

# **Appendix H**

---

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

**RECEIVED**

Table H.1 – Submissions received during consultation period with response

**Verbal Submissions**

Date	Approx. time	Duration	Name	Property	Comments received	Response
24/04/2015	2pm	~5mins		Opposite council yards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to know how much of her land is to be acquired and details of how to comment?</li> <li>• Doesn't object to the bypass just concerned with acquisition and value attributed to land. I explained that only concept design work had been completed and that the areas for acquisition are unlikely to be known until the project progresses. It was recommended she provide comment on her concerns and attend the meeting on the 6 May.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquisition details addressed in <b>Section 6.8</b>. It is noted that these figures provided are very preliminary are expected to change as detailed design is completed. A mitigation measure identified within this REF is for every effort to be made to minimise unnecessary acquisition. It is understood preliminary discussions with Council have commenced in this regard.</li> </ul>
27/04/2015	1pm	~10mins	Jack Mallon	Pinch point near river/railway line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• His property is affected by the alignment and wants to know the extent of the effect. I explained that we couldn't quantify extent of effects (in terms of land area) until we have the detailed digital design from Council/GHD but we can see which properties are affected.</li> <li>• Asked to be sent the detailed design drawings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above.</li> <li>• Provided as requested.</li> </ul>
1/05/2015	10:30am	~5mins	Paul Galea	not adjacent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Couldn't access link to Council document. Had suggestions about alternative routes which I indicated was not part of the brief, although noted that some recommendations as to refinements was a likely outcome of the assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council documents provided. The process for the selection of the route is outlined in <b>Section 2.4</b>. Further consideration of route selection or possible wholesale changes to the alignment have not been considered within the REF as it is outside the scope of Geolyse' engagement.</li> </ul>

1/05/2015	10:55	25 mins	John Waters	Lives on boundary road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about impacts from noise and on property valuations.</li> <li>• Believes the bypass is necessary but does not agree with the alignment and is disappointed with the way council has (in his words) forced the route on local residents and has given poor advice to people considering building in the locality.</li> <li>• Will be attending the people meeting.</li> <li>• Would like to know what noise level limits would apply to his property and I explained this would be determined via the noise assessment.</li> <li>• Is looking to sell and leave Cowra and believes will lose money because of the route.</li> <li>• Has discussed the matter with the Valuer Generals office.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise impacts are addressed in detail in <b>Section 6.3</b>.</li> <li>• Route selection and alternatives is discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Refer <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• The potential for impacts to property values is addressed in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>• As above</li> </ul>
20/05/2015	9:15	7 mins	Chris Hatherley	Calare Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned why he was not be invited to the public meeting as he is only 110 metres from the bypass. I explained the decision was taken to write only to people directly abutting the alignment and to put the advert in the paper. I offered to provide a copy of the public meeting minutes so that comments could be provided. He indicated he would obtain a copy from the neighbour and provide comments to me by COB Monday (25th Monday).</li> <li>• He asked how accessible the draft report would be and I explained that was up to Council but we have no objection to it entering the public domain immediately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of consultation process is outlined in <b>Section 5</b> of this assessment.</li> <li>• Given the high level of community interest in the project it is recommended that the draft REF be made available to the general public for review and comment, and that any comments be incorporated into the final document. This may include, subject to Council agreement, presentation of the draft REF by Geolyse to a public meeting.</li> </ul>

20/05/2015	Via Council		Mr and Mrs Preston	19 Fishburn St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with the interface of the proposed bypass with Fishburn Street and whether their access would be restricted or whether a cul-de-sac may be included for the existing property's access.</li> <li>• Also concerned about the height of the bypass, and the drivers of vehicles on it being able to look into their property; they questioned whether privacy screens may be installed at appropriate points on the route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All intersections are considered in the traffic assessment (refer <b>Section 6.4</b>) and recommendations provided. Detailed design would look at these issues in more detail, subject to detailed survey, and would ensure that all intersections meet required standards. Access arrangements for individual properties would also need to meet standards and mitigation measures to this effect are provided within the traffic assessment.</li> <li>• Concept alignment at this location (approximately chainage 3180) shows the finished road level would be 500mm above the existing road level). The final levels would be confirmed as an element of detailed design but, based on this minor increase, it is not anticipated that privacy would be a significant concern.</li> </ul>
27/05/2015	11:30	7 mins	Graham Dunn	Resident of Cowra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned who the determining authority was and why the Department of Planning did not have a greater role in the process?</li> <li>• Highlighted ongoing concerns with road projects around NSW generally and stated that a regional road user group should be setup to comment on road projects generally</li> <li>• Has provided written comments (not received at the time of the ph call)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was explained that the project is considered in respect of Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (refer <b>Section 4</b>) and as such the determining authority is also the authority proposing the work, in this case Cowra Council. Other authorities (such as Roads and Maritime Services, NSW DPI Fisheries, NSW Office of Water etc) have determining authority roles but the final decision is taken by Council. Process and role of the DP&amp;E is dictated by relevant guidelines and policies; in this instance the role of DP&amp;E is limited.</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Received and considered below.</li> </ul>

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS (PRIVATE)**

Date	Format	Name	Property	Comments received	Response
5/05/2015	email	Paul Galea	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the use of Boundary Road and believes there are better options. Proposes that the alignment should continue south of Airport Road (following same alignment) before turning east along an unnamed road reserve and then joining the Young Road. Original design resumes at Young Road. This will reduce impacts to Airport and Boundary Roads and tree loss.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See previous comments in respect of alignment - no consideration of the adopted alignment or alternative alignments have not formed part of this assessment beyond the matters addressed in <b>Section 2.4)</b></li> </ul>
11/05/2015	letter	Stephen and Patti Brown	37 Campbell St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding construction and operational impacts on the structural integrity of the dwelling (built in the 1870s).</li> <li>• Concern about impacts to business as a result of increased noise, traffic movements, more difficulty parking.</li> <li>• Concern about 80km/hr speed limit in this area that may discourage patrons.</li> <li>• Concern about proposed crossing of Waugoola Creek, the proposal to use of a raised culvert and the impact this will have to flood behaviour.</li> <li>• Concern that only a small proportion of residents want the route alignment as adopted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mitigation measure is provided in the Noise and Vibration Assessment that any buildings of heritage significance, or buildings in close proximity to building works, should be subject to a pre-construction structural dilapidation report. Monitoring would occur during and post construction to ensure no damage to buildings</li> <li>• Noise issues addressed in <b>Section 6.3</b>; traffic/parking issues addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b>. These assessments conclude that the activity can, subject to the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures including adopting matters identified via detailed design, occur without significant impact to existing properties.</li> <li>• GHD Bypass Study notes an assumed speed limit of 70km/hr in this portion of the bypass. Final determination of speed limits would be by Roads and Maritime Services in conjunction with Council – refer <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Further flood modelling would be required once detailed design progresses to determine the full extent of impacts. It is anticipated that an engineering solution can be identified during detailed design that would maintain or improve the current situation</li> </ul>

