

Meeting Record

Project:	Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy	Reference:	1093.50
Location:	Coffs Harbour Ex-Services Club, Vernon Street, Coffs Harbour	Date:	26 February 2003

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

Interest/Groups represented:

SOUTHERN CFG

✓		David Doyle	Existing Highway interests
✓		Bob Bunting	Inner West Coffs residents interests
✓		Trish Welsh	Inner West Coffs residents interests
✓		Murray Williams	Utilities 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
	✓	Peter Jackson	Infrastructure interests
✓		Wilson Dale	Inner West Coffs residents interests

PROJECT TEAM				
✓			Chris Clark	RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins	RTA
✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓		Bruce Penman	Connell Wagner
	✓		Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
	✓		Jenny Bonfield	Mayor, Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			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: 16
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 8 (Southern CFG)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith opened the meeting at 5.36 pm
- 1.2 **Apologies.** Apologies were received from: CFG member Murray Williams, Cr Jenny Bonfield, CHCC, Mark Ferguson CHCC, Jo Gardner, PlanningNSW, and Bob Higgins, RTA.

2. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 Andrew Smith asked if there was any comment regarding the previous Notes.
- 2.2 Notes were accepted.

3. BUSINESS ARISING

- 3.1 Andrew Smith suggested all items under Business Arising be deferred to the Project Update section where they would be addressed, with the exception of the Peer Review workshop. Members agreed.
- 3.2 Andrew Smith asked CHCC representative George Stulle to address the request from members for the butcher's paper from the Peer Review Workshop to be provided to

Details:

the meeting.

- 3.3 George Stulle (CHCC) indicated the butcher's paper had been discarded by the consultant. He said Council would follow it up further with the consultant who had taken some notes from the workshop.

Action By/Date:

Council to follow up Peer Review Workshop notes with consultant. Item to be carried over under Business Arising for next meeting

4. PROJECT UPDATE

4.1 Update of Strategy Process

- 4.2 Tim Paterson (Connell Wagner) said the strategy process now involved a review of the Coastal Ridge Way proposal which was being integrated into the considerations of the Inner Corridor and the existing highway. This had implications in terms of the strategy process and timing

4.3 Report on Bus Tour – 22 February 2003

- 4.4 Andrew Smith asked for a show of hands from those who went on the bus tour and if they would like to provide some feedback.
- 4.5 Some CFG members were dissatisfied with the limited number of information packages available on the tour, the inability to share information and commentary between the two buses involved and the lesser amount of time spent on the northern section. A number of members said they found the bus tour an opportunity to share and listen to the views of others, gain a perspective of the routes and to have "a look at some of the hills to be gone around, over or through".
- 4.6 CFG member Tom Hamilton-Foster said he believed the production of a video of the route options from the air would be worthwhile. This had been discussed on his bus.
- 4.7 CFG member Trish Welsh said she had been disappointed at the few stops to look at the impacts of the Inner Corridor and at not being informed that the Inner Corridor had been refined. *I feel I am going to every meeting and not really achieving anything. I am achieving more from working with my action groups than coming to these meetings. We seem to be spending a lot of time arguing about the Minutes and I feel that we are going around in circles. In April last year we met at the Norm Jordan Pavilion and talked about the defined corridor, not the route, and then to be told on Saturday "this has all changed". I have phone calls from elderly people that cry to me because they are so stressed out by this. If they could now see this corridor route they would be jumping up and down. ... Nobody said the Inner Corridor was going through this residential area. (other CFG members disagreed with this). Except for the Roselands Estate and the Shepherds Lane area. They mentioned the Outer, but not the Inner. (other CFG members disagreed with this)*
- 4.8 Chris Clark (RTA) responded that, it was his understanding that the Inner Corridor boundaries that were included in the bus tour information pack had been extracted from the meeting held at the Norm Jordan Pavilion. He was not at the meeting but the aim had been to provide the most up-to-date information to the bus trip participants. The boundaries shown for the Inner Corridor replicated the results of that meeting. They represented the current and most up-to-date thinking as far as the corridor was concerned.
- 4.9 CFG member Trish Welsh: I did not see this map until a quarter of the way through the trip. Why didn't we all get a copy of it?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.10 Chris Clark responded that, because of the costs involved, it had been decided to provide one package between four people. At the end of the trip, those that wanted a copy could ask for one and they would be made available.
- 4.11 CFG member Trish Welsh: What sort of cost is involved?
- 4.12 Chris Clark: One of the bills for the cost of colour printing alone was \$370.
- 4.13 CFG member Trish Welsh: We are talking millions of dollars in this process and we are talking about between one and four hundred. I would love to have had one. It is a cop-out. Sorry.
- 4.14 CFG member Gail Latham responded that having one package between four had been difficult.
- 4.15 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if members could receive the meeting notes a bit earlier so members did not forget what was discussed?
- 4.16 Andrew Smith indicated the Notes were put out in the timeframe that was agreed to at the last meeting.
- 4.17 CFG member Gail Latham asked why there had not been any media invited on the tour. It had been her impression from the last meeting that the media were going to be invited.
- 4.18 George Stulle (CHCC) responded that he was not aware if anyone from Council had attended the last meeting. He said there had been a suggestion of another trip with the media.
- 4.19 Discussion followed that the last meeting had discussed that the media may attend.
- 4.20 CFG member Gail Latham responded that a representative from The Advertiser had made an inquiry about attending and had been discouraged from doing so. They had attended at Woolgoolga though "so obviously it was something organised at the Woolgoolga end".
- 4.21 George Stulle: I think it was more a matter of logistics. We had an intention to include the media. (Comments by CFG members that the bus was half empty).

