

Meeting Notes



Project	F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study	Project No	IN06111.302
Place of Meeting	Dural Country Club, Dural	Date	28/08/2003; 7pm
Present	John Brewer, RTA (JB) Wilson Poon, RTA Peter Prince, SKM (PP) Jo Moss, SKM (JM) Ken Robinson, SKM 12 representatives of community groups Round Corner Village Residents Association; Quarry Road Action Group; Concerned Citizens Group; Quarry Road Action Group; Galston Chamber of Commerce;; Local community; Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists; Galston Area Residents' Association; Galston Area Residents' Association; Jessica Place Bushcare Group; Dural District Progress Association.		
Purpose of Meeting	Community Focus Group Meeting Number Three		

Please note that this document presents a summary of the presentation, discussions, questions and answers during the meeting. The meeting was not recorded verbatim and this is not a transcript.

1 Introduction – Jo Moss

- JM welcomed participants and thanked them for their participation
- JM outlined the purpose of the meeting and the agenda
- JM reiterated the purpose of the CFG and it was agreed that while discussion of issues is encouraged, participants will ensure that any communications outside the group are clearly represented as their individual view or that of their particular community group and not being representative of the CFG as a whole.
- JB also welcomed participants and commented on the importance of consultation at this stage of the study.

2 Presentation on study outcomes to date – Peter Prince

PP outlined the study outcomes to date – these are the titles of the aspects presented. The presentation material is contained in the Attachment to the Notes of Meeting.

- Planning Assumptions
- Destination /Origin of light vehicles
- Where do trucks start and finish
- Public transport only option
- Results of PT only option
- Need for a new link
- Scope and Link Objectives



- Broad Corridor Types
- Selection of Corridor Type A
- Four Feasible Type A Options
- Transport Improvements
- Social and Environmental Effects
- Economics and Finance
- Next Steps

3 Questions

- In relation to the predicted 100,000 vehicles on Pennant Hills Road (2021) – how are these figures calculated? 5% per annum growth results in 170,000 vehicles.
 - Using historical growth not necessarily a correct basis for predicting future traffic levels. Predicted traffic levels are based on future population and employment levels and distribution.
- Copy of all figures needed to make informed comment
 - PP responded that these are in the background report; the rest of the data used as a basis for the analysis are in the preliminary work in progress.
- A new road will encourage industrial traffic into the area. No decentralisation proposed. What are the planning assumptions?
 - PP explained that the planning forecasts that are used are from the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Natural Resources (DIPNR). Study has used the DIPNR forecast population and employment growth over 20 years. DIPNR forecasts indicate that decentralisation over next 20 years is unlikely to occur. The assumed current trends continuing follow NSW State Government expectations.
- Need for change in attitude by government
 - JB commented that this is a transport study and RT A/DoTARS cannot dictate policy to DIPNR. If the project proceeds to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) stage it will need approval from DIPNR. DIPNR would be involved at the beginning in establishing requirements for an EIS, and towards the end of the process, at the determination phase.
- Need to look beyond current brief
 - PP commented that he would expect government to undertake a study for infrastructure needs beyond 2021 as part of a review of the Sydney Metropolitan strategy, but this is outside the brief for this study.
- Problems are more immediate than long term planning
 - PP commented that the study is considering sustainability in relation to opportunities to increase rail's share of transport in the corridor
- Why are there differences in volumes on Pennant Hills Road for different options. The traffic moving east on M2 is underestimated?



- PP responded by referring back to the existing traffic Origin/Destination information which is used as one basis for the traffic analysis.
- Assume tolls will be necessary (politically). Yellow will give the same benefits of Blue/Purple options and also benefits people in the east.
- PP commented that a toll on new link would discourage travel to/from east given that these users would need to pay the M2 toll and Lane Cove Tunnel toll.

4 Summary comments from community group representatives

Galston Area Residents' Association

- Tunnels will not help much
- Congestion south of M2 – more traffic will result
- Need to assist Pennant Hill Road north of M2
- In relation to Ventilation stacks – do not repeat M5 mistakes
- Pennant Hills Road relief is a good thing
- Tunnelling to “world’s best practice” and to include filtration of stacks
- Need limits to Sydney’s growth
- Public transport needs to be improved – seamless journeys are required

Jessica Place Bushcare Group

- Yellow would appear best
- Option A is good

Local community

- Tunnels are brilliant
- Ventilation stacks need to be installed to best practice

Galston Chamber of Commerce

- Disappointed with report
- No opportunity for Corridor Types B and C to be taken further
- Tunnel may be unacceptable
- Needed more work on Corridor Types B, C – other benefits not considered (eg infrastructure development)
- F3 traffic funnelling at Hornsby (can we bypass this)
- Report presented to exclude Red/Yellow options – pushed to conclusion Purple/Blue. All factors not considered.
- 20 years is not long enough as a study timeframe – should be longer
- the new link will be redundant before it is opened

Quarry Road Action Group

- Has had little feedback from people in local community
- Type A is a “band-aid” solution and too short term.



- General preference for Purple/Blue
- Should go beyond 20 years for longer time. Option C for longer term solution
- Road freight is necessary; rail is not reliable
- Tunnel needed now
- Pollution from tunnels should be treated
- Rail network and public transport improvements both a good idea
- Need better solutions for freight handling

Dural District Progress Association

- Freeway from Galston Gorge off agenda – happy for this outcome
- Rural agriculture industries have a future. Improved roads at Galston would lead to industry developing in the district

Round Corner Village Residents' Association

- Concern over the potential effects of Corridor Type B
- Corridor Type C should be further west
- Tunnel is needed for short term relief
- Concern over stacks and dispersion
- Traffic at Round Corner – would this be alleviated?
- Consideration for longer term must be given
- F3 a problem – Sydney cut off – need alternative

Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists

- Type A – good outcome as heritage items to be less affected
- Misleading about impact on heritage items as not all known

Concerned Citizens Group

- Has argued that Corridor Type C was cheapest option
- Corridor Type C must be considered and road reserve set aside
- State and Commonwealth governments will not agree. It will not happen. Apathy amongst politicians
- Exert political pressure to sort out problem
- Year of opening (2011) is too late

5 Thank you and meeting close

- JM outlined the next steps. Team working towards finalising the study to submit a recommendation by the end of the year. No further rounds of CFG meetings are planned but consultation will continue through next stages of project.