to 10, where zero is completely oppose the BL and 10 is completely support the BL. Through this mechanism, the vast majority of participants indicated they supported or strongly supported the proposal. A tiny minority of participants were neutral about it and only one participant indicated their opposition.

Support or strongly support

For the vast majority of participants who support or strongly support the proposed WHT, the main reasons were:

- That the project was well-overdue and gives residents, who have had a terrible time, more choice.
- It will ease traffic congestion, particularly on Military Road, improve traffic flows and make it easier to get around.
- Improve connections and integration across Sydney.
- A tunnel will have less environmental and visual impact.

Even for those participants who strongly supported the proposal, the inclusion of public transport within the tunnel or as an additional project, such as rail/metro, would increase their support even more. For many participants both road and public transport infrastructure improvements are required. Making the tunnel as wide and as long as possible was also raised by supporters, as was the need for the project to be well-managed and value for money.

Neutral

For the tiny minority of participants who were neutral about the proposal, the main reasons were:

- It's a short-term fix that should have been a public transport proposal.
- Would not provide direct benefit.
- Would take commuter traffic off local roads to leave them free for local traffic but would want to know where the road blocks are.
Oppose or strongly oppose
The one participant who opposed the proposal did so because of the environmental impacts and the fact that densification was happening in other places who could use it more. However, they also indicated they would support the proposal much more if it included a public transport.

Knowledge of the B-Line proposal
Less than half of the participants had heard about the B-Line proposal, with the Mosman Daily being the only identified source of information.

Views about B-Line proposal
Participants who had heard about the B-Line shared what they know about it with other participants and the facilitator also reiterated that it is a dedicated bus lane from Mona Vale to Neutral Bay. Participants were then invited to share their views about the proposal.

The positive comments raised during the discussions about the B-Line related to the value in getting people into public transport, and moving more people, particularly workers, if the dedicated bus lane really worked. It was noted though that for it to be effective in reducing car usage buses would need to be every five minutes. For a few participants, the B-Line is seen as an effective short-term solution while the BL tunnel was being built, and it was noted that in dense, established areas it is a plausible option.

Negative comments about the proposal related to a number of concerns. The impact on small, local business on Military Road who will lose customers if they lose parking, as occurred on Parramatta Road, was mentioned. This would also affect local character as closed business premises would be sold to developers. The danger created by speeding buses was also raised, as was the observation that unless there was going to be a high number of buses ‘24/7’ having a dedicated lane would not be valid. Concern about the loss of traffic lanes were also mentioned

Interrelationship of projects
When asked to think about the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal in terms of the B-Line project and identify any interrelationship, participants made a number of points. These included:

뇌. The tunnel is a better option, that would positively impact residents’ lives and get cars off the roads, and would remove the need for the B-Line by removing commuters from the roads. It would also remove the need for B-Line parking as commuters will travel via the tunnel
뇌. Need to have both projects, as they are complementary and are both needed to reduce congestion
뇌. Need to integrate buses into the proposed tunnels, as well as providing light rail/train services in addition to the B-Line
뇌. Buses must be an attractive option, regular and service lots of different areas. There is a concern that the B-Line will negatively affect current bus services
뇌. Projects need to be done and be done properly, these projects should be built with longer-term needs in mind (as the Harbour Bridge was), and project timetabling needs to be right
뇌. Concern about the loss of lanes due to the B-Line, as this would affect those who have to drive, and that people will be forced into the tunnel, as occurred in Lane Cove
뇌. Concern of the impact to traffic, while the tunnels are being built, if the B-Line was implemented.
3.1.3. Focus group outcomes - self-selected

**Transport modes**

Participants’ preferred transport modes were very similar to randomly selected participants. Most stated that they use a combination of car and public transport, most commonly the train and bus, followed by taxis/Uber.

Participants decision to use public transport options depended on their destination, activity and how convenient it was to get there. Most participants said they use public transport to get to the CBD or if parking was not accessible at their destination. Participants also factored in the convenience of reaching their destination by public transport, when it is accessible, easy and timely. Taxis/Uber were preferred by participants when they were drinking or socialising.

Participants used their cars if reaching their destination by public transport was inconvenient or indirect. This included destinations such as the suburbs, the countryside, and the beach. The time it took to get somewhere in a car and whether it had accessible parking were factors considered by participants. Participants favoured using their cars if they had children or were going shopping.

**Knowledge of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal**

At the beginning of the discussion about the proposal, participants were asked if they had heard about it. The level of awareness about the proposal was slightly higher amongst self-selected participants than randomly selected participants. However, participants had heard about the proposal through similar communication channels, such as traditional media. A few participants mentioned getting information from North Sydney Council either through an electronic newsletter or at the local markets. One participant identified he worked for RMS, previously on the same floor as some of the team working on the proposal and had heard about it through them. All were aware the proposal is a tunnel for use by vehicles.

**Initial views of the Western Harbour Tunnel**

As with randomly selected focus groups, participants were shown an indicative map of the proposal, which had been sourced from RMS (see Appendix B), and asked to consider the Western Harbour Tunnel (WHT) component. They were advised that the proposed WHT would:

- Link the WestConnex at Rozelle to the Warringah Freeway at North Sydney
- Cross underneath Sydney Harbour between Birchgrove and Waverton areas.

Participants were given a few minutes to become familiar with the details on the map and then invited to share their initial thoughts about the proposed WHT.

More self-selected participants’ initial thoughts about the proposal were either negative, or neutral, than the randomly selected participants, with a minority of participants expressing positive views about it.

The most commonly raised negative views were related to the proposal encouraging the use of more cars, adding to what is an already significant number. Bringing traffic into North Sydney was also mentioned. The proposal was seen to be an unnecessary duplication of existing infrastructure, and for which the benefits did not justify the costs: a few participants noting that the tunnel would only be used during peak hours. Concern about the location of exhaust stacks and the need for public transport solutions, which were seen to be cheaper and a better use of money, were also mentioned by some participants, as was concern about the cost of tolls. Finally, it was noted that the proposal was a short-term solution and that a road solution that went around the city would be better.
For those participants who were more neutral about the proposal their initial thoughts were varied. Concern about those people who will be impacted by construction, and whether the tunnel would be utilised sufficiently (citing the Lane Cove tunnel as being underutilised) were mentioned. The location of Aboriginal sites in the lower North Shore and the need to consult with Elders, and the benefit of combining a metro with the road tunnel were also mentioned. Finally, the hope was expressed that the location chosen for the tunnel was correct, and a question about the impacts of drilling was raised.