4.22 **Presentation of Options and Status and Findings of Technical Investigations**

Overhead: Existing Highway (drawings available for distribution during the meeting)

Attach key junction overhead to Notes

- 4.23 Tim Paterson showed the first overhead of the existing highway from Englands Road to Moonee Beach and the key junctions under consideration which might present themselves as long-term highway propositions. He then worked his way through a series of overheads showing preliminary concepts for the key junctions from Englands Road to the north, reminding members that all were "work in progress". Members asked questions relating to the overheads.
- 4.24 CFG member Wilson Dale: Is that a left-in/left-out at the Hospital complex?
- 4.25 Tim Paterson responded that a need was seen for an internal link to the hospital so local movements are not all on the highway.
- 4.26 CFG member Wilson Dale: *So no right turn?*
- 4.27 Tim Paterson: That is correct. We cannot put an interchange at every junction. You need to have a reasonable separation.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.28 CFG member Gail Latham: So you come out Cook Drive somewhere?
- 4.29 Tim Paterson: *That's right.*
- 4.30 Tim Paterson continued.
- 4.31 CFG member Wilson Dale: Next interchange is Halls Road, Cook Drive?
- 4.32 Tim Paterson: Yes we did tentatively have something there. But it is getting very close to North Boambee and you would have to rationalise that. No hard and fast thinking. I would have to say it is sitting close to the other one.
- 4.33 CFG member Gail Latham: With Isles Drive going across to Englands Road, you can go that way to McDonalds. Before that was in place I always thought it would be a smart idea to run it (Isles Drive) across Halls Road.
- 4.34 Tim Paterson: Indeed there is a strategic plan that may do that. Under the North Boambee scheme, there is a possibility of Halls Road providing a collector function. So there are some strategic options.
- 4.35 Chris Clark: If you did that would need to look at providing a connection on the eastern side back down to Cook Drive.
- 4.36 Tim Paterson: So in other words, we can do without that one (Halls Road / Cook Drive interchange). You have to have a local network to make it work.
- 4.37 CFG member Wilson Dale: Another way is to take the access at Cook Drive totally away from the Pacific Highway.
- 4.38 CFG member Gillian French queried if the RTA would look at funding Hogbin Drive? She said Council could not afford it.
- 4.39 Tim Paterson responded that the strategic assessment assumed that Hogbin Drive was completed in 15-20 years. *If Hogbin Drive is not functioning by then, then we have problems.*
- 4.40 Chris Clark: The aim is to look at the overall transport strategy and get that sorted, and then get into discussions (between Council and RTA) as to who pays for what. Funding should not be the driver of the strategy.
- 4.41 Tim Paterson reiterated Hogbin Drive was an "assumed" arterial link, as was Mastracolas Road.
- 4.42 CFG member Gail Latham queried whether the inner corridor duplicated some of the function of Mastracolas Road.
- 4.43 Chris Clark responded not really because they diverged. - West of the end of Gately's Road, the Inner Corridor swings to the north to join the existing highway at Korora Hill whereas Mastracolas Road heads east past Homebase.
- 4.44 Tim Paterson said there was an opportunity in the Inner Corridor (southern section) to incorporate an eventual western ring road possibly as part of a bypass. A ring road linking south to North Boambee is envisaged in the Council roads strategy.
- 4.45 CFG member Wilson Dale: Are you tending basically to put a ring road through the same cutting as the Roberts Hill extension?
- 4.46 Tim Paterson responded that yes, this possible western ring road link is later on in the Council roads strategy and it could be incorporated into a bypass in the Inner

