



Community Engagement Report

Scotland Island Traffic Management Plan

Background

Scotland Island is located on Pittwater, north of Taylors Point on the mainland and Elvina and Lovett Bays on the eastern foreshores of Kur-ring-gai Chase National Park.

The Island, mainly consisting of bushland, is also home to nearly 1000 residents with approximately 350 dwellings primarily located around the perimeter foreshore.

There are a small number of registered vehicles (approximately 30) comprising of private cars and service vehicles. There are also golf cart buggies which are used as transport on the Island.

A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for Scotland Island is proposed to both enhance the safety of pedestrians using the roads and to prevent damage to the roads.

The TMP seeks approval to apply a universal 10km/h speed limit on all public roads on Scotland Island and control access to all vehicles over 4.5 tonne GVM unless authorised by Northern Beaches Council.

Under the proposed TMP registration will be required for all vehicles used on the Island's roads including golf buggies under the conditional registration system. Compulsory Third Party Insurance will also be required. All drivers/operators will also need to hold a State issued driver's license.

Golf Buggies and other vehicles, that would not be deemed standard on the mainland, will continue to be allowed on Scotland Island to assist with the mobility needs of the community.

Community Engagement objective and approach

The [Draft Traffic Management Plan](#) was open for public comment between 9 December and 17 February 2019

The engagement objective was to understand the views of the Scotland Island community on the final Traffic Management Plan and to cater for the needs of the community where possible.

Notifications were posted via Australia Post to all registered property owners (owner-occupiers and non-residents) informing them of the engagement process and steps to make comment.

A project page was also published on Council's Your Say page (yoursaynorthernbeaches.nsw.gov.au) outlining background and access to the draft Traffic Management Plan and Frequently Asked Questions.

The project page provided the community with opportunities to comment via an online submissions form.

A community meeting was held at the Rural Fire Services shed Sunday 9 December 2018, 10-11.40am to allow for all community members to speak to council staff in relation to the project.

Key Findings

There were 17 written community submissions received during the engagement period. The comments from the community meeting were also included in the figures below.

The 10km/h speed limit on all public roads on Scotland Island

- 70% in favour – with additional works required on the roads being a requirement of implementation.

Control access to all vehicles over 4.5 tonne GVM unless authorised by Northern Beaches Council

- 65% in favour – with the main issue being the additional cost that could deter services being provided or the cots being passed onto the community.

Registration will be required for all vehicles used on the island's roads including golf buggies under the conditional registration system

- 65% in support

The main concerns included the:

- cost of the permits for vehicles to operate on the island
- imposition of the additional regulation on vehicles on the island
- existing condition of the road and drainage network
- impact on the existing buggies on the island including the cost of compliance with the new rules
- management of liability issues (noted as a concern to some community members in the event of an accident occurring).

Feedback received at the community meeting was generally supportive of the need to have some form of regulation to cover non-standard vehicle types used on the island and the written submissions do not reinforce this as they focus on other issues.

The ongoing condition of the island's road network was also reoccurring theme. Council is planning a separate project to address this and while it has an impact on the overall implementation of this plan, delaying the implementation for this reason is not recommended.

All verbatim comments received are detailed in Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1 – Verbatim comments

Comments
<p>I refer to your letter to Scotland Island residents of 3 December 2018 Ref: 2018/761854. I would like to write in support of the Traffic Management Plan (the Plan) which I think is in the interest of residents. I wish to bring to your attention one concern. I am a home owner on Scotland Island and have a golf cart for transport for which we intend to seek conditional registration in line with the Plan. I am a non-resident of Australia and we come to our house about 3 times for a total of 4 months per year. Our children who live in Sydney come on weekends throughout the year. My concern is that the Plan stipulates that permit holders should hold a NSW driver's licence whereas I hold a Philippines drivers licence which I use and is valid for driving in Australia. So I hoped that the stipulation could be changed from a NSW driver's licence to a valid driver's licence.</p>
<p>I am a home owner of 10 years and full time resident on the Island. I have an RMS registered 4WD Toyota Hilux utility on the island which I use for heavy equipment and material transport for maintenance my home property. I often share (for free) my vehicle with my neighbours to assist them when asked. For many non waterfront properties, servicing the house and property becomes too expensive and difficult without an appropriate and accessible transport vehicle. Any restriction on my ability to use my vehicle on the island is non negotiable for me and my family. If council attempts to deny me the use of my RMS compliant and registered vehicle on Scotland Island I would be forced to take the matter to court. I am not convinced that a permit system for all vehicle types as proposed resolves the fundamental issues regarding road use on Scotland Island and seems redundant. In the council proposal I do not see any explanation or reasoning a permit system resolves any issue at all. What is the function of a permit for all vehicles? What issue does it address or solve? I am mindful of the key issues around vehicle use on these difficult roads shared by pedestrians and I never exceed 10km/hr. I support a 10km/hr speed limit and priority for pedestrians. My understanding is that the problem centres around the insurance, registration and regulation and safety of 'buggys', electric/golf/4wd types. I think Council should focus on this issue rather than broadening a permit system out for registered vehicles already compliant under RMS / compulsory legislation. I use my vehicle for the sole purpose of moving materials / goods/ equipment to and from my home. I expect to transition to a more ecological and cost effective golf buggy vehicle type in two years time. My 4wd is large so I am mindful of not leaving or parking my vehicle in places for long periods that would be cause for inconvenience of other Islanders access to Wharfs in particular. Scotland Island is a small community and residents that act in a purely selfish mode and are not community minded tend not live here for very long. The 'system' as such is largely self regulating. I do not see how a permit system for all vehicles will improve access to parking and access to wharfs. Residents that are not waterfront are typically the owners of the vehicles under question. They are the residents that need them the most. I believe electric 'buggies' are an excellent solution for the roads here and should be encouraged and embraced as a sensible and ecologically positive mode of transport. They are very well suited to the island, hence their popularity. I would hope that Council does not act in a negative and discouraging way which obliges residents to adopt the use of larger vehicles This would lead to extra noise pollution and unsustainable congestion. I believe council should not act in a way that creates a bias and favours large vehicle adoption over small buggies. This would be a terrible mistake. I believe that the safety concerns raised are overstated as the average speed of these vehicles on the island is normally low. A 10km/hr limit would enhance this point. I advise count proceeds with caution as ill considered regulation could impact very negatively on residents access to their homes.</p>
<p>- The introduction of a policy for buggies should not impact the full registered road users. Introduction of a permit (yet another permit : boat permit, whatf permit, car parking permit,\$\$\$\$\$\$\$) penalises normal vehicles. - the introduction of a new process duplicates an existing process for regular road users . Those users often need to bring their vehicle to the mainland for registration and servicing . What is the benefit and purpose of the extra fee for those users? -the introduction of local speed limit is supported - the management plan needs to address the need of bigger vehicles, not just buggies, this include parking near wharves and along roads. Apart near Tennis, I am not aware of tension between vehicle users around the island. - It is Council responsibility to make the roads roadworthy - Scotland Island is not a place for over organised urbanism and items such as drawn parking spots on the ground would be largely seen as patronising and not accepted. - There has been a few instance recently of teenagers taking off with people's buggies and going to joy rides. The strategy may help making these people accountable. - Remains the issue of who will police the requirements.</p>

