

MINUTES

Burrill Lake Co-Design Committee - Meeting Four

Date	26 October 2021		
Time	6pm – 9:07pm		
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 Wilford	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
	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
Apologies	Nicky Sutherland	NSu	KJA - Secretariat

These minutes are a summary of the Committee's discussions with no reference to any specific characteristics of the alignments under review, which Transport deems to be currently confidential. The community will be provided with a detailed report at the conclusion of the Co-Design process, including the Committee's recommendations.

Ian Carroll 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 recognises 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 style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting open and welcome• Acknowledgment of Country
2.	Meeting agenda, minutes, actions and Committee correspondence – Tricia Wunsch (Facilitator)
2.1	<p>The facilitator outlined the agenda for the meeting and confirmed the meeting would run to time.</p> <p>It was explained that going forward the Committee correspondence log will be provided in full to Committee members weekly. The log will include Transport's response to each enquiry.</p> <p>A review of the outstanding actions was provided.</p> <p>In previous meetings, some Committee members expressed concern about the process for the approval of the Committee minutes and the level of detail provided in the public facing summary minutes. They also had concerns at having two sets of minutes. The facilitator confirmed there would be one set of minutes and these minutes would summarise the meeting. It was also confirmed that in the interest of time, and as per the Terms of Reference, the Committee would not have an opportunity to ratify the minutes once the first round of comments had been received and if appropriate, incorporated into the final.</p> <p>The facilitator spoke to the topic of holding face to face meetings (in reference to the COVID restrictions and guidelines)</p>
2.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Committee member was concerned an action log from meeting three was presented prior to the Committee reviewing the minutes for that meeting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several Committee members requested their dissent for the minutes from meeting two be noted on the minutes. The facilitator and Transport agreed to note this on the minutes. It was agreed a Committee member would provide the preferred wording for inclusion. A Committee member read posts from social media where Burrill Lake community members expressed their concerns around Transport's lack of transparency during this process. This was noted by the facilitator and Transport.
3.	NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) – Michael Phelan
3.1	<p>NPWS's Michael Phelan is from the Shoalhaven Area, South Coast Branch, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service. He presented to the Committee on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role NPWS plays in planning of Transport projects Revocation, re-categorisation and road adjustment policy Considerations when assessing the use of National Park land for roads The process required for revocation of land use, including the final decisions being at NSW Cabinet and Government levels
3.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Committee member raised a concern regarding the impact from some of the proposed alignments to flora and fauna in both National Park and other land in and around Burrill Lake. Transport confirmed that whilst the Milton Ulladulla bypass (MUb) does not have any impact on National Park lands, this would be a consideration for Transport when deliberating on alignment options for Burrill Lake. A Committee member asked if NPWS has a role in reviewing impacts on ecology outside of NPWS gazetted lands or impacts to archaeological sites of significance to the Aboriginal community. NPWS noted they are involved in impacts to wildlife but the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC) has carriage of cultural impacts. Transport explained the exhaustive process and ongoing consultation required if a project plans on impacting a National Park. A Committee member asked for clarification of what land compensation measures might be required. NPWS explained they would seek land of a similar ecological value. NPWS would put forward a range of options, however, as an agency, they are limited in their ability to acquire land. The availability of appropriate land for acquisition that satisfies the ecological values is also a factor NPWS consider during the planning and approval phase. A question was asked about impacts to property and community amenity as a trigger to considering revocation of some amount of National Park. NPWS noted impacts to the community would be one element of a comprehensive proposal that would be submitted to the Environment Minister about any revocation and would also form part of the Environmental Assessment Transport would undertake to identify a preferred option. A Committee member noted that while there may be no National Park impacts on a highway upgrade through Burrill Lake itself, there would be likely impacts for the endangered salt marsh at the Tabourie straight when the upgrade continues further down south and that it is a significant issue. Additionally, the western options to bypass Burrill Lake impact a National Park, and this is more favourable than potential impacts to properties than an upgrade of the Princes Highway through Burrill Lake.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Committee member asked if a submission was made to the Environment Minister regarding the western corridor alignment for the Milton Ulladulla bypass. Transport noted that no submission was made to the Environment Minister about this option as a western corridor option was not identified as the preferred option for the Milton Ulladulla bypass.
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPWS representatives noted they would remain within the meeting for the next presentation to address any further relevant questions.
4.	Environment – Graham Roche, Senior Manager, Environment and Sustainability, Transport for NSW (SME)
4.1	<p>Graham Roche, Senior Manager, Environment and Sustainability is from Transport for NSW.</p> <p>He presented to the Committee the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the liveability and sustainability criteria as part of the assessment framework for the Committee and outlined the environmental and heritage considerations for each option. Shared the SEED portal - the Central Resources for Sharing and Enabling Environmental Data in NSW. The portal shows a range of environmental data from different government agencies and is a useful tool for a high-level initial environment assessment. It is broad scale mapping and does have some limitations. Transport use this tool for desktop research, and more comprehensive on-ground studies are required for the team to obtain a greater understanding of the environmental constraints for each option. Initial observations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of endangered ecological communities in the Burrill Lake area Habitat for cryptic orchids Salt marshes and marine vegetation Littoral rainforest, Bangalay Sand forest and coastal wetlands Aboriginal archaeological sites Noise and visual impact How traffic moves – e.g. free flowing and accelerating
