

## Meeting Record

Project:	Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy	Reference:	1093.50
Location:	Coffs Harbour Ex-Services Club, Vernon Street, Coffs Harbour	Date:	11 December 2002

Present: Apology Copy: Name:

SOUTHERN CFG			
	✓		David Doyle
	✓		Bob Bunting
✓			Trish Welsh
	✓		Murray Williams
			Bruce Partridge (WITHDRAWN)
	✓		Phil Doyle (proxy)
✓			Gillian French
		✓	Steven French (proxy) – replaces J Oliver, former 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				
✓			Chris Clark	RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins	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
✓			Bill Wood	Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			Rick Bennell	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		George Stulle	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		John Finlay	Planning NSW
	✓		Jo Gardner	Planning NSW
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 13
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 7 (Southern CFG)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith opened the meeting at 5.44 pm. He welcomed members back since their last meeting in July 2002 and indicated that tonight's meeting would discuss where the process was heading in relation to investigations for the southern section as well as the outcomes of Council's Peer Review. Andrew also introduced the new Project Manager from the RTA, Mr Chris Clark.
- 1.2 **Apologies.** Apologies were received from Jo Gardner, Planning NSW; Bob Higgins, RTA; Cr Pam Howe, CHCC; Murray Williams and Ernie Armstrong. Andrew also indicated that CFG member Bruce Partridge had resigned to take up a new posting in Queensland. Phil Doyle, who was his proxy but was not in attendance tonight, would now take his position.

## 2 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 Andrew Smith asked if there was any comment regarding the previous notes.
- 2.2 CFG member Gillian French asked whether that referred to the notes from the Peer Review workshop. Andrew Smith indicated he was referring to the previous CFG notes. The outcomes of the Peer Review would be discussed shortly.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.3 CFG member Trish Welsh pointed out that the notes from the previous meeting involved an undertaking that all outstanding issues would be written on the agenda for the next meeting and it had not happened. *When they are listed, could they be not in dot point format, but in number format, so that they can be related back to the previous Minutes? It was agreed that all matters would stay on until they are resolved.*
- 2.4 Andrew Smith agreed to address that.
- 2.5 Minutes were accepted, noting Trish's comments.

Meeting agendas to list outstanding issues from previous meetings

### 3 MATTERS ARISING

- 3.1 **Outcomes of the Peer Review Workshop.** Andrew Smith invited members to raise issues relating to the Peer Review.
- 3.2 Rick Bennell (Coffs Harbour City Council): *From Council's perspective, we thought it was successful in terms of communication; part of it was to build a better link between the CFG and the Steering Committee. Fair progress was made. We hope you received the overheads and Geoff Smyth's interpretation of what was put on the board. I think it was a clear and honest interpretation. We discussed some of those today at the Steering Committee as well.*
- 3.3 Cr Bill Wood (Coffs Harbour City Council) said at its meeting that afternoon, the Steering Committee had agreed in principle to having observers from the CFGs attend. The Steering Committee also had discussed the need to develop its own charter and prepare protocols for CFG representatives to attend as observers. He anticipated that perhaps by February next year, that would be in place.
- 3.4 Gillian French asked if the meeting was going to deal with the Pacific Highway Planning Strategy Peer Review Workshop document. *We still need to work out how to action some of these things, rather than wait till February next year. Key issues, such as communication, consultation.*
- 3.5 CFG member Wilson Dale said one of the major issues raised in the document was the timely issuing of Minutes and this had not occurred with the peer review workshop document. *It took from 6 November to six weeks later.*
- 3.6 Trish Welsh said a lot of the dot points written on the butcher's paper at the workshop were not listed. She asked if it was possible to get a copy of what was written on the butcher's paper and not a condensed version.
- 3.7 Gillian French: *Two points in particular need progressing further, basically follow up of what was on the butcher's paper: (reading from Workshop Minutes): "There is a need to ensure that consideration of the social values in a bypass option are taken into account at an early stage in the process." I recall Mark said categorically that the Steering Committee asked the RTA to look at all three Options to the same level, and all three Options should have social, economic impact done now, not wait.*
- 3.8 Wilson Dale: *"Noise" – not mentioned in this document at all. That was raised three times.*
- 3.9 Trish Welsh: *That is why I am asking for a copy.*
- 3.10 Andrew Smith: *It was a Council workshop. Rick?*