The positive thoughts mentioned about the proposal included improving the congestion on the Spit Bridge, Military Road and the Harbour Bridge, relieving traffic bottlenecks and providing more options for drivers, who could use technology to identify the best routes for the day/time of their travel. The proposal was seen as being a long time coming. The fact that the proposal was for a tunnel, rather than another bridge, and so would not affect the visual amenity of the harbour was also mentioned, although it was noted that the benefits would depend on how the interchanges were going to work. The improved connectivity, linking different freeways, and taking traffic out of the city was also valued.

**Potential impacts of the Western Harbour Tunnel**

Participants were then asked to identify any potential positive or negative impacts they would expect from the proposal or any concerns they had about it.

**Positive impacts**

The positive impacts participants identified include:

- Easing congestion on the Harbour Bridge and in the city, and reducing traffic along Military Road
- Making it easier to get around Sydney and providing more options for road users
- Addressing the issues there are with the roads for those who want to drive and those who need to, such as delivery drivers.

**Negative impacts and concerns**

The negative impacts and concerns participants identified include:

- Building for current issues, not for the future and being a bandaid solution; the time it will take to be implemented; and a preference for other methods to encourage businesses not to be in the CBD
- The impacts of construction, including the negative health impacts of tunnelling on those who live nearby; and the effects of exhaust stacks
- The significant impact it will have on the Warringah Freeway; and the amount of traffic that will be ‘pumped’ into North Sydney
- Concern that traffic will not be heading west; and that the tunnel will facilitate a huge flow of traffic to the existing harbour crossings
- The number of people who will benefit not justifying the costs.

**Other comments**

- Metros are a cheaper option
- Need to have a public transport system included; better to have both cars and metro/light rail in the tunnel; we need multimodal transport options; should not just be looking at roads
- The options assessment is missing
Tunnel ventilation technology may have changed by the time the construction concludes.

New tunnelling technology will be quicker and less expensive, so we should incentivise private companies to seek newer and more efficient technologies to build the tunnel.

**Level of support/opposition to the Western Harbour Tunnel**

Participants were asked to give an indication of the level to which they supported or opposed the WHT, using a sliding scale from zero to 10, where zero is completely oppose the WHT and 10 is completely support the WHT. Through this mechanism, just under one-half of participants were neutral and not quite one-third were opposed or very opposed. The remaining participants supported the proposal.

**Support**

For those who support the WHT the reasons were:

- The need for an additional harbour crossing and a better-connected transport system; and the personal advantage when travelling to the west
- That the road would be privately owned and a toll road, so user pays
- Densification in the local area and the need for Council to consider the ‘bigger picture’.

**Neutral**

For those who were neutral about the proposal, the reasons were:

- It's a good idea which achieves a lot of traffic reduction outcomes but not sure it’s the best value for money or well thought out
- The links are great but thinks road tunnels are unsafe, prefers above ground roads
- Agrees with trying to resolve the issue but not convinced it is the right option (would like more information)
- There is the need for something but not just a car solution, would support the proposal more if it’s connected to public transport, or includes a public transport option
- Need to think about the future, not fixing the current problem, it’s a band aid solution and the need to encourage public transport use, not driving.

**Opposed or strongly opposed**

Those who oppose or strongly oppose the WHT do so because it is:

- Short-sighted, does not resolve transport issues and is delaying the problem
- Expensive and the money could be used on a train line; does not appear to be an integrated transport system
- Too close to the city
- Not putting people into public transport which will solve the congestion issue.
Initial views of Beaches Link

Participants were referred back to the indicative map of the proposal, which had been sourced from RMS (see Appendix B), and asked to consider the Beaches Link (BL) component. They were advised that the proposed BL would:

- Connect the Warringah Freeway and the Burnt Bridge Creek Deviation at Balgowlah
- Also involves an upgrade of the Wakehurst Parkway to two lanes each way, between Seaforth and Frenchs Forest.

Participants were given a few minutes to become familiar with the details on the map and then invited to share their initial thoughts about the proposed BL.

The level of support for the BL component of the proposal was generally commensurate with the level for the WHT. Supporting comments related to the need to resolve the issue of congestion caused by the Spit Bridge. The fact that there is only one way in and out of the northern beaches, and that there were often accidents, was also mentioned. Public transport alone was identified as not being sufficient to resolve the lack of access for the northern beaches, and providing another option was valued. Fixing roads was seen as being necessary.

Many comments were neutral. The most commonly raised point related to the need to provide both a road and a public transport solution to this issue. The lack of public transport on the northern beaches, and the need to provide a light rail/metro option, including to the hospital, and a ‘decent bus line’ to Palm Beach, were mentioned. A combined response was seen as an opportunity to create something significant. For some the issue could be resolved without expense if the Spit Bridge did not open to let in ‘a few boats’. One participant noted that there was a finite population on the northern beaches so that the proposal would not increase traffic to/from the area.

The need to create a link to the CBD, and to address broader congestion issues in the areas where traffic will exit the tunnel, through a masterplan, were also raised. Providing a link to the Lane Cove Tunnel and the M2/M7 was mentioned, as was the value in removing tunnel spoil via barges. Some participants would have liked more information: about whether the Wakehurst Parkway would become a toll road; if some roads would be ‘lost’; to increase tunnel usage (as per M2); and where exhaust stacks would be placed.

More negative comments related to the proposal just moving bottlenecks elsewhere, essentially to the exist points where two to three lane roads become one lane roads, and encouraging people to drive into the city.

Potential impacts of Beaches Link

Participants were then asked to identify any potential positive or negative impacts they would expect from the proposal or any concerns they had about it.

Positive impacts

The positive impacts participants identified include:

- Provides a direct way to the northern beaches, with using Military Road, and makes it more accessible
- It helps to bypass the city and is taking traffic off the streets into tunnels
- It’s not duplicating existing infrastructure
- Might reduce congestion on ferries.
Negative impacts and concerns
The negative impacts and concerns participants identified include:

- This tunnel is mostly under land rather than water, so a tunnel seems disproportionate
- Lots of commuter travel to Chatswood and bigger industrial estates, rather than to the city.

