

MINUTES

Burrill Lake Co-Design Committee - Meeting One

Date	31 August 2021		
Time	6pm – 9:10pm		
Venue	Microsoft Teams		
Chairperson	Julian Watson (JW), Transport for NSW (Transport)		
Committee Members	Andrew Destry	AD	Transport
	Julie Lacy	JL	Transport
	Scott Wells	SW	Shoalhaven City Council
	Peter Johnston	PJ	Shoalhaven City Council
	Ian Carroll	IC	Burrill Lake Community Association
	Paul Mitchell	PM	Ulladulla & Districts Community Forum
	Niree Creed	NC	Lions Club and Farmers at Burrill Markets
	Barrie Walford	BW	Milton Ulladulla Historical Society
	David Swarts	DS	Lake Tabourie Ratepayers and Residents Association
	Cheryl McMahon	CMc	Resident
	Richard McLoughlin	RMc	Resident
	Ron Cox	RC	Resident
	Simone Chee	SC	Resident and business owner
	Kirra Dowling	KD	Resident and business owner
Additional attendees	Tricia Wunsch	TW	KJA – Lead facilitator
	Veronica Kooyman	VK	KJA – Facilitation and Secretariat Support
	Nicky Sutherland	NSu	KJA - Secretariat
	Nicole Stevenson	NS	Transport
	Sarah Webb	SW	Transport
	Scott Ferguson	SF	Transport
Apologies	Victor Channell	VC	Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council

1.	Welcome – Julian Watson
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting open and welcome • Acknowledgment of Country • Introduction to the Transport committee members and subject matter experts (SMEs)
2.	Introductions and process of the committee – Tricia Wunsch
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the KJA team • KJA's role in the process - facilitation and management of meetings to enable the participation of all Committee Members. Secretariat services and coordination of responses to queries. Advocating for the process and not the outcome. Advised the meeting is being recorded. Please do not record or screen shot. • Housekeeping • Meeting agenda • Round the room' participant introductions – name, group represented (for stakeholder reps) and you/your group's aim
3.	Background and process so far – Julian Watson
	<p>Transport provided an overview of the process so far which has led to this committee being formed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 20-year roadmap to 2040 for the Princes Highway and the vision for the upgrade works • The need for short term safety improvements and maintenance in parallel with the longer term planning • The preferred corridor for the Milton Ulladulla bypass being confirmed. <p>The scope of the co-design process will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options and intersection treatment/s at the southern connection of the Milton Ulladulla bypass • Highway crossing of Burrill Lake • Highway upgrade and treatment of various intersections at Burrill Lake • Highway alignment and speed environment • Accessibility and connectivity for local vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists • Delivering a sense of place for the Burrill Lake community. <p>Transport talked to timeframes for the upgrade of the Princes Highway at Burrill Lake and the negotiables and non-negotiables of the committee and co-design process.</p>
4.	Q&A Session
4.1	<p><i>Committee member:</i> The upgrade of the highway at Burrill Lake, needs to happen at the same time as the Milton Ulladulla (MU) bypass and can't be delayed to ensure the bypass is effective.</p> <p>Response – Transport: Many of the traffic challenges and congestion issues faced on the highway, particularly in peak holiday periods, are related to the eight kilometre</p>

