



LEGEND

CHCC Preferred Corridor (adopted at a special meeting on 29 October 2003)

Preferences received for:

- Coastal Ridge Way/Option A - 78 submissions
- Western Bucca Valley/Option A - 12 submissions
- Western Bucca Valley/Corindi River - 25 submissions
- Western Bucca Valley/Sherwood Creek - 8 submissions
- Coastal Route Options - 42 submissions

NOTES:
 SUBMISSION NUMBERS MAY DIFFER FROM THOSE SHOWN IN TABLE 3.5 AS:
 1. THE MAPPING EXCLUDES SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED FROM:
 - NON-PROPERTY OWNERS THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA
 - CORINDI AND RED ROCK RESIDENTS WHO WERE NOT PART OF THE LGA DATABASE IN MAY 2004
 - A SMALL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FOR WHO MATCHES COULD NOT BE MADE WITH THE LGA PROPERTY DATABASE (MAY 2004)

2. ONLY ONE SUBMISSION SHOWN PER RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLD



FIGURE 3.5
PLOT OF PREFERENCES RECEIVED FOLLOWING
COMMUNITY UPDATE No.5 (JUNE 2004)

- the stakeholder involvement interaction and how the stakeholder input has influenced the planning and option development process
- the response by stakeholders and graphic representations of responses, including representations to the Premier, Minister for Roads and other Government Members
- over-arching issues related to both sections of the Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy or the Pacific Highway Upgrading Program
- issues raised in interim submissions and graphic representations of these responses
- responses by the project team to issues raised in representations following the identification of route options
- conclusions in regard to the community feedback received

It should be noted that the feedback on the Coffs Harbour Highway Planning Strategy is not necessarily representative of the views of the overall Coffs Harbour community. The outcomes are the result of responses to questions on the survey forms provided with each information release as well as written submissions and, statistically, cannot be considered as a valid survey of the area.

There are several reasons for this:

- the surveys were designed with the intent of canvassing issues on the potential impacts of the various route options and suggestions for improvements rather than to provide quantitative data on preferences for a particular option or options
- this was reflected by the methodology used for data collection, questionnaire design, survey distribution, coverage of the sampling frame and survey management
- the responses were strongly influenced by interest groups with preferences for one or more particular route option
- the activities of the various lobby groups and duplication of survey forms are likely to have influenced the submissions received. The extent of this influence is difficult to determine.

3.4 Key information milestones

Tables 3.1 to 3.5 summarise the feedback received at each of the five (5) key information milestones. They set out the:

- information release and timing
- key announcements made
- number of written submissions and survey forms received for assessment
- positive and negative impacts of major importance to the respondents
- respondents' first preferences or 'votes'
- number of interim written submissions and survey forms received for assessment
- positive and negative impacts of major importance to respondents in the interim written submissions and survey forms received for assessment
- interim respondents' preferences or 'votes'

Figures 3.1 to 3.5 of the LGA illustrate:

- where responses have been received from to each key information release and the options contained in that information release
- the preferences or 'votes' recorded from respondents, including those contained in representations to the Premier, NSW Minister for Roads and other government members, but excluding petitions

The following overall assessments can be made regarding the feedback received to each key information release:

Information Sheet No.1/Summary Brochure (September 2001)

- the community response was generally low reflecting the broad nature of the corridors identified in the southern section and the even broader study area for the northern section
- of the three corridors announced, there was most support for the inner corridor (17.3%) followed by the central corridor (7.4%) and the outer corridor (1.2%)
- although not part of the announcement, there was a strong preference for an upgrade of the existing highway (58%) and for a far western bypass running through the Orara Valley to Halfway Creek or Grafton (16.1%)

Information Sheet No.2 (March 2002)

- of the four corridors announced for the northern section, there was most support by respondents who recorded a preference for the outer corridor A (18.1%) followed by the existing highway corridor D (9.1%), the inner corridor C (1.6%) and the central corridor B (1.1%)
- in the southern section, 4.9% of respondents who recorded a 'vote' expressed a preference for the existing highway compared to 1.6% for the inner corridor
- although not part of the announcement, 55.5% of respondents who recorded a 'vote' expressed a preference for the as yet unassessed Coastal Ridge Way proposal
- a far western bypass running through the Orara Valley to Halfway Creek or Grafton also received support (8.1%)
- extensive distribution of pro forma submissions by lobby groups resulted in a peak in the responses received and the influence of the activities of the lobby groups on the source of the submissions is difficult to determine.
- as with the responses received from the other key information milestones, there was a strong trend for the submissions to prefer options which were located away from and were considered to have little impact on the respondent
- in the interim period following the March 2002 exhibition, support for the Coastal Ridge Way (66.7%) and a far western bypass (22.2%) continued to be the preference of most respondents

Community Update No.3 (December 2002)

