

Meeting Notes



Project	F3 to Sydney Orbital Link Study	Project No	IN06111.302
Place of Meeting	Chifley Hotel Pennant Hills	Date	25/08/2003, 7pm
Present	John Brewer, RTA (JB) Hari Kishan, RTA Peter Prince, SKM (PP) Jo Moss, SKM, (JM) Ken Robinson, SKM		
	17 Representatives of the community including: Australian Plants Society, North Shore Group; Hornsby Conservation Society; Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust; Local Neighbourhood; Pennant Hills District Civic Trust; Kissing Point Progress Association; Hornsby Rotary; Concerned Citizens Group; Local schools and clubs in Normanhurst area; Residents of Kingsley Close, Exeter Road and Lucinda Ave; Chatswood West Ward Progress Association; Australian Labor Party, North Epping Progress Association; STEP Inc.		
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 of 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.

- Study outcomes to date
- Issues
- Major planning assumptions
- Origin/Destination of vehicles
- Trucks
- 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
- Environment/Social
- Economics and Finance
- Next Steps

3 Questions and Discussions

- Why was there no display at Pennant Hills? Comment that no one had a chance to see it locally and it was not too late to do something about it. Follow up comments from another participant also raised this issue, that a display ought to have been located in the middle of the options' area.
 - JM responded that display locations were selected on the basis of having appropriate amenity, being accessible for the largest number of people and also availability on the dates and times required.
- Carlingford Court display was suggested by Beecroft people. Pleased to note that recommendation was accepted from last meeting.
- Why is there no eastbound link to the M2 for Purple/Blue options?
 - PP stated that Purple/Blue options would have a link but that it doesn't warrant an easterly motorway to motorway connection. Traffic from the link would exit to Pennant Hills Road north of the M2 and go east using the existing slip lanes.
- What about vehicles other way – M2 westbound Pennant Hills Road then north?
 - The existing arrangements would still apply.
- What is the purpose of the link – access to city, relief to Pennant Hills Road? Will trucks use tunnel?
 - PP responded by referring back to the project objectives which include the need to relieve traffic congestion on Pennant Hills Road over a 20 year horizon. Yes, trucks would use the tunnel.
- Why are trucks considered separately to cars?
 - The link would need to be a National Highway carrying large volumes of trucks.
- Confusion in strategies. Need to look at 2050 – spend money now once and for all
- Western Sydney Orbital will be open in 2006 but this link would not be built until 2010 – link is needed now.
- Disappointment with report; has been no progress since previous meeting;



environment not addressed; fuel use and diesel supply not addressed; rail freight not properly considered; there will be destruction of homes; study justifies road and has neglected alternatives.

- PP responded that study has assumed current fuel usage, that travel behaviour would not change significantly and there would be no rate of reduction in fuel supply over the next 20 years.
- PP also explained that the study has considered, and included in the base case assumptions, rail improvements including assuming that rail captures 40% of tonnage moved in the corridor (from 26%). There would still be a need to improve roads.
- Any feedback from rail organisation?
 - Rail Infrastructure Corporation has been consulted during the study.
- Why so many trucks down Pennant Hills Road?
 - PP responded that the demand is there, driven by economic growth and market forces.
- In future trucks will be loaded out of town and travel straight to the docks
 - PP responded that there will still be a need to manage trucks on Pennant Hills Road and growth in rail transport.
- Diesel fuel supplies down 80% in the future. Greenhouse gas assumption not addressed.
 - Greenhouse gas emissions to be considered in comparison of options.
- In relation to the open cut in the vicinity of Brickyard pit it was commented that Canley Park is on the west and there is Council development on east of railway line. Why is this option considered?
 - PP commented that there is an opportunity to break the tunnel in that vicinity; it is in concept form only and there is not a specific alignment. Other options are being considered including an alternative to stay in tunnel for the length of the Purple option.
- Comment that Brickpit is now a garbage dump
- Comment that Purple option with open trench at Brickyard is not acceptable – purpose of new link is to reduce inconvenience to people along the corridor, not increase adverse effects.
- Why would fewer drivers use the Yellow/Red link if access further along the M2?
 - PP responded that, as the traffic figures suggest for Yellow and Red options, M2 tolls work against Yellow and Red, particularly for those drivers with origin/destinations in the southern suburbs. Users from the south would avoid the M2 toll.
- How far apart are stacks? What is the design tunnel depth?
 - PP responded that this is a strategic study and that these details would be addressed at the next stage of the study if a decision is made to proceed with



a preferred option. In general terms, tunnels would be at least 20-30 m deep. Ventilation stacks not yet located.