Other comments or questions
- Need to consider public transport, including a rail link to Chatswood
- There are so many delays and issues with public transport
- At certain times, the road from North Sydney to Balmoral is a car park
- While this will bring benefits, must make it efficient in the long term and carefully consider environmental impacts and the placement of exhaust stacks
- Need to think about the bigger picture and the future in 20 to 30 years' time.

Level of support of/opposition to Beaches Link
Participants were asked to give an indication of the level to which they supported or opposed BL, using a sliding scale from zero to 10, where zero is completely oppose BL and 10 is completely support BL. Through this mechanism, slightly more participants indicated they were neutral about the proposal than those who indicated they were supportive, with the remaining one-quarter of participants being opposed.

Support or strongly support
For those participants who support or strongly support the proposed WHT, the main reasons were:

- It will take traffic off Military Road
- The status quo is unacceptable.

A number of participants who supported or strongly supported the proposal merely said that they would support it even more if it included a public transport component.

Neutral
Participants who identified as being neutral about the proposal stated:

- The proposal is positive but not sure it’s the most cost effective option
- Not convinced the route is correct, does not like to encourage driving into the city
- Proposal has vision and is a great concept but does not think the end point is good
- Something is necessary but does not think this is it, need an implementation plan to comment on
- Will ease traffic in Mosman and Neutral Bay and provides an option to the Spit Bridge but also needs a public transport component with a link to Ryde/Chatswood.

Oppose or strongly oppose
Reasons for opposition to the proposal were:

- Only likes to connection from the Spit Bridge to Cammeray, something is needed for the Spit Bridge
- Not supportive of underground roads, fixing current roads and a rail option would be cheaper
- It’s a new link but prefer money to be spent on public transport
Sees proposal delivering a lot more traffic into the Warringah Freeway and current harbour crossing if it does not have public transport. Uncertain about the Wakehurst Parkway becoming a toll road.

Knowledge of the B-Line proposal
Less than half of self-selected participants had heard about the B-Line proposal. Those who did know about the proposal had heard about it through: the local paper; a briefing from North Sydney Council; and via a handout provided at the bus stop.

Views about B-Line proposal
Participants who had heard about the proposal shared their views about it and the facilitator also reiterated that it is a dedicated bus-lane from Mona Vale to Neutral Bay. Participants were then invited to share their views about the proposal.

The only positive comment that was made about the B-Line proposal was that having double-decker buses would increase capacity.

Neutral comments related to a range of different topics, including:

- Improving commuter travel times may reduce car usage
- Sounds great but there is already a bus-lane; prefer bus lane to be peak hour only
- Light-rail and metrobuses work well, metrobuses are express but still use existing bus stops
- Appears to be a metro 'lite' option - stops are where metro stops would go
- Need underground car parking to support proposal
- Other ways to resolve the issue, including: incentivising people to use public transport through a road user charge; making public transport cheaper after hours; using alternate driving days (as per Beijing); and using shuttle buses to take people to larger stations where they can transfer to local bus services.

Negative comments about this proposal related to a number of points. The loss of parking along Military Road, which is currently insufficient, and the impact this will have on businesses and shopping strips were mentioned. These changes would make Military Road a highway. The insufficient capacity of the currently available lanes and the effect of removing lanes on the existing congestion was also raised. There were examples where removing lanes for buses did not address issues, and Victoria Road was given as one of those examples.

The location of stops was also negatively mentioned, being identified as being too far away from shopping centres and the existing bus stops. Providing a 24-hour bus lane would not resolve issues as buses are still slow in peak hour. Finally, the proposal was seen as 'political point scoring' that would benefit commuters from the northern beaches getting to work at the expense of others further down the route.

Interrelationship of projects
When asked to think about the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal in terms of the B-Line project and identify any interrelationship, participants made a range of comments:

- The two projects are not interconnected, they are doing two different things
- B-Line will not be necessary if the tunnel works well, it will provide more room on the road for public transport
- B-line will help while BL is being built; and will make catching the bus better, even in non-peak times, but removing parked cars
- Other solutions need to be considered, such as changing school and work times so that everyone is not all travelling at the same time
- Irrespective of the tunnel the B-line should not go ahead, it does not suit the environment it is going into.

3.1.4. Focus group feedback

At the end of each focus group individual feedback was obtained using a feedback form. The feedback form explored participants’ satisfaction with the focus group process and allowed them to provide suggestions about how the session might be improved.

A total of 56 of the 57 participants in these groups provided feedback

- 9 participants in the first focus group (Tuesday 27 June 2017)
- 10 participants in the second focus group (Wednesday 28 June 2017)
- 10 participants in the third focus group (Thursday 29 June 2017)
- 9 participants in the fourth focus group (Tuesday 4 July 2017)
- 9 participants in the fifth focus group (Thursday 6 July 2017)
- 10 participants in the sixth focus group (Monday 10 July 2017).

Feedback form analysis

Participants were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a range of statements about the focus group, using a five-point scale where one is strongly disagree and five is strongly agree. Results are demonstrated in the table below:
The average ratings for all the statements were all above four on the five-point rating and there was very little deviation in results.

### Suggested improvements

Although they were largely complimentary about the focus group process, participants did identify how the focus group could have been improved. The most commonly stated improvement was that participants should have received more detailed information prior to and during the focus groups so that they were able to have a deeper discussion about the project and were better informed. Such comments include:

- “Perhaps some agenda handed out beforehand or at beginning”
- “It would have been good to have more info before coming to the session about what we would discuss would allow us to get more insight to the topic”
- “Prior research packs”.

Participants also remarked that the venue details were not advertised properly. Lastly, participants suggested that the focus group size could be changed, with one participant suggesting that it was too big, and another suggesting that it was too small.

![Individual feedback chart](image-url)
Note: consideration had been given to whether it was possible to provide participants with more information about the proposal without influencing their views, however as there was no source of independent information the decision was made not to provide any further details about the proposal.