I understand the need for some control of vehicles on the island, but what are the restrictions to buggies and what sort of fee are going to be imposed on those that already have them is my issue. We already by thousands of dollars between boat parking stickers for the mainland, boat parking stickers on the island, carpark stickers and etc. What else are we going to have to pay to have a buggy now, and what sort of buggy will be allowed to register? Any golf buggy?

Two weeks after attending this meeting I attempted to get Conditional Registration after getting my Golf Buggy to the standard required by RMS. I attended the RMS office at Warriewood, taking with me the application, supporting evidence of the need for Conditional Registration, and the relevant download from the RMS site. USELESS! The woman I was directed to immediately told me it was "illegal". I asked her to check with the RMS website and she repeated it was illegal. On telling her other vehicles have qualified I was told they were illegal! I told her of the meeting and it was like speaking to a brick wall. All I got was "It's illegal!" The basis for this statement was not NSW legislation but a Scotland Island Community website which states, inter alia, "other modes of transport, such as golf buggies and quad bikes, are also used on the island. These vehicles are unable to be registered under current RMS regulations and their use is deemed illegal." As this seems to be at cross purposes to the spirit of the meeting I spoke with the SIRA President and handed him the print-out containing this statement (highlighted by the RMS employee), and pointed out that the statement was incorrect and asked it be amended or removed. As no action was taken I later raised this issue some SIRA Committee Members and even now this information appears on the website. While it does the RMS office will continue to use it as an excuse not to register complying vehicles. As it discriminates against those Scotland Island residents who are mobility impaired it appears to be in breach of a number of anti-discrimination laws, as Conditional Vehicle registration is available in all other areas of the State. The use of "mobility scooters" as an alternative means of transport for disabled persons is not feasible due to the state of the roads, including the mounds constructed on them to channel water and I am aware of a number of instances where people have fallen from their scooters. I have several comments to offer. 1) The Abstract fails to recognise that all wharves on SI, other than Tennis, which the ferry services have steep access/egress routes. Looking at a map one would be led to believe that both Vivian Street (a main access route) terminating at Bell Wharf and Lowanna Street, terminating at Eastern Wharf for example are what they purport to be: streets. In reality they consist of stairs both in excess of 100 steps. Elsie Street, linking Florence Terrace to Thompson Street is another steep stairway, with the steps only extending to halfway up the street. 2) It is debatable whether the larger population reside along the foreshore of the island, but further back in what is locally known as "the hinterland". There are a number of residences on the waterside perimeter which are built on extensive blocks of land, while those on the inland side of the lower ring road system, tend to be closer in size to the average suburban block, where the population is less likely to consist of week-end and holiday residents. There is also a considerable number of residents living on the top of the island. The map shows access can be gained via Fitzgerald Avenue, but in reality one would be hard pressed to find that access on the island itself. There are a number of bush tracks linking the top of the island with the southern ring road and only one partially sealed road which links to the northern lower ring road. 3) Recently Ausgrid and a tree removalist contractor engaged by that corporation were working on the island. While Ausgrid operated on one side of Cargo Wharf which, as the name implies is where cargo, including building supplies, are landed, and the contractor worked the other. The two trucks effectively blocked all access to and from Cargo Wharf due to the narrowness of the existing roads. Builders, for example, couldn't access materials needed for their work, but still had staff to pay, and the cost ultimately being shouldered by the clients. Admittedly, there are cases where this is due to encroachment by a few residents and some due to topographical factors most of the designated roads/streets have become exceedingly narrow to the extent that passing in most areas is impossible. A safety point recognised is that as a result of this perceived encroachment pedestrians are denied any area which could be construed as a footpath.