	<p>section between Milton and Ulladulla. Traffic issues are caused by numerous factors and the bypass will remove traffic from the town centres of Milton and Ulladulla. We are not looking to delay the bypass, but recognise the planning for the Milton Ulladulla bypass is further advanced than the proposed upgrade at Burrill Lake. Once the preferred option has been identified, Transport will seek project funding for the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake.</p>
4.2	<p>Committee member: Advised there were questions raised in an online consultation session regarding the Milton Ulladulla bypass in December 2020 that the new Burrill Lake Bridge was not engineered to take heavy vehicles and could not accommodate three or four lanes of traffic. Raised that the bridges as part of the bypass corridor had been reviewed to determine their ability to accommodate heavy vehicles, however no review had been carried out on the Burrill Lake Bridge. Asked how traffic would cross the existing Burrill Lake Bridge if the bypass would accommodate heavy vehicles when the funding has not been confirmed for the upgrade at Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response – Transport: Changes can be made to the bridge to support a larger volume of traffic and Transport will confirm the capacity for high mass limit vehicles (HML.) It will provide a response by the next meeting. At this early stage of planning, bridges within the Milton Ulladulla bypass corridor has been reviewed.</p> <p>ACTION: Transport will provide details on the weight capacity for the Burrill Lake bridge at the next meeting.</p> <p>Clarification: The existing Burrill Lake Bridge can be re-configured to accommodate three lanes and could be widened to accommodate four lanes.</p>
4.3	<p>Committee member: Acknowledged Transport’s introduction did not reference budget allocation for the project. Committee member noted the Federal Government has committed \$500 million to upgrades along the Princes Highway corridor in NSW, with \$400 million to be specifically allocated to the Milton Ulladulla bypass. The Federal Government has also indicated the Milton Ulladulla bypass is due to commence in early 2023. There was a request for Transport to put all information to the committee to help them best understand and assess the options.</p> <p>Response –Transport: The Federal government has allocated funding for the Milton Ulladulla bypass based on the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) corridor. The connection of the bypass to the existing highway is included in bypass project funding. The remaining scope, which includes south of the bypass connection through Burrill Lake is not part of that project and funding allocation.</p> <p>Clarification: a timeframe for construction is yet to be confirmed by Transport.</p> <p>Facilitator to Transport: Is it fair to say these things are often funded in phases?</p> <p>Response – Transport: As the Program Director, we are always looking to secure Federal and State funding and to extend the program, but the project scope for the Milton Ulladulla bypass doesn’t include the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake.</p>
4.4	<p>Committee member: Advised the wider community were told the deck on the existing Burrill Lake Bridge could be taken off to accommodate four lanes. This</p>

	<p>information was shared during a meeting with Transport in February 2021.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Yes, the existing bridge can be modified to increase its width and traffic volume capability. We will provide more details for the group regarding the heavy vehicle capacity.</p>
4.5	<p>Committee member: Acknowledged Transport indicated no changes will be considered to the Milton Ulladulla bypass corridor. Asked if the corridor is confirmed as two lanes each way from Little Forest Road to Canberra Crescent.</p> <p>Response - Transport: The corridor has been confirmed. However, Transport is yet to determine a range of features including the number of lanes or local road connections. These are the considerations we are looking at. Given the topography of the study area, there would be challenges for a single lane bypass in each direction because of the requirements for climbing lanes, heavy vehicle overtaking lanes and other considerations. The team will be looking at what is required from a traffic perspective, future proofing perspective and how to manage slowing vehicles on sloping grades.</p> <p>Asked if the scope of this committee can provide input into that decision making process?</p> <p>Response - Transport: It is outside the immediate scope of this committee. We would be happy to take feedback on that separately. We will be looking to develop the Milton Ulladulla bypass to make sure it supports future traffic movements north and south of where the Milton Ulladulla bypass connects with the highway.</p>
4.6	<p>Committee member: Asked will there be consideration of charging facilities for electric vehicles as part of new transport infrastructure, with the likelihood of electric vehicles needing to recharge in the area due to its proximity from Sydney.</p> <p>Response - Transport: The enablement of current and future electric vehicles is a focus of the Princes Highway upgrade program and we would like to explore these options with you. There are two ways charging electric vehicles might be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • side of the road, super-fast chargers for the convenience of the customer • a tourism opportunity for the local townships where people stop and engage with local businesses and services, supporting economic growth <p>Transport and the Federal government are working on programs to support future technologies across the transport network. We are very happy to take any feedback on this either within this committee or separately.</p> <p>ACTION: Committee members may submit feedback on their ideas for vehicle charging facilities at Burrill Lake, during the co design process.</p>
4.7	<p>Committee member: Asked does Transport have historical traffic counts and is it continuing traffic counts. Asked does data show a need for two lanes in each direction through Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Lane requirements are based on a combination of factors. Traffic counts show there is about 10,000 to 11,000 average annual daily traffic (AADT) across the bridge at Burrill Lake, with the numbers increasing to 12,500 during holiday periods. Some challenges include understanding when that traffic is in Burrill</p>