Most valued
The focus group participants were asked what they valued most about the focus group. Participants particularly valued hearing and sharing a diverse set of views and opinions about the proposal. Participants also greatly valued the facilitation of the discussions, which was open and non-judgmental, with every voice being heard. Such comments include:

- "Diverse group with different views"
- "Hearing ideas from others about the proposals, really respectful and well facilitated discussion"
- "Ensuring all voices were heard"
- "An open minded discussion of a wide range of views from a good cross section of the community"
- "Everyone has chance to share their opinions and it felt like they mattered and were taken seriously"
- "Being able to hear other opinions/not being judged".

Participants also valued that the focus groups were a learning experience, as they were able to find out about local issues and important infrastructure projects that may or may not affect them. Finally, they valued having the opportunity to provide feedback and have a say, and appreciated that they were being listened to.

Final comments on proposal
There was a lot of similarity in what participants had to say when asked if they had any additional comments about the proposal. Many participants commented that they were in support of this project, citing that it is a good idea that needs to be implemented soon. There were, however, many comments stating that although they support the project, it must be in conjunction with public transport. Such comments include:

- "Integrated approach – include public transport option"
- "We need it – but it must include public transport"
- "Only that we need more public transport along with cars on these corridors"
- "Support if all transport avenues are acknowledged in the planning process"
- "Good idea – but connect to Chatswood not North Sydney. Run a lightrail/metro or public transport in conjunction"

Some participants stated that they needed more information and were keen to find out more about the project. There were also a few participants who said that BL needs to be built first and would prefer the WHT to be built later on.
3.2. Online survey

As participants ‘self-selected’ to complete the survey, it attracted community members who were already interested in this proposal and other proposed infrastructure projects that affect the North Sydney LGA. As indicated previously, ‘self-select’ participants are most often negatively motivated (by their opposition) to participate and are never demographically representative of the broader community. Demographic data was collected to allow an analysis of how representative these self-select participants are of the community in the LGA, noting that not all participants completed every question.

3.2.1. Demographics

**Gender**

![Respondent gender](image)

Women were slightly over-represented in the online survey, at 56.5% of respondents. The ABS Census figures for the North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA) indicate that women make up 52.4% of the population. Men were under-represented in the online survey, with only 41.0% of the respondents, versus 47.6% in the Census.
**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>North Sydney LGA, 2011 Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>+16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>+13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>+6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>+0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table two - participants’ age compared to Census data for LGA

Overall, people younger than 40 were under-represented amongst respondents to the online survey, whilst people over 40 were over-represented. Nobody under 20 completed an online survey and only five respondents out of 161 were from the age group 20-29 years.

**Place of residence**

![Place of residence chart](chart.png)

Figure 2 - Respondent place of residence

The suburb of Cammeray was significantly over-represented in the respondents to the online survey. Although Cammeray residents make up just 10.9% of the population of the North Sydney LGA, they accounted for 31.8% of respondents to the online survey. Crows Nest was slightly over-represented (7.5% of
LGA, 10.4% of respondents) whilst Neutral Bay, North Sydney, Milsons Point, Cremorne and Wollstonecraft were all under-represented in the online survey.

**Note:** Because a much larger proportion of Cammeray residents completed the online survey than their proportion of the population according to the census, additional analysis was performed to determine whether respondents from this suburb were having a strong effect on the final results. To this end, the results of several questions were analysed as two separate groups, Cammeray residents and non-Cammeray residents.

It was found that the Cammeray residents were in general more negative about the various transport proposals, particularly about the effects of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link components (Question 5 of survey). However, because they still comprised a minority of the respondents, and their responses were not strongly different to those of others, the outsized sample of Cammeray resident respondents had a minimal effect on the overall trend of the results.

**Place of business**

A total of 78 survey respondents were business owners rather than, or in addition to, being residents of the North Sydney LGA.

![Figure 3 - Respondent place of business](image)

Places of business outside the North Sydney LGA were the most common (29.9% of nominated places), followed by North Sydney including the CBD (26.4%). For individual suburbs within the North Sydney LGA, Cammeray was the most common (14.9%), followed by Crows Nest (9.2%) and Neutral Bay (5.7%).
3.2.2. Preferred mode of transport

**Mode of transport**

![Bar chart showing preferred mode of transport](Figure 4 - Respondent preferred mode of transport)

The most popular method of transport amongst respondents was walking (23.8%), followed closely by train and private transport (both 21.3%). Another common preference was the bus (16.3%).

Overall no single method or category of transport mode (private, public or passive) predominated.
Factors for preference

The most important factor influencing respondent transport mode preference was convenience, with just over one-fifth of all responses (22.5%), followed by time (17.5%) and how far/where the respondent is going (16.3%).

Figure 5 - Respondent nominated factors influencing mode preference
3.2.3. Transport issues in Sydney

Respondents were asked an open-ended question about what they thought the biggest transport issue in Sydney was. Responses were then grouped and enumerated into themes, with the potential for some comments to address multiple themes.

A need for more, better, and better connected and integrated public transport was the most common response category (41.6% of responses). Responses in this category were concerned that not enough was being invested into making public transport reliable, regular, convenient and well connected.

Too much car use was the next most common category (22.0%). Responses in this theme generally specified that Sydney’s transport infrastructure was too car focused.

Traffic congestion was the next most common category (18.7%). Responses in this category indicated that the issue was with gridlock and long travel times for cars. Not all responses in this category prescribed a solution, although some responses indicated that gridlock was the result of an insufficient focus on public transport and/or a car-centric approach to transport (the two most popular themes). Others indicated that the solution to traffic congestion was a greater investment in road infrastructure to keep up with Sydney’s growth, which was also the next most common response theme (7.9%).

Figure 6 - Respondent opinions on the biggest transport issue facing Sydney

Respondents were asked an open-ended question about what they thought the biggest transport issue in Sydney was. Responses were then grouped and enumerated into themes, with the potential for some comments to address multiple themes.

A need for more, better, and better connected and integrated public transport was the most common response category (41.6% of responses). Responses in this category were concerned that not enough was being invested into making public transport reliable, regular, convenient and well connected.

Too much car use was the next most common category (22.0%). Responses in this theme generally specified that Sydney’s transport infrastructure was too car focused.