4.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Committee member raised concerns that every option presented would impact fragile areas according to the SEED map. Several other members noted this observation as well. Transport noted that every infrastructure project has impacts, and the process followed is to assess a range of options and explore opportunities to avoid or minimise the different impacts. The identified preferred option for Burrill Lake will need to meet the project objectives while minimising environmental impacts. Further investigations would be undertaken on the ground to better understand the impacts and a better assessment of the options. NPWS noted that the data in the SEED map is informed by studies carried out, often due to a project being undertaken, e.g. the Burrill Lake Bridge. The lack of identified items on the SEED map can be misleading, i.e. the area could have significant features that are not yet known, until studies are required or undertaken. Reference was made to options of a western corridor (west of Burrill Lake) appearing to have fewer environmental impacts according to the SEED map.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Committee member suggested studies be undertaken on the western side of Burrill Lake to compare against the confirmed strategic corridor of the Milton Ulladulla bypass, and options through Burrill Lake, and reiterated the comments about other sensitive areas further south along the Princes Highway towards Lake Tabourie. Transport noted that these studies would not be carried out as western options (and changes to the Milton Ulladulla bypass corridor) are out of scope for this Co-Design process. • One Committee member asked when the likely noise impacts for different alignments and speeds for options being explored would be known. Transport noted detailed noise monitoring would not be done for every option as part of the Co-Design process. However, Transport will provide the Committee with an overview of noise impacts for the different options or information from noise guides about impacts from different traffic levels and speeds. • The Committee was provided with a link to the SEED portal via the chat function • A Committee member asked if National Park was to be impacted either in Burrill Lake or further south, does NPWS have the opportunity to state what their preference or preferred corridor would be or is a decision made by Transport. Transport noted a range of subject matter experts from various government agencies, including NPWS, would be invited to attend a value management workshop to provide their input and assess options. Transport offered to provide the Committee with tips and instructions on how to navigate and use the SEED portal, noting it contains a lot of different data sets of differing levels.
4.3	<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport to provide the Committee with the following additional information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of noise impacts for the different options or information from noise guides about impacts from different traffic levels and speeds. ○ Tips and instructions on how to navigate and use the SEED portal.
4.4	<p>NPWS representatives left the meeting at the conclusion of the environmental discussion.</p> <p>A Committee member requested broad noise maps be produced for each option for average daily traffic now and in 2040. Transport will provide general guidance around possible noise impacts. See action at 4.3.</p>
5.	Presentation of updated designs as requested by the Committee – Andrew Destry
5.1	<p>Andrew Destry (Transport) presented a summary of options to refresh the Committee on what has been presented to date, and what options will be presented at this meeting and the next.</p> <p>At this meeting, three variations to one alignment option through Burrill Lake were presented at the request of the Committee. An additional variation to the alignment through Burrill Lake and to the Milton Ulladulla bypass interchange will be presented for discussion at the next meeting.</p> <p>Transport presented information at the Committee's request as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-level construction timeframe and estimates for each option (assuming the variations of each option have similar construction timeframes)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel time estimates (derived from traffic modelling) for additional options/variations • Vehicle classifications/types according to daily and holidays peaks • Refinement to existing options to reduce construction footprints.
5.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions throughout the presentations. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee were invited to send through any further requests for traffic modelling. • One Committee member noted that providing local beach access will be critical when considering the width of the Princes Highway. • A concern was raised that the construction process could damage or destroy the Bangalay sand forest. Transport noted a large proportion of forest could be preserved, highlighting the stringent environmental approvals requirements. Other measures, such as physical barriers to protect forest areas (and other) would be used to minimise impacts during construction.
6.	Dinner break
7	Presentation of updated designs as requested by the Committee continued – Andrew Destry
7.1	<p>At the start of this session it was noted there was an agenda item to discuss local services, amenities and connectivity. Andrew Destry noted this would naturally be part of the discussion about the variations to be presented, e.g. pedestrian bridges, and these items will form part of this session.</p> <p>Andrew Destry presented three eastern option variations to the Committee.</p>
7.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions throughout the presentations. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Committee member raised concerns around impacts to sand dunes and sand dune vegetation. They wanted to understand what prior activities had been undertaken to stabilise the dunes and what future actions could be employed to reduce any future potential impacts Transport noted that further studies, including geotechnical would be undertaken for options that progress for further consideration and outlined some of the mitigations methods that could be used if needed. • It was also noted that the eastern side of Burrill Lake includes the location of the Shoalhaven Water infrastructure/utilities, a bike path and the proposed development on the Edgewater Motel site. Transport noted these are considerations. • Transport asked the Committee if there was any feedback about Lions Park and potential impacts to the usability of the park. The Committee member representing Lions Club noted they would consult with their Executive and provide further feedback. They noted any impacts to the park were of significant concern. The Moreton Bay fig tree in Lions Park was reiterated as an important and iconic feature of the park. • There were suggestions from the Committee members for a range of possible community facilities such as staging areas for emergency vehicles, art space/workshops, Men's shed, short-term emergency accommodation/shelter, foreshore pathways/walkways, improved beach access/tracks, boardwalks,