				(65% of 400 responders in the GHD study) and opinion that this is not representative of the 12,000 resident population.	• See previous comments in respect of route selection and adoption.
11/05/2015	letter	L Stubbing	58 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the safety of the Young Road/Fishburn St intersection</li> <li>• Believes that Airport/Boundary Roads section of bypass won't be used much as heavy vehicles heading south rather than west and would therefore be a white elephant</li> <li>• Proposes improvement to Young Road/Fishburn St intersection instead of bypass</li> <li>• Specific concerns about the proposed alignment noted as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expensive white elephant, won't be used enough to warrant money invested, will need widening and street lighting.</li> <li>- Dangerous crossing Young Road.</li> <li>- Residents will have to be compensated.</li> <li>- These roads are gazetted as a travelling stock route and are part of a school bus run.</li> <li>- More jobs will be lost.</li> <li>- Mobil and BP service stations will suffer. Rose Garden café will suffer, Maccas will suffer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic assessment considers and recommends the appropriate treatment of all intersections including the Fishburn St/Young Road intersection - refer <b>Section 6.4</b>.</li> <li>• Studies completed by GHD to determine time benefits of route options; further analysis of this element of the project has not been completed via this assessment</li> <li>• Alternatives of this nature are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> but not addressed further via this assessment.</li> <li>• Comments as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upgrade and development works would be required and the final cost of these would not be known until detailed design has been completed and the designs have been reviewed by a quantity surveyor or construction company.</li> <li>- All proposed intersections are considered via the traffic assessment (refer <b>Section 6.4</b>) and would be designed to meet relevant standards to ensure safety</li> <li>- Compensation in respect of acquisition is a matter to be determined directly between affected land owners and Council</li> <li>- Safety of road uses is considered in detail in the traffic assessment (refer <b>Section 6.4</b>)</li> <li>- It is assumed that job loss is inferred in reference to following dot point and impacts to businesses. See below.</li> <li>- The bypass is aimed at removing heavy vehicles from the main street – refer <b>Section 6.4</b>. Light vehicles would be encouraged to remain on the existing highway and continue to pass through town</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

				<p>- Most importantly, lives will be lost as you are creating a traffic “black spot”. Identifies following positives about the suggested Young Road upgrade alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It’s already there.</li> <li>- It’s industrial.</li> <li>- It’s almost 4 lanes wide now,</li> <li>- Just needs a BIG roundabout at the Fishburn Road inter-section.</li> <li>- Save rate payers money – no compensation for affected residents</li> <li>- Mobile service station happy BP happy, Rose garden café happy, Maccas happy, residence of Boundary Road/Airport Road happy.</li> <li>- It’s a “NO BRAINER”</li> </ul>	<p>and utilise services and businesses. Consideration of economic impacts is provided in detail in <b>Section 6.9</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The traffic assessment confirms that the bypass and all resulting intersections can operate at an appropriate level of service, thereby ensuring safety. Consideration of alternatives is provided in <b>Section 2.4</b>.</li> </ul>
14/05/2015	letter	Barry Burns	121 Waratah St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about noise</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of noise of bypass together with increased noise activity projected at the airport in coming years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed noise assessment is provided in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• As above</li> </ul>
15/05/2015	letter	Bob & Brenda Moriarty	38 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the impact of the bypass on the amenity of the area and on wildlife</li> <li>• concerned about traffic safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment in respect of landscape character and visual amenity is provided in <b>Section 6.1</b> and an assessment of socio-economic impacts is provided in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>• A detailed traffic assessment is provided in <b>Section 6.4</b> which confirms that a safe road environment can be provided</li> </ul>
18/05/2015	letter	Merv & Jane Tasker	50 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the bypass is required</li> <li>• concerned about the current alignment, in particular the intersection of Boundary Road and Olympic Highway. Believes an upgrade of this intersection is required due to past fatalities</li> <li>• Intersection of Boundary and Airport Roads also a problem - suggests a gentle sweeping curve with appropriate camber/slope. May present access issues for RFS/SES. Acquisition required which may not be popular</li> <li>• Grenfell and Airport Road intersection is poor but space exists to provide an improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• The traffic assessment considers all intersections and confirms required intersection treatments</li> <li>• This measure has also been identified by the ecologist and would be a mitigation measure outlined in the report</li> <li>• See above comments about intersection works</li> </ul>

			<p>intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All three intersections would be used by traffic generated by the saleyards, abattoir, grain storage and Council depot and will require a level surface for safe manoeuvring</li> <li>• Loss of amenity to residents on Boundary Road due to increased traffic and increased noise</li> <li>• safety concerns for residents turning into properties from the bypass and for school bus services that operate along the route. A service lane could address these issues</li> <li>• Concern about loss of trees and resulting loss of visual amenity</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of surfaces and intersections needs to be high to ensure that the bypass operates at a high standard</li> <li>• Will access to side streets (Hartley, Service Road, Calare Street, Waratah) be limited?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road design should allow for 80km/hr to ensure free flow of traffic and time reductions over main street route</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn from problems with Orange Northern Distributor such as surface failure</li> <li>• Have opportunities for servicing businesses been considered along the bypass?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent/current improvements to Bells Line of Road and Great Western Highway will likely lead to greater traffic levels through Cowra and onwards South - bypass needs to respond to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above</li> <li>• As above</li> <li>• Traffic and noise impacts are considered in <b>Sections 6.3</b> and <b>6.4</b>. Amenity impacts considered throughout <b>Section 6</b> .</li> <li>• All property accesses would need to achieve compliance with Austroads standards for road design to ensure safety; this is a recommended mitigation measure. Provision of school bus bays as a minimum is a mitigation measure</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Detailed design would considered all of the accesses but the current arrangement is anticipated to remain in terms of access</li> <li>• The GHD Bypass Study identified a range of proposed speed limits across the bypass and this is reflected on page 108 of the GHD Bypass Study – refer <b>Table 3.1</b>. A final decision on speed limits would be the responsibility of Roads and Maritime Services in conjunction with Council.</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Access to all properties (business and private) is considered in <b>Section 6.3.6.3</b>. Access would be maintained as a minimum.</li> <li>• Traffic projections are conservative and consider a 20 year horizon - refer <b>Section 6.3.6.3</b>.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to residential amenity of Boundary and Airport Roads as compared with Olympic Highway/Young Road which is largely industrial. Use of this road for the bypass would be a better outcome</li> <li>• Notes that the current Redfern St - to Olympic Highway route is particularly dangerous</li> <li>• Suggest bypass would be more appropriate rerouted further south and west of the airport and re-joining the Mid Western Highway near Forbes Road</li> <li>• Points out that people expect high quality infrastructure and won't accept high risk situations, as occurred historically</li> <li>• Identifies that figures (route alignment images) provided with the consultation letter omit a number of three houses on Boundary Road</li> <li>• Overall concerns are summarised as safety, noise and potential 24/7 disturbance and the commensurate loss of value to property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity is considered throughout <b>Section 6</b></li> <li>• Traffic impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.4.</b></li> <li>• Consideration of alternatives is discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> <li>• Noted. All elements of the design would need to ensure compliance with the relevant standards as a minimum</li> <li>• The existence of these houses is noted and have been factored into the relevant detailed assessments</li> <li>• Impacts are considered through <b>Section 6</b> with valuation being specifically addressed in <b>Section 6.9.</b></li> </ul>
19/05/2015	letter	Craig A & Dianne E Fisher	66 Boundary Road	<p><b>Flora/Fauna/Landscape/Visual:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about clearing/widening impacts to space available for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• Concerned about vegetation removal and potential impacts to biodiversity.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential visual impacts to existing agricultural landscape character.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health/Noise/Dust:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about increased operational traffic noise.</li> <li>• Concerned that there is no mitigation of the effects of increased noise to their residential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic impact issues are considered at <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Potential impacts to flora and fauna are addressed in <b>Section 6.2</b>, potential impacts visual amenity are discussed in <b>Section 6.1</b> and potential impacts to traffic and pedestrians, including safety, is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Visual impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.1</b></li> <li>• Noise impacts are considered at <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Noise impacts are considered at <b>Section 6.3.</b> Necessary mitigation measures would vary property</li> </ul>

