

Meeting Record

Project:	Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy	Reference:	1093.50
Location:	Coffs Harbour Ex-Services Club, Vernon Street, Coffs Harbour	Date:	4 July 2002

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

SOUTHERN CFG			
✓			David Doyle
	✓		Bob Bunting
✓			Trish Welsh
	✓		Murray Williams
	✓		Bruce Partridge
✓			Phil Doyle (proxy)
✓			Gillian French
		✓	Jenny Oliver (proxy)
✓			Gail Latham
✓			Marlene Jacobs
	✓		Peter Lubans
✓			Ernie Armstrong (proxy)
	✓		Hugh Saddleton
	✓		Paul Norton
✓			Ron Smith
✓			David Pike
		✓	Ron Gray (proxy)
	✓		Tom Hamilton-Foster
	✓		Peter Jackson
✓			Wilson Dale

PROJECT TEAM				
✓			Wes Stevenson	RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins	RTA
	✓		Robert Kook	RTA
	✓		Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
	✓		Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓		Bruce Penman	Connell Wagner
	✓		Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
	✓		Alison Clausen	Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
✓			Clyde Treadwell	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		Bill Wood	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		Rick Bennell	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		George Stulle	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		Jo Gardner	PlanningNSW
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 11
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 6 (Southern CFG)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith opened the meeting at 5.45pm. He introduced Clyde Treadwell, Senior Town Planner, Coffs Harbour City Council and Wilson Dale, CFG member for the PANIC group. Andrew noted that the issue of having a representative from PANIC had been discussed at the last meeting.
- 1.2 Andrew extended an invitation to those interested to stay after the meeting for an informal "members only" meeting which excludes project team from attending.

2 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 Trish Welsh: Is it possible to display on the Agenda a "Business Arising" section with all the business that has arisen, and then keeping it on the Agenda until the matter has been addressed. Andrew Smith agreed to this.
- 2.2 Item 3.5. Trish Welsh: To date there still has not been a fact sheet released to the media. She represents an area of 1500 and cannot possibly provide feedback. A fortnightly newspaper column, like the Mayor's column, would keep the community informed for both the north and south. Andrew Smith replied that he did follow up

Business Arising progress list to be included on future agendas

Details:

Action By/Date:

- with the journalists at *The Advocate*. He said they won't run separate articles on fact sheets unless there is a worthwhile story in it. The sheet that went to them was still in relation to the same story.
- 2.3 Item 3.7. Trish added that they actually said 'councillors', not 'council staff' and asked whether a written request had been made to council for a councillor to attend all meetings of the CFG for the duration of the meeting. Andrew Smith advised that he had spoken to Cr Bill Wood who said Council would try to get someone here. Wes Stevenson said he also had spoken to Cr Wood and he had put an apology in.
- 2.4 A CFG member proposed releasing the People's Choice fact sheet to the members for dissemination through their networks. People's Choice Handout to be provided to members
- 2.5 Item 3.9. Gail Latham asked whether Councillors were receiving copies of minutes. *Andrew Smith: I'm almost certain it has happened but I will check.* Gillian French asked whether the councillors were specifically invited to come to the meetings, adding that they tried to explain that they can attend any committee and any steering committee meeting. *Andrew Smith: There has been an invitation extended right from the start. He asked members whether they were saying it should be happening on a meeting to meeting basis. As most members agreed with this, Andrew Smith agreed to do so.* Pramax to ensure Councillors are receiving copies of minutes and Councillors to be invited to attend on a meeting to meeting basis
- 2.6 Item 3.11. Ernie Armstrong sought clarification on the Peer Review. *Wes Stevenson replied the impact of the Peer Review will be discussed tonight.*
- 2.7 Item 5.23. Trish Welsh asked whether there was any information on 5.23 at the moment. Wes Stevenson replied he would be speaking to that tonight.
- 2.8 Item 5.24. Trish Welsh also asked whether information on the acoustics and noise investigations could be placed as an item under Business Arising. She also asked whether the minutes could not refer to "CFG member" but have the member's name instead? *There was discussion on this including the need for members' privacy since the Minutes are public documents which go on to the web site.* Trish Welsh put to the meeting that her group should be able to look at the minutes and ask if Trish Welsh is acting in their best interests. *Andrew Smith agreed that he will try to get names and initials down.* Acoustics and noise investigations to be placed under Business Arising on next agenda
- 2.9 Item 4.9. Gillian French – suggested it would be good for future reference to add in there the reply to this item which was: "and it will be at the discretion of the RTA and if funds are available". Another CFG member expressed the view that proving hardship is not very difficult especially if you are over 50. *Clyde Treadwell responded that basically in the Council's LEP there is a clause on acquisitions and 5A zoned lands. It gave authorities including Council and others a duty to acquire lands under certain circumstances. Wes Stevenson added that this was related to the time between the announcement of the preferred route and getting it into the planning documents and was subject to RTA having funds.* Revised minutes to be adjusted accordingly
- 2.10 Andrew Smith noted for the Minutes that he must get Wilson a copy of the RTA Land Acquisition Policy booklet. Pramax to provide Wilson Dale with a copy of the Land Acquisition Policy booklet
- 2.11 Gillian French also asked if Andrew would send out the revised minutes. *Andrew Smith noted for the Minutes that this will be done.* Revised minutes to be provided to CFG members