	<p>preservation of sandstone blocks from the old coast road be considered as part of any upgrade of the highway at Burrill Lake. Comments about damage occurring to the existing sandstone blocks was taken on notice and referred to the appropriate officers within Council, by Council representatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Committee member noted that if Transport focus just on the road then the community will focus just on the road and will not consider the potential amenity improvements that could be included with any consideration of any option. They highlighted the importance of the improvements and offsets that can be done, given a western bypass alignment option is out of scope for this progress. • One Committee member noted that there was a beach track/access point missing from the design. It was noted and the Committee member committed to sharing with the Transport project team its location so it could be added. A discussion was held that highlighted the value of the beach tracks to the community and the desire for safe connectivity to the beach to be maintained or improved if possible, as part of the project. • There was discussion about the old coast road, its maintenance, and if it is listed on the LEP corridor or a heritage register. • One Committee member raised the impact of recent bushfire events and the lack of road access during emergencies. They asked that Transport address highway resilience at the next meeting. Transport noted the importance of incorporating strategies to increase resilience of the transport during emergencies such as bushfires, floods and other events as part of the Princes Highway upgrade program. Transport suggested their subject matter expert for emergency management will be invited to present at the next meeting. • Clarification was sought on which option had the least potential property impacts. • Clarification was requested on the ways Transport could reduce the footprint of one option.
7.3	<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee member to send Transport the location of the additional beach access track. • Bushfire and emergency management to be included on the agenda for Meeting five with a relevant SME to attend. • Transport to update advice on potential impact to properties for each option • Transport to advise on ways to reduce footprint for each option
8	Next steps and meeting close
8.1	<p>Scoring and assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport will provide an updated pack to help the Committee in the assessment process, including a scoring spreadsheet. • After meeting five, it is proposed the Committee will have a week to consider assessments and submit for collation. Assessments will be anonymised in preparation for review and discussion during meeting six. • There are 19 variations and options combined for the Milton Ulladulla bypass interchange and options through Burrill Lake. An important part of meeting five will be to discuss how many of the options and variations the Committee will select to carry forward for assessment and scoring.
8.2	Next steps

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair invited Graham Roche to attend the next committee meeting. Transport acknowledged the challenging process in producing the minutes and the Committee's concern about the minutes. Transport will look to reduce production timelines and notes the Committee concerns. • Transport noted the next meeting will be 9 November and will provide timely advice on whether this meeting can be held face to face or online. Five days' notice was requested by a Committee member for notification of the meeting being held online or in-person. This was agreed and acknowledged.
8.3	The Chair thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 9.07pm.