

MINUTES

Burrill Lake Co-Design Committee - Meeting Two Parts A and B

Date	Part A: 21 September 2021; Part B: 28 September 2021		
Time	Part A: 6pm – 9:18pm; Part A: 6pm – 7:43pm		
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
	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
Apologies	Victor Channell (Parts A & B)	VC	Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council
	Cheryl McMahon (Part B)	CMc	Resident

As per the Terms of Reference, minutes are produced in consultation with the Committee.

Ron Cox, Cheryl McMahon, David Swarts, Paul Mitchell, Ian Carroll, Kirra Dowling, Simone Chee, Niree Creed, Barrie Wilford and Richard McLoughlin are of the view these minutes are not a transparent record of proceedings.

Transport's response

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. We do this to ensure any unconfirmed option with potential impacts to the surrounding community does not create unnecessary concern. We recognise our proposed highway upgrades will have impacts on surrounding communities and we are committed to minimising concerns as much as possible. This requires us 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.

These minutes are a summary of the Committee's discussion and actions for Transport. As per the Terms of Reference, minutes are provided to the Committee for review.

1.	Welcome – Julian Watson
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting open and welcome • Acknowledgment of Country
2.	Meeting agenda and housekeeping – Tricia Wunsch
2.1	<p>The facilitator outlined the agenda for the meeting. A housekeeping reminder was provided, including using the chat function and raising hands within the Teams platform.</p> <p>A recap of meeting one followed with a review of the actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the correspondence received from Committee members since meeting one and how those items will be addressed during the process. Topics were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggestions for the site tour ○ Noise enquiries ○ Historical and environmental assets needing protection ○ Access to maps ○ Land ownership ○ Comments about speed limits on possible alignments ○ Correspondence outside of meetings ○ Concerns about the Co-Design process ○ Local amenities ○ Alternative alignments to be suggested by the Committee
2.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A request was made to access (audio) recordings of the meetings. The facilitator confirmed the recording was for the purpose of taking minutes and would not be shared • Multiple Committee members requested that Transport consider a western bypass of Burrill Lake • A committee member noted the absence of a representative from the Ulladulla Aboriginal Land Council. Transport confirmed a representative had accepted a position on the Committee and been invited to all meetings.
3.	Draft options review – Julian Watson, Andrew Destry and Nicole Stevenson

3.1	<p>Transport provided responses to actions from meeting one, to either close them out or to present at future meetings. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weight capacity for the Burrill Lake Bridge • Options for vehicle charging facilities invited • Transport owned property at Burrill Lake presented • Details of land tenure was presented • 20 year AADT (average annual daily traffic) modelling to be presented at meeting three • Provision of value management workshop example to be provided • Details for future meeting dates provided
3.2	<p>Burrill Lake Bridge</p> <p>Transport confirmed the Burrill Lake Bridge is engineered to safely accommodate higher mass limit vehicles (HMLV), Transport explained the existing lane structure for the Burrill Lake Bridge and the options available to increase the lane capacity to three or four lanes. It was confirmed that shared user paths for pedestrians and cyclists would be retained in all options for any possible treatment of the Burrill Lake Bridge. Transport provided examples for how this could be engineered.</p>
3.3	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of services (utilities) under the pedestrian deck was discussed • Transport confirmed safety mitigations such as education and signage about the danger of jumping from the Burrill Lake Bridge • Committee member raised construction impacts if the existing bridge were to be widened in comparison to building a new bridge. Transport responded the alignment options can be modified for either of the two bridge treatments • There was discussion of options for speed limits for the Burrill Lake Bridge and the full alignment options. Transport confirmed the Committee will review speed zones as part of the co-design process. • Road user safety if the shoulders are removed on the Burrill Lake Bridge • A committee member requested an estimate of costs for upgrades to the existing bridge, compared to western bypass options. Transport responded that western bypass options are out of scope.
3.4	<p>Transport explained technical terms used when presenting the options to the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross sections • cuttings • tadpoles • batters • elevations • colour codes (legend) for the proposed alignments • explanation of naming conventions for the differing alignment options.
3.5	<p>Transport presented option one. The presentation included identifying connectivity to and from various locations in the project area, including on and off ramps, intersection</p>