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.12 Item 3.11. Gail Latham asked if the Peer Review took the northern section into account. Andrew advised that this is to be dealt with later.
- 2.13 Item 5.17. Ernie Armstrong – referring to the words “It is soft soil country...” He said that is incorrect, and he didn’t think a judgment like that should be made without the data because people are going to make considerations and decisions based on that, which is wrong. After checking with the members, Andrew Smith agreed that the particular line should be struck out. Line to be removed in revised minutes
- 2.14 Item 5.22. Ernie Armstrong stated that this item is the value judgment that he believes they should be getting informed on. Ernie believes that the wording “... proportion of truly long haul trucks from Sydney to Brisbane is probably quite small” should not be in there as it is not backed up with any statistics. Wes Stevenson said he agreed with what was said based on past investigations. He offered to produce this if it was asked for. A CFG member said he understood no 24-hour studies had been done on traffic movement. Wes Stevenson replied that there were 24-hour counts done over the period of a week – published in the traffic study done by TTS. Trish Welsh said she could not find it on the web site and asked if the traffic figures could be e-mailed to members. It was noted for the Minutes that the 24-hour counts and the proportion of long distance vehicles are to be provided to CFG members before the next meeting. CFG members to be provided with traffic information before next meeting
- 2.15 Item 5.25. Ernie Armstrong asked whether the CFG were going to see a copy of the report on agricultural land use. Wes Stevenson replied that the report was not finished but would be made available when it was finalised. Agricultural Report to be made available to CFG when finalised
- 2.16 Gillian French said it worried her that some of these investigations are not including the Inner Corridor area. Members were under the impression that they were going to be done in their area. Andrew Smith responded that the next item on the agenda will explain the timing of some of the processes.
- 2.17 Item 5.28 (re further discussion with Council and other stakeholders regarding visual aspects, electronic drawings, land use and socio economic issues). Trish Welsh asked if there is going to be a report back to the CFG and said it should be an item under “Business Arising”. Andrew Smith agreed that this was a good idea – noted to make sure that this happens. Item to be included under Business Arising for next agenda
- 2.18 Items 5.30 (geotechnical information) and Item 6.3 (possibility of road further west). Ernie Armstrong asked for any update on this item and whether (item 6.3) was something that had to be actioned. Andrew Smith said it was just a statement that had to be noted. Gail Latham asked what dates the geological mapping are working from and if it was current. Some of these maps came out in 1996 and she would like to query how far back these maps go. A CFG member asked if it was in relation to the inner corridor or the existing highway or whatever? Andrew Smith said he will note that – it could be dealt with under Business Arising.

3 MATTERS ARISING

- 3.1 **Peer Review Consultation.** Andrew Smith called upon Wes Stevenson (RTA).
- 3.2 Wes Stevenson: The Steering Committee has considered what impact the Peer Review might have on the Strategy. For example the Peer Review might find some fault with the work that has been done to date. As a result the Steering Committee has decided to suspend further work in the Coffs Harbour section of the strategy

Details:

Action By/Date:

area. Our people have been out in the field and are going to finish their work to a Draft Report stage. Geotech was not commenced. Council's Peer Review was to be commenced within six weeks from the 14th July which takes it up to August. Council would then take a week or two to consider the findings. Assuming there are no issues, it would probably take a minimum of ten weeks before we can get to the stage of making an announcement on route options. Realistically, a preferred route will now not be known until early next year. The Peer Reviewers also are looking at interviewing members of the CFG and I will let Clyde talk about how they propose to do that.

