

Meeting Notes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Cinema Room, Boundary Street, Woolgoolga	Date:	6 August 2002

Present: Apology Copy: Name:

NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Area)			
✓			Graham Ashton
✓			John Beales
✓			Mark Beard
✓			Gregory Benson
✓			Jasmer Bhatti
✓			Roslyn Dunbar-Wells
✓			Ron Gray
✓			Karrena Joass
✓			Kevin Knott
✓			Steven Moody
✓			Phillip Pearce
✓			Des Saunders
✓			Bruce Scanlon
✓			John Tozer
✓			Manjit Sidhu
	✓		Robert Watson
	✓		John Langhorn
PROJECT TEAM			
✓			Chris Clark RTA
	✓		Wes Stevenson RTA
✓			Bob Higgins RTA
	✓		Robert Kook RTA
✓			Scott Lawrence RTA

✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓		Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
	✓		Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
✓			Janice Smith	Pramax Communications
✓			Bill Wood	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		Rick Bennell	Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			George Stulle	Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			Jo Gardner	PlanningNSW
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 8
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 7 (Woolgoolga area)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Janice Smith opened the meeting at 5.58pm. Apologised on behalf of Andrew Smith who is on holiday.
- 1.2 Janice called on Bob Higgins of the RTA, to introduce new RTA project manager Chris Clark; and Scott Lawrence, an Environmental Officer, who is attending as an observer at tonight's meeting.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 Janice Smith referred to the fact that there were two sets of Minutes: one from the previous Meeting held on 2 July, and one from the Extraordinary Meeting held on 16 July 2002.
- 2.2 The first Minutes to be dealt with were those of the 2 July Meeting.
- 2.3 Item 3.1 of 2 July Minutes – regarding Jas Benning as a replacement for Paramjit Sidhu – query as to whether Pramax had approached the executive of the committee in this regard. Janice Smith advised that this was an Agenda item this evening.
- 2.4 Item 3.3 of 2 July Minutes– Query as to whether Tim Paterson had asked the Steering Committee to clarify regarding a newspaper article headed "Highway options due this month". Tim Paterson replied that it had been put to the Steering Committee. CFG member commented it was the words "routes" and "corridors" that were somewhat confusing. CFG member queried whether the press release had been released. The member said frequent media releases were one of the issues raised by members in the past. Tim Paterson replied that he did not have control over the press release, but it was put to the Steering Committee.
- 2.5 Item 3.4 of 2 July Minutes– CFG member queried whether the northern section was going to be reviewed as part of the Peer Review. Bob Higgins: The Peer Review is controlled by Council. The RTA is proceeding with the northern section. It is a matter for Council to decide what it is doing. George Stulle (Council) advised that at

Details:

Action By/Date:

this stage, there is no intention to review any of the aspects of the northern section He said there was a suggestion that the Peer Review team should meet with the Northern CFGs and that issues relevant to the northern section that were being assessed in the review, would be included.

- 2.6 An amendment was made to the Attendance Record for the 2 July meeting to note that CFG member John Langhorn was present at that meeting. Noted
- 2.7 The Minutes of the Special Meeting of 16 July were then dealt with.
- 2.8 Item 2.54 of 16 July Minutes – CFG member requested amendment – it should read “... Options B and C...” (not “ Options D and C ”). This was noted. Noted
- 2.9 Item 2.63 of 16 July Minutes – CFG member said the last sentence should read: “... and asked how the *Council and* Steering Committee reached its decisions”. (ie, the words “Council and” had been omitted). This was noted. Noted
- 2.10 Item 2.65 of 16 July Minutes – CFG member said the first sentence should read: “Cr Bill Wood said Council commonly voted but that was an entirely different situation.” This was noted. Noted
- 2.11 Discussion followed on how to present the meeting notes including whether a verbatim record should be provided in which case the meeting notes would be lengthy or whether meetings could be recorded. Tim Paterson advised that the taping of meetings had been reviewed but decided against it. The context of tape recording can be an issue. Another CFG member suggested providing a draft of the notes to members. Tim Paterson indicated this would add another loop to the provision of notes. One CFG member said: I think when you look at the size of the document what we have is pretty good really. And we can correct those as they come along from time to time. Janice Smith: Does anyone have any objection to simply making those adjustments at the meetings? Members agreed although one CFG member still had some issues from the meeting of 2nd July – Janice Smith suggested dealing with them under “Business Arising”.
- 2.12 Item 5.31 of 2 July Meeting: Re “... Draft Route Selection Report. CFG members would not get a copy as it would go from the Steering Committee to the Minister for Roads and then to an announcement in December.” CFG member: is this still the time frame? Tim Paterson: the time frame is no longer valid. The essence of the process remains the same. The Minister will make an announcement as the Minister sees fit and the route selection report will become public domain. This will include a whole suite of documentation. CFG member: No further time frame at this stage? Tim Paterson: It will depend on what we arrive at tonight.
- 2.13 Item 5.36 – CFG member asked if there was any information yet on flora and fauna (Janice advised that this should be dealt with in Business Arising).