	<p>Lake, what is causing delays and what the road users' journey plans are.</p> <p>We expect the Milton Ulladulla bypass will reduce traffic congestion, particularly for the northbound traffic due to the causes of congestion issues being north of Burrill Lake. The Milton Ulladulla bypass gives the community greater opportunity for reduced congestion, particularly during heavy peaks, because traffic can move through.</p> <p>It's challenging to say we require 'x' lanes when we have 'x' traffic numbers. During our planning, Transport looks at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic numbers • When peak travel is occurring (is it two days a year or 30 days a year)? • Impact to the community • Consideration of existing infrastructure • Consideration of public transport services ability to support traffic movements rather than an infrastructure solution. <p>Throughout this co-design process, we want to understand what is important to the community and balance this with the objectives of the Princes Highway upgrade. The timing of the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake needs to be considered as we continue to plan.</p>
4.8	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked is there an established and preferred plan through Burrill.</p> <p>Response - Transport: We don't have an established or preferred plan. There are a range of different ways we could move vehicles in, through or around Burrill. What the team have started to look at is what are the constraints, what is the topography and how may these impact the community. We have developed a few corridors options which we will share and discuss as part of this co-design process.</p> <p>We have come here to work out a solution with the committee. We have done some work so that when we speak to you about some of the alignments we can understand the constraints, the challenges of some journey types and some of the different ways we can separate local traffic from those travelling through.</p> <p><i>Committee member:</i> Expressed hope Transport will do the work on the options and seek the committee's advice whether the options would work or not. Acknowledged Transport are the subject matter experts.</p> <p>Response - Transport: We have a team with a lot of experience and there is always a range of ways in which we can deliver an outcome. Later in this meeting we will talk about what have we looked at broadly. Through this co-design process, we would like the community to play a much bigger role, giving us input into what elements are important, what things won't work and give reasons so we can take these on board as we plan the upgrade. We are hoping the group can bring along their expertise and local knowledge. Transport will call on subject matter experts to help get a solution that works best for the community. All projects have impacts and there are always a range of factors that need to be balanced including cost, environment, safety, property, etc.</p>
4.9	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Noted the committee have been advised an alternative alignment to the Milton Ulladulla bypass to include a Burrill Lake bypass is not in scope for this committee. Asked if the committee could look at a Milton Ulladulla bypass connection at Kings Point Drive rather than Canberra Crescent, noting no confirmed funding for the Princes Highway upgrade at</p>

	<p>Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response - Transport: We won't be looking to terminate the Milton Ulladulla bypass at Kings Point Drive. The committee will explore options where the LEP corridor meets the existing highway at or around Canberra Crescent.</p>
4.10	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if Transport will share with the committee what land Transport already owns in Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Yes, we can share this information.</p> <p>ACTION: Transport to provide information for what land is already owned by Transport at Burrill Lake at the next meeting.</p>
4.11	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Expressed disappointment in the minimal detail provided by Transport regarding the Milton Ulladulla bypass' connection with Canberra Crescent, and questioned the committee's ability to have input into the design. There was concern the Program Director was unable to confirm the bridge capacity for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Regarding the bridge capacity for heavy mass vehicles, I have taken it on notice and the team will confirm the details. Throughout the process there will be other items I can't confirm in a meeting, however I have an agency of skilled people able to provide answers as they arise.</p> <p>The purpose of this first meeting is to introduce the group to each other, Transport and KJA and to provide background and context to the project. We haven't got into the detail yet within this session. We are also at the start of the planning and process and seeking to work with the committee and later the wider community. To ensure this consultation is genuine, we do not have a pre-determined point of view. We have developed some early options and we will use upcoming meetings to discuss the options and respond to questions from the committee.</p>
5.	Your perspective on community priorities – Tricia Wunsch
	<p>KJA facilitated an online poll to respond to the following questions. Responses were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What values are important to you when considering the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The amazing bush we ride and walk through ○ Bushland, landscape and natural beauty ○ The "quiet " village atmosphere ○ Vista of the foreshore and Pigeon House Mountain in background ○ For me it reverberates with memories of being there with my toddler children. They are now in their 40s. ○ Lake, walking and bike riding for families ○ Village atmosphere with all facilities and beach readily accessible on foot ○ It's feel and look ○ Small safe village feel ○ Unique coastal village ○ Village with a welcoming community ○ The lake itself and how amazing it has thrived with the lifting of the bridge