- 3.3 Question from Ernie Armstrong: Who are the Peer Reviewers? Clyde responded: Arup.
- 3.4 Question from Gail Latham: Is the review going to take into account Woolgoolga? Clyde responded that he can answer that.
- 3.5 Question from Ernie Armstrong: Any names in Arup? Clyde responded that he can supply them.
- 3.6 Clyde Treadwell of Coffs Harbour City Council then read from Council's Peer Review Brief.
- 3.7 Wes Stevenson continued: You might have seen in the press that the Steering Committee has decided to continue work in the northern section of the Strategy area (Sapphire to Woolgoolga). The basis was that although the Peer Review will look at that area, it is not comparable to the southern section because there have been no decisions made eliminating corridors.
- 3.8 Clyde Treadwell added a further two points: 1) Arup are proposing to have a round of meetings. Proposing to meet with CFG on 12 July in a 3-hour meeting starting at 6 pm. Clyde said he wanted to get feedback from the members as to whether that will be a problem. 2) From that, they are going to go away and analyse the work done. On 16th July they propose to meet with selected members of the CFG and get input from them, starting at 5 pm.
- 3.9 Trish Welsh asked if Arup were going to be consulting with the various lobby groups. Clyde replied: Western Alliance, WAR, and PANIC. Trish Welsh asked about dates, to which the response was: 12/7 – Western Alliance at 2 pm. 13/7 – WAR at 10 am. Also on 13/7 – PANIC at 2 pm.
- 3.10 Trish Welsh asked how the selected members would be chosen. Clyde responded he did not know – he thought they will ask the meeting who are the people who want to be selected. Arup also will consult with other government authorities, get stakeholder input through interviews, and prepare a consultation report to table with Council on 2 August. The liaison person with Arup would be either Clyde or George Stulle.
- 3.11 Another CFG member asked if the Banana Industry had been consulted for review? Clyde responded that it was not listed. After discussion among members regarding this, Andrew Smith advised they needed to find out how much latitude there is to negotiate for the banana groups and any other stakeholder groups which they believe may need to be interviewed.
- 3.12 Gail Latham asked whether they are preparing fresh information, or are they getting

Details:

Action By/Date:

the information from Council sources, traffic studies, development and so on? Clyde responded by reading from the notes he had read – “. . . to have peer review of the work undertaken to date on the Pacific Highway . . . economic, social, environmentally sustainable factors...” This review represents Stage 1 of two stages.

- 3.13 Gail Latham: Stage 2 being? Clyde replied he believed it would be a more detailed review of the northern area. After that first meeting there may be further consultation identified. Gail asked: In Stage 1? To which Clyde replied, yes.
- 3.14 Gillian French believed tourism could be very severely impacted. Bananas also will be severely impacted. Gillian added she had spoken to Rob Cleary a month ago and he had not been spoken to about any of this. She also believed councillors have not had access to the same documentation that the CFG members have, and obviously councillors and this Peer Review person must have access to all the same drawings, etc. Clyde replied that everything that Council has been involved with, they will have access to. Clyde added that Rob Cleary is a representative on a Council working group so he cannot understand him not being aware of it. Basically the councillors have had briefings on a regular basis.
- 3.15 Trish Welsh mentioned that the Strategic Planning Committee on the 8th May were not presented with the same overheads that the members saw at the CFG meetings. Clyde answered that at these briefings they have been told about all information.
- 3.16 Trish, Gail and Gillian remarked that that is not good enough, and agreed that they need to see what we are seeing. Wes Stevenson remarked that in the past the RTA has been to Council. Clyde replied that the councillors are being briefed and are told if there is anything else they need to know we are happy to provide it.
- 3.17 Andrew Smith asked if it was being suggested that a CFG-type session in length and content be held. Gail Latham responded yes. At meetings with the councillors and steering committee, do they see everything? Wes Stevenson said that Rick Bennell has presented some information to Council and RTA subsequently also presented information to Council on where we are up to.
- 3.18 Trish Welsh asked if they showed the overheads of the highway cuttings, corridors, etc? Wes replied that they showed some of them.
- 3.19 Gillian French said it worries her that the consultants (Arup) have a lot of facts to get in a short period of time, and she did not think the councillors fully understood what CFG members are talking about. Therefore she believes they should come to the CFG meetings. Gillian believes it is critical that they get the overheads and drawings and cross sections, the same visuals that the members have had, otherwise how can they give the Peer Review their concerns and interests if they are not informed? Gillian said perhaps each lobby group should try to have a collective session with Councillors.
- 3.20 Wes Stevenson said they have undertaken to brief Councillors on a regular basis, but he could not guarantee that they will see every detail. Gail replied that they have got all the working documents. Perhaps all they will need is every option – that is, all the overheads, pictures of the highway, where the cuttings are, on and off ramps, cross sections. Wes replied that the brief is for Stage 1, which is not that far down the track. He said that sort of material is not much use for the Peer Review because

Details:

Action By/Date:

it has not been developed.