The overriding factor I believe is the inactivity of the various local governments who have administered the island over the decades. The question is now whether this situation is beyond repair. In the assumption it is I suggest altering the street/road/avenue/terrace designations to lanes where appropriate and either steps or stairs where appropriate. This would also be more in harmony with the semi-rural aspect of the island. One doesn't need a guide to have a number of these encroachments pointed out as they are blatantly obvious. 4) The community vehicle is not always available, e.g. being taken off-island for warranty requirements and other repairs. On other occasions there can be a problem with booking. For example, my wife and I were travelling overseas on holiday and booked the community vehicle to help transfer our luggage to the wharf, and meet with a shuttle. With minutes to go we were informed that the vehicle had been taken for the purpose of driving Council workers, leaving us to struggle with our bags to the nearest wharf. On another occasion after it was booked it never showed up. 5)

The information concerning the closing of all roads to vehicles (mentioned in the Draft Management) as proposed by SIRA is not feasible. Firstly, it fails to recognise the transport needs of those residing at the top of the island. Secondly, it fails to take into account factors such as prevailing weather conditions and the competition in inclement weather this causes when the ferry arrives. I was surprised to read this as neither my wife nor I, who have been residents of the island for more than 30 years, or those I've discussed the proposal with since reading it, were not consulted in relation to it. 6) Finally, the steep slope on Thompson Street, between Elsie Street and Richard Road via Harold Avenue, needs to be concreted and corrugated, similar to the access to Cargo Wharf. Currently it consists of a tarmac sealed surface which, when covered with leaf litter, as is often the case, becomes very slippery, not only for vehicles but pedestrians as well. Regardless of the ultimate outcome of this procedure, it's imperative that this stretch of roadway be made safer than it currently is.

Hello, Presently we are not in support of this TMP as there is not enough information on how general and large vehicle access permits will be allocated and implemented. We would like to know more about how the council determines eligibility for a "general purpose" vehicle permit? Eg distance from wharf, disability, small children, need to carry shopping etc? Are there any circumstances where applications for a vehicle permit on the island would not be accepted? Or does everyone who applies for this permit receive one? Are permit numbers restricted? Will there be a cost for a vehicle permit on the island? We are not in support of the application if there is a cost associated with this permit, as it would be an unreasonable disadvantage to people living on the island who need to use vehicles that they would have to pay to use their own vehicle, especially after paying for mainland parking, boat tie up etc. We would also like to state that the argument that vehicles are damaging the roads should be removed as a justification for the TMP, as this effectively puts the blame for poor road maintenance of the island's public roads onto the residents of the island, where in actual fact all roads exist to service the residents, including their access via walking or via vehicles equally. There should not be any guilt associated with the use of vehicles on an island as steep or as large as Scotland Island, particularly for residents living at the non-waterfront properties. The justification is also misleading as the use of vehicles on the roads is not the only, and not necessarily the primary reason for degradation of the roads. A significant amount of damage to roads is caused by storm-water run-off, poorly built roads, unsealed roads, road erosion and the fact that there is little to no maintenance of these roads in comparison with roads on the mainland. We feel that the argument put forward in the TMP regarding vehicle use being the cause for the state of the roads is biased, inaccurate and ignores other factors and tries to confuse the issue, blaming the state of the roads on vehicle use. This is angling towards an island without vehicles, which is not viable for residents who rely on vehicles to transport elderly, children, food, furniture and supplies. The community vehicle is not available 24/7 and not able to cater to last - minute needs for access and transport. Therefore it is not possible to use this service as a substitute for having private vehicles on the island. Information regarding designated parking areas is also too vague to support at this stage - are there enough for every application, how close would they be to residents dwellings and again what is the criteria for approving a park? "All new developments would also be required to provide on-site parking where authorised vehicles are garaged." - is this "on site parking" imperative if the resident does not intend to have a vehicle on the island? Regarding access for larger construction vehicles, would there be a fee involved for these temporary permits? We are in support of the 10/km/h speed limits, priority to pedestrians and cyclists, registration of vehicles (and buggies) and the plan to upgrade the roads, however, overall, we are not in support of the TMP due to the restricted use / permits (our support of this could change depending on how restrictive the permits are, and whether or not fees would be involved). Thanks for your time.

I have had a look at the Scotland Island TMP and essentially, I disagree with the permits for legal vehicles and with the current plan for parking bays – it appears that you want to mark out parking bays on roads that don't exist and which are not policed, and you want to issue permits for vehicles that are already legal on the roads. But I agree that the legality of buggies does need to be sorted out. My comments and questions follow.

Re: Introduction I disagree with the statement that '[houses] are mainly located around the perimeter foreshore'. There is a considerable population that does not have direct water access – that's why we have vehicles on the island. If most people had direct water access, there would be far few vehicles. The intro mentions 'serious concerns' that were raised, but does not state what those concerns were/are. I have not seen any dangerous driving on the island, except for very particular people, or by visitors who have stolen a local vehicle, and this TMP will stop neither of those groups.

Re: Permits for vehicles (1) I can't help but feel that this business of a 'permit' for vehicles that are already legal is from a very mainland perspective. Imagine a suburb on the mainland that has such very poor roads compared to all the suburbs around it (imagine!), and Council wants to restrict traffic driving there because it will damage the roads – then, yes, issue permits, that will stop casual users going on those roads. But people don't lightly bring a vehicle over to the island – you have to put it on a barge, book it weeks in advance, wait for high tide etc. Asking people to get a permit from the Council to bring a vehicle over will be an annoying extra, but it won't significantly alter the number and type of vehicles on the island.

(2) What is the purpose of registering all vehicles with Council? You state that it will 'restrict the type and number of vehicles using the public road' – exactly how? If it is for the purpose of refusing vehicles over a certain size then state that size; why even implement a permit for all the others? If it is for the purpose of limiting the number of vehicles on the island then state what the maximum number is. How will you decide that maximum? Will it be one per house?

(3) How are you going to decide who gets a permit and who doesn't? What if you have already issued all the permits and someone disabled moves on to the island? Will you continue to let able-bodied people drive their cars, but refuse one to a disabled person?

(4) On p7/7, you state 'Pedestrian access and safety will be improved due to the restriction of vehicles on public roads to only authorised vehicles.' Could you please explain exactly how you believe this will work? As far as I can tell, you are simply going to issue a piece of paper to all the vehicles already on the island, and that is then going to make it safer for us. Please explain how you come to that conclusion.