Details:

Action By/Date:

Corridor. He continued on with the existing highway overheads showing an interchange at Combine Street

4.47 CFG member Trish Welsh: *What's the speed limit?*

4.48 Tim Paterson responded perhaps 80-90 km/h. Speed had to be balanced with the geometry of the road, urban design, etc.

4.49 CFG member David Pike: How do you turn from Combine Street to go south?

4.50 Tim Paterson responded that the natural ridge lent itself to an underpass. It might need some sort of roundabout treatment.

4.51 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if there was anywhere else in New South Wales that had a 6-lane highway through town doing 80-90 km/h?

4.52 Tim Paterson: Yes. Wollongong – a very long, continuous one. There are numerous CBD and residential-type areas. I don't know the names of the individual suburbs. ... I can find out for you. They have all of the urban land use constraints and issues that we see in Coffs Harbour.

RTA/CW to source towns with 6-lane highways running through

4.53 Cr Bill Wood (CHCC): *Kembla Grange and others.*

4.54 CFG member Gillian French said there was concern about the gradient and the severity of the bend where the Big Windmill was.

4.55 Tim Paterson said it was still a constrained location in terms of the road geometry (reducing the radius of curves would be needed to achieve higher travel speed of say 80kph). He continued onto the business district where he said four lanes would have the capacity to last a very long time. The question was how much separation could be obtained from through traffic trips and local trips.

4.56 CFG member Gail Latham: So Council would not have to start putting a ban on commercial activity along the highway because there would not be any access?

4.57 CFG member Hugh Saddleton: *Probably no parking.*

4.58 CFG member Gail Latham said if traffic did not have to stop at traffic lights and had a straight run through, there would be a lot less noise. She was aware of Council's concerns because there was consideration of encouraging urban development on top of some buildings in the CBD.

4.59 CFG member Gillian French: Are you looking at a tunnel rather than a roundabout flyover-type of thing?

4.60 Tim Paterson responded that a tunnel was problematical. The type of ground was not conducive to tunnels. Tunnels were more of a proposition when there was a gradeline or a ridge. Perhaps in 20 years' time it might change a bit. He continued with the next overhead, indicating there was huge traffic generation in the area of Bray and Orlando Streets and Park Beach Road. There was a need to think about rationalising that. With the completion of the Mastracolas Road link, there would be even more transport movements in that area. There was a need to look at focusing key movements along Bray/Orlando area and considering rationalising access to Park Beach Plaza to facilitate changing local patterns.

4.61 CFG member Trish Welsh queried a section of the overhead.

4.62 Tim Paterson responded that it signified a structure over the highway which was again very schematic. It was referring to grade separation, an overbridge across for

Details:

Action By/Date:

local traffic. Not a flyover. He continued on to the Macauleys Headland area, indicating that, perhaps in the long term, a tunnel under there might become a real proposition.