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The lake ○ Beautiful bushland for safe hiking ○ The natural beauty and liveability ○ Its beauty and village feel. It looks and feels like a community with its own character and tone ○ Quiet, clean, family friendly environment ○ The calm space for community. <p>2. What are your concerns about the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The bridge will be over engineered and not complement the amenity of the community ○ Increased traffic noise - cutting of access ○ Excessive destruction of bushland ○ Safety for our children ○ Adverse impacts on many of the things that people currently love about Burrill Lake ○ The high amount of suppression on our bush areas ○ Potential for significant property impacts ○ Pedestrian access across the bridge ○ Visual impact ○ Accommodating increased freight movement through the middle of the village ○ Degradation of amenity, noise impact ○ Increase heavy vehicles, noise, pollution, safety in accessing the east side of the highway ○ Noise
6.	Break
7.	What is driving the need for the upgrade and what are the constraints - Andrew Destry
	<p>Transport presented the broad strategic corridor options, talking through the data, the planning process and the identified constraints.</p> <p>Transport noted there would be a more detailed look at those options at future meetings.</p> <p>Factors considered during the initial planning of these options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property and land use including residential, business, National Parks and other land use • Bush fire and flood planning • Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal heritage • Community and stakeholder views • Environmental factors including salt marshes, sea grass and potential impacts to the lake. <p>Speed zones were also discussed, acknowledging the impact of intersection treatments and local road access.</p> <p>Transport presented high level traffic data and noted that more detailed modelling will be provided at future meetings.</p>
	Q&A Session

7.1	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Requested information on the land tenure arrangements and current status of the area from Green Street, Ulladulla, to Burrill Lake and enquired whether it would be impacted by the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response – Transport can provide an outline of the various land tenures.</p> <p>ACTION: Transport to provide the land tenure for the area at the next meeting</p>
7.2	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Expressed interest in shared pathways. DS advised Shoalhaven City Council built a seven kilometre compact gravel path between the Dolphin Point roundabout to Lake Tabourie and hopes Transport will make it a two-metre-wide cycle way as part of their ongoing plan. Enquired what the plan is for the Princes Highway upgrade between Burrill Lake and Batemans Bay.</p> <p>Response - Transport: The planning for the upgrade between Burrill Lake and Batemans Bay is underway and we are looking to release the details in the coming months. We will share these details with the wider community. Transport will continue to work with Shoalhaven City Council on initiatives to enhance active transport options for the community.</p> <p><i>Committee member:</i> Added that the initial gravel path was implemented by Shoalhaven City Council as a temporary gravel path. Council's strategies envisage a more formalised shared use path in future. Council will continue to advocate for a formalised path between Burrill Lake and Lake Tabourie to be included in the Princes Highway upgrade project (Burrill Lake and Burrill Lake to Batemans Bay)".</p> <p><i>Committee member:</i> The Lake Tabourie community (who is represented on this committee) is interested in finding out more information about the planned upgrade of the Princes Highway at Lake Tabourie.</p> <p>Response – Transport and facilitator: The highway upgrade south of Burrill Lake is not in scope for this committee, and Transport will provide more information about this project to the community outside this committee.</p>
7.3	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if the speed limit on the upgraded highway be 80 or 100 kilometres.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Speed limits will be determined based on the options selected and could be between 60 and 100 kilometres per hour.</p>
7.4	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked the best email address for sending comments and ideas.</p> <p>Response - Facilitator: Emails can be sent to: codesign@erm.com</p>
7.5	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if Transport has determined the traffic count required on an average day and during holiday peak times when there are significant delays. Asked if the bridge is the issue or whether it is the local road connections and roundabouts causing delays.</p> <p>Response - Transport: The bridge and intersections are both constraints at different</p>