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.11 Rick Bennell indicated he would obtain the butcher's paper and bring it to the next meeting.
- 3.12 Trish Welsh indicated she had asked at the workshop if she could have a copy of the butcher's paper notes and the answer was yes. *We want to see stuff that is written down, not after somebody has chopped it about.... A lot of issues are left off.*
- 3.13 Wilson Dale said he also had raised an issue about the project being a single project and it had been twisted around as a comment. *I wanted it made clear that the various Options be looked at as a single project as far as evaluations.* (reading from the Workshop Minutes): *"To date the project has not been considered as a single project and is divided into two study areas."* Comment. *The point I made was that it should be considered as a single project.*
- 3.14 Gillian French: *The other bullet point, apart from the third bullet point, needs to categorically state that all three Options need to be considered equally. But the bullet point above that needs to state categorically* (reading from the Workshop Minutes): *"Some representatives need to be assured that all route options have been considered and the community involved in the consideration of those options." That was specifically written on butcher's paper. The issue I know was: yes, that will be looked at, and how the community will be involved from now. Not in six months' time. I see that is not necessarily the final document.*
- 3.15 Andrew Smith asked if the report had been accepted by the Steering Committee?
- 3.16 Bill Wood: *That particular report from Smythe Maher has been adopted by the Steering Committee – has been accepted by the Steering Committee , put it that way.*
- 3.17 Gillian French: *Do we not have a right to amend this? If anyone feels it needs it?*
- 3.18 Bill Wood: *I think there has already been some issues raised about the completeness of that document and until we get the butcher's paper out we can only go by what is in that document, but I think we have already undertaken to get the base document here and maybe then we can move forward.*
- 3.19 Gillian French: *Obviously more was talked about apart from what was on the butcher's paper. We need to put in the Minutes that there are additions.*
- 3.20 Andrew Smith: *We have noted that.*
- 3.21 CFG member Peter Lubans said the workshop document was "a summary". He suggested that if members wanted to make such requests as they had, they should get them organised before they came to meetings so the meetings didn't get bogged down.
- 3.22 Wilson Dale said there were two issues – 1) the need to get such documents out as soon as possible after workshops and 2) the mechanism for changing them. He said one idea suggested at the workshop was somebody recording and minuting as they went and then handing them out at the end of the meeting.
- 3.23 Andrew Smith said Trish Welsh had previously suggested that the actions be listed on the next agenda.
- 3.24 Bill Wood: *So is everyone clear, Trish is proposing an action-based Minute paper.*
- 3.25 Trish Welsh: *Yes. It stays on until it is done.*
- Council to bring Peer Review Workshop butcher's paper notes to next meeting

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.26 Andrew Smith asked if there were any other major issues relating to the CFG from the Peer Review Workshop.
- 3.27 CFG member David Pike asked if meetings of the CFG clashed with Council meetings and therefore there was a problem getting Council representatives to attend.
- 3.28 Bill Wood said Council meetings were held on Thursdays. Tim Paterson indicated there was no reason why meetings of the three CFGs couldn't be staggered. The Coffs CFG meeting could therefore be held on another night rather than Thursdays.
- 3.29 Andrew Smith: *Any other major issues?*
- 3.30 Gillian French said it was great to finally get a rundown on what happened at the workshop but the key need was action. *Mark made the comment on the night that all this back-biting is not helping. The issue is, and noted in these bullet points, the reason why it is left to individual groups to communicate with the neighbourhood. It has still not been said. It is left to residents to look at their papers to get information out. Before we move on next. How do we turn these bullet points into 'action' points? How do we improve communication and consultation.*
- 3.31 Trish Welsh asked why the latest information release, Community Update 3, December 2002, stated the Steering Committee had agreed to recommence investigations into the feasibility of a long-term bypass of Coffs Harbour but did not mention the Coastal Ridgeway. *Why isn't it in here? It is missing.*
- 3.32 Chris Clark: *There was a media release that went out where we agreed that we would investigate the Coastal Ridgeway.*
- 3.33 CFG member Gail Latham: *So basically I guess who is in charge of the press releases now. Is it still Jo? So it is still up to Jo basically to keep the people abreast through the newspaper and as developments actually happen? If something develops?*
- 3.34 Andrew Smith said one of the issues raised was a perception by the community that there was an information lag.
- 3.35 Gillian French said the media release referred to (29 October 2002) was a bit confusing. *"Once restarted, the investigations will compare the inner corridor bypass of Coffs Harbour with an upgrade of the existing highway", Mr Higgins said. Right down the bottom it says "met with Wilson Dale". It says as a byline, "The steering committee will review this latest proposal put forward by Mr Dale". I don't know. What people pick up on is, Mr Higgins, "Once restarted, the investigations will compare the inner corridor bypass of Coffs Harbour with an upgrade of the existing highway." ... Why wasn't the Coastal Ridgeway put up in that paragraph?*
- 3.36 Trish Welsh: *And not put in this? (referring to the booklet)*
- 3.37 Bill Wood said, that afternoon, the Steering Committee had endorsed another tour of the terrain to the west of the present highway. The Acting Director of Engineering, Mr Lewis Ford, was co-ordinating it. He would prepare a list of people that would be invited that would include representatives from key community groups, the Banana Growers' Association, chambers of commerce, Department of Agriculture, etc. A date would be set in the New Year for the tour. *One of the issues there is to try and get three Councillors who were unable to make the previous visit along. We won't get a date that suits absolutely everyone.*