Traffic congestion was the next most common category (18.7%). Responses in this category indicated that the issue was with gridlock and long travel times for cars. Not all responses in this category prescribed a solution, although some responses indicated that gridlock was the result of an insufficient focus on public transport and/or a car-centric approach to transport (the two most popular themes). Others indicated that the solution to traffic congestion was a greater investment in road infrastructure to keep up with Sydney’s growth, which was also the next most common response theme (7.9%).
3.2.4. Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project

Priorities

Respondents were asked “The NSW Government has announced the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project. See note below explaining the project. When thinking about the project, what factors should the NSW Government consider when deciding whether to proceed with it or not?”. Respondents were asked to rank those factors they did nominate.

The first, second and third priority factors nominated by respondents were quantified.

![Figure 7 - First, second and third priority factors for decision on project](image)

The most important factor by first priority, and with a fair number of second and third rankings by those who did not nominate it first, was public transport (29.4% of first priority rankings). The next most common factor by rankings, was environmental impact (15.6%) and health impacts (also 15.6% but with significantly less second rankings than environmental impact). There were still significant nominations of the factors “effect on local neighbourhoods” and “effect on local traffic”. There were relatively few nominations of “financial implications”, “effect on parking” or of other factors.
Western Harbour Tunnel component effects

Overall, a majority of respondents believed that the Western Harbour tunnel project would have a negative effect (31.7% completely negative, 20.5% somewhat negative), and a much smaller number, less than one-third rated the Western Harbour Tunnel positively (14.3% somewhat positive, 17.4% completely positive). The remaining responses were split between being neutral (9.3%) or respondents feeling they did not know enough to have a view (6.8%).

Figure 8 - Respondent ratings on effect of Western Harbour Tunnel component on North Sydney LGA
Beaches Link component effects

 Respondents were even more negative in their attitudes to the Beaches Link component of the proposal. Once again, a majority rated the component negatively (35.4% completely negative, 19.9% somewhat negative), and a little less than one-third rated the component positively (11.8% somewhat positive, 18.6% completely positive).
**Project concerns**

Respondents were asked an open ended question “What, if any, is your number one concern about the project (the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link)?” Responses were then grouped and enumerated in themes, with the potential for some comments to address multiple themes.

Three clear categories of responses emerged as of most concern. The most common response theme was around the environmental effects that would be induced by the project (29.9% of responses), in terms of both air pollution and noise, both from the changes brought by the project and its construction.

Another commonly cited concern was that the project was favouring car infrastructure over public transport (25.7%). Also frequently cited was the concern that the project would bring increased traffic to the North Sydney LGA (24.6%), either because of changes to road configurations to accommodate the new infrastructure, or because increased road capacity can induce demand.
**Project benefits**

**Percentage of responses**

What, if any, will be the project's number one benefit? (Themed responses, multiple themes per response permitted, n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion in North Sydney LGA</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefit / sarcastic response</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster travel</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to the city</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Spit Bridge bottleneck</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lanes at warringah freeway</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed up buses</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11 - Respondent opinions on project’s number one benefit*

The most commonly cited response theme was that the project would reduce traffic congestion within the North Sydney LGA (34.3%), with many of responses in this theme citing that traffic in side streets would be reduced and that it would reduce traffic on Military Road.

The second most common theme consisted of responses that there was no benefit (32.9%), often in the form of a sarcastic answer to the question.

The next most common response theme was that the project would reduce travel times (14.3%), followed by the related theme that the project would allow better access to the city (7.9%).
Attitudes to Western Harbour Tunnel component

When asked to identify their level of support or opposition, respondents tended to oppose the Western Harbour Tunnel component, with just under half of all respondents being completely or somewhat opposed the Western Harbour Tunnel component (27.3% and 21.7% respectively).

A little over one-quarter supported the component (7.5% somewhat support, 21.7% completely support), with over one-fifth of respondents giving a neutral response (21.7%).

Figure 12 - Respondent support or opposition to the Western Harbour Tunnel component of the project
Reasons for supporting the Western Harbour Tunnel Component

All respondents were asked why they had given the ratings they had given to each component. Ratings that indicated support or opposition to each component were analysed separately. Responses were then grouped and enumerated in themes, with the potential for some comments to address multiple themes.

The most common response category for respondents who had supported the Western Harbour Tunnel, was that the Western Harbour Tunnel component will reduce congestion on local streets (42.4%).

Another common response category was that the Western Harbour Tunnel will improve travel times and convenience for through traffic (30.3%). The other significant response category was that the Western Harbour Tunnel component was simply necessary.
Reasons for opposing Western Harbour Tunnel component

Figure 14 - Respondent reasons for giving a ‘1’ or ‘2’ to question on Western Harbour Tunnel component (indicating opposition)

The most common reason given for opposing the Western Harbour Tunnel was that it should be a public transport link, not a road link (36.6%).

The next most common objection to this component was that the costs and benefits did not add up, or had not been properly investigated (21.1%).

Other common objections were that the new transport links would ultimately increase local congestion (18.3%) and that both this traffic and through traffic would increase air and noise pollution in the North Sydney area (15.5%).
Attitudes to Beaches Link component

When respondents were asked to indicate their level of support or opposition to Beaches Link, they tended to oppose it, with just under half opposing this component, either completely (32.3%) or somewhat (16.1%). Around one-third of respondents supported the component, with 8.7% somewhat supporting it and 24.8% completely supporting it. The remaining 18.0% were neutral about this component.

Figure 15 - Respondent support or opposition to the Beaches Link component of the project
Reasons for supporting the Beaches Link component

The most common reason for supporting the Beaches Link component was that it would reduce congestion on local streets (43.8%). Other common reasons for supporting the Beaches Link components were that it would provide better access to and from the Northern Beaches (21.9%) and that it would improve through traffic (15.6%).

**Figure 16 - Respondent reasons for giving a ‘4’ or ‘5’ to question on Beaches link component (indicating support)**

The most common reason for supporting the Beaches Link component was that it would reduce congestion on local streets (43.8%). Other common reasons for supporting the Beaches Link components were that it would provide better access to and from the Northern Beaches (21.9%) and that it would improve through traffic (15.6%).
Reasons for opposing the Beaches Link

The most common reason for opposing the Beaches Link component was that it should be a public transport link (38.2%).

Other common reasons for opposing this component were pollution and noise concerns (20.6%), that the link would ultimately increase local congestion (19.1%) and that the link was either not worth the cost or that the case had not been sufficiently made that the link was worth the cost (11.8%).

