

## **MINUTES**

## **Burrill Lake Co-Design Committee - Meeting Three**

Date	12 October 2021				
Time	6pm – 9:45pm				
Venue	Microsoft Teams				
Chairperson	Julian Watson (JW), Transport for NSW (Transport)				
Committee	Andrew Destry	AD	Transport		
Members	Julie Lacy	JL	Transport		
	Scott Wells	SW	Shoalhaven City Council		
	Peter Johnston	PJ	Shoalhaven City Council		
	lan 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 (Part A)	СМс	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 – Subject Matter Expert		
	Sarah Webb	SW	Transport – Subject Matter Expert		
	Scott Ferguson	SF	Transport – Subject Matter Expert		
	David Norman	DN	Transport – Subject Matter Expert		
	Michael Sheridan	MS	Transport – Centre for Urban Design		
	Sam Black	SB	WSP		
Apologies					

These minutes are a summary of the Committee's discussion and actions for Transport. As per the Terms of Reference, minutes are provided by the Secretariat to the Committee for feedback and then finalised by the Secretariat and Transport.

lan Carroll, Cheryl McMahon and Ron Cox do not support these minutes and are of the view that they are not a true and correct record of the meeting and not in accordance with the Terms of Reference for this committee.

Transport is committed to providing timely and transparent information to the wider community as soon as outcomes are known. At the end of the Co-Design process, the wider community will be provided with a detailed report, including the Committee's recommendations and Transport's preferred option.

At times, Transport may be required to remove some details of discussions, including features or alignments of unconfirmed options. Transport does this to ensure any unconfirmed option with potential impacts to the surrounding community does not create unnecessary concern. Transport recognise the proposed highway upgrades will have impacts on surrounding communities and they are committed to minimising concerns as much as possible. This requires them to be careful and considerate, and ensure only feasible options are presented to the wider community.

Throughout a project's development, Transport will regularly consult with targeted stakeholders and these discussions may also remain confidential until a feasible or recommended option is identified.

1.	Welcome – Julian Watson		
1.1	<ul> <li>Meeting open and welcome</li> <li>Acknowledgment of Country</li> </ul>		
2.	Meeting agenda and housekeeping – Tricia Wunsch		
2.1	The facilitator outlined the agenda for the meeting.		
3.	Urban Design Presentation – Michael Sheridan		
3.1	Transport provided a presentation on Urban Design providing an overview of urban design features that can be considered as the planning for the project progresses. The presentation included viewing examples of treatments for similar projects, demonstrating how urban design features can enhance live ability and amenity of a project area. The presentation included:  • Introduction to Urban Design • Project elements • Bridges • Underpasses • Roundabouts • Noise barriers / walls • Pedestrian and cycle paths • Potential for the creation of new open spaces • Landscaping		
3.2	The Committee was invited to ask questions and make comments. The following topics were discussed:  • The impact of speed limits on intersection treatments		

Ability to turn right across opposing lanes of traffic are not features of the current draft design options. Transport's options include safe movements at Many of the scenarios provided in the presentation for urban design wouldn't be possible within the study area due to space limitations, however, other design options will be considered. 4. Traffic modelling of Transport alignment options - Sam Black 4.1 Transport invited traffic modelling subject matter expert from WSP to present on the traffic data for the Burrill Lake area. The presentation included: Shoalhaven Strategic Model, drawing upon predictions and forecasts for employment and population in addition to inputs from Shoalhaven City Council Model data was verified against traffic data from 2008 onwards and multiple traffic surveys conducted from 2018 through to Feb 2021. The surveys looked at holiday peak periods and average school days Traffic Volumes – existing peak periods Traffic Volumes – forecast growth Milton Ulladulla bypass impact on traffic (once operational) and forecast to 2041 holiday peak Alignment and intersection options assessed and traffic implications discussed Traffic forecasts for options through Burrill Lake Existing travel time and predicted future travel times for each option was The presenter pointed out that there are uncertainties associated with forecasting traffic volumes too far into the future and this factor was discussed. 4.2 The Committee was invited to ask questions and make comments. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised: Separation of local and through traffic and ways to measure any increase in larger vehicles (e.g. heavy trucks) traffic would be desirable Concern about the possibility of heavy vehicle increase through Burrill Lake if the road is upgraded. Transport noted it is looking the impact of and potential for larger vehicles on the Princes Highway as part of the upgrade program Travel time savings were not evident in one of the upgrade options. Transport noted that this was due to how one particular intersection was modelled and will update the model to reflect the actual travel time savings for the next meetina A committee member commented that travel times are not the most important aspect when assessing the options. The presenter noted travel times are only one aspect of assessing the options and that other factors should be considered as well when reviewing options. 4.3 **Action:** Transport to provide the Committee with the following additional information: Forecast growth table for 2021, 2026 and 2041 A breakdown of vehicle classes including a ready reckoner of vehicle class types. 5. Dinner Break