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.38 Trish Welsh: *Does 'key representatives' include the people from the action groups?*
- 3.39 Bill Wood: *There will be representatives from the CFGs.*
- 3.40 Gail Latham: *So is this for all of the identified groups? Where are you going to tour?*
- 3.41 Bill Wood: *The idea is to do a tour and take in the terrain generally and look at where the Options go and that sort of thing.*
- 3.42 Gail Latham: *The other Options did not get a personal tour. Is there any reason for special attention to this group?*
- 3.43 Bill Wood: *There will be an examination of the Coastal Ridgeway, and also a look at where the inner corridor will be going. It is not purely for the purposes of the Coastal Ridgeway but it will be part of the process.*
- 3.44 Discussion followed on the merits of media releases versus paid advertising for the project and the Coastal Ridgeway investigations and whether people read the newspapers or not.
- 3.45 Chris Clark indicated that responsibility for any media releases or paid advertising about the project lay with the Steering Committee. There was so much information being put out by the government and the steering committee that, unless it was new, the hierarchy was reluctant to put out "old information". Cost was an issue and also the matter of trying to ensure it was not perceived as steamrolling information out to the community. He said he was prepared to take up the suggestion to get information to the community about the Coastal Ridgeway and other items but could not make promises.
- 3.46 Gillian French: *What we are asking is, we need to look at a way of improving communication. Is that an option?*
- 3.47 Bill Wood: *It is certainly an option that has been suggested and can be considered. One way of putting an entirely new perspective on this is to have that "on the ground" tour. It is under consideration as to whether we need to have the media along. If we can have the media along on some "whole of tour" media visit, instead of them just putting a microphone under somebody's nose, I think that is going to generate a whole lot of interest. instead of talking about a line on a map.*
- 3.48 CFG member Ron Smith: *Are all the CFG members invited on this tour?*
- 3.49 Bill Wood: *That is what we will have to work through. Probably representatives from various groups.*
- 3.50 Ron Smith: *How do we decide this?*
- 3.51 Bill Wood: *By getting people from the target groups, you have some of those members there, as well as CFG members will be invited, but I cannot tell you categorically who is on the list.*
- 3.52 Wilson Dale: *What kind of vehicle?*
- 3.53 Bill Wood: *More than one.*
- 3.54 **Review of CFG Process (purpose, charter, role and protocols)**  
Andrew Smith: *There was a query raised in terms of the CFG process and the Charter, about whether or not we had accepted the previous Charter. We have minuted that we accepted the Charter for this group, with its amendments, at the*



Details:

Action By/Date:

*meeting of 29 January.*

- 3.55 Trish Welsh: *I think we need the Charter, not the draft.*
- 3.56 Gillian French: *And I think we need to stick to the Charter.*
- 3.57 Andrew Smith: *I think the amendments were not substantial and we agreed to that.*
- 3.58 Gail Latham: *To be put into the Minutes.*
- 3.59 Gillian French: *Are we sticking to the Charter? Because it says that this group will be the point where we listen to the community needs, and we are saying that this is not happening.*
- 3.60 Peter Lubans: *Who is saying?*
- 3.61 Gillian French: *People at the Workshop.*
- 3.62 Peter Lubans: *I agree some people are saying, but please don't say the whole of the community.*
- 3.63 Andrew Smith: *If you read statements like that in any Charter you should not take everything in absolute form. The question is "How well" are we disseminating information, not "Are we" disseminating information.*
- 3.64 Gillian French: *"Minutes distributed within 2 weeks". That is not happening.*
- 3.65 Andrew Smith: *We go through 36 pages of shorthand notes. We try to get that down to a concise record. We try to be objective, and not subjective. And it goes to a couple of people to make sure it is correct.*
- 3.66 Gillian French: *So do we need to amend that Charter?*
- 3.67 Trish Welsh: *We requested to get the Minutes in their raw version, and that is what I want. At the Peer Review meeting with the Steering Committee, we brought that up and it was agreed.*
- 3.68 Andrew Smith: *That is a different question.*
- 3.69 Rick Bennell: *We talked about a number of issues. When committees are not working well, you are talking about administration, not the points of action. We are better off asking "What action can we take to deal with those three dot points?"*
- 3.70 Trish Welsh: *I don't trust that the Minutes I get are a true reflection of the meeting. Sorry, but every meeting we have brought up things that have been left out. We asked at that meeting of Council and the Steering Committee, "Can we have a raw version?" And Bob Higgins said, "There will be a lot of technical stuff you don't understand", and we said, "We don't care". And that is what was agreed to.*
- 3.71 Andrew Smith: *Is that related to this meeting?*
- 3.72 Trish Welsh: *That was one of the points. We asked for the raw version of the Minutes and it was agreed to*
- 3.73 Andrew Smith: *We had this issue raised at one of the other CFGs and it was made available. Only one or two wanted the raw, verbatim record. We made that available to the person who wanted it. So our answer is the same.*
- 3.74 Marlene Jacobs: *Then our Minutes won't correspond.*

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.75 Andrew Smith: *The Minutes that go out are what we table each night.*
- 3.76 Peter Lubans: *A suggestion. I have missed a few Minutes, but in the same vein. If the Minutes are delivered as we said, within a certain time, and certainly within a week prior to a meeting, then people have that opportunity to contact, e-mail back, and have the changes made before we get to the meeting and have the changes made, but we shouldn't have the time spent here. Don't have the meeting if you can't have the Minutes to us the week before.*
- 3.77 (In response to a question from Andrew Smith, the members said they don't get them until the day before, or the night before).
- 3.78 Trish Welsh: (in response to Peter Lubans' suggestion): *I am happy with that.*
- 3.79 Peter Lubans: *Don't have a meeting unless you give us the Minutes 7 days in advance.*
- 3.80 Wilson Dale: *Could we have an agreement as well, that any information that is presented, for example, slides, presentation material, that we have them at the meeting in hard copy?*
- 3.81 Trish Welsh: *That has been previously agreed to.*

## 4 OTHER ISSUES

- 4.1 **Recommendation of investigations into the Southern Section**  
Chris Clark said regarding the Coastal Ridgeway investigations, it was important to revisit how the original outer, middle and inner corridor options for Coffs Harbour were determined. *All that work was based on an engineering investigation to try and determine what options were out there and which options were feasible.*
- 4.2 Gillian French: *From an engineering perspective?*
- 4.3 Chris Clark: *From an engineering perspective. We came up with the corridors and did an evaluation of the corridors. At this point in time we are doing an identical process with the Coastal Ridgeway proposal. We have had discussions with Wilson (Dale) and Steven (Moody). We are looking at that and getting a better understanding of what the proposal is, what its implications are in engineering terms, ensuring RTA guidelines and design standards are met, and so on; whether it is feasible or not and, if it is feasible, does it warrant a full-blown investigation that we will do for the other corridors? At the moment we are in the middle of that process.*
- 4.4 Gail Latham: *When do you expect to complete?*
- 4.5 Chris Clark: *Sometime in the middle of next year. The majority of our efforts over the last 3-4 weeks have been involved in getting information out about Sapphire to Woolgoolga, which has absorbed all of our resources. We will now be continuing our investigations into the Coastal Ridgeway proposal and into ongoing investigations into the Coffs Harbour proposal.*
- 4.6 Wilson Dale indicated he was preparing a document which was basically looking at evaluation and discussing a few options for the kind of things that will go on in the comparative evaluation. He hoped to have it ready in a few weeks and would like it to be considered as part of the overall process.
- 4.7 Gail Latham: *It was just stated that the RTA would be following the same process as the other Options.*



Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.8 Wilson Dale: *Excuse me, but you have no idea of what will be in this document.*
- 4.9 Gillian French: *To date, everything has been from an engineering perspective. What we are saying, and what is written in the Charter, is that there is more to this community than an engineering perspective. We are concerned about the impacts it will have. I thought I heard Mark say that the Coastal Ridgeway, the Inner Corridor and the Pacific Highway would have all three issues looked at simultaneously. We are not Port Macquarie or Taree. He did say that.*
- 4.10 Chris Clark: *When we go out with the further investigations for the highway and the Inner Corridor and possibly the Coastal Ridgeway – the Option Evaluation Process – at that point in time we will be providing the additional information on the social, economic, environmental issues - very similar to Sapphire to Woolgoolga. Before we start spending quite a lot of money and time in doing social and environmental assessments of the Coastal Ridgeway proposal, we need to get into the stage of trying to find out what it is and if it is achievable and viable in engineering terms. We don't know that at this point in time with the Coastal Ridgeway.*
- 4.11 Wilson Dale: *Anybody who has travelled about Europe and Japan would know that terrain is no barrier to building roads. We are not talking about engineering.*
- 4.12 Gail Latham: *That is basically what I meant when I said, Wilson, that you might be building up a lot of stuff but it probably won't be looked at. If it has not been looked at with the others, if it is going to be an identical process.*
- 4.13 Wilson Dale: *Let's just take one issue.*
- 4.14 Peter Lubans: *We are heading in a direction which the group wants to go. I think you have had a lot to say. All that is happening now is we have listened to you. Please let's get on with the process.*
- 4.15 Trish Welsh: *I am having trouble here. With what was said at the Steering Committee meeting, that the upgrade of the highway, the Coastal Ridgeway, the Inner Corridor would all be looked at simultaneously. Is that what you just said?*
- 4.16 Andrew Smith: *I think Chris's response was yes, but you need to do that in a certain order, and evaluate it on an engineering basis first.*
- 4.17 Trish Welsh: *That was not agreed to. It was agreed that they would be looked at, at the same time.*
- 4.18 Gillian French: *We are representing thousands of people who want to know what is going on. The RTA is going to build the cheapest road possible – they don't care about social and economic issues to the community.*
- 4.19 Chris Clark: *That is not fair. The first thing you need to do in any investigation is to identify what is feasible from an engineering point of view. There is no point in taking it any further if it is not feasible. If it does not get past that base line, there is no point in wasting taxpayers' money investigating all the other issues associated with it.*
- 4.20 Gillian French: *There are countless examples out there of an Option being built which is far away from being the cheapest Option.*
- 4.21 Bill Wood: *Even with those initial studies, there has to be some assessment made of the social and environmental impacts and they all have to be considered.*
- 4.22 Gail Latham: *Basically prior to this though, the handout to the CFGs, so that was in*

Details:

Action By/Date:

*early May (reading from document): "... Preparation of a detailed cost estimate cannot be justified ... However, ... the Steering Committee has accepted that there is no sound reason ... investigation to be undertaken." That was stated before and that was the 1<sup>st</sup> May.*