- 4.63 CFG member Trish Welsh queried the possibility of a tunnel because it was close to residences.
- 4.64 Tim Paterson responded that it was an engineering response to the terrain and land use conditions in the area. The alternative of trying to straighten out the road over Macauleys wasn't a realistic option as it was a very prominent ridge in an urban area.
- 4.65 CFG member Trish Welsh said there was an analogy with the Inner Corridor because it was residential.
- 4.66 CFG member Gail Latham: So you are still going to have to cut through West Korora Road?
- 4.67 Tim Paterson indicated the movements on the overhead.
- 4.68 CFG member Trish Welsh: What is the ridge where those two black lines stop?
- 4.69 Tim Paterson: Diggers Beach Road.
- 4.70 CFG member Trish Welsh: So you are looking at a tunnel to come back out on to Diggers Beach Road?
- 4.71 Tim Paterson responded, as an example, yes. He continued onto James Small Drive where there was an example of a key point of interchange. The grade separated interchange could tie in to Bruxner Park Road and James Small Drive (south) where the highway had already been amplified. Another point of interchange at Opal Cove was indicated on the next overhead which tied into the options for the Sapphire to Woolgoolga project.
- 4.72 CFG member Ron Smith: Would some of these have to happen regardless of a bypass?
- 4.73 Tim Paterson responded that some of the key nodes or junctions would have to be upgraded to facilitate the growth in local traffic but they would need to be progressively treated over time.

Overhead: Inner Bypass

- 4.74 Tim Paterson said the overhead indicated the broad strategy with key junctions or interchanges – South of Englands Road, North Boambee Road and Coramba Road. There was a question mark with Mastracolas Road as to what the link might be there; then Korora.
- 4.75 CFG member Trish Welsh asked where at Korora?
- 4.76 Tim Paterson: Near to Bruxner Park, about a kilometre north of Bruxner Park Road.
- 4.77 CFG member Trish Welsh: *What is the next one?*
- 4.78 Tim Paterson responded somewhere near Opal Cove. He then moved on to a brief update on some of the design options shown on the aerial photos. The corridor shown was a modification of the corridor that was released in March 2002 and one that was broadly agreed to within the CFG in April 2002. Three design options were shown. Members asked questions regarding the design options including the length of a tunnel shown and the depth of cuttings.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.79 Chris Clark reminded members that the lines were all “work in progress” and it was more than likely there would be subsequent changes to them.
- 4.80 CFG member Wilson Dale queried how old were the aerial photographs used?
- 4.81 Rosemary Russell (Connell Wagner) responded they had been taken about a year ago.

Overhead: Coastal Ridge Way

- 4.82 Tim Paterson indicated the CRW had a similar access strategy to the Inner Corridor with an interchange again at the southern end south of Englands Road, and then Coramba Road. Probably not North Boambee. The next point of interchange would be Bucca Road.
- 4.83 CFG member Trish Welsh queried whereabouts of interchange at Coramba Road?
- 4.84 Tim Paterson replied on the crest of Red Hill, just on the western side of it. He pointed out features on the orange elevation map which showed the relationship of options to the existing highway. The blue showed the former Outer Corridor and CRW was shown in green. The CRW crossed North Boambee Road in the vicinity of the quarry. The “blobs” signified substantial cutting. The CRW continued to climb up to the main part of the range and then traversed on, crossing Bucca Road in the vicinity of Central Bucca Road. He showed how the CRW might tie into Option A in the northern section.
- 4.85 CFG member Gail Latham: So an overpass up Bruxner Park Road?
- 4.86 Tim Paterson: Yes.
- 4.87 CFG member Paul Norton: Towards Boundary Road, you would create a natural overpass instead of a cut and fill?
- 4.88 Tim Paterson: We are only thinking conceptually again. Some of those local roads may have little deviations to contain cost and work within the terrain.
- 4.89 CFG member Gail Latham: Coastal Ridge Way goes close to Gaudrons Road, Old Coast Road?
- 4.90 Tim Paterson indicated by showing on the orange map. He responded that, laterally, the CRW, was not that far away but in terms of elevation, it was quite detached. The elevation jumped from 20-50 metres to about 250 metres. The CRW was “work in progress”. Because of the quite significant terrain that was traversed, the depth of cuttings and the depth of some of the fill embankments were of a magnitude to warrant tunnel and viaduct formations. Some of the cuttings were of a depth that had not been dealt with in Australia so the route warranted a different engineering solution. Discussion followed with CFG member Wilson Dale regarding embankments.
- 4.91 Chris Clark indicated a technical workshop had been held with the proponents of the CRW during the week prior to the CFG meeting. At the workshop CFG member Wilson Dale had suggested that further reduction to the cuts and fills could be achieved by modifying the alignment in that area. He had asked if more work could be done to refine the alignment. By agreement, boundaries had been set on the width of the corridor that would be looked at. They had agreed on a maximum corridor width of 750 metres either side of the CRW.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.92 CFG member Trish Welsh asked what was the widest distance between the CRW line and parts of the former Outer Corridor?
- 4.93 Tim Paterson: *Two kilometres there.* (He indicated on the map).
- 4.94 Discussion followed on when the information would be provided to the broader community.
- 4.95 Tim Paterson indicated it would be released at the same time as the concepts for the Inner Corridor and existing highway. He continued with overhead presentation including showing zoning constraints for the three broad corridors and bio-diversity constraints.