---

Figure 17 - Respondent reasons for giving a ‘1’ or ‘2’ to question on Beaches Link component (indicating opposition)
3.2.5. The B-Line

**Attitudes to the B-Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
<th>When thinking about the proposed B-Line, which statement best describes your attitude?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I completely support the proposal</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the proposal</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I neither support nor oppose the proposal</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oppose the proposal</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I completely oppose the proposal</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know enough about it to have a view</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 - Respondent support or opposition to the proposed B-Line

Respondents were asked “The NSW Government has also proposed to build a B-Line (a dedicated bus lane/rapid bus transit) from Mona Vale to Neutral Bay. See note below for more information. When thinking about the proposed B-Line, which statement best describes your attitude?”

Overall, respondents tended to support the proposal, with a little under one-half of all respondents either completely supporting it (21.7%) or supporting it (24.2%).

Around one-fifth of respondents were opposed to the proposal (12.4% opposed, 9.9% completely opposed), with one-fifth of respondents being neutral (19.3%) and 12.4% responding that they did not know enough about it to have a view.
B-Line interactions with Western Harbour Tunnel

The most common respondent view was that the B-Line should proceed irrespective of the Western Harbour Tunnel (39.2%), the next most common response was the B-Line should be placed on hold until the implications of the Western Harbour Tunnel have been fully explored (27.1%). Just 12.0% of respondents felt that the B-Line should be cancelled. Over one-fifth of respondents did not feel they knew enough about it to have a view (21.7%).

Figure 19 - Respondent views on conditions under which the B-Line should proceed
3.3. Online mapping tool

Summary

Figure 20 - Online mapping tool comment themes

The most common category of online mapping tool comment was an objection relating to air pollution (34.5%). The next most common type of comment was practical suggestions for traffic modifications to local streets (20.0%). Objections to the proposal on the basis that it would increase local traffic was the next most common comment theme (16.4%). Other objections were around the disruption from construction (10.9%), noise (9.1%) and uncertainty around compulsory acquisition of property (3.6%).

Objections - air pollution

Responses in this category were usually worried about the local impact of air pollution from the proposed projects, often stemming from the potential location of tunnel ventilation stacks.

Example comments

"Anzac Park Primary School is planned to have 1000 primary students. It is not suitable to put a tunnel portal and emission stacks near this area and the RMS have said stack will be unfiltered and the tunnels will be very long. The Warringah Freeway is a man-made valley and the emissions will not disperse effectively. Where is the business case for these tunnels? Why is there no rail option in them? If road tunnels are to be built they must include full emissions filtration - as is being built for the new Hong Kong tunnels, or better. This area already has 10 lanes plus of surface freeway and cannot deal with concentrated emissions being added"
"Where exactly in Cammeray are they proposing to put exhaust ventilation facilities? It would be completely irresponsible to put an emissions stack so close to a primary school."

**Traffic modification suggestions**

Responses in this category were specific traffic modification suggestions for local streets. Some of these were linked to the proposed projects whilst others advised that modification were already needed.

**Example comments**

- "East Crescent Street is a one way street at its entry point from Blues Point Rd, however a number of vehicles use it as a u-turn bay or are unaware of the one-way nature of the street and drive out from this street the wrong way. It is suggested a concrete barrier or planting be implemented at the entry to this street to beautify it and also make drivers aware of it being a one-way street, making it safer."

- "The Naremburn to North Ryde cycleway urgently requires a grade separated safe link to West Street. This should not be held up any longer by projects like the Beaches Link which are entirely inappropriate in 2017."

**Objection - traffic**

Responses in this category were concerned about the impact of the project on traffic volumes and conditions, both overall and specific locations.

**Example comments**

- "The Beaches Link and Western Harbour Tunnel projects will make traffic congestion in North Sydney far worse. These new road tunnels cannot be used in isolation - cars will inevitably have to use existing surface roads to complete their journeys. The new road tunnels will only encourage more people to drive when we really need to be encouraging more people to walk, cycle, and take public transport."

- "If there is an exit onto Ernest St, it will dump masses of car traffic into it. It will need to be "upgraded". As per Euston St Alexandria, this will be a disaster for residents on this street."
Figure 21 - Map comment themes enumerated by suburb, frequency histogram

The suburb breakdown of the map comment themes shows that a range of objections were most commonly associated with Cammeray - with most of the air pollution and noise objections, a large share of the traffic objections and all of the compulsory acquisition objections. Traffic modification suggestions, on the other hand, were associated with North Sydney, Crows Nest and McMahons Point.
3.4. Online submission forms

Health impacts were the most commonly cited theme, representing just under one-quarter of all theme submissions (23.2%). This was followed closely by environmental impacts (19.5%) and effect on local neighbourhoods (18.9%). Other common themes included effect on local traffic (15.1%) and public transport (10.3%).

**Health impacts**

Respondents who selected the theme "health impacts" frequently cited the air pollution associated with additional traffic or the tunnel ventilation stacks as the source of their concern.

**Example comments**

- "Health impacts - from the smoke/ventilation stacks - particularly with schools and children in close proximity..."
- "I'm concerned about the effects of the Beaches Link and Western Harbour Tunnel on Cammeray and surrounds, especially unfiltered smoke stacks near residential areas and the effects of a major on/ off ramp near Cammeray village and how this will effect us."
- "Submission to object the preferred site of exhaust stack at anzac park/avenue."
Environment impacts

No submission nominated environmental impacts without also nominating health impacts, and from the associated comments, it appears these submissions were concerned with air and noise pollution from additional traffic or the tunnel ventilation stacks, although some comments made note of impacts on the natural environment from construction.

Example comments

- "I am against the proposed beaches link and western harbour tunnel. It is a poor way to invest our taxes by creating worsened traffic conditions and not alleviating the crush on public transport. Buses are not the best option and the increase in private cars is certainly bad for the future. The funds should be used on increasing train lines. The tunnel will create more pollution through ventilation stacks and destroy our beautiful natural environment. I am tired of the state govt ruining the environment and wasting our money."

- "I strongly object to the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link motorways. They will reduce local air quality and increase pollution through the inclusion of tunnel vent stacks and increased local traffic. Trees and parkland will be lost."

Effect on local neighbourhoods

Respondents who selected the theme "effect on local neighbourhoods" wrote comments that indicated they perceived the effect to come from air pollution, noise, extra traffic through local suburbs, loss of parkland or a combination of these.