3. MATTERS ARISING

- 3.1 Confirmation of Members' Position – Outcomes of Special Meeting. Janice Smith spoke about the Special Meeting held on 16 July, adding that the Steering Committee observed from media coverage that not everyone was happy with the results of the last meeting. Janice then displayed overheads to summarise the outcomes of the Special Meeting. Attach copy of overheads
- 3.2 Janice invited each of the members to state their position regarding those outcomes relating to the Special Meeting.
- 3.3 Most CFG members said they were happy with the outcomes. One member

Details:

Action By/Date:

believed some requests by the CFG could slow the process down. Another member questioned the accuracy of media releases put out by the Steering Committee, for example, the 'no options through Country Club Estate'. Others believed the information provided to them yesterday was a step in the right direction and reinforced the need for an open and transparent process. Some asked however if the project team could give consideration to providing information earlier. Others agreed that the frequency of media releases was important.

- 3.4 Janice Smith then invited feedback from the Steering Committee.
- 3.5 Jo Gardner, Bob Higgins and Bill Wood indicated they were surprised that, after CFG members had stated at the end of the last meeting that they were happy with the process and wanted to move on, media reports indicated this was not the case. Jo Gardner also said her comments that the corridors did not affect the Estate was based on the best information she had at that point in time. She said there needed to be further discussion about how to deal with the press. The Steering Committee representatives also said they felt a good understanding had been reached following the special meeting on what the issues were that were concerning the CFG and the Steering Committee had addressed those issues. It also might be possible to provide information to the group earlier than had occurred on this occasion.
- 3.6 One CFG member suggested that perhaps the CFG and committee could collectively have input into the content of media releases.
- 3.7 Jo Gardner indicated that after each CFG meeting and Steering Committee meeting there would be discussion on what a media release should include. Discussion then followed on the timing and accuracy of recent press coverage.
- 3.8 Another CFG member indicated there were rumours from the Grafton office of the RTA that a decision had been made. Bob Higgins: I would be interested to find out whoever that person is from our office who spoke to you because I know that no option has been decided.
- 3.9 Janice Smith told the meeting items for a media release would be noted following the CFG meeting.
- 3.10 Further discussion followed on the content and accuracy of recent media coverage
One CFG member said the issue of whether options went through Country Club estate needed to be addressed. Connell Wagner to check subdivision boundaries with Council
- 3.11 Another CFG member stated she felt the meeting was becoming very confrontational and the group as a whole needed to either agree to move forward or close down. She said she thought after the Special Meeting things would improve and suggested that differences of people and personalities had to be put to bed.
- 3.12 Janice Smith reiterated that the issues to be covered in the next media release would be listed at the end of the meeting.
- 3.13 New CFG Member representing banana industry. Janice Smith introduced the new Member of the CFG, Manjit Sidhu.
- 3.14 Manjit Sidhu told the group he had lived in the area for 29 years, represented the Cricket Club, and was well known in the community.
- 3.15 Janice Smith advised that Mr Sidhu had been provided with information about previous CFG meetings, was a banana grower and had property in the central and inner corridors.

Details:

Action By/Date:

4. PROJECT UPDATE

Presentation by Tim Paterson – Schematics of existing highway upgrade (confidential information)