5. WORKSHOP SESSION ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES

- 5.1 Tim Paterson moved on to socio-economic characteristics, listing:
 - Community cohesion – physical or psychological separation.
 - Amenity factors – noise, visual and air quality impacts.
 - Access and movement patterns – vehicular, pedestrian, cyclist.
 - Land use and property – broad and individual levels.
 - Effects on business activity – direct and indirect factors.
 - Effects on tourism – subset of business, but warrants separate consideration given its importance to Coffs Harbour economy.
- 5.2 Tim Paterson said each of the points were relevant matters in a socio-economic assessment.
- 5.3 Discussion followed on how socio-economic assessments were carried out.
- 5.4 CFG member Gillian French said she had been involved in a survey of businesses about six years ago which was more like an economic survey but she would see if respondents had raised issues relevant to such an assessment.
- 5.5 Tim Paterson indicated the list provided drew on the assessment carried out for Sapphire to Woolgoolga, of which there had been no particular criticism. He said the aim was to workshop the list with the CFG members tonight. Comparing the impacts of the three suggested corridors would be carried out by social planners.
- 5.6 Discussion followed on how and whether to workshop the list at the meeting.
- 5.7 CFG member David Pike asked whether there would be a separate agricultural study?
- 5.8 Tim Paterson responded that agriculture would be assessed by a specialist practitioner.
- 5.9 Discussion continued. It was suggested that CFG members think about the list and the item be included on the next meeting's Agenda.
- 5.10 CFG member Wilson Dale said, regarding noise levels, his group had started a survey at Sapphire. 10% of the population were highly annoyed by the noise level. Over 40% per cent of the people who lived in that area are highly affected by noise. It had been a subjective assessment on a scale of 1-6.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 5.11 CFG member Gail Latham: And yet the noise receivers on the maps do not show that, according to Connell Wagner.
- 5.12 CFG member Wilson Dale: Environmental Planning standards call for 10% or less to be highly affected by noise.
- 5.13 Tim Paterson responded that, in relation to noise, Wilkinson Murray was doing that part of the work for the Project Team. They were examining how the noise assessment might be conducted in a strategic context. It involved looking at the options and considering the major elements of noise. Heavy vehicles would be a major consideration. Night-time traffic noise would be assessed along with who would be the receptors to the noise and what the annoyance factor might be.
- 5.14 CFG member Gillian French: So they are working on this now?
- 5.15 Tim Paterson responded yes. The acoustic consultant had asked for a reference date. 2021 had been chosen because information had been projected on what the traffic environment could be like then and it was a key year underpinning the strategy.
- 5.16 Discussion followed on a review of noise standards by the EPA in response to European standards which called for much quieter vehicles and what road surfaces, tyre technology and vehicle emissions might be developed by 2021.
- 5.17 Chris Clark indicated that if there were changes in technology, they were going to be applicable to all three options and therefore comparing them all on a level basis was valid.
- 5.18 CFG member Trish Welsh suggested that CFG members could carry out a SWOT analysis on social impacts before the next meeting, return the results for collation and circulation before the next meeting and then discuss the item at the next meeting. This was agreed.
- 5.19 Further discussions followed regarding noise assessments, improvements in pavement technology and noise impacts on property market values.
- 5.20 Chris Clark indicated he had information to present regarding traffic movements following the opening of the Yelgun-Chinderah bypass.

CFG members to carry out SWOT analysis on socio-economic factors and return for collation. Item to be placed on Agenda for next meeting.