(5) The permit is supposed to include the relevant conditions relating to use of Scotland Island roads – the new speed limit, pedestrian priority and areas the vehicle can drive. It sounds as though you are issuing a permit purely to tell people about the rules on the road. How does council normally communicate these rules to people? You don't have to issue permits to everyone who drives in the Northern Beaches area to do that, right?

I don't agree that Scotland Island has to have permits for that reason. It is admin for the sake of admin.

(6) The TMP states 'Permits for long term use of vehicles for personal use i.e. general access (including access for the disabled), shopping etc. would be determined by Council'. What criteria will the Council use to determine permission for a vehicle?

(7) You even say 'The formal restriction of access under the Roads Act will have minimal impact on existing and future residents as there is limited use of registered vehicles on Scotland Island.' So you are implementing a measure that you already know will have limited impact?

(8) You comment, '... will affect a relatively small number of residents who currently use registered vehicles to access properties at the top of the Island ...' Quite apart from the feeling that you are aiming this at me when I haven't done anything to deserve it – it really isn't just people at the top of the island who have a vehicle – you realise that the 'road' to the top of the island isn't included, right?

(9) If a TMP is implemented, how is it to be policed? Any current problems are problems only because there is no policing on the island. If there are unregistered vehicles on the island, which are currently illegal, why have none of them been booked? Buggies have been on the island for years and years, no one has ever been booked. People might park in the way or in turning bays, but no one has ever been booked. There have been no accidents either, as far as I know. So exactly what difference is this TMP going to make in practise?

(10) Why are there two types of permit – one for vehicles just used on Scotland Island and one for a vehicle 'providing service'. What does the second one cover?

(11) I agree with the resident who raised the concern that tradespeople will pass on the additional costs of having a vehicle to customers – and possibly more – which would make engaging a tradie on the island even more expensive than it already is. The residents are already hostage to a very small number of people who work on the island, this would definitely make that situation worse.

Re: On-site Parking for New Developments (1) There is a throwaway comment regarding new developments: 'All new developments would also be required to provide on-site parking where authorised vehicles are garaged.' How would this on-site parking link up to the roads where the road has not been built? E.g. Thompson St outside my house. I actually link to the 'fire trail' (which isn't a fire trail). If there were a new development on the non-existent Thompson St, would you approve on-site parking that links to the 'fire trail'?

And what about plots of land that have no access to a road at all? There are at least two three I can think of just off hand. Will they have to have on-site parking even though they have no road access...?Re: Parking BaysIt is disingenuous in the extreme to create parking bays because of the width of a road that doesn't actually exist yet! First build the roads – and then do the parking bays. There are already rules about where cars or buggies can park, which are consistently being broken, so why are they not being ticketed? I can tell you the answer to that – because no one polices the island. Residents handle that themselves, by asking the people involved to park better. Marking bays is just going to be annoying with little benefit. And people will not be happy about money being spent to police parking without money being spent to make the roads drivable.Re: Conditional Registration for BuggiesThis is the only thing in the plan that makes any sense. It is also the only thing that is a legal requirement which Council have to fix.Re: 10km/h speed limitWhile this looks like a good idea on the face of it, I'm not sure whether it will make any difference. Very few vehicles go faster than this anyway, as the roads are too bad. And if they do, who's going to know...? Are you going to introduce speed cameras? My personal view is that the only way anyone ever knows about traffic speeding is if one of the residents complains about it. And I'm pretty sure I know exactly who it would be...

I am opposed to the proposed DRAFT TMP for Scotland Island. Whilst I agree that vehicles should comply with RMS registration, I do not believe that paying for annual permits (or bonds for visiting vehicles) will increase community safety. This will just add yet another fee to living offshore and further increase the difficulty and expense in having tradesmen attend the island. I live full time on Scotland Island and regularly walk around it. NEVER have I felt endangered by a vehicle on the roads. I have felt danger from the low hanging power lines, overhanging branches and poorly surfaced roads. I do not believe that the small amount of vehicle use on the Scotland Island roads are causing undue damage, rather this is council's lack of upkeep. Having residents pay for a vehicle permit will not change this. I do not believe that the DRAFT TMP meets its desired outcomes for increasing community safety and decreasing damage to our roads.

Further to my email forwarded to Council on the 10 December 2018 1. As confirmed by Council at the residents meeting on 9 December, I would like the opportunity to address the Council's, Traffic Management Committee when it next meets to discuss the Scotland Island Traffic Management Plan 2. As a part of the review that consideration be given to increasing the weight limitation currently proposed (1.5tonne GVM) on privately owned registered vehicles so as not to exclude those vehicles. Despite having a fully registered and comprehensively insured vehicle for the past 26 years, under the current TM Plan my vehicle would be non compliant. This is as a result of Council and Police inaction in addressing the prolific increase in unregistered vehicles onto the Island. 3. As a component of the review, consideration and determinations as to the status of the "Access Road" to the top of the Island through Elizabeth Park. 4. Council to significantly increase funding to the Island in support of the "Road and Drainage Strategic Plan". 5. Council to provide "Hardship funding" for those financially disadvantaged by having to conditionally register their Buggies, but no assistance for anyone who has complied with the Law by maintaining a fully registered vehicle is ridiculous and discriminatory 6. Tradesman permits will further reduce the willingness of tradesperson to work on the Island and increase the cost to residents even further

Please add better plumbing to the roads- there is huge runoff.. very much in favor of: - heavy vehicles will require a permit - or pay a bond - roads will become a shared zone - 10km per hour limit - pedestrians will have right of way

I agree that there needs to be a traffic management plan restricting use of all NON - Electric vehicles on the island. I believe that the use of electric vehicles should be exempt. I am a pensioner and use my electric golf cart to aid me with my shopping - I live on the eastern side of the island and there are 200 steep steps from Eastern Wharf to my residence. My golf cart is essential to commute between my residence and either Cargo wharf or Tennis wharf when I have shopping or other items weighing more than 15 kgs. My hobby is wood work and I am unable to use the community vehicle to transport sheets of plywood to my workshop. I use my golf cart as there is no other option apart from a private contractor who charges \$200 per delivery!!! Which is not economic. If permits are to be introduced I believe that there should be a Seniors Discount for those of us who need our electronic means of transport. Council also needs to facilitate the registration process given the isolation of the island and the fact that it would be impossible to bring golf buggies to the mainland for inspection.