- 4.23 Andrew Smith invited Tim Paterson to discuss the investigations to be undertaken.
- 4.24 Tim Paterson indicated the main items would be engineering investigations because they would give definition and shape to the Options. There would be some strategic cost estimates prepared; work on traffic network systems and the traffic performance of the different schemes as far as they were developed. Further work would be carried out on the assessment of the consequences of the different Options – landscaping and visual implications; traffic noise; broader socio-economic issues, natural environmental consequences; land use planning issues and heritage. As with the outer corridors, the investigations would aim to answer whether the current Options were feasible.
- 4.25 Gail Latham: *Were there fatal flaws in dropping those two Options?*
- 4.26 Tim Paterson said the Steering Committee had made that judgment in March and it had been very fundamentally endorsed by the Peer Review.
- 4.27 Trish Welsh: *From an engineering perspective.*
- 4.28 Tim Paterson: *That was an important point. They gave importance to terrain, traffic systems, etc.*
- 4.29 David Pike: *Is the issue of 'agriculture' and 'banana lands' being considered, the impacts of the existing highway versus the inner corridor?*
- 4.30 Tim Paterson: *That will be a feature. We are trying to answer the questions, "are there outcomes, impacts". It is not about saying "Oh this is the answer". We want to know what options are available strategically for the long term. It is not the intention to leave ourselves just with one. One of the key consequences is that we may have two strategic options at the end of the process.*
- 4.31 Gillian French: *Is 'geology' another area?*
- 4.32 Tim Paterson said yes, initially there would be desktop investigations. If significant issues were revealed, that could point to the need for some technical investigation.
- 4.33 Wilson Dale: *As part of the social impact, noise issues, will you be interviewing people of the Sapphire area? We get lots of calls from people in the Sapphire area complaining about the noise.*
- 4.34 Tim Paterson: *Nothing has happened at this time.*
- 4.35 Wilson Dale indicated that, to him, it was essential to investigating the inner corridor.
- 4.36 Tim Paterson: *That has not been identified as a pending activity. The intention was there for our Noise Consultant to conduct a strategic assessment of whether the project – either along the highway or along the inner corridor – was likely to be able to achieve the sort of noise goals for such a facility in the future.*
- 4.37 Chris Clark indicated that from the staffed displays that had been held at Park Beach Plaza, those that would be held at Woolgoolga and the normal community involvement processes, the project team was well aware of the concerns expressed by the community and residents of the Sapphire area.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.38 Gillian French: *Your consultant will presumably work out some sort of test? The noise reverberates back off the mountains.*
- 4.39 Tim Paterson: *The key contributing factors will be taken into account in the methodology. The key question is "Can a new highway facility achieve the noise goals demanded by the EPA?"*
- 4.40 Wilson Dale: *To the population this is the key issue. If you look at the community feedback, noise is probably the number one issue.*
- 4.41 Peter Lubans: *An issue in town, too. And tens of thousands cop it through town; as to when we argue where it goes – someone is coping it somewhere.*
- 4.42 Tim Paterson: *We recognise it as a key issue. Also the new B-double issue, and a raft of other issues. Feasibility issue. Amenity issue. One of the challenges is taking the view of 15-20 years down the track. That is why it is necessarily a strategic assessment. It is something that is not done very often and it is going to be an interesting process. And the professionals we can contact to see if there are fatal flaws. Equally, the other corridors must be considered.*
- 4.43 Andrew Smith: **Next Information Sheet.** *Regarding the next information sheet – potentially that means the next CFG Meeting - when will we be meeting again?*
- 4.44 Tim Paterson: *I don't think there is any risk of not getting minutes out on time. It gets a rev in the New Year. I expect we need a month before more substantive progress is made in a number of areas.*
- 4.45 Andrew Smith: *So February?*
- 4.46 Tim Paterson: *I think it must be in February. I cannot tell at this stage.*
- 4.47 Andrew Smith: *Any other issues not discussed tonight?*
- 4.48 Marlene Jacobs: *Where is Woolgoolga at now with their Options? 'A' selected. Wouldn't that have some repercussions?*
- 4.49 Tim Paterson: *That is part of the Coastal Ridgeway.*
- 4.50 Marlene Jacobs: *Is that going to change anything?*
- 4.51 Tim Paterson: *The Coastal Ridgeway, the northern half generally is Option A. Where we have had to create totally new geometry is in the "in between" country, cross Bucca Road and linking into Option A. Settlers Road and that area is where we have had to give it some shape and definition.*
- 4.52 Gillian French asked Marlene as to what her question was – was it "If A was selected, would that wipe us out?"
- 4.53 Tim Paterson: *No it does not .... There is no reason why it could not divert through the Upper Bucca area to tie in. It could still come back in to the existing highway corridor in the vicinity of North Moonee area.*
- 4.54 Marlene Jacobs: *So you are not going to say 'yes' or 'no'?*
- 4.55 Tim Paterson: *I think the strategy must remain. I think it is the scheme plus Option A. The broad intention is that hopefully we end up with a judgment or decision as to a preferred Option for Sapphire to Woolgoolga, next year.*
- 4.56 Trish Welsh asked if councillors were receiving individual copies of the meeting notes

Details:

Action By/Date:

and if they were invited to meetings on a meeting-to-meeting basis.