			<p>area and therefore does not provide balance as set out in the NSW Road and Noise Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about potential increased aggression in the community and sleep deprivation due to increased noise levels.</li> <li>• Concerned about short- and long-term health issues associated with noise exposure.</li> <li>• Concerned about dust and noise impacts during construction.</li> <li>• Concerned that the likely dust and noise emissions, even with environmental management, are unacceptable during construction and operation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Surface water/Groundwater:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about potential contamination from the Old Wool Top as a result of earthworks, possibly causing Arsenic contamination.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential contamination from waste water during and after construction.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential contamination from the Shell Depot on Campbell Street.</li> <li>• Concerns about safety relating to the steep access to the river crossing, and potential for water contamination from accidents.</li> </ul>	<p>to property and individual solutions would be discussed with land owners from the range of options outlined in <b>Section 6.3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per the conclusions shown in <b>Section 6.3</b>, given that noise levels can be adequately managed on an operational basis it is not anticipated that aggression, sleep deprivation or noise related health impacts are a likely project outcome.</li> <li>• See above</li> <li>• Air quality impacts are considered at <b>Section 6.6</b> and noise impacts at <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• The air quality assessment completed (refer <b>Section 6.6</b>) demonstrates that the project would be within acceptable levels.</li> <li>• Land contamination and remediation are addressed in <b>Section 6.10</b>. Any potential contamination from existing sources would be addressed in a project specific construction environmental management plan (CEMP) to ensure that adequate remediation measures are applied.</li> <li>• It is not clear what the waste water during construction would result from but any waste water generated would be managed in accordance with the relevant Landcom requirements and the specific measures would be provided for in CEMP.</li> <li>• The shell depot contamination matters are specifically addressed in <b>Section 6.10</b> and the mitigation measures would be incorporated into CEMP.</li> <li>• Road safety matters would be ensured by undertaking design in accordance with Austroads standards. Given the intersection of the Lachlan Valley Way and the bypass road would be a low speed environment, and noting the requirements of Roads and Maritime Services for the classified road</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about increased surface water pollution into local waterways from Boundary Road and Airport Road.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety concerns relating to residential driveway access.</li> <li>• Safety concerns relating the lay down area for the school bus in their residential area.</li> <li>• Safety concerns relating to compression breaking and heavy vehicle speed limits.</li> <li>• Concerned that the proposed works do not contribute to positive economic outcomes in the area.</li> <li>• Concerned that Geolyse has not accurately represented residential areas in Figures attached to letter</li> </ul>	<p>to retain priority, it is not considered that there is any increased likelihood of accidents in this location – refer <b>Section 6.4</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface waters associated with Boundary and Airport Roads would be managed through appropriate design in accordance with the Austroads standards.</li> <li>• Safety associated with residential driveways is addressed in the traffic assessment provided in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Safety of school buses and passengers is considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Speed limits would be set by Roads and Maritime Services and would be policed in the same way as for any existing or proposed road. Compression braking would be restricted within the urban areas</li> <li>• The overarching intent of the project is to remove a significant proportion of heavy vehicles from Kendal Street to improve the amenity of that area.</li> <li>• It is noted that the Figures attached to the consultation letter were slightly dated and omitted some newer dwellings, particularly on Boundary Road. These newer properties have been noted and included in the detailed noise and air quality assessments (<b>Sections 6.3 and 6.6</b>).</li> </ul>
19/05/2015	email	Mr SP & Mrs CI Wheeler	36 Campbell Street Cowra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biggest concern is continuous traffic noise generation, especially where the roads are close to homes in the area.</li> <li>• Concerned about speed limit of 80km/hr and the potential for the higher speed to increase noise and pose higher risks to pedestrians and homes in the event of an accident.</li> <li>• Concerned about the value of their home and how it might be impacted by the proposed bypass, in particular asking whether any study of this impact has been done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road noise is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Speed limits are recommended in the GHD Bypass Study and range from 50 - 80 km/hr throughout the alignment and are noted as being 70km/hr in the Campbell St area. Final speed limits would be set by Roads and Maritime Services and would designed to ensure safety for all road users</li> <li>• Valuation is considered in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests details of project timing</li> <li>• Disappointed with the arrogant attitudes of councillors and the lack of direct consultation by Council with residents</li> <li>• Notes the arrogance of the consultation letter in excluding issues of route selection from the consultation phase. Why bother consulting if views are not to be considered?</li> <li>• Development will directly affect the household and as such direct involvement in the process is vital. Requests an opportunity to meet with Council or Geolyse to discuss specific issues and concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this stage the REF would be completed in July/August 2015. Beyond that the matter is in Council's hands.</li> <li>• Council engaged Geolyse to complete the REF and the consultation strategy was agreed with Council; this approach is set out in <b>Section 5</b>. Geolyse cannot provide comment on consultation outside of this process</li> <li>• As Geolyse has been engaged only to access the adopted route, the intent of the letter was to focus submissions to deal with those matters within the remit of the REF. The letter was not intended to appear arrogant and we offer our apologies if it was interpreted in this way.</li> <li>• Request for a meeting with Council is noted.</li> </ul>
20/05/2015	Fax	Kevin & Louise Moodie (Kev Moodie Couriers)	70 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that diverting traffic from Kendal St via Boundary Road is not a bypass.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential visual impacts to semi-rural outlook</li> <li>• Concerned about speed of vehicles on a bypass with the 'blind' hill travelling west on Boundary Road from Young Road, with regard to exiting driveways safely.</li> <li>• Concern about majority of houses being located on the right hand side of Boundary Road, resulting in residents having to cut across the bypass road; concerned about increased accidents.</li> <li>• Concerned about two school bus stops on Boundary Road.</li> <li>• Concerned about animals (dogs and horses) associated with zoning of areas surrounding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intent of the project is to remove as much heavy vehicle traffic from Kendal Street as possible. Diverting through heavy vehicle traffic away from Kendal St would achieve this goal.</li> <li>• Visual amenity issues are addressed in detail in <b>Section 6.1</b></li> <li>• Speed limits would be set by Roads and Maritime Services and would be set to ensure the safety of all road users</li> <li>• Potential traffic impacts, including access, are addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Adequate provision for bus stops in accordance with the Austroads standards would be provided – refer <b>Section 6.4</b></li> </ul>