- there was a strong preference for Option A (58%) followed by Option D – an upgrade of the existing highway through Woolgoolga (15%)
- although not part of the announcement, 11% of respondents who recorded a 'vote' expressed a preference for the Coastal Ridge Way proposal while there was 1% support for a far western bypass running through the Orara Valley to Halfway Creek or Grafton
- although the announcement was in regard to route options for the northern (Sapphire to Woolgoolga) section, a significant number of submissions were received from the Coffs Harbour and Sawtell areas. The influence of the activities of the lobby groups on the number and the source of the submissions is difficult to determine.
- as with the responses received from the other key information milestones, there was a strong trend for the submissions to prefer options which were located away from and were considered to have little impact on the respondent

Community Update No.4 (February 2004)

- of the inner corridor route options announced, there was more support for the IS2 (6.8%) and IN2 (6.7%) options compared to IS1 (3.5%) and IN1 (2.3%)
- the announcement of the assessment of the Coastal Ridge Way resulted in it being the preference of 17% of respondents who recorded a 'vote' while a far western bypass also continued to receive support (6.8%)
- in the northern section, the new Option E announced received more support (5.5%) than the revised Option C1 (2.6%)

- there were strong preferences for Option A (14.3%) and for an upgrade of the existing highway from Sapphire to South Woolgoolga, primarily to cater for local traffic (15.4%)
- most support (17.3%) was reserved for Coffs Harbour City Council's preferred corridor which had not been assessed at that stage
- *the exhibition period included the distribution of pro forma submissions by lobby groups and the influence of the activities of the lobby groups on the source of the submissions is difficult to determine*
- a significant number of pro forma submissions were received in the interim period following the February 2004 exhibition
- of the interim responses received which recorded preferences, 62% supported Coffs Harbour City Council's preferred corridor, 16% supported the Coastal Ridge Way and 11% supported Option A in the northern section
- as with the responses received from the other key information milestones, there was a strong trend for the submissions to prefer options which were located away from and were considered to have little impact on the respondent

Community Update No.5 (June 2004)

- of the options assessed in Council's preferred corridor, most support was recorded for the Coastal Ridge Way / Option A route (44%) followed by Western Bucca Valley / Corindi River (12.4%), Western Bucca Valley / Option A (6.6%) and Western Bucca Valley / Sherwood Creek
- a far western bypass running through the Orara Valley again received some support (4.5%)
- there was significant support (26.3%) for a coastal route option (inner bypass of Coffs Harbour, upgrade of the existing highway between Korora and South Woolgoolga, Woolgoolga Bypass and upgrade of the existing highway between Arrawarra Creek and Halfway Creek)
- as with the responses received from the other key information milestones, there was a strong trend for the submissions to prefer options which were located away from and were considered to have little impact on the respondent

Table 3.1

Display period 21 September 2001 to 11 December 2001	INFORMATION SHEET No.1/SUMMARY BROCHURE - SEPTEMBER 2001 Key announcements: Southern section - Outer corridor, central corridor and inner corridor Northern section - study area				
	DISPLAY PERIOD COMMUNITY RESPONSE: Submissions 128; Survey forms 365				
	OUTER CORRIDOR	CENTRAL CORRIDOR	INNER CORRIDOR	EXISTING HIGHWAY ⁽¹⁾	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾
Impacts of major importance	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration	Negative Impact Residential property	Negative Impact Residential property	Negative Impact Residential property	
Preferences (total 81) ⁽²⁾	1 (1.2%)	6 (7.4%)	14 (17.3%)	47 (58.0%)	13 (16.1%)
	COMMUNITY RESPONSE OUTSIDE DISPLAY PERIODS (12 December 2001 to 14 March 2002): Submissions 11; Survey forms 20				
	OUTER CORRIDOR	CENTRAL CORRIDOR	INNER CORRIDOR	EXISTING HIGHWAY ⁽¹⁾	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾
	Impacts of major importance	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Road safety	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Road safety	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Road safety	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Road safety
Preferences (total 0) ⁽²⁾	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

(1) The unbolded options were not part of the key announcements, but were still recorded as preferences by respondents.

(2) Some respondents listed first preferences for options in both sections and some respondents did not express a preference for an option.

