



NORTHBRIDGE SAFETY BARRIER PRESENTATION

Date:	18 JUNE 2009	
Time and location:	10:30AM, Willoughby Council – Admin Building – 31 Victor St	
Presenters:	Bruce Pettman, Principal Heritage Architect, NSW Dept. of Commerce	
	Khalid Javed, Bridge Maintenance Manager, RTA	
	Paula Wilson, RTA Infrastructure Communications	
Participants	Smuttu Sivarasa - RTA Bridge Planner	Katrina Stankowski NSW Heritage Council
	Ian Berger - RTA Environmental Heritage Officer	Rajeev Maini NSW Heritage Council
	Michael Sheridan - RTA Urban Designer	Simon Wiltshier Engineering Australia Heritage Committee
	Fiona Frost - North Sydney Council Traffic Planning Officer	Michael Dudley Chairperson Suicide Prevention Australia (SPA)
	Linda McClure Willoughby Council Strategic Planning Manager	Ryan McGlaughlin Executive Officer SPA
	Lynette Morris Willoughby Council Heritage Planner	Anthony Smith SPA
	John Hooper Willoughby Council Councillor	Kevin Fitzpatrick President Naremburn Progress Association
	Glen Meaks North Shore Local Area Command NSW Police	Gillian Tomlinson - Bridgeview Precinct, North Sydney
	Grant Sheldon Northbridge Progress Association	
	Peter O'Carroll - Bay Precinct, North Sydney & Tunks Park Community Group	
	Nanette O'Carroll - Bay Precinct, North Sydney & Tunks Park Community Group	
Minutes:	Martin Gormley, RTA Project Engineer	

No.	Item	Comments	Action
1.0	Introduction	RTA (Paula & Khalid) welcomed the participants and gave an overview of the project including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of this consultation • Summarised the RTA process to date since commencement of the project • Updated on current status 	Note
2.0	Presentation	GAO (Bruce) described the various stages of the project including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial options study • Development of assessment criteria • Final Options analysis and • The Preferred option 	Note

No.	Item	Comments	Action
3.0	Suicide Prevention Australia	<p>Suicide Prevention Australia's Dr Michael Dudley, Anthony Smith and Ryan McGlaughlin were invited to present to the meeting, and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to June 2009 issue of Aust & NZ Journal of Psychiatry • When fences removed on Grafton Br in Auckland suicides increased five fold • Since barriers reinstalled in 2003 there have been no deaths • Mooney Mooney Br had 3 to 4 deaths per year prior to installation of safety barriers, none since • SPA endorse the use of fences as a deterrent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suicide is often a highly impulsive act frequently involving adolescences fuelled by alcohol or drugs. • Barriers impede jumping and allow more time for intervention and reconsideration. • Generally no corresponding local increases of other forms of suicides when fences erected – less Police call outs • Would prefer gap between pickets to be reduced – however this may make it possible to wedge foot and climb • Preference to use term “completed” suicides rather than successful or committed suicides 	Note
4.0	Presentation	Following the presentation of the options for the safety barrier - a general discussion was held as follows:	Note
4.1	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was general support for a barrier • However the vertical nature of the picket fence (Option 1, the RTA's preferred option) and its height were not well received by some parties. • Height of fence considered critical. Request to consider lowering the height of fence and/or set back at an angle • Experience of bridge viewed as more important from the road and footway rather than distant views 	Note
4.2	Option 3 Suspension Option	<p>NSW Heritage Council stated their preference for Option 3 – Suspension Option. Also queried why this option only scored 2No ticks in the heritage assessment – Reason as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Netting acts as a veil in front of external bridge detailing • Visual clutter caused by tensioning cables • Suspension technology interferes with the structural integrity of the 1930s arch. • The suspension and arch technologies are never combined on the same span. • The suspension system will add an additional design layer 	RTA to follow up with Heritage Council
4.3	Option 5 Bridge Widen (Initial Option Analysis)	<p>Some attendees requested that this option be investigated further as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall height of safety barrier would be reduced for this option • Would move fence further away from traffic lanes and improve view for motorists and pedestrians on the bridge • Provide safer path for pedestrians and allow cyclist to use existing footpath • Options 1, 2 & 3 considered ugly <p>Response to Option 5 – RTA originally discarded this option for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low demand for cyclists due in part to steep curving approaches and alternative route available via Flat Rock Gully Res. Local councils have not provided cycleways to the bridge as current width of footpath and carriageway not considered suitable. • Relatively low number of pedestrians use the bridge • This option would require major structural additions to the bridge and most likely include additional strengthening works. 	Further assessment required

No.	Item	Comments	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This radical option would significantly impact the heritage fabric of the structure • This option would need to be 2m wide not 1.2m as shown on sketch to comply with latest design guidelines • NSW Heritage Council considered this option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the least reversible as sections of parapet would need to be removed and major structural components added to support widening • Also adding width would tend to alter the slender appearance of the bridge 	
4.40	Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vertical nature of the picket fence and its height were not well received by some parties • Request to consider lowering the height of this fence and/or set back at an angle 	Further assessment required
4.41	Option 1 - Paint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for feedback on and colour and durability of paint and consider more durable options 	RTA to provide details on paint system
4.42	Option 1 - Mockup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that a “mock up” or sample panel to be provided on site 	Further assessment required
4.5	Option 1 / 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that consideration be given to Option 1 placed on external face of balustrade similar location to Option 2 – less obtrusive than Option 1. 	Further assessment required
4.6	Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request consideration of Help Line signage and/or telephones at towers 	Further assessment required
	Thanks	Thanks again for all the participants who gave up their time to attend and to Willoughby Council for the use of their facilities	

The meeting closed at 1.30pm