				<p>Boundary Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about potential impacts to quietness of the area and safety of families walking and jogging.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential impacts to property valuation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This situation does not change. The responsibility to keep animals controlled and contained is that of the owner</li> <li>• Amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b> . Road safety is considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Valuation is considered in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> </ul>
20/05/2015	letter	Jane Tasker	50 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was unable to attend the public meeting</li> <li>• Agrees that the bypass is necessary</li> <li>• Young Road is a better option for the western end of the bypass and access to existing services (fuel etc) is available and the road is flatter and therefore more suitable for trucks</li> <li>• Why spend millions of dollars on the bypass when a better solution exists (i.e., Young Road)</li> <li>• Questions whether Boundary Road would have kerb and gutter?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much of front garden and trees will be lost?</li> <li>• What happens to rural ambience?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will access be gained?</li> <li>• Concerned about safety when entering/existing property.</li> <li>• What concessions for inconvenience and decrease in property values?</li> <li>• What empathy does Geolyse have with the residents? Is it expected that residents should accept loss of amenity for the benefit of the greater community?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will routing the bypass up Boundary Road make any difference to the rest of the community? Impacts to the CBD are addressed as a result of the rest of the bypass solution and as such why involve Boundary Road at all?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Alternative routes are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative routes are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed design of Boundary Road would determine the finished appearance. The concept design does not propose kerb and gutter but this may change</li> <li>• Acquisition is addressed in <b>Section 6.8</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b> and particularly in <b>Section 6.8</b></li> <li>• Access is considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• As above</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property value is considered in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The REF process is designed to ensure that all relevant factors are considered. Geolyse appreciates the difficulties and emotions that a project of this nature generates but is engaged to consider these matters dispassionately and in accordance with relevant guidelines.</li> <li>• Alternative routes are considered via <b>Section 2.4.</b></li> </ul>

20/05/2015	letter	Mallon	Not stated (relates to Figures 5 and 6 of consultation letter - refer <b>Appendix G</b> )	Points put forward: 1 Restriction to access to this property 2 Restriction to water point for stock. This is the only stock water point in the upper area of the property 3 The position of power lines 4 The position of telephone cables in the entrance of the property	1 Property access is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b> 2 This would need to be discussed with Council, potentially during the acquisition negotiations 3 Power lines would be modified as required to ensure that adequate clearance is provided 4 Telecom services would be modified as required to ensure that adequate clearance is provided
20/05/2015	email	John and Robyn Worthington	115 Waratah Street	Concerns regarding environmental impacts as follows:  <u>Construction Phase</u> • In the absence of detailed design expects that pavement and drainage system upgrades will be required  • Assumes existing pavement width is insufficient which suggests upgrade works would be required • Noise, dust and ground vibration would occur during construction phase which could affect their property • Traffic patterns would be affected  • During recent upgrade works to Grenfell Road there was significant additional traffic using Waratah St in particular heavy vehicles including B-doubles, despite Waratah St not being a designated b-double route. No apparent effort was made by Council or the police to monitor and regulate this and additional vigilance would be necessary during construction works • Due to potential for heavy vehicle activity on Waratah St during construction repair works to the pavement of Waratah St should also be	• Detailed design would determine the extent of upgrade required but it is anticipated, based on the concept design, that at least 5 kilometres of upgrades would be required and 3 kilometres of new road • Noise, vibration and air quality impacts are addressed in <b>Sections 6.3</b> and <b>6.6</b> respectively and all mitigation measures would be included within a CEMP • Traffic impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.4</b>  • Measures would be included in a CEMP to ensure monitoring occurs by the contractor, Council or the police where appropriate • Any impacts associated with detours during construction would be addressed. Dilapidation surveys of detour routes would be included in the CEMP • Noise and vibration impacts are addressed in <b>Section 6.3</b> and traffic is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b> .  • Budgets are a matter for Council to consider