- 4.57 Andrew Smith: *Yes, the Minutes go through.*
- 4.58 Trish Welsh: *Are they receiving an invitation to each meeting on a meeting-to-meeting basis?*
- 4.59 Bill Wood: *There is a standing invitation.*
- 4.60 Trish Welsh: *We agreed at the July meeting to invite them on a meeting-to-meeting basis. 2.5, that was a big issue.*
- 4.61 Bill Wood: *I agree. They are not at the moment specifically invited to attend a particular meeting on, say, Wednesday evening, 11 December. But that could be done. But I am sure they all understand that they can.*
- 4.62 Trish Welsh: *Also the Agricultural Report. When will that be finalised? Ernie Armstrong asked it at the last meeting and it was said that it was not finished.*
- 4.63 Tim Paterson: *We have been off the case entirely for a number of months and it runs with those other investigations.*
- 4.64 Gail Latham: *Are you going to make sure these are going to be kept up with? (She held up the latest information brochure).*
- 4.65 Andrew Smith: *Yes. We did have limited supplies yesterday but we now have 10,000 and all the stands will be kept well stocked. There were 4,571 brochures and comment forms individually mailed out today. So that, in addition to the stands, we will keep the supply up.*
- 4.66 Gail Latham: *Given the information just confirmed that Option A is linked to the Coastal Ridgeway, I was fairly ticked off to see that the Council was condoning the People's Choice issue by having a box in the Council foyer, right up against the display. I feel, for the Steering Committee, that was the wrong thing to do. Unless all groups have no objection to any of the particular groups to do likewise. (Some members asked Gail to explain further, and Gail continued): There was a box in the foyer of the Council Chambers right next to the stand that showed the routes. I feel that that looked as though Council was condoning that as a preferential group, because every group should be allowed to have their box there, or nobody has one.*
- 4.67 Bill Wood: *It is a fair comment, Gail. Certainly the Council would not condone having a box there for any particular group. Whether the box was placed there and not moved, I don't know. We will remove it, and then consider it.*
- 4.68 Wilson Dale: *It will not be in the Council. The whole thing is up before the public. The People's Choice as it was, wasn't before the public.*
- 4.69 Trish Welsh: *These maps are fantastic. I think it's a bit unfortunate that it's released one week before the school holidays and the deadline is one week after the school holidays. It is the festive season, and people are travelling away. Are we going to reach all the people? If you truly want to comment on it, you have to study it. I can't look at it until the New Year as I am on holidays. Can't you extend it until the middle of February?*
- 4.70 Bill Wood: *Those closing dates have never been rigidly enforced on many occasions. If submissions were received within a reasonable period of time after the closing date – say, 14 days – they will be considered as they have always been considered.*

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.71 Peter Lubans: *I suggest that when they are due to close, you put something in the newspaper – a publicity release to remind them?*
- 4.72 Trish Welsh: *Everybody knows the school holidays are January. Can't we make it the middle of February?*
- 4.73 Gail Latham: *That upsets the plan.* (Gail held up the brochure).
- 4.74 Chris Clark indicated the Steering Committee would take the matter on board: Some articles might be placed in the papers towards the end of the exhibition period and submissions could be accepted after the closing period. The matter would be considered by the Steering Committee before submissions closed.
- 4.75 Bill Wood: *The people who are likely to be making these decisions are well informed and have an understanding of what the process is.*
- 4.76 Trish Welsh: *I have had a lot of phone calls from people who have just bought in Roselands Estate and are very, very distressed about a potential bypass.*
- 4.77 Peter Lubans: *Their solicitor would do a search.*
- 4.78 Trish Welsh: *If you ring the Council, the Council do not tell you that the property is the subject of a possible bypass.*
- 4.79 Chris Clark: *Any property enquiries that the RTA receive, if the property is in any of the corridors, or likely corridors, the solicitors get advised of this in writing and get sent a copy of the brochure. And if they are adjacent to the corridor, we also send that to them in writing and they get sent a brochure as well.*
- 4.80 Bill Wood: *Maybe they are not engaging a solicitor in the sale.*
- 4.81 Peter Lubans: *I saw one that cost the solicitor \$100,000 because he did not advise.*
- 4.82 Andrew Smith: *I think your original point was that of advertising that submissions are drawing to a close and Chris has said that that will be considered.*
- 4.83 There were no further matters arising and Andrew Smith closed the meeting, advising that meeting notes would be sent out before the next meeting. Advice of the date of the next meeting also would be provided as soon as it was determined.

## 5 CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 7.15 pm

**Next Meeting:** To be advised