	<p>times. Congestion also depends on the local traffic and whether it is impacting traffic flow or joining the highway in the direction of the traffic.</p>
7.6	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked when the Burrill Lake Bridge would become a constraint, based on planning work already done and considering the Milton Ulladulla bypass connects at Canberra Crescent.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Transport will provide further details on the traffic modelling at a future meeting. Traffic and bridge capacity depends on the options selected and the intersection treatment types at various points along the highway. We will look at the options including the current and future traffic in this committee.</p>
7.7	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Expressed concern about a possible 100 kilometre speed limit through Burrill Lake and asked if Transport considered a bypass of Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response - Transport: As part of identifying the Milton Ulladulla bypass corridor, we looked at a number of options including connections south of Burrill Lake and south of Lake Tabourie. At this stage we are not planning a bypass at Burrill Lake. Any consideration of a western bypass of Burrill Lake would be separate to the Milton Ulladulla bypass and out of scope for this committee.</p>
7.8	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Expressed concern about the impacts to Burrill Lake, based on the broad options presented, and explained reason for joining the committee is to find ways to not destroy the township.</p> <p>Response - Transport: Transport will take the committee's feedback on board, and understands that Burrill Lake is special to locals and visitors and will consider these values when identifying options to upgrade the highway. We are at the very early stages of planning. During this process we will look at speed zones and how they impact the alignment so that we can discuss as a group and gather feedback to make speed limits part of the options it recommends.</p>
7.9	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Advised most people on this committee would want the highway upgrade done in a way to not require another upgrade in 20 years' time. Suggested the highway upgrade accommodate four lanes now and get it done. Advised there is room on the northern side of the bridge for a number of different options. When investigating the options, the group needs to be aware of potential property impacts and how access will be maintained to properties and businesses.</p> <p><i>Advised the highway needs to remain open to traffic during construction. Asked if Transport can confirm how potential property impacts will be managed, and how access will be maintained during construction.</i></p> <p>Response - Transport: The corridor presents many challenges. Like many of our upgrade projects, there may be property impacts. We will work to minimise these impacts as the planning continues.</p> <p>During our planning, we will also consider service roads for local streets and will consider options for differing speed environments and different configurations to connect the local network to the highway</p>

7.10	<p>There were several requests for timelines for the project, more detailed information on traffic modelling and for more information on potential alignments to be shown at the meeting.</p> <p>These requests are noted, and will be addressed in future meetings.</p>
7.11	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked what options might be considered for Kings Point Drive and accessing the old highway instead of using the bypass. Asked how Kings Point residents would travel to Ulladulla or to Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response – Transport: Transport is planning the options for connection points as part of the Milton Ulladulla bypass project. We will provide more information on the connections points as part of the review of the environmental factors for the bypass.</p>
7.12	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if there any projections for Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes for the highway through to 2060? Suggested it would be useful to understand for future planning.</p> <p>Response – Transport: We don't plan that far in advance, as a 40-year projection would be unreliable. Transport typically develops a model for 20-year 'after project', 'during project' and 'without project' for Milton Ulladulla bypass to try to understand traffic volumes. We consider the overall demand and how we balance demand across the network and the state. We also look at how to work with other solutions that may be available, whether they are transport solutions, service solutions, or infrastructure construction solutions as well as trying to work with the local planning projections. Some data is linear growth, sometimes we see a bump, sometimes we see a reduction or very low growth. A challenge will be determining the right projections for regional centres and communities, following COVID-19. Transport can provide the 20-year modelling at a future meeting</p> <p>ACTION: Transport to provide data for 20 year AADT modelling at a future meeting.</p>
7.13	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if the committee will go into more detail for each option</p> <p>Response –Transport: Yes, during future meetings we will explore the options in more detail and allow time for questions. The committee will also be able to suggest options for consideration.</p>
8.	Meeting structure and assessment process – Tricia Wunsch and Julian Watson
	<p>The facilitator took the committee through the rest of the program for this process including the proposed structure and objectives of each meeting.</p> <p>Transport outlined the assessment criteria and the considerations for each of those criteria including a process to weight each criteria.</p> <p>The committee were asked to provide feedback on considerations to be added or changed.</p>