As a resident of the island who operates a golf buggy, and has a young family who would find life without it extremely testing, we would welcome any proposal allowing continued use of such vehicles. However, The traffic management plan proposed, seems to dictate there will be many new restrictions for private vehicle owners, and many new costs associated with them, without much comment given as to the actual costs involved for residents, nor the benefits we might see for fees, permits, registrations paid. Nor does it offer a detailed assessment outlining how, if at all, we might see improvements to the roads and adjacent infrastructure such as storm water drains, gutters, kerbs, culverts etc. Also, what sort of improvements we are likely to see in regard to the "designated parking areas". Currently the roads around the island, as well as any areas people use for parking, are in varying states of disrepair, to the point where some are actually inaccessible when wet, or after storms. I should point out that the concerns of residents from SIRA in their representation to Council outlined in the Draft plan thus: "A proposal to close all roads on Scotland Island originated from representations to Council from the Scotland Island Resident Association (SIRA) in response to resident concerns regarding issues relating to the use of private vehicles on these roads, i.e. damage to roadway due to vehicle usage, pedestrian safety, and impact on residential amenity." I would like to see evidence of exactly what types of vehicles are doing the damage. I would argue that it is the vehicles employed commercially, or contracted to council (for example the trucks with GVM's greater than 4.5 ton who do the weekly recycling run - a service supplied by Northern Beaches Council), or the various utes with vehicle weights of over a ton - which incidentally includes the Community vehicle leased from Northern Beaches Council to SIRA - that do ALL the damage to the roads. There is no evidence at all to support that golf buggies, or the motorised scooters used by many, are causing ANY damage to the roads. These types of vehicles are actually employed at Golf clubs all over the world for the very reason that they cause no damage whatsoever to the very fragile surfaces they drive over. If council or SIRA would be amenable to providing evidence to the contrary, including providing some evidence as to the suitability of the existing roads providing access to vehicles over 4.5t GVM, with justification as to why these are not in better condition just to accommodate the EXISTING registered vehicle use, this might go along way to helping buggy owners understand why they should pay registrations and other fees, whilst expected to drive on roads that are like ungraded private farm access roads. Secondary to the roads, there are many areas that could be used for parking that are instead filled 365 days of the year with Junk and or skip bins (put there not just from residents, but also from council approved operators by the way). The enforcement and subsequent removal of these may help to alleviate the concerns about buggy/private vehicle parking space. Finally, Storm water systems also vary in quality causing washout of road surfaces in every storm event. Some other concerns about the nature and validity of the draft proposal follow: In regard to the services offered by various operators on the island such as:

The ferry service The private barge services The community vehicle; These are simply not practical in all situations, sufficiently so, as to allow many residents to live there without a private vehicle. The timing of the services offered is not always practical, as outlined in two examples.

A tradesman who begins work on sites all over Sydney expected to be on site at 7am, cannot rely on a ferry service that begins at 6:20am each day, nor a community vehicle to carry his tools etc at a similar hour, and expect to be on time for work. He needs a private vehicle (and for most a golf buggy or similar is sufficient) on the island, that can reasonably access a private boat. He also needs the facility to park that buggy somewhere near the applicable wharf. A second example - A man or woman who works in the city may not arrive home in time for the last ferry offered at 7:25pm. (I know many people who work in the CBD and live only in Cromer or Collaroy who could still not get back in time for this service - and there are an increasing amount of professionals living on the island) He may also have children at school or in day care, or with relatives or baby sitters. It is not reasonable that this person be expected to walk home (A walk in the dark from April to October) - and many people have a walk of over a kilometre to certain ferry wharves offered. Also, two small children cannot be expected to do this without the assistance of a private vehicle. There are many other examples of personal situations where moving around by private means ie private boat and private vehicle are essential. So to hinder or restrict the use of, or parking of, private vehicles seems to punish a large proportion of working families who rely on their vehicles just to live a reasonably normal life. We realise that we have made a choice to live in an area that is water access only, but the community and its individuals find various ways of making this choice a realistic and practical one for a family growing up in Sydney's Northern Beaches. We already live with a myriad of extra fees and charges that rate payers on the mainland do not endure... including but in no way limited to: exorbitant church point car parking fees, church point boat mooring fees, cargo wharf boat mooring fees. We need to know that Council considers in its regulation and enforcement of necessary rules, the daily lives of the community affected, and that it offers genuine benefit back to its rate payers and wider island community. I would like to see a more detailed proposal outlining the all the exact costs that would be imposed on residents wishing to register vehicles of all types, including insurance requirements. As well as that, outlining the cost of permits for truck hire (ie removal trucks, delivery trucks). Also, a far more detailed assessment outlining how, if at all, we might see improvements to the roads and adjacent infrastructure as well as "designated parking areas". In every other suburb in the Northern Beaches Council LGA, residents can expect to see not just their council rates, but their vehicle registration and insurance costs at work not only to improve roads but at a minimum to have a presence there to repair damaged existing roads, or indeed ensure that the existing roads are designed and constructed to accommodate the types of vehicles that can access them. As residents, and this is mere opinion but popular opinion among all private vehicle operators that I know, This TMP is being drawn up to appease another group in the community, who for their own reasons can afford to live a lifestyle that allows them to operate without a private vehicle, and resent the use of private vehicles on the island. I don't think this group fully understands how damage is created and by which groups of vehicles. I also note that If we are expected to adopt this proposal, Council needs to complete this TMP to explain not only what restrictions will be imposed on the island, and how they will be enforced, but also where, how, and when we can expect improvements to be implemented on the roads and other areas accessible by vehicle. Without that, frankly it feels like we are dragging the island into the 21st century by way of introducing regulations and higher costs of living, while physically leaving it somewhere back in the 1930's. Most of us private vehicle owners would agree with me I feel, when I say either leave it alone, or complete a more thorough assessment and show us not just the TMP but the full community benefit.

