

Meeting Record

Project:	Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy	Reference:	1093.50
Location:	Coffs Harbour Ex-Services Club, Vernon Street, Coffs Harbour	Date:	7 July 2004

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

Interest/Groups represented:

SOUTHERN CFG

✓		David Doyle	Existing Highway interests
✓		Trish Welsh	Inner West Coffs residents interests
	✓	Phil Doyle	Outer West Coffs residents interests
✓		Gillian French	Korora residents interests
		Steven French (proxy)	Korora residents interests
✓		Gail Latham	Bucca Valley residents interests
	✓	Marlene Jacobs	Boambee West residents interests
✓		Peter Lubans	Business & Tourism interests
		Ernie Armstrong (proxy)	Business & Tourism interests
	✓	Hugh Saddleton	Development interests
	✓	Paul Norton	Emergency Services interests
✓		Ron Smith	Environmental interests
✓		David Pike	Agricultural interests
		Ron Gray (proxy)	Agricultural interests
	✓	Tom Hamilton-Foster	Commercial interests
✓		Wilson Dale	Inner West Coffs residents interests
✓		Doug Binns	Bucca Valley and Gaudrons Rd residents interests
	✓	Bert Beasley	Inner West Coffs residents interests
	✓	Greg Driscoll	Coramba and Karangi residents interests

PROJECT TEAM				
✓			Chris Clark	RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins	RTA
✓			Adam Cameron	RTA
✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓		Janice Smith	Pramax Communications
	✓		Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
	✓		Steve Murray	DIPNR
✓			John Finlay	DIPNR
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 8
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 12 (Southern CFG)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Tim Paterson (TP) of Connell Wagner (CW) opened the meeting at 5.55pm.

2 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 CFG member Wilson Dale (WD): Item 3.7 page 4, in relation to Community Update No. 5, the deepest cut on the Coastal Route – in fact deepest cut on IS2 is 103m and on 1N1 is 70m.
- 2.2 TP: Acknowledged.
- 2.3 CFG member WD: Item 3.54 regarding tunnels and costs, I don't remember saying just western options I meant all of the options including the highway upgrade. There is no big difference. 3rd sentence – the cuts seem to be well within world standards. Item 3.54 from last Notes: ignore "western"
- 2.4 Adam Cameron (AC) of RTA: What information is that based on?
- 2.5 CFG member (WD): Sideling Hill in the US. There is a variety of material, some of it is not hard rock material. They have used 24 metres between benches – you come up with 7.5m between benches – in a typical construction with the rocks around here you would expect 15m not 7.5m.
- 2.6 TP: Not in NSW. That is not the advice from our engineers.
- 2.7 CFG member WD: The issue that you are resisting, you are saying tunnels didn't need to be factored in to any of the schemes not just western. Tunnels are needed for aesthetic reasons around Coffs Harbour, not engineering.
- 2.8 CFG member WD: Item 3.60 – Bob Higgins talked about advice from geotechnical experts – I believe the RTA has been traumatised by its experience on the F3. Given the rock here, it is very different from that – I think experts providing information that supports information away from CRW.
- 2.9 TP: In terms of the minutes, as I recall those were Bob Higgins words for the

Details:

Action By/Date:

record.

- 2.10 CFG member WD: OK. Item 3.86 – Clarification needed – ‘whole network’? The point I have raised was have you factored in the benefits to traffic on the existing highway with the through traffic and heavy traffic taken away?
- 2.11 TP: Yes, the whole network was looked at.
- 2.12 CFG member WD: Was that a positive or negative side of the equation?
- 2.13 TP: I don't know the answer - it is a network based approach on the travel statistics information to time distance and expense costs – on the base cost and the improved cost – some positive, some negative – I could get transport and economics people that did the work to provide an answer – and get a clarification of the benefit cost analysis factoring any benefits on existing routes.
- 2.14 CFG member Peter Lubans (PL): Is this going too far? Are we supposed to talk about minutes, not discuss other issues?
- 2.15 CFG member WD: Item 3.138 - There is a statement in there that is totally incorrect. I didn't make that statement, there is no way I made that statement (bush fire management). I am not suggesting you put the road through a National Park. It was in relation to fire management - I said it's not necessarily a bad thing, the way National Parks is managed". I didn't say it was "passing through".
- 2.16 TP: If the intent was in relation to fire management, that will be changed. A "road passing through" should be taken out of Item 3.138 of previous Notes.
- 2.17 CFG member WD: General comment – particularly people organising meeting, some of these responses weren't exactly the way I remembered them.