- 4.1 Janice Smith advised it would be appropriate for members to make notes on their own schematics.
- 4.2 Tim Paterson began an overhead presentation of each of the schematics indicating the aim of the presentation was to enable members of the CFG to interpret the drawings. He advised that the material was clearly not for issue to the media. It was for the CFG members to own and for them to use with the people they were representing. It was fundamental to understanding the issues and bringing those issues back.
- 4.3 Two CFG members pointed out that some street names were incorrect. Newmans Street should read Newmans Road and Dalwood should be Dalgety Street. CW to rectify
- 4.4 Tim Paterson stated that an important consideration was land use change and the urban development that is expected to happen over the next 5, 10, 20 years. This is mainly in the southern end, notably in the Moonee area. Moonee is expected to end up with a population of about 7,000 people in about 20 years' time. An important notion was how to cater for the movements to and from the highway.
- 4.5 CFG member: It seems that the Sandy Beach traffic was directed towards the southern exit of Sandy Beach, past the school. Would it not be better directed towards the northern exit to the highway? Tim Paterson: Could be. I think the predominance of moves are southbound which probably led to that scheme. We will have a look at that. Look at redirecting Sandy Beach traffic to Graham Drive north rather than south
- 4.6 Members of the CFG queried traffic figures indicated on the schematics. Tim Paterson indicated it was base-line information that assists in understanding trips that are generated. He then answered questions relating to how the traffic figures are gathered and what they represent.
- 4.7 A CFG member queried an "at-grade" approach as opposed to "grade separation". Bob Higgins: What we are trying to do is come up with a viable route. In terms of this process we are looking at one extreme of an "at-grade" approach, knowing that eventually it will evolve to "grade separation". This exercise gives an opportunity for important constructive feedback. Clearly there is a staging issue. You will find that on the Woolgoolga section there has not been any looking at "at-grade" in terms of Option D because it just would not work. In other sections, some intersections could work "at-grade". These are the issues that need to be teased out as part of this process. There could be other reasons that come up as to why they need to be "grade-separated".
- 4.8 CFG member. The Bucca Road area – concerned about a conflict of only 300 metre separation between Heritage Park and the Zoo. Any chance of adjusting the Zoo's entrance point? Tim Paterson: Yes, that is one of the trickiest parts, and Tiki Road as well. If it is an at-grade scheme we would prefer to come up with something. We are talking to the Zoo people tomorrow night. There may be a way to provide a service road internally. Or possibly a turn-around bay so that there is a break in the median.
- 4.9 CFG member: Has any thought been given to having Diamond Head Drive as the main access for the highway, and doing away with Graham Drive as the access? Tim Paterson: There would be significant land take just to accommodate the dual

Details:

Action By/Date:

carriageway. It would be very difficult.

- 4.10 CFG member: On the seagull intersections, how many cars can fit into the intersections safely? Discussion followed on the aim and design of seagull intersections including ones further south at Raymond Terrace and Karuah which are the latest design standards. RTA to provide information on seagull intersections for next CFG meeting
- 4.11 Tim Paterson continued with his presentation indicating opportunities for seagull intersections and an opportunity for some form of future link road which could potentially figure as part of the urban development to the north of Hearn's Lake Road.
- 4.12 CFG member: So if that got built as is, people driving from Coffs Harbour would have to drive to Bosworth Road and come back down again? Tim Paterson said yes and described on the diagram the movements which would be necessary.
- 4.13 CFG member: They will be able to avoid the highway, which will be good. Tim Paterson: Correct.
- 4.14 A CFG member pointed out an incorrect distance on Safety Beach Road on one of the diagrams. Tim Paterson: There is something wrong there – the chainage is clearly out of plumb.
- 4.15 A CFG member asked what form median strips would take and would there be any vehicle barrier to prevent "head-ons"? Tim Paterson: It can take different forms, there could be solid barriers. Median widths haven't been determined yet – in an urban setting typically you have a skinnier median.
- 4.16 CFG member: I would like to think there was more of a vehicle barrier than native bushes. Chris Clark: There are a lot of considerations – it depends on travel speed and how widely separated the two carriageways are, which has impact on land take locally.
- 4.17 CFG member: Could the RTA provide photos for next meeting of the ones at Raymond Terrace? Bob Higgins agreed to this. RTA to provide photos for next CFG meeting
- 4.18 Tim Paterson continued to work through the schematics.
- 4.19 CFG member: Might I suggest that we look at the Mullaway turnoff as the first example: either leave the thing alone or do it properly. A half-baked job is a waste of money. The amount of work done and not finished and then ripped up to get re-done amazes me. Tim Paterson: Yes, good point. Any other queries on the "at-grade" options or opportunities?
- 4.20 A CFG member observed there was a concern about the number of seagull intersections and a preference to not have too many. Through traffic would be continually confronted with joining traffic at slow speed which posed a significant safety issue. Tim Paterson: Could be. We have a scheme of doing safety audits. You cannot look at the intersection in isolation, but as part of the full system. Might be a "mix and match" so you take away a lot of the potential safety concerns.
- 4.21 Discussion followed on specific access arrangements and traffic movements on the schematics and their impacts including property impacts and travel times.