I strongly disagree with the use of vehicles on the island as it fundamentally contradicts the unique beauty of living here. Walking is no longer the primary form of transport!! There are more buggies everyday and they are a nuisance to those of us that do walk and push wheelbarrows to move our goods. Buggy and other vehicle drivers tailgate us when we are walking forcing us to be dangerously followed or forced to stand aside. I personally have been hit on the elbow by a vehicle when I was carrying a large bag of shopping and there was not enough room for it to pass. The roads are not wide enough and an exclusion zone of 1m all round pedestrians and cyclists must be implemented - this already applies on the mainland. The Roads must be sealed - as pedestrians we are constantly breathing in the dust kicked up by buggies and vehicles - this must stop. We also have a problem with the dust from the road constantly covering our house inside and out. Until roads are sealed no traffic can be allowed. Safety - I have documented evidence of buggies being driven by children, mothers with babies on their lap (driving one handed) overloaded buggies, buggy driven by mentally disabled minor, children unrestrained (no carseats or seatbelts) children standing up in the front seat of vehicles and suspected DUI. There was also an incident of an overturned buggy with children involved. How will this be adequately policed it certainly is not at the moment. Other illegal vehicles - I have witnessed many instances of unregistered motor cycles (many would never be road legal) being ridden around the island without crash helmets being worn and ridden by teenagers too young to have a licence. Also a scooter pulling bicycle baby carriage!! collecting babies and children from the pre school. This must be adequately policed. House owners are creating crossovers over the nature strip to keep vehicles on their property without planning permission and in many cases causing erosion problems. Parking - parking in the park at Tennis wharf must be stopped as it impedes the pathway as well as making a mess of the amenity. Buggies drive on to the beach in order to turn - this is unacceptable!! New barriers must be installed immediately. There are similar problems with the areas around the other wharves, the foreshore access at Cargo wharf is frequently blocked with no access at all when the tide is high. Noise - we have gone from being a peaceful community to having constant traffic noise. If we are to have any buggies, golf carts, motorcycles or cars the cost of a permit must be prohibitive If every property has a vehicle the island will be unliveable. I would agree to vehicle use for aged or disabled residents only - everyone else has the ability to walk and this would be in line with council policy. My children grew up here walking everywhere and carrying their fair share of shopping - the current generation walk nowhere. I would suggest a 5k speed limit - this was the case in the past. In summary - Pedestrians must have priority and this needs to be made clear to all drivers. No one without a full driving licence should be allowed to drive any vehicle on the island, All mainland driving regulations and safety standards must be applied. The total number of vehicles must be limited. Vehicle must be kept entirely on the owners property and parked vehicles should in no way impede the use of or natural beauty of public land. Adequate enforcement must be actioned.

1. Have real estate agents explain on coming people have their Golf Buggies be Registered prior to landing. 2. 10 klm per hour or walking speed for buggies, slower coming off hills. 3. signs in all landings outlining laws by way of official police notices 4. publish all rules for buggies on SIRA news notices and in the local news paper 5. children and un licenced drivers not use them 6 all blocks clearly numbered and signage for streets be implemented

Dear Northern Beaches Council, My name is, i'm 22 years old, have spent my whole life on the island and after recently returning from finishing a degree in Architecture show great concern over the proliferation of vehicles and degradation of what used to be pedestrian orientated streets. I support the restriction of vehicles on the island to those who require them due to access related issues. My comments relating directly to the Traffic Management Plan: - The traffic management plan makes mention of the need to resolve parking for vehicles at public wharfs. The man. plan must address the issue of golf buggies parking in Catherine Park. The current area where residents park private vehicles (golf buggies) is land zoned as RE1 public recreation in the Pitt. LEP and i highly doubt this situation would exist at public parks on the mainland. Golf buggies along the foreshore not only has undermined significant stone walling but turned the pathway into a pitlane for a select few, which serves as an insult to residents walking home who are greeted by this sight in their public park. Private vehicles must be blocked from entering Catherine Park unless authorised by Council. - The man. plan states "All new developments would also be required to provide on-site parking where authorised vehicles are garaged". This strategy is worrying as many properties are of such slopping nature that a driveway would be catastrophic to already undermined road banks and fragile soils. In addition, the proposed arrangement of private vehicles authorised for certain residents means that once the garage/driveway is made clear on the site that property is then only tailored to a resident who requires a vehicle. - I would also like to comment on Councils aims of "enhancing the quality of the street environment". Such a statement should take note of the 'unique' quality of Scotland Island's street environment. Dirt trails amongst bushland was the street environment and councils ambition to turn the streets into shared zones with traffic calming devices, driveways and tarmac only promotes more traffic and degrades the experience of the pedestrian. 15 years ago you wouldn't have dreamed of driving a golf buggy on the island but road improvements have allowed for this. - Finally i'd like to comment on the daunting task council faces in restricting vehicles to certain residents. My family live 5 minutes by foot from the public wharf, as such my single mum and siblings accepted the fact that living on an island presents hardships related to transporting food and other necessities. Such is the nature of living offshore and there is an increasing entitlement among new residents that such difficulties are easily abated by the acquirement of a vehicle. This approach loses sight of the uniqueness of the place and ruins the experience for everyone else, many of whom have managed without for many years. It is my opinion that too many young families have buggies and 'i need it to drop the kids off at the kindy' is not a valid argument. Council should support the great initiative of the community vehicle, and use it as an argument to combat the woes of transporting shopping by hand.