				<p>factored into the project budget</p> <p><u>Operational</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipates increased in vehicle noise, ground vibration, light intrusion and heavy vehicle traffic on Waratah St. Noise will be discernible inside and outside of property, especially when there is no background noise. This is a definite adverse effect</li> <li>• Currently vehicles using Airport Road at night have their high beam headlights on. Vehicles southbound on Airport Road turning left into Waratah St sweep across the property into bedrooms and living rooms (when blinds are open). This will increase with increased traffic. This is a definite adverse effect</li> <li>• Increased traffic movements on Waratah St accessing commercial areas on Young Road from the bypass. This is a definite adverse effect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational noise and vibration impacts are considered at <b>Section 6.3</b>. Light intrusion impacts would be expected to be limited to the south-east side of Boundary Road. Discussions with the affected land owner would be completed to determine an appropriate mitigation level, such as landscape screening or the like. Vehicles using the bypass would not be expected to turn into Waratah Street, especially as Waratah Street is not proposed to be gazetted as a heavy vehicle route.</li> <li>• As above</li> <li>• As Waratah Street is not identified to form part of any extended heavy vehicle route, increased movements on Waratah Street are considered unlikely – refer <b>Section 6.3.6.3</b>.</li> </ul>
20/05/2015	email	Noelene Melchert	Not stated	Hard copy comments sent by mail	Noted
20/05/2015	email	Peter Wheeler	38 Campbell St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was advised by Council that any bypass would pass to the east of Waugoola St and not affect Campbell St</li> <li>• Alignment will pass within six metres of the house and therefore noise (from brakes and accelerating/decelerating) will be a problem</li> <li>• Concern about changes of speed limit from 50km/hr to 80km/hr and the impacts to safety that will occur</li> <li>• Bypass will devalue the property which represents a significant portion of superannuation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This REF does not consider alignment issues beyond the matters addressed in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> <li>• Noise is considered in detail in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Speed limits are indicated in <b>Section 3.3.2</b> but would ultimately be set by Roads and Maritime Services - refer <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Acquisition options should be discussed with Council.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the statistics cited regarding community support for the route is flawed and not representative of the broader community. Much of the Council information is misleading and feels that the decisions surrounding the bypass are being made by an uncaring Council governed by self interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The REF is focussed on assessing environmental impacts of the adopted route and does not extend to matters outside of this. These comments are provided to Council for their noting</li> </ul>
20/05/2015	email	Albert Melchert	52 and 54 Parkes St	<p>Following points of concern noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excessive noise due to heavy vehicle braking and accelerating due to the hill on Campbell and Brougham St/Darby Falls Road. Consideration should be provided to mitigation measures such as sound barriers or sound proofing houses</li> <li>• Intersection design should give priority to heavy vehicles so they do not need to stop</li> <li>• Residential access will be affected and will be dangerous for residents. A service road must be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise impacts are addressed in detail in <b>Section 6.3</b>.</li> <li>• Traffic impacts including intersection design is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b>. Comments of Roads and Maritime Services are noted which require classified roads crossing the Bypass to have priority</li> <li>• Safety of accesses is considered in the traffic impact study at <b>Section 6.4</b></li> </ul>
20/05/2015	email	Amanda and Ken Anning	82 Boundary Road, Cowra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GHD Bypass Study was flawed and contains false information/evidence regarding the proposed route, making assessment difficult. The report is not reflective of the wider community opinions. Disregarded a petition by the Aboriginal mission against the southern option (option 3).</li> <li>• Costings identified to develop option 3 are flawed.</li> <li>• Costs for Option A in Bypass Study was overinflated by including 2 bridges and land acquisition. No acquisition was identified in relation to option 3, which is shown to be incorrect.</li> <li>• Traffic data was skewed as data was only collected for Airport and Boundary Roads on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geolyse has not been commissioned to evaluate the appropriateness of consultation completed as part of the 2013 Bypass Study</li> <li>• Initial costings were intended as estimates only. Detailed costings would be completed once a detailed alignment is prepared.</li> <li>• As above. Acquisition would be necessary but would be refined and minimised through detailed design – refer <b>Section 6.8</b>.</li> <li>• Updated traffic data has been collected for the purposes of this assessment and projected forward</li> </ul>

			<p>abattoir sale days; these days generate more traffic but this traffic would not use the bypass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canowindra Rd statistics were collected but not used</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crash data used for the main street was inaccurate</li> <li>• Consultation method was inadequate and did not cover a broad enough cross section of the community</li> <li>• All of the above confirms that the response level was not representative of the community as a whole</li> <li>• A meeting was held with Council and Councillors, and the Local Aboriginal Land Council at which alternate options were discussed but no action was taken to consider these options.</li> <li>• Current option is high cost and only deals with half of the perceived traffic flow, has a marked ongoing cost, and does not remove a significant amount of traffic from the main st.</li> <li>• Safety for drivers is a factor; if drivers bypass Cowra rather than stopping they may risk their lives.</li> <li>• Only location for truck refuelling is on the Grenfell Road, and if vehicle stop to use these facilities they would continue up the main st and not return to the bypass.</li> <li>• Loss of business impacts for local businesses due to less people stopping in Cowra</li> <li>• There are a number of impacts to residents along the proposed route, one of which is noise. Feel that the placement of noise monitoring devices was flawed and should have been in areas where noise is currently likely, such as at the bottom of hill. Offered use of the property for</li> </ul>	<p>for 20 year bypass and no bypass options – refer <b>Section 6.4.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geolyse is not in a position to comment on data that was or was not used in the preparation of the 2013 Bypass Study. Geolyse has utilised a broad range of data in the preparation of this assessment document</li> <li>• As above</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geolyse has not been commissioned to evaluate the appropriateness of consultation completed as part of the 2013 Bypass Study</li> <li>• As above</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of options considered is outlined in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any option would have an ongoing cost. Route selection options are outlined in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic matters are considered in detail in <b>Section 6.3.6.3</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities should be investigated for the future development of a service station on the bypass alignment – refer <b>Section 6.8</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is addressed in <b>Section 6.8</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>further noise testing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigation such as double glazing and air conditioning are options but does not consider the ongoing cost of running air conditioners, nor the environmental impacts of running units continuously. For all of the above reasons, residents should have a greater role in the assessment process</li> <li>• Pollution will also have an impact as a result of truck emissions, dust produced and asbestos from truck brakes. Subject property is in a direct position to be impacted by these factors and while the broader impacts may be acceptable, impacts at the site specific level will be significant, including to children and washing.</li> <li>• Safety is another key issue due to the proximity of the alignment to housing, both in relation to children playing (and the possibility of them getting on to the road) and for vehicles entering and exiting the property. Extra vigilance will be needed in both regards and this has an impact.</li> <li>• Loss of amenity and loss of safety for walkers, riders, horse riders etc on these roads.</li> <li>• Impacts to safe pick up and drop off of children on school buses, even if a safety road is provided (which would be difficult with width and other constraints)</li> <li>• Impact of bypass on land valuation and the fact that there is no control over the circumstances.</li> <li>• Overall we feel that we have been unfairly treated with a lack of consultation and lack of consideration of points raised.</li> <li>• If a bypass is to be built, it should be done correctly and for the betterment of the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Air quality impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.6</b></li> <li>• Traffic impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b></li> <li>• Traffic impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Perceived impacts to property valuation is discussed in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>• Consultation process for the REF is set out in <b>Section 5</b> . Continued efforts would be made to engage with residents.</li> <li>• Noted and agreed.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

21/05/2015	letter	DA & GW Beer	46 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disappointed not to receive copy of public meeting minutes as promised</li> <li>• Property purchased due to rural amenity and when purchased there was no indication that a bypass would be developed</li> <li>• Concern regarding school children and school bus safety due to interactions between heavy vehicles and school buses, especially where speed limits are 80km/hr</li> <li>• Believe the costing for construction of the route is flawed</li> <li>• It is a fact that all properties involved will be devalued and to what extent has Council taken into account the loss of land and buildings (including a shed on Campbell St)</li> <li>• Believes the percent support for the route is incorrect as only a small proportion of the community responded</li> <li>• Believes some councillors are having second thoughts about the alignment after hearing the concerns of the public</li> <li>• Maintenance costs will be borne by ratepayers and has been underestimated; the ongoing cost has not been explained to ratepayers</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route does not capture heavy vehicles travelling to or from Canowindra and the number of vehicles using this route will only increase in the coming years</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will Council stop heavy vehicles using the main street, especially those going to Canowindra?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would appear the minutes were not sent to this meeting attendee in error. Apologies are offered for this oversight.</li> <li>• Amenity issues are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b> and specifically in <b>Section 6.8</b>.</li> <li>• Road safety and speed limits are considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• The route would be costed by a quantity surveyor once detailed design is completed</li> <li>• The potential for impacts to property values are considered at <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>• As the route has been adopted by Council further consideration on this point is not provided within this REF</li> <li>• The outcome of the environmental assessment is no doubt just one factor in Council deliberations about the project</li> <li>• Ongoing maintenance costs would need to form part of Council's ongoing budget unless the road was classified via the Roads Act at which point state funding assistance would be provided to assist with maintenance.</li> <li>• This option has been selected as the best option to remove the majority of vehicle from the town centre; it is acknowledged that other options may remove more but such considerations are outside of the scope of this REF</li> <li>• The bypass would be optional for all traffic and the incentives to use it would stem from ensuring that it is a quicker and easier option than travelling through town; this would be addressed through a range of measures including but not limited to quality of construction, design of intersections and speed limits</li> </ul>
------------	--------	--------------	------------------	---	--