3.21 Gillian French: You said they were looking at the highway and the corridors. Clyde Treadwell replied: 'determination of remaining corridors in the southern investigation area', that is, inner corridor and existing highway. (Clyde read from Council's Brief): "Critical review of determination of remaining corridors". Gillian asked: So basically you are looking at why was the outer one and the central one dropped off? Wes responded 'yes'.

3.22 Clyde read again from Council's Peer Review Brief one of the sections he had read before. Gillian asked if the members could have a copy of the Brief, to which Clyde agreed. Andrew Smith confirmed that he can get a copy out to the members.

Council's Peer Review Brief to be provided to CFG members

3.23 Further discussion took place on the need for councillors to attend CFG meetings.

3.24 Gillian French thought it would be of benefit for the Peer Review to not only look at why corridors were dropped off but also at the BCR rationale as part of the process when the inner corridor was kept on. The highway has never had a BCR rating done. All the information that has been happening may have changed the BCR rating. Andrew Smith replied: I think you should take that issue to Arup at the meeting.

3.25 Gillian said she would like to note that as an official minute to Council. Wes Stevenson replied that the project team hasn't sufficient information to do that yet. Gillian French asked why he couldn't give them a rough estimate like they did for the outer and the central corridors. Gillian said that it should be minuted that "Council should be requested to..." Clyde pointed out that changing the brief would change the time frame so there are ramifications there. Marlene Jacobs was of the opinion that they are waiting till next year anyway. Another member commented that the studies so far seem to be using BCRs in two different ways: one a rough way to eliminate options quickly; and another in a different rigorous way to justify going ahead with the project. Wes Stevenson replied that further down the track we will know more precisely about the costs but may not need to do the estimates more stringently for a strategic exercise. The member continued: When it comes down to planning real money and you have got to justify it to the Minister and the Treasurer as well. Wes replied, we followed the Economic Analysis Manual techniques as we will later on. The member continued: I have got a copy of the Manual and I say you do not.

3.26 Andrew Smith responded that the members needed to take their comments to the meetings with Arup.

3.27 Gail Latham asked if another option for a bypass was proposed would it be examined like Wilson's People's Choice corridor and be examined under the terms of the Peer Review. Wes: *As we did with Wilson's we would look at it. We consider any reasonable suggestions.* Clyde Treadwell commented that perhaps the second stage of the Peer Review could take on board any other options that come up throughout the process.

3.28 Marlene Jacobs: The information booklet to come out in July – where is that up to? Wes: *What we are doing in July/August is to go ahead with Woolgoolga. Once we kick off Coffs Harbour again after the Review findings have been considered we will head towards an announcement but that would not be till Christmas. And if the findings are that the RTA and the Steering Committee have to look at some other*

Details:

Action By/Date:

option, then that will push it back.