5. FORTHCOMING ACTIVITIES – INVESTIGATIONS

FEEDBACK TO PROJECT TEAM

- 5.1 Janice Smith thanked Tim Paterson for his presentation and asked the group to briefly indicate how they would go about getting feedback and how it could be

Details:

Action By/Date:

- presented to the Project Team. She suggested written feedback using bullet points.
- 5.2 Members of the group then began to indicate how they would collect feedback. Some members of the group asked for clarification on how the information could be used. Jo Gardner: The issue is to provide you with something that is conceptual for you to discuss with your members – in case somebody does not understand what it means. They are concepts to be looking at ways we can deal with intersections and how we can get traffic on and off the highway. CFG member: So you cannot put them on public view? But you can invite them to come and have a look? Jo Gardner: Yes.
- 5.3 Members continued to indicate how they would collect feedback but advised that many people would only want to provide feedback about Option A. Bob Higgins: We have to assess the feedback on A, B, C, and D. Each of the routes must be looked at in terms of what is the most viable route. Option D is much more difficult than A, B or C. But this is probably one of the biggest things, we need to go through the process as put up. What is the most viable. I do understand what you are saying. But we must find a way to tease out these issues. Eventually we are going to have to put something out on public display. It is important that we put the most viable schemes out.
- 5.4 CFG member: So the fact that we get a lot of negative response is obviously of value because you will find out the reasons why you should not put it there? Bob Higgins: We like to get a whole range of comments from the community, but from an informed position. What is important, is to get to the issue behind the negative comment. You need to understand the *reasons* why they don't like it.
- 5.5 Janice Smith asked Bob Higgins to consider setting a timeframe for feedback and the next meeting. Bob Higgins indicated feedback should be sent to Pramax Communications by September 3, 2002, for collation and the next meeting would be held on September 10, 2002. CFG feedback to be provided to Pramax no later than 3 September, 2002
- 5.6 Tim Paterson: This is all a progressive input to establish the physical engineering concepts so we can go to the community at large with very firm proposals. It will make that process longer than we had initially planned.
- 5.7 A CFG member then asked if similar information could be provided to the CFG members regarding the other options. Discussion followed on the merits of providing this and the Steering Committee agreed to provide line schematics the following week.
- 5.8 Chris Clark indicated that if members had questions about the information, the Project Team would be available to answer queries.
- 5.9 A CFG member asked if there had been progress on the Mary's Waterhole issue. Tim Paterson: We have generated alternative alignments to avoid the site. The key issue is the size of the protected area. We have had some better feedback from National Parks but have not progressed it as far as needed to at this stage. We are meeting the client in a few weeks' time and can put those plans on the table.
- 5.10 A CFG member when the next release to the public would occur. Tim Paterson: I wish I could answer that. If there are issues which lead to a substantial change in the concepts, that means more time to get the graphics and displays ready. Perhaps another month. If the feedback is minor tweaking, I think we have to make that call at the next meeting. Accepting there will continually be issues raised which will change things.

Details:

Action By/Date:

6. OTHER ISSUES

MEDIA RELEASE FROM THIS MEETING

- 6.1 Janice Smith then listed the items to be included in the media release following tonight's meeting including reiterating the role of the CFG, that submissions are ongoing and also the implications that this process will have for the information release. She also suggested the release included the names of the members of the CFG for contact through the freecall number. Members agreed. The media release should also include information that the CFG had been provided with diagrammatic sketches indicating concepts of the Highway Upgrade Option and will soon be given sketches for Options A, B and C.
- 6.2 Further discussion ensued about the need to clarify media references to options going through Country Club Estate and how previous statements, if found to be incorrect, could be corrected. Bob Higgins: I think we have to establish whether it is right or wrong. I want to get a map prepared showing all those sorts of things.
- 6.3 Janice Smith reiterated that the Steering Committee representatives would establish this and discuss it at the next meeting.

Agenda item for next CFG meeting

OBSERVER FOR MOONEE MEETING

- 6.4 A CFG member indicated that he was unable to attend as an observer for the Sapphire/Moonee CFG meeting and his proxy also was unable to attend. Janice Smith asked if another member would be available. Bruce Scanlon indicated that he might be able to attend.
- 6.5 A CFG member asked the status of the report on submissions. Janice Smith indicated some responses from Steering Committee members were still outstanding but expected to be received shortly.
- 6.6 Janice Smith asked if there were any other issues. She then thanked everyone for their attendance.

7. CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, 10 September, 2002