Item 3.138 from last Notes:
ignore "road passing through"

3 SUBMISSIONS REPORT

- 3.1 Rosemary Russell (RR) of CW presented Submissions Report via overheads.
- 3.2 CFG member Gail Latham (GL): Have all submissions been tallied?
- 3.3 RR: By last mail on the 28th. Any late submissions after 28th will be in next report.
- 3.4 CFG member GL: I wish I had known that - I had a whole heap of documents sent out last week.
- 3.5 CFG member WD: How does that the response compare with previous submissions – 170 and 440 survey forms for February – I'd say it is well down.
- 3.6 CFG member: I understand that if there is going to be a cut off date that will be the cut off time. I rang Bob Higgins and there was no extension.
- 3.7 RR: Extensions were given if there was a pre-existing arrangement.
- 3.8 TP: Submissions could be received at any time but there has to be a cut off date.
- 3.9 CFG member: We had something like 2 to 3 weeks tops to get community feedback – and they would not accept anything past the deadline. I have a discontent with the time frame and people should have been included.
- 3.10 TP: The decision was taken and that was it.
- 3.11 CFG member Trish Welsh (TW): There were two whole booklets to read and three weeks to go out to the community – not enough time given. Can more time be

Copies of presentation slides
attached.

Details:

Action By/Date:

given in the future?

- 3.12 TP: Noted.
- 3.13 TP: Please give Rosemary the courtesy to continue with the presentation.
- 3.14 CFG member TW: Talk about courtesy! I want it noted that I have been requesting that we have handouts at the meeting before the presentations. I am a visual person and can't understand information being presented unless I have a copy in front of me.
- 3.15 TP: Noted
- 3.16 CFG member: We have asked in the past that highway upgrade costs be included in any documents put out. This was not done in the last update.
- 3.17 CFG member Gillian French (GF): The highway upgrade option has been discounted in Community Update No 4. Are people in the general public aware that this is not an option?
- 3.18 TP: The Community Update was on display for several weeks.
- 3.19 CFG member GF: Interest in the issue of indigenous heritage seems to have gone up.
- 3.20 CFG member: I think people need to be more clear, what is being positive or negative.
- 3.21 RR: Issues are taken from the submissions.
- 3.22 CFG member: Responses well down on previous submissions.
- 3.23 CFG member TW: People just don't understand it – I live in Shephards Lane, and I can't work out the map (Community Update 4).
- 3.24 RR: It is small scale on A4 page, the display posters had a much larger scale map.
- 3.25 CFG member TW: Well I still can't work it out – in future put arrows pointing to where the streets/roads go. It is getting too complicated for people – the minutes are getting too technical.
- 3.26 CFG member GL: It is no less clear than the Woolgoolga options and they seemed to be understandable.
- 3.27 CFG member GF: People's issues do not seem to have any weight at all.
- 3.28 TP: A number of outcomes need to be considered and it is evident that the route had real disadvantages – factors considered were functional issues, cost issues, social and economic and environment implications – conclusion was taken in relation to the facts.
- 3.29 CFG member GF: Social Impact analysis – can this be done?
- 3.30 TP: Have to have an outcome that relates to all areas – the conclusion that was drawn was that Council's preferred corridor didn't come up to scratch on two of these factors.
- 3.31 CFG member TW: How can we draw a conclusion of what is more important?
- 3.32 TP: There has to be a satisfactory outcome in all areas.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.33 CFG member WD: It does not appear that the community has had an effect whatsoever. It appears that there is an agenda and the public responses are not really important.
- 3.34 TP: I can't see how you could be saying this.
- 3.35 CFG member WD: I'm referring to the Coastal Ridge Way.
- 3.36 CFG member: Council has covered the issue that things were not being done properly and that was refuted with the independent Peer Review – 18 months ago.
- 3.37 CFG member: It took 6 months to go through and do that and that has been addressed.
- 3.38 CFG member GF: I didn't disagree but I still believe we are going to end up with the same result. Out of all the people that responded there will be not much consideration given to this.
- 3.39 Chris Clark (CC), RTA: The presentation was purely and simply a report on submissions. It is not a statistically valid survey and it is one of the issues that any project has to contend with.
- 3.40 CFG member GF: Why do you bother doing it?
- 3.41 CC: The views of the community are an important part of the process.
- 3.42 TP: Can I ask we go to the VMS section on the agenda? Chris will take us into what the process is and then get into who has an interest in the VM.