Table 3.2

Display period 15 March 2002 to 10 May 2002	INFORMATION SHEET No.2 - MARCH 2002									
	Key announcements: Southern section - Upgrade of existing highway and assessment of outer corridor, central corridor and inner corridor Northern section - Corridor options A, B, C and D Assessment of a far western bypass running through the Orara Valley to Halfway Creek or Grafton									
	DISPLAY PERIOD COMMUNITY RESPONSE: Submissions 1580; Survey forms 660									
	OUTER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	CENTRAL CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	INNER CORRIDOR	EXISTING HIGHWAY	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY ⁽¹⁾	OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C	OPTION D
Impacts of major importance			Negative Impact Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community impacts	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality			Negative Impact Flora & fauna	Negative Impact Community impacts Agricultural land use	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Community impacts	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Road safety Community impacts
Preferences (total 1832) ⁽²⁾	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (1.6%)	90 (4.9%)	148 (8.1%)	1017 (55.5%)	332 (18.1%)	20 (1.1%)	30 (1.6%)	165 (9.1%)
	COMMUNITY RESPONSE OUTSIDE DISPLAY PERIODS (11 May 2002 to 5 December 2002): Submissions 109; Survey forms 7									
	OUTER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	CENTRAL CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	INNER CORRIDOR	EXISTING HIGHWAY	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY ⁽¹⁾	OPTION A	OPTION B	OPTION C	OPTION D
Preferences (total 81) ⁽²⁾	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	18 (22.2%)	54 (66.7%)	7 (8.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

(1) The unbolded options were not part of the key announcements, but were still recorded as preferences by respondents.

(2) Some respondents listed first preferences for options in both sections and some respondents did not express a preference for an option.

Table 3.3

Display period 6 December 2002 to 28 February 2003	COMMUNITY UPDATE No.3 - DECEMBER 2002 Key announcements: Northern section - Route options A, B1, B2, C and D									
	DISPLAY PERIOD COMMUNITY RESPONSE: Submissions 390; Survey forms 1050									
	OUTER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	CENTRAL CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	INNER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	EXISTING HIGHWAY ⁽¹⁾	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY ⁽¹⁾	OPTION A	OPTIONS B1 & B2	OPTION C	OPTION D
Impacts of major importance							Positive Impact Noise & vibration Negative Impact Flora & fauna Forestry effects Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Access effects Travel time/efficiency Waterways quality Cost of construction Firebreak	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Community impacts Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Access effects Travel time/efficiency Waterways quality Cost of construction Business & tourism Visual & urban design	Positive Impact Indigenous heritage Access effects Travel time/efficiency Waterways quality Negative Impact Noise & vibration Community impacts	Positive Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Access effects Travel time/efficiency Waterways quality Business & tourism Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality
Preferences (total 1450) ⁽²⁾	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (1.0%)	159 (11.0%)	839 (58.0%)	114 (8.0%)	99 (7.0%)	222 (15.0%)
	COMMUNITY RESPONSE OUTSIDE DISPLAY PERIODS (1 March 2003 to 18 February 2004): Submissions 73; Survey forms 8									
	OUTER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	CENTRAL CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	INNER CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾	EXISTING HIGHWAY ⁽¹⁾	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY ⁽¹⁾	OPTION A	OPTIONS B1 & B2	OPTION C	OPTION D
Impacts of major importance							Negative Impact Noise & vibration	Negative Impact Residential property	Negative Impact Residential property	Negative Impact Road safety
Preferences (total 37) ⁽²⁾	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (24.2%)	12 (32.3%)	11 (30.0%)	2 (5.4%)	1 (2.7%)	2 (5.4%)

(1) The unbolded options were not part of the key announcements, but were still recorded as preferences by respondents.

(2) Some respondents listed first preferences for options in both sections and some respondents did not express a preference for an option.

Table 3.4

Display period 19 February 2004 to 19 March 2004	COMMUNITY UPDATE No.4 - FEBRUARY 2004											
	Key announcements: Southern section - Route options within the inner corridor (IS1, IS2, IN1 and IN2) and assessment of upgrade of existing highway Northern section - Route options C1 and E Assessment of Coastal Ridge Way proposal											
	DISPLAY PERIOD COMMUNITY RESPONSE: Submissions 170; Survey forms 444											
	INNER SOUTH 1	INNER SOUTH 2	INNER NORTH 1	INNER NORTH 2	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY	OPTION A ⁽¹⁾	OPTIONS B1 & B2 ⁽¹⁾	OPTION C1	OPTION E	EXISTING HIGHWAY NTH ⁽¹⁾	COUNCIL'S CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾
Impacts of major importance	Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community Impacts Visual & urban design	Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community Impacts Visual & urban design	Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community Impacts Visual & urban design	Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community impacts Visual & urban design					Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community impacts Visual & urban design	Negative Impact Residential property Noise & vibration Road safety Air quality Community impacts Visual & urban design	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Road safety	
Preferences (total 938) ⁽²⁾	33 (3.5%)	64 (6.8%)	21 (2.3%)	63 (6.7%)	63 (6.8%)	159 (17.0%)	134 (14.3%)	17 (1.8%)	25 (2.6%)	52 (5.5%)	144 (15.4%)	163 (17.3%)
	COMMUNITY RESPONSE OUTSIDE DISPLAY PERIODS (20 March 2004 to 31 May 2004): Submissions 410; Survey forms 31											
	INNER SOUTH 1	INNER SOUTH 2	INNER NORTH 1	INNER NORTH 2	FAR WESTERN BYPASS ⁽¹⁾	COASTAL RIDGE WAY	OPTION A ⁽¹⁾	OPTIONS B1 & B2 ⁽¹⁾	OPTION C1	OPTION E	EXISTING HIGHWAY NTH ⁽¹⁾	COUNCIL'S CORRIDOR ⁽¹⁾
Impacts of major importance	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality					Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality	Negative Impact Noise & vibration Air quality	Negative Impact Noise & vibration	
Preferences (total 444) ⁽²⁾	6 (1.4%)	4 (0.9%)	2 (0.5%)	5 (1.1%)	5 (1.1%)	70 (16.0%)	50 (11.0%)	6 (1.4%)	2 (0.4%)	5 (1.1%)	14 (3.1%)	275 (62.0%)