	treatments, options for local roads and potential property impacts.
3.6	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A committee member asked what the impacts would be for property identified as being within buffer zones used during construction. Transport noted potential impact to property is part of the criteria the Committee needs to assess. While the buffer zones are currently shown on indicative plans, more design work is required to refine the options. As the Co-Design process continues, Transport will continue to refine designs to understand specific impacts and will share these with the Committee. • A committee member requested Transport map an alternative intersection treatment type • Questions were raised regarding underpass traffic height clearances and the proposed height of a new bridge. Transport showed a cross section to approximately show the height difference. Transport will provide more details on the relative height details for each options to assist in the assessment process. • A committee member commented that there would be potential impacts to land zoning classifications which Transport noted. • A committee member asked how the intersection at Kings Point Drive would be considered as part of the Milton Ulladulla bypass project.
4.	Dinner Break
4.1	<p>Transport presented the second and third options. The presentation included identifying connectivity to and from various locations in the project area, including on and off ramps, intersection treatments, options for local roads, potential property impacts and cuttings.</p> <p>Transport described the difference between design speed and posted speed limits.</p> <p>Transport asked the Committee to draw on local knowledge to provide insights to beach access paths, with the following comments provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern end of the Burrill Lake Bridge across to Princess Avenue South and beyond, around the foreshore to the beach • Just below Coopers Hill, south of Blackburn lookout • Noting, the 'Old Coast Road' should be preserved, due to its historical significance • Track at northern end of Burrill Lake, near the proposed Milton Ulladulla bypass southern connection • Northern and southern ends of the Holiday Haven Burrill Lake tourist park. • Path across from the Community Centre Hall is highly used <p>Council representatives explained the proposed access to be provided at the lakefront at Princess Avenue South.</p>
4.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised for potential property impacts

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A committee member requested Transport map the alignment with a reduced footprint of the access road servicing the Holiday Haven Burrill Lake caravan park. • Traffic data which Transport advised would be presented at meeting three • Transport advised the height of the overpass at the northern end interchange would be at least 5.3 metres high • Noise mitigation techniques where Transport confirmed a 'cutting-in' can assist in reducing noise due to it creating a natural barrier • Concerns were raised for impacts to pedestrian safety at community amenities. Transport advised they would separate high-speed traffic from pedestrian movements • Assessment to include individual, anonymised scores by all members • Shoalhaven City Council confirmed it is currently designing a shared user path to connect Kings Point to the existing shared user path network along the Princes Highway.
4.3	Transport gave an overview of options four and five, noting more time will be given to revisit these options in a future meeting.
4.4	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed:</p> <p>A Committee member requested information on comparison of costs for the options presented compared to western bypass options (western bypass option is not within scope of the co-design committee). Transport responded that while cost is a factor, the western options to bypass Burrill Lake are not as effective at reducing the traffic levels in Milton and Ulladulla. More information about the strategic options for the MUB can be found on the project webpage:</p> <p>https://roads-waterways.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/milton-ulladulla-bypass/index.html</p>
5.	Explanation of individual site tour and mapping tool – Julie Lacy
5.1	Transport explained that due to ongoing COVID restrictions, an in-person group site tour is not possible. Transport suggested Committee members could explore some locations during their COVID safe individual exercises, prior to meeting three.
5.2	<p>Transport presented an online mapping tool developed for the exclusive use of Committee members. The mapping tool allows members to drop pins at key locations with the study area to provide comments, which are visible to all Committee members.</p> <p>A committee member requested the mapping tool be amended to include layers displaying each option. Transport confirmed the objective of the mapping tool is to enable comments to be pinned within the study area, not to display options.</p>
5.3	The facilitator explained the structure for subsequent meetings. Due to time constraints for the presentation of the final two options, an additional hour was put forward to be scheduled on Tuesday 28 September to enable sufficient opportunity for the presentation of these options in full and for Committee discussion.