Dear Sir/ Madam, As a resident and homeowner of 27 years on Scotland Island, along with coming to Scotland Island as a child / weekender, I am greatly concerned at the amount of golf buggies which are now everywhere. I have raised 3 children here, am a non waterfront resident and walk some distance to our home. This has always been a part of island life - keeps you healthy and well, maintains safe walkways/ roads and forges stronger community ties due to stopping and talking with people. It is a slower paced life and an inherent aspect of the charm and uniqueness of the place. I have been involved with grant projects and festivals that have enhanced our significant public open space, Catherine Park and am appalled at the beautiful entrance we created with the input of an internationally renowned landscape architect and local resident being ruined, disrespected and overrun with golf buggy parking. The turning circle they make - particularly in wet weather - has also torn up the grass and is affecting marine life on the small beach to the north of the jetty. People drive them at breakneck speed and children have been seen driving, barely controlling the vehicles. One older woman was almost hit by kids who couldn't stop - she had to jump in the bushes. I will be very concerned if these buggies result in large signs and the over policing of our roads - also counter to our way of life here. Owners need to consider: do I need to always drive or can I walk this time? How fast they drive and where they park. Courtesy and respect for the many many residents who have brought up small children and grown older here is needed rather than assuming this is a 'right'. Parking needs to be away from Catherine Park - in front of the Scot. Island. Fire Brigade - after dropping and picking up unless a disability sticker is displayed. Our community addressed the old car issue in this way and also secured the Community vehicle which is an excellent and sustainable solution to transport needs. More driving in a community who used to predominantly walk is a retrograde step. With Thanks for your time.

I strongly support the adoption of the Traffic Management Plan and would like to suggest a few extra points needing clarification.

1. Long history of resident concern and action It would be appropriate to acknowledge the extremely long process of community engagement on this issue, beginning in 1998. In 2000 the extensive "Island Roads, Paths & Drainage Survey" was designed, distributed and analysed by a resident sub-committee of the Scotland Island Residents Association. This survey showed overwhelming support (88% of the 144 surveys returned) for the Island's roads as being principally for pedestrian usage, with occasional vehicle use as the secondary priority. This position has been confirmed in subsequent surveys and it is long overdue for Council to turn this into effective management strategies.
2. Purpose of Traffic Management Plan On page 5, the draft states: The Traffic Management Plan for Scotland Island is proposed to both enhance the safety of pedestrians using the roads and to prevent damage to the roads themselves. I suggest that a further purpose is to maintain safe public access to wharves and to prevent damage to the foreshore, park and bushland reserves. At the two public wharves with road access, Tennis, and Cargo, there is considerable damage and compromised pedestrian safety from vehicles parking, driving and turning on the foreshore or adjacent park.
3. Parking, particularly at Tennis Wharf On page 5, the report says "Parking is to be restricted on roads to designated parking areas" but does not give details as to where these will be. There is no mention of the longstanding problem of buggies entering Catherine Park, using the pedestrian pathway as a road, and parking all along the foreshore. I have several times counted 14 in this location. I cannot put a date on it, but when the new playground was put in at Catherine Park, there was a community agreement passed at a sizeable meeting, that vehicles would not enter the park except for emergencies or community functions where it was genuinely necessary to take in equipment e.g. fairs, concerts. Resident working bees built the stone gardens at Tennis Wharf and planted native trees along the foreshore. For quite a lot of years this agreement was respected and the area around Tennis Wharf looked great – it is a really beautiful meeting place and recreational area with children playing, people chatting, swimming, sitting around, arriving and leaving. Once a couple of buggies started to park there, it grew to become "the new normal" and has become a source of considerable angst for those concerned about public safety and amenity, and preserving the foreshore's natural environment. I walk across the foreshore of Catherine Park each time I go from my home to my boat and have been amazed how some people drive buggies along the pathway towards me, sometimes at quite a speed, as if it is a road and I need to step aside. Occasionally, parents drive right across the park to take their children to kindergarten, despite the easy access down steps from the road above. In wet weather I have seen deep ruts created in park by motor bikes and vehicles driving across the grass. Either side of the path has been turned into compressed dirt with the grass killed and topsoil washed away. This area is growing larger. The root zone of the significant bloodwood beside Tennis Wharf has been damaged by the constant vehicle use, as have the stone work, path, plants and grass. This area is a public park, beach and wharf access so I do not understand how vehicles can be permitted to drive and park in it. Please clarify what is the plan for addressing this problem.
4. Bikes, trail bikes, motor bikes Occasionally someone brings a trail bike onto the island, are they classified as a vehicle? Are bikes, trail bikes and motor bikes also subject to the 10kph limit?
5. Wet weather impact There is no mention of the different impact of heavy vehicles in wet weather. When issuing permits for visiting vehicles, could this be considered? Often the visiting vehicles are extremely heavy as they are moving vans or trucks with equipment for utilities and roads maintenance or construction vehicles. Their weight causes enormously more damage to the dirt roads after significant rain. Perhaps a condition could be put that access was suspended if there had been more than X mm of rain in the previous three days?
6. Temporary permits It is suggested that visiting vehicles could either buy a temporary permit or pay a bond subject to there being no damage to the roads. Realistically, who is going to inspect the whole route used by a truck before and after a specific vehicle and be able to allocate responsibility legally?
7. Enforcement Likewise, unless there is regular enforcement of the new code, particularly parking requirements, it will not be reliably adhered to. What is the provision for enforcement?