Example comments

- "I am opposed to the proposed tunnels because (1) the proposal will damage my local park: Saint Leonard’s Park; (2) the proposal will bring more traffic into my local neighbourhood - and increased parking problems and (3) the entire proposal overlooks possible public transport solutions to the problem of transport infrastructure serving the northern beaches."

- "We oppose the tunnel portal and exhaust stack in the ANZAC Park area. This poses a significant health risk for surrounding residents and vulnerable children at the newly built ANZAC Park school. We also oppose the lack of filtration on for exhaust particles. Reduced health of our community will put greater strain on our state through increasing healthcare costs, reduced productivity and quality of life."

Effect on local traffic

Respondents who selected this theme were concerned that the projects would generate extra local traffic, and often questioned the logic behind the construction of additional road infrastructure in North Sydney.

- "I wish to strongly oppose the proposed car tunnels being built to and from the Northern Beaches. Our roads are already severely congested. Surely we should be aiming to reduce cars on any roads, not encourage them. SURELY. Just on the news this week the State Government is saying they will be increasing the number of trains to alleviate congestion. With more people being squashed into Sydney, more cars is not the answer. I totally object to this proposal. Thank you."

- "We cannot support the Western Harbour Tunnel Beaches proposal in its current form and detail. We live in Cammeray adjacent to 12 lanes of traffic on the Warringah Freeway. Traffic noise and..."
pollution have increased with each extension of the Freeway. We could not agree to any proposal that would exacerbate any of these issues. We seek an improvement in our environment, not a deterioration from more traffic, noise and pollution...

**Public transport**

Respondents who nominated this theme were keen for more public transport links as an alternative to the proposed projects.

- "The NSW government should consult the community before proceeding with this proposal. Also, more public transport is needed"
- "Building road tunnels is a big mistake. Roads cannot carry the increase in Sydney’s population. Are the Government going to build 10 lane superhighways. I don’t think so. The way to move people by the millions is how it has been done in Europe and other countries. IT IS BY RAIL. A rail tunnel would relieve our roads from vehicle congestion. It would be no big deal to leave the car at home and catch the tube rail to the city from the Northern Beaches or the Western Suburbs. But like all pollies, decisions are already been pigheadedly completed and so a survey of what should be right is ignored."
3.5. Other submissions

Council received nine written submissions from individual community members and precinct committees. Seven out of the nine submissions raised objections to the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project. One submission was in favour of the project and one submission was an objection to the B-Line project.

The most commonly raised concern throughout the submissions was regarding pollution. Submitters were concerned about the tunnels not having any ventilation shafts, and the health and environmental impacts that would arise from that. They were also worried about the tunnel's unfiltered stacks, stating that unfiltered stacks were not best practice, specifically when compared to other countries that have tunnels with filtered stacks. The placement of the stacks was another concern. Submitters were worried about the health impacts stacks will have on Cammeray residents, and if placed near local schools (Anzac Park Primary School and North Sydney Boys High School), the negative health impacts that it will have on school children. The environmental impacts that unfiltered stacks will have was another concern.

Another major concern raised in the submissions was the financial cost of the project. Submitters stated that this project was very expensive, and there was concern that it could end up being a significant waste of taxpayers’ money. The opportunity cost of spending money on a motorway rather than on public transport was also raised.

Other concerns include:

- The project is not aligned with peak state bodies’ strategies, such as RMS and Transport for NSW
- The project is a short-term solution for congestion and traffic issues in the area – it is not a long-term option
- Public transport options not being included or considered to go along with the tunnel
- There has not been adequate (or any) assessment of other appropriate transport options, or analysis of the transport issues impacting the North Sydney community
- The need for sufficient community consultation
- The tunnel will bring in more cars to the area which is already congested
- The impacts that construction will have on the community, such as increased traffic and noise
- The burden that the project will have on Council providing a clean environment
- Consideration of spoil removal from the tunnel.

One submission was in favour of the project and condemned Council for their opposition to the project. This submitter stated that the tunnel would relieve the area’s congestion and needs to built while there is money available to do it.

One submission was an objection to the B-Line project. This submission raised a concern regarding the safety and community welfare that will be affected by the B-Line, and urged that a comprehensive analysis of transport issues be undertaken.
4. CONCLUSION

The outcomes of this engagement with the community in the North Sydney LGA demonstrate the range of different views that exist across the community, in relation to the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal.

However, outcomes also demonstrate that community members who are sufficiently motivated to self-select to participate in engagement activities are not representative of the local community, either in terms of their demographic or in the views they hold.

Although there were some common interests and concerns amongst the two types of participants, the randomly selected, broadly demographically representative focus group participants expressed significantly different views about the proposal and their support of it than self-selected participants.

Key outcomes were:

- Participants tended to use a combination of public and private transport to meet their travel needs. Online survey participants had a higher use of passive transport modes than focus group participants.
- Decisions about which transport option to use are based on: the journey time, the ease and cost of getting to the destination, the availability and cost of parking, the activity being undertaken (such as shopping or drinking) and how convenient the mode is (for example, when travelling with children or equipment).
- Generally, but not in all cases, public transport was the preferred mode of transport for commuting to work for participants. The choice of transport mode for non-work related travel depended on the above factors.
- Randomly selected participants were significantly more in favour of the WHT component of the proposal than self-selected participants.
- Most common reasons for supporting the WHT were:
  - Reductions to congestion, on both local roads and major transport corridors and existing harbour crossings
  - Improved accessibility, linking different parts of Sydney, and improving the ease and time of travel
  - Need for road infrastructure to support the growing population
- Self-selected participants were significantly more opposed to the WHT component of the proposal than others.
- Most common reasons for opposing the WHT were:
  - It should be a public transport crossing
  - Its health, environmental and construction impacts
  - Lack of evidence that other options were considered and that the cost/benefits justify the project.
• Increases to local congestion

Focus group participants were even more supportive of the Beaches Link component of the proposal than the WHT component with the vast majority of randomly selected participants being supportive. While online survey opposition to the Beaches link component was consistent with the WHT component, slightly less respondents were neutral, and more were positive, about Beaches Link. Content from other self-selected methodologies did not provide feedback about the two different components of the proposal.