21/05/2015	letter via Council	Lorna McVicar	33 Boundary Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property was purchased in order to enjoy peaceful rural setting</li> <li>• Feels the bypass is being developed without proper consideration of the opinions of residents</li> <li>• The road would need to be upgraded, widened, strengthened, to facilitate b-double usage. Concerns in this regard are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise (engine brakes also normal road noise)</li> <li>- Smells (stock trucks)</li> <li>- Devaluation of my property's worth</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Potholes</li> <li>- Speed control</li> <li>- The crossing of Young Road on busy weekends (eg: Bathurst 1000) backing up Boundary Road.</li> <li>- Ongoing road maintenance</li> <li>- Traffic 24/7</li> <li>• Establishing a b-double route over Boundary Road will affect pedestrian and cycling use of the road.</li> <li>• Change of existing b-double route to proposed route will affect residents and will increase danger and trip times.</li> <li>• Road will move closer to dwellings</li> <li>• Concern that a bypass will reduce the amount of tourists that stop in town</li> <li>• Wishes to lodge a strong objection to the route</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Consultation process for the REF is set out in <b>Section 5</b> . Continued efforts would be made to engage with residents.</li> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>- Noise impacts are addressed in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>- Air quality impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.6</b></li> <li>- Impacts to property value are considered in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>- Maintenance would be an ongoing matter for Council</li> <li>- Speed limits would be set by Roads and Maritime Services and enforcement would remain the responsibility of the NSW Police Force</li> <li>- Detailed intersection design would account for peak flows in accordance with Austroads standards</li> <li>- As noted above</li> <li>- Traffic impacts are address in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Road design would account for all road users – refer <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Traffic safety and property access is addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Detailed design would demonstrate precise extent of setback reduction but certainly some is anticipated</li> <li>• This is considered in <b>Section 6.9</b></li> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
22/05/2015	letter	A & N Melchert	54 Parkes St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with traffic noise, dust, pollution and vibrations the bypass will cause.</li> <li>• Concern about safety when entering/existing properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These matters are addressed in <b>Sections 6.3</b> and <b>6.6</b>.</li> <li>• Traffic safety is considered in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> </ul>

22/05/2015	Fax	CD Hatherly and JD Dawson	88 Calare St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely disappointed at not being notified by mail about the public meeting. Believes there is a lack of transparency on behalf of Council. Will raise this concern with other residents</li> <li>• Due to proximity to alignment (approx 110 metres) will be affected by the construction, operation of the bypass and affected in a monetary sense if property has to be sold to move away from the bypass. Bypass will detrimentally affect land values.</li> <li>• Will be affected by heavy machinery undertaking construction during standard working hours, including noise from machinery, noise from unloading and loading machinery, noise from reversing beepers, noise from heavy machinery loading, unloading and delivering materials, and the coming and going of concrete and bitumen trucks. Bitumen machinery is very loud, especially when rolling and spraying, and concrete trucks creating gutters will be loud. The comings and going through a residential area will have significant noise impacts.</li> <li>• Residents will be affected by dust and a watering regime will be required</li> <li>• Post construction noise resulting from operation would be the most significant impact; using residential streets for a bypass is ridiculous. Heavy vehicles are much louder than an average car and residents will suffer from the noise.</li> <li>• Roller shutters would be more appropriate as mitigation (as opposed to double glazing or air conditioning units mentioned at the public meeting) but the best option is to not build the bypass at all.</li> <li>• Air pollution impacts to resident is will occur as a result of the bypass and air quality standards will decrease</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Impacts of the adopted alignment are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b> . Land valuation is considering in <b>Section 6.8</b>.</li> <li>• Noise impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Air quality impacts are assessed at <b>Section 6.6</b></li> <li>• Noise impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Various mitigation options would be</li> <li>• Air quality impacts are assessed at <b>Section 6.6</b></li> </ul>
------------	-----	---------------------------	--------------	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many foreseen and unforeseen impacts to traffic as a result of the bypass including the damaging effect of heavy vehicles</li> <li>• Safety of residents accessing and exiting their property should be a consideration</li> <li>• Suggests diverting traffic to the Olympic Highway towards Grenfell Road and away from Boundary Road</li> <li>• Loss of rural residential amenity will occur as a result of the bypass. Noise mitigation measures, such as barriers, must be considered and it should incorporate native plantings to minimise visual impacts. There will be a cost to ratepayers in maintaining such features.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding vibration impacts to homes and people as a result of heavy vehicle use, especially valid considering proposed b-double usage</li> <li>• Vigorously objects to the bypass passing through or near residential homes and looks forward to seeing all concerns addressed in the draft REF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and access impacts are assessed at <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Traffic and access impacts are assessed at <b>Section 6.4</b></li> <li>• Alternative alignments have not been considered within this REF, beyond the discussion provided in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> <li>• Amenity is a cumulative outcome and the impacts to it are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b>. Noise impacts are specifically considered at <b>Section 6.3</b> and visual issues at <b>Section 6.1</b></li> <li>• Vibration impacts are considered in <b>Section 6.3</b></li> <li>• Concerns are considered throughout this REF</li> </ul>
26/05/2015	email	Anne Jeffery	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to traffic flow on bypass from weekly garbage collection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic impacts are addressed in <b>Section 6.4</b></li> </ul>
19/06/2015	Letter	Graham Dun	116 Lachlan Street	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the start the GHD report fails to outline proper terms of reference for the inquiry. A valid approach to any problem solving must first include an analysis of the problem which in turn allows goal setting to guide research. In this case it would need to address issues such as connectivity, general design criteria and agreed standards of efficiency.</li> <li>2. Traffic bypassing of most major towns throughout NSW is becoming an increasing concern. The NSW Planning Department has a responsibility under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, to ensure sound processes for infrastructure planning however,</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Geolyse has not been engaged to consider the adequacy of the GHD Bypass Study</li> <li>2. A range of literature considering the impacts of bypasses is cited and discussed in <b>Section 6.9</b>. Impacts associated with the alignment are considered through <b>Section 6</b> of this REF.</li> </ol>