Overhead: Vehicle Classification System

Overheads to be attached to Notes

- 5.21 Chris Clark ran through the classification of vehicles showing 2 categories of light vehicles and 10 categories of heavy vehicles.
- 5.22 CFG member Hugh Saddleton: Is it true that the B-doubles do less damage than the ordinary semi -- because of more evenly-distributed weight?
- 5.23 Chris Clark responded that it was probably similar. There was very similar weight distribution. In August 2002, the Yelgun-Chinderah project was opened. Prior to that, 25m B-doubles using the Pacific Highway from Sydney could go no further than Ballina. The exception was the short B-doubles which, for example, serviced petrol stations. They did not have any limitation on where they could go. Measurements had been taken at a number of locations both before and after the opening of Yelgun-Chinderah project to give an idea of how much additional traffic was on the Pacific Highway.

Overhead: Location of Vehicle Movement Counters

- 5.24 CFG member Trish Welsh: Is there any reason why Coffs Harbour is not included?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 5.25 Chris Clark responded that there was no permanent vehicle station in Coffs Harbour but he would provide information from preliminary results from Council records over the Christmas holiday period.
- 5.26 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if it was possible to know the number of B-doubles that represented through traffic as opposed to those that stopped in Coffs Harbour for local deliveries:
- 5.27 Chris Clark responded that he was trying to source that information.
- 5.28 CFG member Trish Welsh: Can you e-mail this information to us?
- 5.29 Chris Clark: We do need to look at how adequate that information is.
- 5.30 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if an update on the traffic information could be listed under "Business Arising" for the next meeting?

Traffic information update to be listed under Business Arising for next CFG meeting

Overhead: Daily Movements Averaged over Weekly Periods

- 5.31 Chris Clark continued his presentation. After the opening of the Yelgun-Chinderah project, there was an increase of about 300 total vehicle movements which was fairly consistent between the locations. In terms of heavy vehicles:
 - Nabiac: B-doubles increased from 30 to about 220.
 - Port Macquarie: from 20 to 180.
 - Yelgun: from 20 to 150.In general terms, there has been an average increase of about 100 semi-trailers since the opening of Yelgun-Chinderah and 150 B-doubles; giving a total of additional heavy vehicles on the Pacific Highway of about 250.
- 5.32 CFG member Tom Hamilton-Foster suggested average daily movements ignored that most heavy loads occurred on Sundays, Mondays, etc, and tailed off on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. There also was a jump in the numbers coming back, which there never used to be before, so residents were copping it both ways because of the opening of the bypass north.
- 5.33 Discussion followed on the numbers.
- 5.34 CFG member Gillian French: Everyone in town is now saying we can't live with these trucks. What are your plans between now and 20 years to alleviate the situation? Why have you collected this data?
- 5.35 Chris Clark: To do our forward traffic projections and to pick up the trends happening out there on the road. And to see what changes or modifications need to be made to the road network.
- 5.36 CFG member Gail Latham: *It certainly is the issue.*
- 5.37 Discussion followed about various CFG members' experiences with current traffic volumes and heavy vehicles.
- 5.38 CFG member Gillian French: We can't put up with it for 20 years. No one foresaw the impact that Chinderah would have on the little places. ... The warrants for the need for a bypass has gone up since that happened. Do you think this will result in the bypass coming forward in time, or will something be there to improve our lives in the next 20 years? Because this community can't put up with it.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 5.39 Chris Clark: At the end of the day, the best way to bring forward any major upgrades for the highway, is to end up with an Option that is affordable and has good economic benefits as far as the community is concerned, and is broadly supported by the community. That is putting it in the best possible position to attract government funding.
- 5.40 CFG member David Pike: What sort of sensitivity will you be doing with these traffic movements? For example, trends on say, a Monday afternoon. We all know Christmas is bad. But every week, you are going to get one a minute. We know that, but that's not what the figures are saying.
- 5.41 Chris Clark: We do have historical data which is very much an input into the traffic volumes.
- 5.42 George Stulle: We are involved in the process along with the other two government authorities. The first step is to get an agreed Option that the community supports. And then the timing for that agreed option.