4 VALUE MANAGEMENT STUDY

Value Management Agenda

- 4.1 CC: First, my apologies for being late and for Bob Higgins being unable to attend. The VM Workshop for the Coffs Harbour section will be on Monday and Tuesday 2nd and 3rd August. It will be a two- day workshop – 8.30am to 5pm each day and on the night of the first day there will be a dinner provided to help build a team as part of that workshop process.
- 4.2 CFG member GF: Can it be held on a weekend?
- 4.3 CC: No, that's not possible with the range of Government agencies and attendees. Coffs Harbour is a totally separate workshop from Woolgoolga. The aim of the workshop is to take forward an option that has been identified by the workshop as being the preferred option. The VM will be for the coastal options only.
- 4.4 CFG member GL: Will there be another workshop?
- 4.5 CC: That decision has not been made.
- 4.6 CFG member TW: If there is a VM Workshop for the Inner Corridor, there has to be one for the Council corridor options. They have to be treated equally.
- 4.7 CC: That decision has not been made.
- 4.8 CFG member TW: Who is the decision maker?
- 4.9 CC: The decision on the preferred option is made by the Minister for Roads. We want to work through and identify the best corridor and, in the light of that, consider how we can go forward as to how to address the other options on the table.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.10 CFG member GF: This is a waste of time if we don't include the other routes.
- 4.11 CC: First step is to identify the preferred option then proceed with a planning mechanism to reserve a corridor.
- 4.12 CFG member GL: Last meeting said that there would be an EIS for the northern section.
- 4.13 CFG member PL: What we've been asked to do is to look at the Inner Bypass corridor.
- 4.14 CFG member WD: Bob Higgins clearly said that a recommendation would be made for the Inner Bypass corridor and the existing highway and Options C, C1 and E.
- 4.15 CC: The RTA will make recommendation to the Minister on a preferred option.
- 4.16 CFG member TW: You should say that in early August there'll be a VM for the Inner Bypass and later you will be doing the other options. I'm very unhappy.
- 4.17 CC: The Submissions Report has not been finalised yet and a decision has not been made on the options in Council's preferred corridor.
- 4.18 CFG member TW: It has to be on the table that there will be a VM for this route and no others.
- 4.19 CFG member David Pike (DP): The Banana Association doesn't want to be party to an assessment of the Inner Bypass, we want it to go away and look at the CRW.
- 4.20 CFG member GF: We need to combine the CFGs.
- 4.21 CC: The VM is only one of the inputs to go into the final decision.
- 4.22 CFG member GF: The community says it wants a true bypass – there's an issue of trust and it's come up before. The community wants a bypass in the hills, a proper bypass, not in the town. We need to commit to a date for a VM for the other options.
- 4.23 CC: We're not in a position to make that commitment. What I can tell you is that we're holding the two workshops to identify the best Coastal Route option for a bypass of Coffs Harbour and Woolgoolga
- 4.24 CFG member GF: What about the middle bit and a proper bypass?
- 4.25 CC: There is no viable option for the Sapphire to south Woolgoolga section other than upgrading the existing highway. There is no gain in having a workshop on this.
- 4.26 TP: That is the point of the VM. If there is to be a Coastal Route, what is the best one?
- 4.27 CFG member WD: Could we explore what this VM will be about? There should be an opportunity to come out of the workshop and say none of the options is acceptable.
- 4.28 CC: Certainly, the participants will have that option and a chance to express themselves. Four options will be taken to the workshop (IS1, IS2, IN1, IN2) – the outcome of that workshop is to determine, on balance, which of the coastal options performs best.
- 4.29 CFG member GF: I want to pass a motion that both VM Workshops include CRW or

Details:

Action By/Date:

any of the other options that are a true bypass.