- 3.29 CFG member: Is it possible to give the meeting an indication of the community responses at this stage? Andrew Smith: *The submissions report is about 880 pages. There has been something like 1600 submissions received – a lot bigger than we thought.*
- 3.30 Gail Latham asked, what was the feeling? Andrew Smith replied that they had a range of views – from support for the far west option right in through to “upgrade the highway”. The report has to go to the Steering Committee first.
- 3.31 Trish Welsh asked if the CFG members would receive a copy. Andrew replied, it will be a public document but because of the size we will not be mailing it out, but it will be available to the CFG.
- 3.32 Gail Latham commented that she really felt that there should be a rider or something put on the bottom to say these views are representative of such and such but to be realistic of all of the people of the corridors that have been dropped off, you would have had treble the submissions – Bucca, Orara, Boambee. Andrew Smith advised that there is going to be another round of information release and consequent to that will be more submissions again. A CFG member said: I would like to definitely agree. Coramba – once we were dropped off, it went quiet. If anything like that was tabled, it's proof that we do not care. Andrew Smith noted this.
- 3.33 Marlene Jacobs commented that she would like it to be noted – if the Peer Review had been announced even one day before submissions closed, it would have made a very big difference.
- 3.34 CFG member asked if the agricultural study had been completed or is it still outstanding. Wes replied that field work is complete but report is only prepared to draft stage. Gail Latham asked about flora and fauna, to which Wes replied that noise, agriculture and flora/fauna had started but been put on hold and they have only completed all the field work in the northern section.
- 3.35 Discussion followed on the release of draft reports and final reports. Wes explained the meaning of ‘draft report stage’ and ‘final report stage’ to the meeting and added at this point of a normal meeting we would have come along with the preliminary findings. That will happen later.
- 3.36 Wes Stevenson then reported on the ‘traffic’ item. He said it was a preliminary report which he needed to get into a spreadsheet. He said counts had been obtained from Dundee on the New England Highway. They are fairly representative of a place not influenced too much by local movements. Also a point just south of Grafton on the Pacific Highway. This is only sample data: Traffic Classification Data 1998 and 2001 for each of those two studies. 1998. New England Highway (not quite 2 weeks field study), the New England is very seasonal. A quiet week and a busy week. In the quiet week, 262 semis on average a day, and 78 B-doubles. Busy week, 461 semis and 178 B-doubles. 2001. 251 semis and 137 B-doubles. So it is a bit between the two, and just looking at the maximum number of semis we might have had one day around 600 in ‘98 and one maximum in 2001 was only around 350. Pacific Highway. July 1998. 4 weeks of data. Average 603 semis a day. Maximum of 1000 semis in one day. B-doubles – 6 on one day and 2 on another. October 2001. Semis 691 each day on average. Maximum 950 each day. B-doubles had increased a bit – up to 15 in one day. So assuming that this is

Details:

Action By/Date:

representative of these periods then you have had a fairly significant increase in 3 years for semis on the Pacific Highway. If all the B-doubles move across from the New England then you are expecting around 100 vehicles extra per day. I am not expecting that all of them will. We will know in a month or so.

- 3.37 Gail Latham asked if it was likely that another study will be made? Wes replied that he will let things settle down.
- 3.38 A CFG member commented that all the bananas from Queensland used to travel down the Pacific Highway. A few sneak through but the Department of Agriculture is chasing them out of the area. Gail Latham asked who polices this. The member replied, NSW Agriculture.
- 3.39 Wes continued: So if you went on other roads where B-doubles have been allowed there has been a reduction of 20% in other heavy vehicles because of that. If that happens on the Pacific, and if half the B-doubles on the New England came over then there will be some overall reduction in the number of trucks on the Pacific.
- 3.40 Question by Gillian French: Do you have the timing of these – we talked before about the trucks on the highway. Particularly interacting with local traffic. Wes replied: Wilson already mentioned that the count data would be out and we will get that to you.
- 3.41 Wes explained to the meeting how a counter works.
- 3.42 CFG member: The obvious question here is that there is no comparison between the New England Highway and Pacific Highway. Wes commented – no comparison. Light vehicles around 1,000. Whereas the Pacific: 6500 – 7,000. CFG member: Why isn't the Pacific Highway a National Highway? Wes said he did not know
- 3.43 Question from Ernie Armstrong: Do you have to worry about local internal roads that relieve the Pacific Highway? Wes replied, that is an argument that Council has got with the RTA. Ernie further asked: Do the RTA see their role as supportive of that construction? Wes replied, I don't think the RTA saw that as their role.
- 3.44 Clyde Treadwell then spoke to the meeting about the acquisition clauses in Council's Environmental Plan (LEP). He said basically clause 20(7) establishes an obligation to acquire land that is zoned 5A Special Uses (Classified Road). He said this document has been endorsed by the RTA as part of Council's LEP review process in 1999/2000 so it establishes that if the land is vacant and the RTA receive notice that the owner wants it acquired then the RTA is to acquire it.
- 3.45 A CFG member expressed the view that some believed if you go to the RTA requesting hardship then acquisition would be far less than if they came to you. Wes replied that if an owner applies on hardship grounds, the RTA is replacing a buyer in the market. There was considerable discussion between the CFG member and Clyde Treadwell regarding the hardship claim. In response to a query from Clyde Treadwell, the CFG member said he was talking about a whole number of things. He said when his property was acquired last time there was very short notice. There was none of this being strung out for over 30 years.
- 3.46 Wes replied that if hardship acquisition can be negotiated and the RTA comes as a buyer they offer market price. They buy it for what it is at the time.
- 3.47 Trish Welsh asked, is that real estate valuation or a valuer's? Wes replied, market

Details:

Action By/Date:

value is assessed. The CFG member said last time he could get the valuer of his choice. So that part was not an issue. He said the committee was led to believe you could carry on whatever you did on that land until the RTA purchase it – but the Council was “no, we don’t want you to develop that land because they’re doing up somewhere”. So you are hit with hardship much earlier than you believe. Your compensation is adequate up to 30 years but after that you are limited in your options.