			<p>there seems to be a reluctance to address the issue of road provision. This lack of action seems inconsistent with the Department's activities in other areas such as private land and building development. The need for the formulation of Local Environment Plans is yet another area where road corridor planning has been neglected. Early identification of the need for traffic corridors supported by independent and dispassionate advice as far as possible removed from parochial interests, is essential for minimising harmful impacts on the community and is especially necessary in situations where property values and zoning problems arise.</p> <p>3. Another area of concern in road planning is the issue of community apathy and the failure to counteract this by appropriate consultation management. The problem is especially prevalent in highway development because interregional connection is the primary function of highways yet regional participation to assist a holistic approach to road planning has been poor. There is little evidence of regional business or industry consultation having taken place in the GHD report. There has also been an almost complete lack of public meetings which suggests a poor level of transparency and does not engender community confidence. Interviews conducted between individual members of the public and Council staff where information may not be publically revealed or published, is also not reassuring. Again, State Planning should be aware of the effects of poor participation and the long-term consequences in project outcomes. Adherence to the principles of Best Practice Consultation (Australian Government, Office of Best Practice</p>	<p>3. Consultation associated with the preparation of this REF is set out in <b>Section 5</b> . Cowra Council and Geolyse would continue to liaise with residents to ensure that consultation is appropriate to the project. As the proponent, Cowra Council is the nominated determining authority and the jurisdiction of the Department of Planning and Environment is limited, as set out via Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 – refer <b>Section 4</b> for the relevant statutory environment.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Regulation) could improve understanding and provide better public relations.</p> <p>4. There are further concerns about the lack of regional advisory or liaison committees attached to the Roads and Maritime Services. These could enable a regular means of public communication and would bring the RMS in line with most other major government agencies.</p> <p>5. The absence of any formally organised road user advocacy organisation in the Central West is further evidence of the weakness of the public bargaining position.</p> <p>I believe that option 3 as outlined in the GHD report, is unacceptable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It lacks the essential connection between the Sydney and Canowindra roads;</li> <li>• It is not adequately removed from the residential area of the town thus creating problems with property values, loss of amenity and safety;</li> <li>• It is likely to be subject to unacceptable speed restrictions because of its passage through growing residential areas, sharp curves and unsafe intersecting traffic situations;</li> <li>• alternatives are available that do not have these problems.</li> </ul>	<p>4. This is noted but is a larger issue that transcends this assessment.</p> <p>5. As above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 3 was considered the most effective solution for project although it is acknowledged that it does not address all heavy vehicles using Kendal Street</li> <li>• Amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b>.</li> <li>• Project speed limits are discussed in <b>Section 6.4</b>. Ultimately, speed limits would be set by Roads and Maritime Services.</li> <li>• Consideration of alternatives is limited to the comments in <b>Section 2.4</b></li> </ul>
<b>Responses received during public notification period of July 2016</b>					
undated	Letter	Craig and Dianne Fisher	66 Boundary Road	<p>Concern with lack of direct answers on previous concerns raised.</p> <p>Main concerns are perceived safety problems.</p> <p>Identify that there is a need for a service road or turning lane, and that a service road is preferred as it would separate heavy vehicle traffic from the residential traffic and school bus traffic. The location of the service road.</p>	<p>The REF provides a comprehensive assessment of impacts throughout <b>Section 6</b></p> <p>Noted</p> <p>A 3.0 m wide parking lane would be provided adjacent to residential and industrial properties, which would also serve to provide for entering and exiting vehicles – refer <b>Section 3.3.1</b></p>

				Asks whether home owners with driveways that require them to reverse onto the road are going to be helped with the cost to change driveways.	As outlined in <b>Appendix M</b> , access to private properties would be addressed through concept and detailed design to ensure safety is maintained
				Identifies that sound reduction for homes affected by passing traffic should be thoroughly considered with what the residents have now.	This would be a matter for determining through implementation of a construction noise and vibration management plan
				States that residents along Boundary Road do not want fixed solid walls installed and instead homes along Boundary Road should have sound proofing insulation installed in walls and roofs with double glazing as these homes were not designed with traffic noise concerns.	This would be a matter for determining through implementation of a construction noise and vibration management plan
				Concerned about residents outlook and reduction in house values, and the effects on their lifestyle.	These matters are discussed throughout <b>Section 6</b>
				Concerned that the proposed works and ongoing upkeep of the bypass do not provide a positive economic outcome to Cowra and is not justifiable.	The findings of the REF are summarised in <b>Section 8</b>
12 August 2016	Letter	Jack Mallon	Not stated	The respondent reproduced sections of the executive summary relating to the consent requirements and nominated determining authority. The respondent does not provide any specific question relating to this text.	No response required
				The respondent reproduced text from the executive summary relating to the potential for additional investigations during detailed design and that the conclusions of the REF may need to be revisited. The respondent does not provide any specific question relating to this text.	No response required
				Asks whether the consultant will reveal the distance between the set of locked gates located at approximately chainage 5895 and provide an official map of the area?	This would be determined once concept and detailed design have progressed, at which time discussions regarding acquisition would also take place
				The respondent provided a survey diagram to demonstrate that Campbell Street terminates at its intersection with Parkes Street (land parcel registered to the respondent, Lot 2 DP519943).	Noted

			<p>The respondent asks about Plate 48 in the Traffic Study where in this location are a set of gates</p>	
			<p>The respondent makes reference to Plates 49 and 50 of the Traffic Study that both illustrate Campbell Street as a thoroughfare with a sealed surface. The respondent asks is this land parcel identified by survey as “right of access, variable width”.</p>	<p>This would be determined once concept and detailed design have progressed</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses concern about Council Meeting minutes from 22 July 2013 (being minute 154/13), specifically:  <i>For some reason the third dimension to minute 154/13 has omitted to include that council would conduct “investigations into the viability of alleviating concerns of affected residents” as required by the expressed terms of the resolution.</i></li> </ul> <p>The respondent did not provide a specific question in relation to the above.</p>	<p>This section of the REF has been updated for completeness to reflect the full resolution</p>
			<p>The respondent quoted advice from Mayor West received on 7 June 2016 about authorisations relating to entry to the respondents land not being in place and that they had been corrected. The respondent asks “is there some provision for retrospectively in the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i>?”.</p>	<p>This relates to an issue of access between the land owner and Council</p>
			<p>Asks “has anyone of the affected areas in relation to property of JP Mallon been identified as Campbell St South”</p>	<p>This relates to an issue of access between the land owner and Council</p>
			<p>The respondent quoted correspondence from Council’s General Manager (11 April 2016) revealing inter alia “it would appear the contraction did not have the requisite authority signed by the General Manager”. The respondent does not provide any specific question relating to this quote.</p>	<p>This relates to an issue of access between the land owner and Council</p>