- 4.30 CFG member TW: I second that. I believe we are being pushed into corner - I don't trust the process that might follow the VM.
- 4.31 CFG member GL: We were always being told this was going to be the way.
- 4.32 CFG member PL: Can we proceed that some commitment be made and be made before the VM. At least we'll be moving forward.
- 4.33 Lengthy discussion followed on the exact wording of how the feeling of the motion should be minuted.
- 4.34 It was agreed by CFG members WD, TW, GF, DP and PL that the following should be minuted: "We want a commitment to hold a VMS on Council's Corridor (as identified in Community Update 5) prior to undertaking the VMS on the Inner Bypass"
- 4.35 CFG member GL: I'd also like this minuted – VMWs so far have been on routes or corridors that the RTA has considered as being viable prospects – so far the RTA hasn't considered at VMs routes that are not viable. Recognising that the Western Bypasses are costly, VMs should only be necessary if routes are considered viable.
- 4.36 CC: People attending the workshop would be representatives of Government agencies, Council, community, transport industry and the project team (he showed a slide with the organisations and numbers proposed to attend).

Selection of CFG representatives to take part in VM Study

- 4.37 CFG member GL: Who is Council going to send?
- 4.38 CC: Council has been offered 4 positions at the VMS, they will decide who represents Council. Council is an important part of the process and they will continue to be an important part of the process – it is vitally important that we do have Council as part of it.
- 4.39 CFG member TW: Given there are people which represent 13 different areas, we have to pick 4 people to represent all these different areas – why are there two places for the indigenous community and only four places for all of us?
- 4.40 CFG member WD: If somebody is representing an area which is not affected why would they be involved?
- 4.41 CC: We have to have representatives of the broader community and not only people directly affected – their views should be brought to the table as well.
- 4.42 CFG member TW: I feel four CFG members are not enough.
- 4.43 CFG member GL: Northern CFGs total 31 and they only have four representatives. There are only 19 of us and we are getting four.
- 4.44 CC: We need to get some indication who is interested to attend workshop and next how can they be selected. We can look at identifying key localities within the community. Or members of the CFG may have their ideas how we can choose members for the VM. First of all, who will be available? (Five people indicated they would be interested, with Trish Welsh requesting Bert Beasley who wasn't present at meeting wanting to attend).
- 4.45 CC: OK, there are five nominees – anyone representing north – yes WD, TW and

Details:

Action By/Date:

Bert Beasley – Ross Lane and Shephards Lane. Doug Binns – Bucca Valley, Sapphire areas.

- 4.46 CFG member PL: Put my name forward. I think that the people here tonight should be the 4 – TW, WD, DB, PL. Preference should be given to those here tonight. Bert Beasley can be first reserve.
- 4.47 CFG member GF: Preferred option is not necessarily one Minister might go with?
- 4.48 CC: The RTA will make a recommendation to the Minister. This VMS is only a part of input into assessment. At the end of the day the preferred option is up to the Minister to decide.
- 4.49 CFG member GF: I am concerned that the road will be reserved, and not end up being constructed. Need to conduct an EIS ASAP and not in 20 years.
- 4.50 CC: with EIA they need to be done fairly close to the actual time of construction for environmental is constantly changing, if we do an EIA next year and don't construct until 10 years down track that EIA may not be valid, it would have to be re-done.
- 4.51 CFG member GF: A lot of oddities with regards to noise. Can we ask at least these tests be done before the EIS?
- 4.52 CFG member WD: I agree with that.
- 4.53 CFG member GL: If projections, for 2021, were greater then the decision is made in 3 years time you will come up with quite different figures won't you?
- 4.54 CC: Technology is changing and methods of treating noise etc are changing. It is right and appropriate that the EIA is done as near as possible to the start of the project to reflect current conditions.
- 4.55 There were some discussions regarding house prices being brought down as a result of the inner bypass.
- 4.56 CFG member TW: The day the inner corridor is announced, property will go down.
- 4.57 CC: Market value of a property is assessed as if the road proposal did not exist.
- 4.58 CFG member TW: I don't believe this is going to be the case.

5 MEDIA RELEASE

- 5.1 TP: There should be a media release about the upcoming VM Study and nomination of representatives from CFG. 3 specific requests from one or two people to qualify the current status of option A in the north.
- 5.2 CFG member WD: Request for VM for Community Update No. 5 options.
- 5.3 TP: That can be put forward.
- 5.4 TP: Thanked RR, who is retiring, for her valuable contribution to the Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy process.

6 CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 8.00pm.

Next Meeting: To be advised.