- 3.48 Clyde Treadwell: Under some scenarios where the 5A Special Uses applies to the land people should be aware of that when purchasing. That goes with purchasing any land. There is also the issue you are touching on if you have land that is rezoned to 5A Special Uses and there is an impediment to development on that land. Council can advise you. If you lodge the application and are unhappy with the decision that Council make, you can go to the Land & Environment Court. The current 5A Special Uses zone is fairly flexible and enables a lot of uses to be undertaken with Council consent.
- 3.49 Gillian French related another incident of someone in Woolgoolga who felt that Council, if they knew the information, should have disclosed it.
- 3.50 CFG member: If your land is zoned 1A or 5A now, how much does that land depreciate in value? Is the value paid under 1A? Wes replied, the value is paid on what it would have been without the road reservation being there.
- 3.51 CFG member: If you have property that under certain situations would change zoning because other things happened, because the highway went across the property, would there be any recognition that siting the highway in that location had taken away the value of the potential zone? Wes replied: It is case by case. Someone would have to prove that it would have been zoned at a higher classification than it currently was and would have been paid market value.
- 3.52 Gail Latham: Say anywhere Council has got proposed urban development going, say you are going across West Korora Road, is there development for that area or Finlays Road? Clyde Treadwell: Korora residential area including the West Korora Road precinct was excluded from Bruxner Park Road south because of issues raised primarily by land owners. It has been diverted from that rezoning and is pending further investigations in regard to the highway.
- 3.53 Question by Trish Welsh: West Coffs development past Shepherds Lane. What is the latest on planning in that area following the strategic planning meeting? Clyde Treadwell: Basically Council has a document called an urban development strategy which identifies future urban lands. One of the areas is West Coffs area. That area has been earmarked in the 1996 urban development strategy and that strategy is about to be revised over the next 12 months. So the highway corridor is an issue to be considered in that review but also the candidate areas are being reconsidered anyway.
- 3.54 Trish Welsh: Is it true that the recommendation was going to Council that regardless of consideration of the corridor there would be no more development in that West Coffs area? Clyde: I think it was up for further consideration in the urban development strategy. Trish: So was that a recommendation? Clyde: That is part of the strategy review.
- 3.55 Further discussion ensued following Trish’s quote of Rick Bennell. Clyde responded:

Details:

Action By/Date:

We are rethinking our urban development strategy. West Coffs is one of the areas.

- 3.56 Gail Latham: That is my point. It is inextricably linked. You cannot tell me that Council won't be influenced by how much they will lose as part of the corridor. If the Inner Corridor comes through West Korora Road and that has been diverted for the time being, some of the others for Woolgoolga might include some of the other options that go through Country Club Estate and Woolgoolga Creek Road, these are ratepayers that you are missing. Clyde replied: Again, we are going through that process. About every 5 years we review that document.
- 3.57 Gail Latham: How much does PlanningNSW impact insofar as what local government does. Clyde: They say that we cannot rezone outside of an identified strategy. Gail added: PlanningNSW is part of this whole process as well, so should the Peer Review find 'this that or the other' and 'that goes against', how much leg has the Council got to stand on, to counter PlanningNSW saying "you are not going to get away with this"? Response by Clyde: There is an agreed strategy that involves PlanningNSW and Council. There is a process we have to go through of identification. Gail further queried: So the last one goes to 2001? Clyde responded: The reason it was not done in 2001 is because we did not yet have the latest Census data for doing our projections.
- 3.58 Marlene Jacobs: North Boambee - the Mayor stated in the paper that 20,000 homes would be lost if the highway goes through there. They are talking about rubbery figures from the RTA. I would actually like to see how they came up with that figure. I am very concerned about that figure coming up out of nowhere. I would like you to feedback to this group what would be the actual effect of putting on this list going through that area, how would that affect numbers? Clyde responded: 20,000 homes is 60,000 people and I accept that it was in the paper but maybe it was misquoted. Marlene Jacobs: Maybe that would be something useful to come back with – a realistic figure.
- 3.59 Andrew Smith then closed the meeting.

4 CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 7.45pm

Next Meeting: To be advised