6. FORTHCOMING ACTIVITIES / INVESTIGATIONS

6.1 Proposed Study Program

Overhead presentation by Chris Clark

Attach overheads to Notes

- 6.2 Chris Clark indicated that as far as the Coffs section was concerned, it was hoped to put the refined Options on exhibition mid-year. That would occur about the same time as a decision on the preferred route for Sapphire to Woolgoolga. Comments received from the exhibition would be examined. A draft strategy report then would be compiled and an adopted strategy would be announced for Coffs Harbour. Changes would then be made to the LEP if zoning changes needed to be made. Following the announcement of a preferred route for Sapphire to Woolgoolga, that project would then move into the EIS stage.
- 6.3 CFG member Wilson Dale said he understood the response to the exhibition of the route options for Sapphire to Woolgoolga indicated overwhelming support for Option A and that it should connect to the CRW. *How are you going to respond to that?*
- 6.4 Chris Clark indicated that the submissions would feed into the various Option selection workshops such as the Value Management Study and into a decision on a preferred Option.
- 6.5 CFG member Gillian French asked, if Option A was favoured, would it be brought out somewhere along the highway and connected to the CRW later?
- 6.6 Chris Clark responded that there was the Sapphire to Woolgoolga project, and then there was a need to identify a strategy for Coffs Harbour which would put it in a position to implement that strategy 20-25 years down the track.
- 6.7 CFG member Gail Latham said she wanted to raise an issue regarding an information stand at the Park Beach Plaza. Residents in the Bucca area had complained that the people staffing the display were either providing incorrect or vague information.
- 6.8 Andrew Smith suggested the matter should be taken up outside the forum.
- 6.9 CFG member Gail Latham responded that if responses were based on misinformation, did they carry a lot of weight?
- 6.10 Andrew Smith indicated submissions had not closed. Until they could be collated and

Details:

Action By/Date:

analysed, it was too early to make judgments about what was contained in them.

- 6.11 CFG member Wilson Dale said he also wanted to raise a matter. He read to the meeting the contents of a letter written by a person to a newspaper.
- 6.12 CFG member Tom Hamilton-Foster: I don't think it should be tabled in the Notes quite frankly.
- 6.13 Andrew Smith indicated this issue was not appropriate for discussion at the meeting and was a matter to be taken up outside this forum.
- 6.14 Chris Clark responded that he agreed. There was a special procedure and a more appropriate forum for people to address this type of issue.
- 6.15 The CFG then discussed the need to follow up with some members of the CFG who had not attended recent meetings about whether they wanted to continue as members. If they did not, alternative representation needed to be sought.
- 6.16 CFG member Ron Smith asked for clarification on whether an EIS would be carried out following route selection and therefore there would be only one EIS for each section?
- 6.17 Chris Clark responded that an EIS would be carried out on the preferred Option for Sapphire to Woolgoolga. Because the preferred option for the Coffs section was not proceeding to construction at this point in time, it would involve a review of the planning legislation to identify what, if any, changes needed to be made to the planning legislation to provide for a bypass of Coffs Harbour or an upgraded highway.
- 6.18 CFG member Ron Smith: In that case, if the Outer Option A was selected and the EIS was done and it was found there were almost insurmountable environmental problems, what happens?
- 6.19 Chris Clark responded that if a preferred Option was selected and problems came up, it would be necessary to go back and revisit the Options that had been discarded. However, one of the primary objectives of the work done to date was to ensure, as far as possible, that the work was robust enough so that there was very little chance of missing any fatal problems. Once a preferred Option was selected, there would be the EIS and significant enhancement of the concept design as well.
- 6.20 CFG member Gail Latham said she was concerned that access for ecological assessment regarding Sapphire to Woolgoolga had been denied by some property owners. Such people had done themselves a disservice because, if anything of value had been found, it contributed to their property being avoided.
- 6.21 CFG member Paul Norton and Tim Paterson indicated on-site inspections were not the only means of identifying such issues.

CFG members who have not attended recent meetings to be contacted re continuing as members.

7. OTHER ISSUES

7.1 Media Releases

- 7.2 CFG member Trish Welsh queried whether a media release from the group's last meeting was going to occur? It was difficult for members representing a large area to get back to people without the support of media releases.
- 7.3 CFG member Gillian French said she also had received feedback from her community that they were not aware of updated information. An important part of the Peer Review Workshop had concerned ways to improve consultation with the

Details:

Action By/Date:

community.

7.4 Chris Clark responded he had indicated at the last meeting he would try to get a media release out but that it might not be possible. That was how it turned out. The project was in a similar position now because the Government went into "caretaker mode" prior to an election. It would not be possible to put out a press release following this meeting.