- Would the M2 consortium gain by the building of this link? Would there be any concession to M2 to apply toll?
 - JB responded that no discussions have been held with the M2 operator. The tolling regime on M2 remains in place in modelling for this study. He reiterated that there have been no discussions with M2 consortium.
- Would tolled or non tolled options be considered in the future?
 - PP responded that the study modelling has assumed existing tolls on M2 (there have been no negotiation about concessions).
 - The study is still investigating the effects of a tolled link.
- Could entrance portals be located further north from Pearces Comer? There could be effects on 21 houses on ex RTA Land in Kingsley Close.
 - PP responded that the design for the northern interchange would be finalised as part of the next stage. At this stage the team has looked at ways/means of avoiding impacts. The portal to the north could be located north of the Pacific Highway and these properties. Current thinking is that the portals would be included within the F3 alignment.
- Will RTA land be used?
 - PP responded that the intent is to minimise impact on properties.
- Are the study working papers available?
 - PP responded that the study has not been completed. At the conclusion of the study, this work will form the background for the study recommendation. If it is decided to develop one of the options further, the work would also form the background for preparing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which would be subject to full public consultation.

4 Summary comments from community group representatives

Kissing Point Progress Assoc

- Northern portal and interchange are issues
- Concern about impact on traffic numbers on Kissing Point Road and Comenarra Parkway
- Red and Yellow options do not meet project objectives and query why they have been included
- Location of ventilation stacks – no industrial lands available in this area for their location
- Pennant Hills Road – by 2021 there will be little improvement over today's conditions
- Red option under Lane Cover River and possible bridge is of concern

STEP Inc

- Object to Red option and bridge across the Lane Cove River, also Yellow option



- General concern over assumptions used
- Past mistakes are being carried forward
- Would like more background information on rail assumptions

Hornsby Conservation Society

- All must be tunnel options
- Bridging rivers is of concern
- Ventilation stacks – filtration should be addressed
- Fuel, greenhouse gas issues should be addressed

Pennant Hills District Civic Trust

- Project needs to be considered over the long term
- Long distance freight by rail is an issue
- Public transport by rail is an issue
- Corridor C postponed? Should be further considered
- Type A will relieve current issues
- Ultimate solution for long term is the best but Yellow is the best interim outcome

Hornsby Rotary

- Other participants have already covered issues of concern

Chatswood West Ward Progress Association

- Opposed to Blue/Purple options
- Red best to relieve Pacific Highway
- Widening M2 is a concern
- Entrances to Lane Cove tunnel should be widened
- Surface B3 option best
- Tunnel is a “Rolls Royce” solution

North Epping Progress Association

- Blue/Purple preferred
- How can M2 take more traffic?
- Extra noise from M2 is a major concern
- Speed on M2 is an issue

Representative of local schools and clubs in Normanhurst area

- Current Pennant Hills Road problems are severe
- Detail needed to assess preferred options
- Concerns about tunnel depth, and stack locations and design

Australian Plant Society, North Shore Group

- Referred to meeting held by Ku-ring-gai Council



- Lane Cove National Park – no impacts mentioned
- Statement that vegetation is degraded is not true
- Pamphlet is generic and there is no mention of possible bridge over Lane Cove River
- 4 ventilation stacks will be necessary
- No industrial areas for stacks (ie access/service in bushland/NP)
- Red/Yellow options will provide limited relief
- Red option encourages road transport from Central Coast
- EIS on each of the options needed
- Not enough information presented to compare options

Representative of residents of Kingsley Close, Exeter Road and Lucinda Ave

- Need certainty on properties to be resumed
- Location of entrance alternative to north on F3 is of concern and needs investigation
- Tunnels depth under houses
- RTA land – not to be used
- Ventilation stacks must not at entrance of tunnel
- Will benefit area in terms of traffic, air etc.

Beecroft & Cheltenham Civic Trust

- Relief of Pennant Hills road (traffic, pollution, noise)
- Impacts on Pennant Hills Golf Course and houses at southern end of Pennant Hills Road
- Effects of tunnelling is an issue
- Southern stack in Beecroft?
- More details needed for assessment
- No to Red and Yellow options
- Blue/Purple – details on stacks etc required
- Timing important
- Concerns about Main Northern rail line upgrade – diesel fumes, etc, noise

Representative of local neighbourhood

- Diesel trains need to be replaced by electric
- Another road is a scandalous proposition
- Too much money on roads
- Spending on road freight industry not appropriate

Australian Labour Party

- Red/Yellow rejected
- Preference is for Blue with east option for on/off ramp
- Full tunnel only



- More dynamic modelling required
- Department of Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources planning requirements wanted
- Need transparency on tolling
- Strict environmental concerns to be addressed - stacks, best practice (M5 problems), greenhouse gas emissions
- EIS Terms of reference to be available for comment

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.
- JB commented that the EIS process would reconvene groups like this. At this stage the Minister is asking for input on broad options. There would be more detail available at the EIS stage.
- JM again thanked everyone for their participation.