8 August 2016	Letter	DA & GW Beer	46 Boundary Road	Concerns that the bypass route will not service heavy vehicles from an industrial area around the old Edgell Factory site, noting that heavy vehicles go to the Chernco business in that area. Generally concerned that Council did not consider this industrial area when recommending the route proposed.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b>
				States that heavy vehicles proceeding to Canowindra won't use the propose route so will still proceed down Kendal Street and that there are also heavy vehicles that proceed to the stone quarry in Glen Logan Road and those vehicles won't use the bypass.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b>
				Expresses concern that the future of Cowra's Industrial area (which they believe needs to be developed and expanded) will not benefit at all with the proposed bypass.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b>
				Identifies that Service Road is not mentioned as an intersection with Boundary Road. The respondent expresses concerns about the potential for other omissions.	The intersection of the bypass and Service Road is discussed throughout <b>Appendix M</b> and is specifically depicted in Plate 15 of <b>Appendix M</b>
				Recommends that Council takes another look at the proposed route and take into account the development of Cowra as a whole, not only the main street.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4.</b>
8 August 2016	Letter	Barry Burns	121 Waratah Street	The study did not mention the seventy three mature Ironbarks forming an avenue along Airport Road.	These matters are specifically addressed in <b>Appendix J</b> and a recommendation for avoidance or compensatory replacement provided.
				Airport noise has increased during the past six months since the REF and will further increase after the ongoing development. We also have noise from the gun club sometimes for two days on weekends of their competition shoots. We have no complaint with either of these areas as they were in place before most of us built or bought in the area, but to expect us to	Noise assessment is provided in accordance with relevant standards at <b>Section 6.3.</b>

				endure more noise by heavy traffic is unacceptable.	
				Concerned about construction noise and vibration as their bedroom is 32 metres from the existing road.	Construction noise assessment is provided in accordance with relevant standards at <b>Section 6.3</b> .
				Concerned about operational heavy vehicle noise and vibration 24 hours a day near their property and the property to the rear of their property (67 Airport Road) which is closer to the road.	Noise assessment is provided in accordance with relevant standards at <b>Section 6.3</b> .
				Concern that there is not measure to control the speed of heavy vehicles if the bypass is built as speed is already an issue and safety concern on Airport Road.	Speed limits are discussed in <b>Table 3.1</b> and in <b>Section 6.4</b> . The final decisions on speed limits rests with Roads and Maritime Services
				Notes that there are alternative routes that could be developed but states that they know it comes down to cost. They consider the proposal a “cheap fix to the problem”. States that “money isn’t an option when it concerns health and safety”.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
25 July 2016	Letter	Graham Dun	116 Lachlan Street	Option 3 route is unacceptable because it lacks the essential connection between the Sydney and Canowindra Roads.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Option 3 route is unacceptable because it is not adequately removed from the residential areas of the town thus creating problems with property values, loss of amenity and safety.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Option 3 route is unacceptable because it is likely to be subject to unacceptable speed restrictions because of its passage through growing residential areas, sharp curves and unsafe intersecting traffic situations.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Option 3 route is unacceptable because alternatives are available (somewhat further removed from the town centre) that do not have these problems.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .

7 July 2016	Email	Paul Galea	41 Grenfell Road	The construction of the Campbell St to Lachlan Valley way and the river bridge (Segment 1) is the only section that is required to be built today.	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Signage must indicate the alternative heavy vehicle routes available, eg. Orange via Blayney or Orange via Canowindra on the western/southern approaches, and Canowindra via CBD bypass on the eastern end.	Noted
25 July 2016	Letter	Warwick Stubbing	Not stated	Frustrated and disappointed with proposal to use Boundary Road as part of the bypass	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Concerned about safety and inadequate visual clearance to enter properties	The traffic study attached as <b>Appendix M</b> demonstrates that access to properties along the bypass route would need to achieve safe sight distance requirements of the Austroads standards, including the provision of a 3m wide parking lane outside the travel lane which would also provide for safe exit and entry
				Reporting does not identify all properties built in Boundary Road area in the last four years	
				Recommends that a more cost effective option would be providing amenities and truck stop on Boorowa Road, with no impact to residential areas	Alternatives are discussed in <b>Section 2.4</b> .
				Boundary Road and Airport Road section of proposed bypass imposes on a large number of existing residential home owners	The assessment provided <b>Section 6</b> , demonstrates the proposed activity can occur without significant impact
				Inadequate commentary on impacts to residences	This is considered throughout <b>Section 6</b>
1 August 2016	Email	Vanessa Wright	Not stated	Concerns about the methodology utilised in assessing noise impacts to residential dwellings	As outlined in <b>Section 6.3</b> , the noise assessment has been carried out in compliance with applicable standards and requirements. There is confidence that this is robust and appropriate assessment
3 August 2016	Email	Terry Everson	10 Taralga Street	Objects to the bypass due to impacts to noise and amenity	Noise and amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b>
9 August 2016	Letter	Terry Everson	10 Taralga Street	Objects to the bypass due to impacts to noise and amenity	Noise and amenity impacts are considered throughout <b>Section 6</b>

1 July 2016	Letter	KM & B F Tomlin	19 Dawson Drive	<p>The plan shows the new road going through the middle of our 2 ½ acre prime Commercial block. As Cowra Council would have noticed we put a lot of time, work and expense into developing this land not only for our benefit, but to improve the entry into Cowra on the Southern side. The attached photos will show this land in its previous state.</p>	Noted
				<p>We have this land for sale and since placing the "For Sale Signs" on the land we have had 3 enquires, a Fuel Company, Tyre Franchise Company and a Truck Operating Business, who all need a large block to operate their business. All of these prospective buyers have been put off when we told them to check with the Council regarding the Bypass and having to obtain a D/A.</p>	Noted
				<p>If we were to currently sell this 2 ½ acres of land will the Council approve a DA. If Council were to approve a D/A how long would it take to be approved? If we were to sell the property and a business was to be established on the land and at a later date the Bypass followed, it is my understanding that the Cowra Council would have to compensate for the land, established buildings and business.</p>	<p>This is not a matter that can be addressed via the REF process and requires direction discussions between Council and the land owner, which are understood to have commenced.</p>
				<p>Under the circumstances we feel until we get some definite answers, direction or some agreement on this matter, we believe we are being held to ransom indefinitely. Being in this situation we consider it to be very unfair for Cowra Council to expect us to pay the rates on this land due to Council not being able to give a specific time line for building of the Bypass. It is therefore under these circumstances that some agreement should be met.</p>	<p>This is not a matter that can be addressed via the REF process and requires direction discussions between Council and the land owner</p>

			<p>We would also like to point out that it is difficult to stage this property for sale with up to 65 Council employee's cars parked 5 days a week along our boundary. We were told by the Council Engineer that a Council car park was being arranged last February 2016. Council could easily solve this problem by purchasing the land now and using it as a car park until such time it was needed for the Bypass.</p>	<p>This is not a matter that can be addressed via the REF process and requires direction discussions between Council and the land owner</p>
--	--	--	--	---