7.5 CFG member Trish Welsh said there also was the question of observers on the Steering Committee – one from each CFG. She asked if that could be placed on Business Arising for the next meeting.

Observers at Steering Committee meetings to be placed under Business Arising for next meeting

7.6 CFG member Trish Welsh also queried the whereabouts of the butcher's paper from the Peer Review Workshop?

7.7 Andrew Smith responded that this was addressed earlier and George Stulle had reported that the butcher's paper no longer existed, so it was a matter of trying to have the notes replicated.

7.8 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if the matter could be placed under Business Arising for the next meeting.

7.9 Procedure for placing Notes of CFG Meetings on Website

7.10 Andrew Smith indicated the current procedure was to place the Notes on the web site as soon as they were available. Amendments to the Notes of the previous meeting were made at the following meeting. He said it had been proposed that the Notes be posted as "a draft" subject to amendment.

7.11 CFG member Tom Hamilton-Foster said he did not believe the proposed practice conformed to accepted meeting procedures.

7.12 Discussion followed on the procedure that should be adopted.

7.13 Chris Clark flagged that whatever procedure was adopted had to be consistent with the other CFGs.

7.14 It was decided the matter should be put on the Agenda for the next meeting to see what the feedback from the other two groups had been.

Procedure for placing Notes of CFG Meetings on Website to be placed on Agenda for next meeting

7.15 CFG member Trish Welsh asked if the representation of various members could be provided to other members?

7.16 Andrew Smith responded that representation could be provided with the Notes.

7.17 CFG member Trish Welsh asked when the report on community responses for the northern section would be available?

7.18 Chris Clark responded two-three months, maybe even earlier.

7.19 CFG member Trish Welsh said she wanted to raise the need for the three CFGs getting together. She said she had found it interesting when information had been shared by members on the combined bus tour.

7.20 CFG member Gillian French: I suppose their Minutes are posted on this website as well?

7.21 Tim Paterson responded "yes".

7.22 CFG member Gail Latham: Perhaps after the Options stage we could meet up then?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 7.23 CFG member Hugh Saddleton: *Perhaps a social barbecue?*
- 7.24 Andrew Smith responded that they would need to define what the purpose of a combined meeting would be.
- 7.25 CFG member Gillian French: What about having a representative from each of the groups so that they can refer back?
- 7.26 Andrew Smith indicated that the Woolgoolga and Sapphire-Moonee groups had started to do that but, after one meeting, the Woolgoolga group had decided they would only have an observer attend the other group's meeting if they felt it was pertinent.
- 7.27 CFG member Wilson Dale: I think the problem was the observer status was unworkable.
- 7.28 Andrew Smith responded: *Yes. Any other issues?*
- 7.29 CFG member Gillian French: What about the communication process? No press release until middle of the year. No Notes on the web site. How do we improve communication? ... It keeps getting deferred. We had this discussion in December.
- 7.30 CFG member Gail Latham: What is wrong with continuing the process of speaking with your representatives?
- 7.31 Chris Clark said communication was an ongoing issue. His suggestion was for it to be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.
- 7.32 CFG member Trish Welsh: Are observers allowed at that meeting?
- 7.33 Cr Bill Wood: From memory, Council were going to liaise with CFG groups.
- 7.34 CFG member Trish Welsh: When is that going to happen? The meeting was 8 weeks ago.
- 7.35 Cr Bill Wood: We have not had a Steering Committee meeting since then but that was the outcome.
- 7.36 CFG member Gillian French: So when is your next Steering Committee?
- 7.37 Cr Bill Wood: Probably about mid-April.
- 7.38 CFG member Hugh Saddleton: One of the problems with communication is that it just drags on and drags on. Why can't we set a meeting once a month? Make the meeting short. So we know where we are going.
- 7.39 Andrew Smith responded that the drivers for meetings were when information and the results of investigations were available rather than calendar months.
- 7.40 Chris Clark indicated the southern section had come out of a hiatus with the Peer Review. There had been one meeting before Christmas, then the Christmas break. There had been some work since then. It was planned to go out with the refined route options mid-year. That would generate the need for more meetings than in the past.

8. CLOSE OF MEETING

Details:

Action By/Date:

Meeting closed at 9.10 pm

Next Meeting: To be advised.