The most common reasons for supporting Beaches Link were:
• Project is long overdue and will improve the options available for northern beaches residents
• Will ease significant traffic congestion that exists on local streets and on the Spit Bridge and Military Road
• Provides better access to the northern beaches and improves connectivity and integration across Sydney

The most common reasons for opposing Beaches Link were:
• It should be a public transport option
• Concern about pollution and noise
• It will increase local congestion

A large proportion of focus group participants, whether they supported, were neutral or opposed the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal, identified that a public transport component with the road tunnel, especially a metro line, would increase their level of support.

Generally speaking, the most significant difference in views better randomly selected participants and self-selected participants was that they saw the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal as one necessary part of the solution, which must also involve significant improvements to public transport.

Online survey participants were more supportive of the B-Line proposal than focus group participants, just under 40% of online participants identified that they thought the B-Line should proceed irrespective of the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link proposal.

Focus group participants were generally, more neutral or negative about the B-Line. Participants who were not supportive of the B-Line proposal were concerned about the impact it would have on already congested roads, and on local businesses and shopping strips. They also questioned whether the proposal was an effective way to address traffic issues.

Generally, for focus group participants the two projects were unrelated and attempting to address two different issues (travel through the area and public transport usage within the area).
APPENDIX A  COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

North Sydney Council Resolutions – related to this project

Council resolution - 1 May 2017 (Min. No. 93):

1. THAT a downloadable version of the petition placed on the council website (in PDF form).
2. THAT information about B-line issues be placed prominently on the Council’s website home page.
3. THAT Council continue to circulate information and any relevant correspondence from the RMS Project Team about the proposed B-line project in Council newsletters and emails as appropriate.
4. THAT a hard copy of the B-line petition be placed at Council’s Customer Service Counters and Stanton Library in a prominent place with appropriate signage.
5. THAT the Mayor write to Mosman Council requesting them to adopt the same or similar initiatives.
6. THAT Council urgently write to the Premier, with a copy to the new local State Member for North Shore, asking that the proposed B-line be halted until such time that a holistic and integrated transport plan which addresses the on-going congestion on Military Road and the Spit bridge, in the context of the newly announced Northern Beaches Tunnel both now and into the future, is developed and a comprehensive community consultation/engagement process is implemented.

Council resolution 1 May 2017 (Min. No. 104):

1. THAT Council write to the Premier, the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight, the Member for North Shore, the Greater Sydney Commission and Infrastructure Australia expressing its concerns regarding the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link projects, and recommend that work on both projects be suspended until the Greater Sydney Commission, in collaboration with Transport for NSW, undertake a robust options assessment that considers all possible solutions to the transport problems affecting the Northern Beaches and the flow on effects on the Lower North Shore. That the letter include a submission that the Government undertake a formal options assessment to address a holistic transport plan for the capacity issues from the Northern Beaches through to the Harbour Bridge.
2. THAT Council maintain an information site on Council’s website, in tandem with the information on the B-line, and include any correspondence and relevant information that Council may have or acquire in relation to this project and circulate such information to all Precinct Committees.

Council resolution 22 May 2017 (Min. No. 142):

1. THAT Council seek a meeting with the Premier to reinforce Council’s view that a holistic transport plan be developed for northern Sydney.
2. THAT Council ask the Premier to release detailed plans of the proposal, including details of which properties are to be acquired and what, if any, parks or other open space will be affected by the proposal.
3. THAT Council ask the Premier to halt the project until meaningful community consultation about the whole project is undertaken and before any expressions of interest or tenders are let or contracts signed.
4. THAT Council coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-Line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA.
5. THAT Council allocate funds to the campaign.
6. THAT any interested Councillor be permitted to observe any focus groups held.
7. THAT the community engagement portion of the submission be completed and reported to the July Council meeting.
8. THAT Council’s website include a reference to this project on the front page and that Council establish an email subscription facility to inform and update interested community members and all Precinct Committees.
9. THAT Council refer this resolution to Mosman Council and invite Mosman Council to work with Council in relation to all of the matters outlined above.
10. THAT this resolution be referred to Lane Cove and Willoughby Councils.
Council resolution 22 May 2017 (Min. No. 143):

21. THAT Council specifically include the B-Line as part of its community campaign in respect of the proposed Western Harbour Tunnel.

Council resolution 26 June (Min. No. 197):

1. THAT in relation to the resolution of Council from 22 May 2017, Min No 142, Point 4: THAT Council coordinate a community campaign and prepare a submission to the State Government supported by any additional expert reports on traffic, planning, impacts of pollution and air quality, noise and community attitudes collated via community engagement including focus groups in respect of the proposed tunnel in the context of the proposed B-line and transport infrastructure and traffic flows in the North Sydney LGA. The report also include the impacts in relation to safety (pedestrian and traffic) pertaining to the proposed traffic changes being considered to accommodate the B-line.

2. THAT in particular, the report investigate and address the safety issues arising from: i) the removing of the safety fencing along the centre of Military Road, which deters pedestrians (including school children) from crossing Military Road at locations other than at traffic lights ii) obstructed sight lines for bus drivers iii) the ability of pedestrians (especially school children) to safety access and use the footpath at peak times when commuters are waiting for buses to arrive (erg: will pedestrians be forced to walk on the road to by-pass commuters waiting for a bus?) iv) lack of safe and weather-proof cover for commuters waiting for buses to arrive v) insufficient pedestrian crossing time on Military Road.

3. THAT the report to Council also note alternative transport options to the B-Line such as a train line from Dee Why to Chatswood via Freshes Forest to meet the new metro line and electric trams (refer article below).


4. THAT Council write once again to the Premier, the Minister for Transport and our Local Member asking them to halt and review works on the B-line until such time that a holistic traffic and transport plan for the Northern Beaches and the North Shore is developed and proper community consultation and engagement is undertaken. That the letter express Council’s view that in the context of the Western Harbour/Northern Beaches link tunnel the B-Line in its current form is now redundant.

5. THAT Council write to the RMS and the Minister for Transport noting the inconsistency and conflict in their dual role as proponents of the B-line (designed to increase capacity of Military Road) and the Western Harbour/Northern Beaches link tunnel (designed to decrease capacity of Military Road) and request that they urgently undertake an independent safety audit of the proposed B-line and such audit be carried out by an independent suitably qualified Traffic Safety Engineer, i.e., not the RMS.