As a resident of the island who operates a golf buggy, and has a young family who would find life without it extremely testing, we would welcome any proposal allowing continued use of such vehicles. However, The traffic management plan proposed, seems to dictate there will be many new restrictions for private vehicle owners, and many new costs associated with them, without much comment given as to the actual costs involved for residents, nor the benefits we might see for fees, permits, registrations paid. Nor does it offer a detailed assessment outlining how, if at all, we might see improvements to the roads and adjacent infrastructure such as storm water drains, gutters, kerbs, culverts etc. Also, what sort of improvements we are likely to see in regard to the "designated parking areas".

Currently the roads around the island, as well as any areas people use for parking, are in varying states of disrepair, to the point where some are actually inaccessible when wet, or after storms. I should point out that the concerns of residents from SIRA in their representation to Council outlined in the Draft plan thus: "A proposal to close all roads on Scotland Island originated from representations to Council from the Scotland Island Resident

Association (SIRA) in response to resident concerns regarding issues relating to the use of private vehicles on these roads, i.e. damage to roadway due to vehicle usage, pedestrian safety, and impact on residential amenity." I would like to see evidence of exactly what types of vehicles are doing the damage. I would argue that it is the vehicles employed commercially, or contracted to council (for example the trucks with GVM's greater than 4.5 ton who do the weekly recycling run - a service supplied by Northern Beaches Council), or the various utes with vehicle weights of over a ton - which incidentally includes the Community vehicle leased from Northern Beaches Council to SIRA - that do ALL the damage to the roads. There is no evidence at all to support that golf buggies, or the motorised scooters used by many, are causing ANY damage to the roads. These types of vehicles are actually employed at Golf clubs all over the world for the very reason that they cause no damage whatsoever to the very fragile surfaces they drive over. If council or SIRA would be amenable to providing evidence to the contrary, including providing some evidence as to the suitability of the existing roads providing access to vehicles over 4.5t GVM, with justification as to why these are not in better condition just to accommodate the EXISTING registered vehicle use, this might go along way to helping buggy owners understand why they should pay registrations and other fees, whilst expected to drive on roads that are like ungraded private farm access roads. Secondary to the roads, there are many areas that could be used for parking that are instead filled 365 days of the year with Junk and or skip bins (put there not just from residents, but also from council approved operators by the way). The enforcement and subsequent removal of these may help to alleviate the concerns about buggy/private vehicle parking space. Finally, Storm water systems also vary in quality causing washout of road surfaces in every storm event. Some other concerns about the nature and validity of the draft proposal follow: In regard to the services offered by various operators on the island such as: The ferry service The private barge services The community vehicle; These are simply not practical in all situations, sufficiently so, as to allow many residents to live there without a private vehicle. The timing of the services offered is not always practical, as outlined in two examples. A tradesman who begins work on sites all over Sydney expected to be on site at 7am, cannot rely on a ferry service that begins at 6:20am each day, nor a community vehicle to carry his tools etc at a similar hour, and expect to be on time for work. He needs a private vehicle (and for most a golf buggy or similar is sufficient) on the island, that can reasonably access a private boat. He also needs the facility to park that buggy somewhere near the applicable wharf. A second example - A man or woman who works in the city may not arrive home in time for the last ferry offered at 7:25pm. (I know many people who work in the CBD and live only in Cromer or Collaroy who could still not get back in time for this service - and there are an increasing amount of professionals living on the island) He may also have children at school or in day care, or with relatives or baby sitters. It is not reasonable that this person be expected to walk home (A walk in the dark from April to October) - and many people have a walk of over a kilometre to certain ferry wharves offered. Also, two small children cannot be expected to do this without the assistance of a private vehicle. There are many other examples of personal situations where moving around by private means -ie private boat and private vehicle are essential. So to hinder or restrict the use of, or parking of, private vehicles seems to punish a large proportion of working families who rely on their vehicles just to live a reasonably normal life. We realise that we have made a choice to live in an area that is water access only, but the community and it's individuals find various ways of making this choice a realistic and practical one for a family growing up in Sydney's Northern Beaches. We already live with a myriad of extra fees and charges that rate payers on the mainland do not endure... including but in no way limited to: exorbitant church point car parking fees, church point boat mooring fees, cargo wharf boat mooring fees. We need to know that Council considers in it's regulation and enforcement of necessary rules, the daily lives of the community affected, and that it offers genuine benefit back to its rate payers and wider island community. I would like to see a more detailed proposal outlining the all the exact costs that would be imposed on residents wishing to register vehicles of all types, including insurance requirements. As well as that, outlining the cost of permits for truck hire (ie removal trucks, delivery trucks). Also, a far more detailed assessment outlining how, if at all, we might see improvements to the roads and adjacent infrastructure as well as "designated parking areas". In every other suburb in the Northern Beaches Council LGA, residents can expect to see not just their council rates, but their vehicle registration and insurance costs at work not only to improve roads but at a minimum to have a presence there to repair damaged existing roads, or indeed ensure that the existing roads are designed and constructed to accommodate the types of vehicles that can access them. As residents, and this is mere opinion but popular opinion among all private vehicle operators that I know, This TMP is being drawn up to appease another group in the community, who for their own reasons can afford to live a lifestyle that allows them to operate without a private vehicle, and resent the use of private vehicles on the island. I don't think this group fully understands how damage is created and by which groups of vehicles. I also note that If we are expected to adopt this proposal, Council needs to complete this TMP to explain not only what restrictions will be imposed on the island, and how they will be enforced, but also where, how, and when we can expect improvements to be implemented on the roads and other areas accessible by vehicle.

Without that, frankly it feels like we are dragging the island into the 21st century by way of introducing regulations and higher costs of living, while physically leaving it somewhere back in the 1930's. Most of us private vehicle owners would agree with me I feel, when i say either leave it alone, or complete a more thorough assessment and show us not just the TMP but the full community benefit.