	Q&A Session
8.1	<p>Several comments and questions were raised about the virtual site tour asking for specific footage or locations to be included for review</p> <p>Response - Transport: Yes we do have some drone footage - but it might not be detailed enough (close to the ground), so we might use a combination of drone and on ground footage. Committee members can suggest areas for inclusion within the virtual site tour,</p> <p>Response – Transport: We are in the process of planning the site tour (virtual) and will share more details and locations shortly.</p> <p>ACTION: Committee members to advise if they have any areas they would like to see included in drone footage.</p>
8.2	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Advised safety was mentioned as a non-negotiable item, however expressed the committee must have input on the safety. Asked if we can explain how safety is non-negotiable.</p> <p>Response – Transport: Safety is always a key objective of the Princes Highway upgrade. Transport would not consider an option that is unsafe from a road design perspective, to drive on, to construct or be maintained. There are a range of safety considerations that will be assessed within those parameters.</p>
8.3	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if Transport can explain to the group how their weightings might affect the process and share examples of how other value management workshops have derived different criteria for different sections of the highway and whether this approach is suitable for Burrill Lake.</p> <p>Response – Transport: Yes, agreed, this is a good idea and Transport will provide more details and examples on how the value management process works and how weighting is applied.</p> <p>ACTION: TRANSPORT to share examples of how value management workshops have derived different criteria for different sections of the highway at the next meeting.</p>
8.4	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if Transport can provide a cost benefit analysis for all the options, as this was not provided within the Preferred Strategic Corridor report for the Milton Ulladulla bypass</p> <p>Response – Transport: A Cost Benefit Assessment for every potential option via a traditional transport analysis would likely promote high speed intersection changes due to the style of benefits quantified. While Transport supports the preparation of a quality business case that seeks to identify quantitative and appropriate qualitative discussion of benefits and cost, a cost benefit analysis for each option won't necessarily deliver us a better or timely outcome for this committee or best consider the community's concerns.</p> <p>Transport is looking to make sure it accounts for more and broader benefits than what is measured in a typical cost benefit analysis, primarily cost. We would still present a cost benefit analysis to business case reviewers, government and our executive to demonstrate we have a strong investment, but we are also interested in how the community's views have been taken into account and how amenities are being</p>

	considered. We are here to listen to the committee and community's viewpoint on the options.
8.5	<p><i>Committee member:</i> Asked if upcoming meetings can be on Tuesday evenings.</p> <p>Response – Facilitator: We will consider the availability of the subject matter experts (SME's) so will look into that and advise the group.</p> <p>ACTION: KJA to look into changing the dates for meetings 3 and 4 to occur on a Tuesday</p>
8.6	<p><i>Additional note:</i> A discussion was held outside the formal committee meeting regarding the groups access to confidential information, data and diagrams displayed during the meeting.</p> <p>Response - To enable members to offer local expertise and advice on potential highway upgrade options, Transport will share data and diagrams with the committee to help inform their decision making and to encourage open and robust conversations.</p> <p>The committee is designed to facilitate open conversations about the information presented and allow opinions to be expressed freely within a safe, confidential environment. As such, each committee member agreed in a code of conduct not to comment publicly on the committee's deliberations or display materials provided by Transport until the process is complete.</p> <p>Committee members are encouraged to discuss items raised with the community groups they're representing and provide feedback to the committee. Minutes from each meeting will also be published on nswroads.work/bl2bb to allow the wider community to be kept informed.</p> <p>The committee is assessing a range of options and only the confirmed and recommended plan will be displayed to the wider community for feedback, to minimise undue concern or perceived impacts amongst the local community and nearby residents.</p>
	Next steps and close – Julian Watson