(1) The unbolded options were not part of the key announcements, but were still recorded as preferences by respondents.

(2) Some respondents listed first preferences for options in both sections and some respondents did not express a preference for an option.

Table 3.5

COMMUNITY UPDATE No.5 - JUNE 2004 Key announcements: Feasibility assessment of route options within Council's Preferred Corridor (Western Bucca Valley / Option A, Western Bucca Valley / Corindi River, Western Bucca Valley / Sherwood Creek and Coastal Ridge Way / Option A)						
DISPLAY PERIOD COMMUNITY RESPONSE: Submissions 108; Survey forms 292						
Display period 1 June 2004 to 25 June 2004	COASTAL ROUTE OPTIONS⁽¹⁾	WESTERN BUCCA VALLEY / OPTION A	WESTERN BUCCA VALLEY / CORINDI RIVER	WESTERN BUCCA VALLEY / SHERWOOD CREEK	COASTAL RIDGE WAY / OPTION A ROUTE	FAR WESTERN BYPASS⁽¹⁾
Impacts of major importance	Negative Impact Access effects	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Forestry effects Community impacts Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Waterways quality Cost of construction Business & tourism Visual & urban design Construction duration/difficulties	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Forestry effects Community impacts Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Waterways quality Cost of construction Business & tourism Visual & urban design Construction duration/difficulties	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Forestry effects Community impacts Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Waterways quality Cost of construction Business & tourism Visual & urban design Construction duration/difficulties	Negative Impact Residential property Flora & fauna Noise & vibration Forestry effects Community impacts Agricultural land use Indigenous heritage Geology & soils Waterways quality Cost of construction Business & tourism Visual & urban design Construction duration/difficulties	
Preferences (total 290)⁽²⁾	76 (26.3%)	19 (6.6%)	36 (12.4%)	18 (6.2%)	128 (44.0%)	13 (4.5%)

(1) The unbolded options were not part of the key announcements, but were still recorded as preferences by respondents.

(2) Some respondents listed first preferences for options in both sections and some respondents did not express a preference for an option.

3.5. Conclusion

Throughout the development of the CHHPS, a range of views have been expressed regarding the merits and issues of the various options assessed. The extensive interaction and involvement of the community since September 2001, the activities of interest groups, and the lobbying of candidates for both the State Election in March 2003 and the Local Government Elections in March 2004 have all resulted in a high level of awareness of the development of the Strategy.

Much of the feedback throughout the development of the Strategy has been from stakeholders potentially directly-affected or nearby the various corridors and routes. As corridors and routes have been ruled out, responses from stakeholders no longer potentially affected by the options have significantly declined. Relatively few responses have been received from environmental groups and stakeholders not potentially directly-affected or nearby the corridors and routes.

The issues consistently of most importance to respondents since the Strategy's announcement have been:

- residential property take
- socio-economic impacts
- noise and vibration impacts and concerns about the ability to mitigate them
- air quality impacts
- road safety impacts

With each key information milestone, respondents also have seen the invitation for submissions and completion of survey forms as an opportunity to record a preference or a 'vote' for the various options. Generally, the 'voting' trend has been:

- those on the more densely settled coastal areas preferred options to the west of the coastal range
- those on the more sparsely settled rural areas of the LGA preferred options closer to the settled coastal area

More recently, two trends have emerged in the responses received and assessed. They have been:

- an increase in support for an upgrade of the existing highway from Sapphire to South Woolgoolga – primarily to cater for local traffic
- requests for a decision on a preferred option to be made as soon as possible

Throughout the development of the Strategy, a number of issues or options have been raised by the community or CHCC which have been responded to by the project team, either by investigation or implementation.

It should be noted that the feedback is not necessarily representative of the views of the overall Coffs Harbour community. The outcomes are the result of responses to questions on the 'Have Your Say' survey form as well as written submissions and, statistically, cannot be considered as a valid sample survey of the area. In addition, the activities of lobby groups are likely to have influenced the submissions received and the extent of this influence is difficult to determine.