## 6. Feedback and discussion from individual site tours 6.1 Due to COVID restrictions, a group site tour was not possible. Some committee members did individual site tours (during their exercise activities) Observing the study area with the options in mind, highlighted the challenge for drainage controls. Transport agreed with this observation A committee member noted the size of the cutting required for some of the options could create extensive visual impacts and impacts on the environment such as loss of vegetation Transport noted the examples of cuttings shown in some of the options are 'worst case' scenarios and that refinements can be made to minimise the impacts, such as changing the vertical alignment of the road where possible A committee member noted one option impacts the sand dunes with high level vegetation and raised concerned about the environmental impact on the unique coastal flora. Transport noted that further environmental investigations will be carried out as the project progresses Discussion for consideration of retaining walls for one of the options Potential impacts to properties was again raised as a key concern by numerous committee members Feedback was received about the options at Canberra Crescent, questions were tabled about feasibility to widen the existing highway, utilising the current road reserve space Request for traffic modelling information to be provided to Committee Committee member commented it is difficult to envisage some of the options that might include four lanes of the highway through Burrill Lake, given the space limitations within the corridor Committee member raised concern of having to make a decision on options when the full potential impacts to properties are not known. Committee members asked Transport to disclose properties within the study area that are 'Transport owned'. Transport will provide this information to the Committee. noting that Transport's policy, includes the acquisition of a property if the property is located within a confirmed corridor, and the owner makes a request to Transport Transport noted that further studies need to be carried out on identified options to understand potential property impacts Noise impacts from heavy vehicles on the existing highway are evident a large distance from bridge when crossing the lake. Concerns raised about potential increased noise any upgrade may generate A number of Committee members raised the importance of maintaining seamless and safe pedestrian connections between the Burrill Lake community and the extensive foreshore areas and that this had to be factored in to the preferred design. Commonly used access points and a number of existing beach tracks were pointed out to Transport. It was requested that all beach access points be included in the draft design options to ensure they are maintained and improved where possible as the design progresses. Transport noted this request. 6.2 **Action:** Transport to provide the Committee with the following additional information: Revision of options for the southern connection of the Milton Ulladulla bypass and its intersection with the Princes Highway at Burrill Lake Transport to provide the traffic modelling data to the Committee Transport to provide traffic modelling for a three lane highway upgrade option Transport owned property information.

7	Committee Alignment Options				
7.1	The chair presented the scope of this Committee and the preferred corridor for the Milton Ulladulla bypass, and re-visited slides provided during a previous meeting. Transport noted requests to map options that bypass Burrill Lake (to the west of the existing highway) as proposed by the Committee and by Shoalhaven City Council, are not in scope of this Committee.				
7.2	The Committee was invited to ask questions and make comments. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:				
	<ul> <li>Requests for non-confidential presentation materials to be provided to the Committee to assist in their review of options</li> <li>Transport noted that the Committee received technical notes to assist in assessment of the options. A number of Committee members expressed disappointment that options west of Burrill Lake (bypassing Burrill Lake) would not be considered as part of the Co-Design process</li> <li>A Committee member raised concern about the scope of the Committee. During meeting one, a diagram outlining the scope (and study area) was displayed. During meeting three, a further discussion about scope took place, and Transport displayed the diagram. A Committee member raised that the diagram presented in meeting three was not the same diagram as presented previously, and it appeared to represent a narrower section of the existing Highway alignment, inferring that the scope had been narrowed. It was noted that if the scope has been narrowed, it would mean other options presented would be out of scope. Transport responded during the meeting, confirming the scope diagram had not been altered and the identical slide was presented (during meeting one and meeting three).</li> <li>The Facilitator reminded the committee that they were advised there would be non-negotiables during the interviews for selection to the Committee and noted that details of scope and non-negotiable aspects of the co-design process were presented to the Committee at Meeting 1.</li> <li>A Committee member suggested a tunnel might be a suitable option for the upgrade through Burrill Lake</li> <li>Transport confirmed discussions with its tunnel subject matter experts who noted significant challenges when planning for tunnels including portals with large construction footprints, the need for stack outlets on each end of the tunnel, and the high costs, among other issues. A tunnel option has been ruled out of contention for this process.</li> </ul>				
7.3	Transport presented updates to previously presented options based on the Committee's feedback, including refinements of the alignments, connection options and intersection treatments.				
7.4	The Committee was invited to ask questions and make comments. The following topics were discussed:				
	<ul> <li>A Committee member commented the amendments do not make a huge difference to footprint or construction impacts to the community</li> <li>A Committee member noted concerns around the potential impacts to the old coast road and forest area. Transport noted these concerns and will look to minimise impacts</li> </ul>				

A number of Committee members supported an option that includes an upgrade to the existing highway, whereby increasing lane capacity to include one additional lane Additional modifications options were also requested (for presentation at the next meeting) A number of Committee members observed that due to the perceived narrowing of the scoping compared to earlier presentations, that there were very limited options available, other than minor tweaks to the existing options. Transport noted these concerned, and reassured the Committee that the scope had not changed An amendment to Option 4 was proposed which had the intent to lessen potential property impacts, and lessen potential impacts on the bushland and Lions Park whilst still maintaining the benefits. Potential impacts of some options on streets such as Princess Avenue was raised again as a concern. 7.5 **Action:** Transport to provide the Committee with the following additional information: Revisions to an option to minimise potential impacts to community assets and amenity Transport to review options to minimise potential impacts to the old coast road and forest area Transport to provide further details of local property owned by Transport and if possible, with dates of purchase Transport to provide more information on the Committee's suggested amendments, to be presented and discussed at Meeting Four. 8 Minutes, correspondence and dates for future meetings 8.1 Prior to meeting three, some committee members expressed their opposition to a summary of minutes being released to the wider community, which includes the removal of references to specifics of the proposed options. Transport noted the concern of Committee members and confirmed Transport will provide the wider community a detailed report at the conclusion of the process. The report will include the Committee's recommendations and Transport's preferred option. 8.2 The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed: Some Committee members strongly opposed the summary of minutes • Some Committee members questioned the minute process requested the Committee be given final approval Transport and the Facilitator noted the Committee's concern about the minutes and has added detail where appropriate. Transport also noted that future minutes will remain a summary of discussions, and that Committee members are provided with the opportunity to comment on the minutes prior to them being finalised by the Secretariat and Transport. 8.3 The facilitator ran through the schedule for the future meetings. Due to the complexity of options and on request of the Committee, additional meetings have been added to the process. 9 Thanks and close

The Chair and facilitator thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 9:45pm.	
--	--