5.4	<p>Actions from the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport to share the Milton Ulladulla bypass strategic corridor option report (link provided at item 4.4) • Transport to provide additional information for the treatment of intersections • Transport to provide technical notes to the Committee to assist their deliberations • Transport to provide Committee members with access to the online mapping tool.
6.	Next steps and close – Julian Watson
6.1	The Chair adjourned the meeting with the expectation it will continue on 28 September, subject to confirmation.
7	Meeting Two Part B - Welcome – Julian Watson
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting open and welcome • Acknowledgment of Country
8	Correspondence – Tricia Wunsch
8.1	<p>The facilitator provided an overview of the correspondence received from the Committee members since meeting two, part A. Transport provided responses to questions or an indication of how queries will be addressed during the remainder of the process.</p> <p>Correspondence topics included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional meetings • Face to face meetings in light of changing COVID restrictions in NSW • Limitations of the mapping tool • Option for a western bypass • Construction timeframes • Potential property and land impacts • Assessment scoring scale • Cross sections for the alignment options.
8.2	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members requested the alignment options be shown within the mapping tool. Transport responded this is not possible and the workbooks have been provided with the maps of the alignments for the Committee deliberations • Requests were made for the provision of presentation materials to the Committee members which Transport and KJA agreed to consider • Concern was expressed by Committee members representing community groups that they are unable to engage properly due to confidentiality. Transport explained the Committee is designed for open and transparent discussions within the closed group, where context and questions can be tabled. Sharing of details outside the group could create misunderstanding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment criteria and weightings including final score. Transport confirmed the Co-Design final report will contain information about the scoring and assessment process.
9	Draft options review (continuation) – Andrew Destry
9.1	Transport presented the fourth option. The presentation included identifying connectivity to and from various locations in the project area using on and off ramps, intersection treatments, solutions for local roads and potential property impacts.
9.2	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were raised for potential property impacts. Transport responded they will always minimise property impacts, and will continue to work through the potential impacts as the planning of options progresses. Heights of bridges and elevated roads over amenities Requests were made to alter the alignments to move/relocate intersections to reduce potential impacts A Committee member raised again for consideration of an inner west option. Transport agreed the trade-offs between potential impacts to homes and impacts to the environment are a difficult consideration in these processes Preservation of the fig tree in Lions Park was noted by Transport A Committee member spoke of flood zones and how this would be mitigated against. Transport responded that drainage studies have yet to be conducted and noted the comment Concerns were raised for the need to potentially relocate community amenities and/or assets. Transport confirmed if amenities or assets were impacted by alignments it would be part of Transport's scope of works to ensure a suitable relocation solution is developed.
9.3	Transport presented an alternative option for the southern connection of the Milton Ulladulla bypass. This option can be adapted to suit any of the four alignments previously presented to the Committee.
9.4	<p>The Committee were invited to ask questions. The following topics were discussed and some concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared user paths for beach access Moving/relocating the intersection to reduce potential impacts Committee members raised concerns that Transport would not consider an inner west option. Transport confirmed the inner west option was considered as part of the Milton Ulladulla bypass process and this option was not taken forward as a viable option. A committee member asked why consideration for a tunnel to be constructed under Burrill Lake had not been discussed. Transport noted that its initial investigations indicate that a tunnel under Burrill Lake is not a viable solution. However, agreed to discuss in more detail at a subsequent meeting.
9.5	<p>Actions from the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport to provide technical notes to the Committee to assist their deliberations Transport to consider providing meeting materials to Committee members

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport to investigate requests/suggestions from Committee to refine some elements within options • Committee to submit suggested options by Tuesday 12 October.
9.6	The facilitator advised a survey would be issued to obtain preferences to confirm for the date for meeting four (in November).
9.7	The Chair thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 7:43pm.