

**Appendix F**  
**MATTERS RAISED AT PUBLIC MEETINGS**

**Cowra Heavy Vehicle Bypass Meeting - Public Consultation**

Meeting Minutes presented for Cowra General Public on behalf of Cowra Council

Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2015

Chair – Cowra Mayor - Mr Bill West

Presenter – Mr David Walker of Geolyse Pty Ltd

Public Attendees: Manfred Melchert, Albert Melchert, Frank Bridges, Kerry Bailey, Patti Brown, Robert Gee, Peter Mallon, Jack Ford, Larry Walsh, Peter Jeffery, Warwick Stubbing, Anne Jeffery, Doug Beer, Barry Burns, Steve Brown, Craig Fisher, Peter Muddle, Mick Crowe, Barbara Tomlin, Russell Moodie, Suzanne Moodie, Ken Anning, Amanda Anning, Chris Waters, John Waters, Allan Barlow, Ross Sharkey, Lyn Sharkey.

Councillors: Bill West, Judi Smith, Ray Walsh, Ian Brown, Peter Wright, Jack Mallon, Ruth Fagan.

Minutes: Latisha Ryall of Geolyse Pty Ltd

Apologies: Cowra Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Meeting start at 6.01 pm.

**Item 1 – Presentation on Review of Environmental Factors**

- David Walker will discuss the assessment with a PowerPoint presentation on the key issues of the Review of Environmental Factors for the Heavy Vehicle Bypass route for Cowra.

Welcome from Mayor Bill West.

This meeting gives an opportunity for the public to hear what is to be said and to put forward some suggestions on the Heavy Vehicle Bypass Route for Cowra.

Noted that issues in regards to Boundary Road residences has been provided by Anne Jeffery in a letter, a copy of which has been provided to both Council and Geolyse.

Please note that this meeting is being recorded for information.

Introduction to Geolyse who Council has commissioned to prepare a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the Heavy Vehicle Bypass route that has been proposed. Geolyse will explain what this means.

Introduction to Geolyse members David Walker and Latisha Ryall (Minutes)

Mayor reiterated that a copy of the letter has been given to David who will comment on the relevant issues.

**Geolyse Response**

David Responded to the Mayor with thanks.

**Introduction by David Walker - Outlining the purpose of this meeting.**

David Walker is a Town Planner who is employed by Geolyse, who have been engaged by Council to conduct an environmental assessment of the bypass route.

The purpose of the meeting is first and foremost about Consultation and in preparing the REF we are obliged to consider all relevant factors and so hopefully everything raised tonight has been considered already. The point of this meeting is to see where the public concerns lie, and what the impacts are perceived is associated with the alignment and with the route, including both the construction and operation of the route.

**Item 1 – Background**

A Summary of the project, where we have come from, what we are doing and what has been done to date will be discussed.

Comments are welcome to be received throughout the presentation at any point, a request that the public are to raise their hand and state a name for recording purposes in order to make a note where the comment has come from.

The structure of the presentation is not specifically broken down into the individual areas of the route, it is focused on the impacts associated with the route

In 2009 a number of options were identified via the Cowra Land Use Strategy for the route for a proposed bypass. Information received tonight from councillors has identified that this item has been on the Council's agenda and under discussion since the early 1980's.

2009 land use strategy identified 4 options. GHD was engaged in 2012 to consider those and other options, which was completed through an **Options Bypass Study**. This was finalised in 2013 and included 10 routes. GHD conducted a cost benefit analysis of a shortlist of 3 routes.

- Option A – A Ring Road, a full Ring Road around the town of Cowra.
- Option B – similar to the proposed route option 3 where Airport Road was connected to Young Road.
- Option 3 – Southern Ring Road.

As part of this consultation GHD undertook a degree of consultation with Key Stakeholders including Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), Councillor's, the Community through Letters and Web service to and a range of ways where people could interact with that process. The consultation found that there was a relatively high level of support for a bypass and Option 3 was the best possible route.

#### **Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Issue raised in regards to the letter which was sent out by Geolyse, stating that 65 % community agreed to a bypass running past Campbell Street. Who makes up the 65% of this survey? Is this the 65% of the Cowra population? 65% of 500 participants? Open discussions with all attendees at the meeting regarding the 65%.

#### **Geolyse Response**

It made up of 65% of the participants who responded.

#### **Presentation Continued**

Quick Summary again to be outlined. Geolyse has been engaged to consider the route that has been adopted, obviously there is a degree of concern regarding the alignment, Geolyse have not been engaged to revisit that alignment. If the public have comments to make on the alignment it is noted that they will be taken on board, but Geolyse have not been engaged to realign the route or consider alternative.

#### **Public Comment – General Consensus.**

Public felt that this meeting was a waste of their time as the connections for the concerns, would be provided to Geolyse who in turn would pass these onto Council, where the public feels that the Council are not supporting them.

#### **Geolyse Response**

David Walker advised that the purpose of this meeting is to identify the impacts associated with the Construction and operation of the route, and that there is a range of impacts that Geolyse are looking at.

#### **Public Comment – John Waters**

The other investigation (GHD) was flawed, only 400 people agreed to this out of the population of Cowra. Geolyse would be in a hard position to look at the impact and other associated aspects with the bypass as there is not full support of the Council or the full support of the town to do this. .

#### **Geolyse Response**

The engagement Geolyse have is to consider the alignment that has been adopted, if there are concerns about the alignment the public can direct them through Geolyse via the consultation process

and those comments will be passed back to Council. David acknowledges that there is a degree of concern about the alignment but that Geolyse is not able to influence this issue. “We as Geolyse are not engaged to influence the alignment.”

**Public Comment – Lorraine Stubbing**

If complaints are going through to Geolyse and you are not accepting the comments tonight we can't approach the issue, and can't tell Geolyse about it, the council does not want to know about the complaint because they have employed Geolyse. What do the public do?

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse has been employed to consider the environmental impacts.

David advised there are two separate Issues.

1. The alignment
2. Impacts associated with the alignment.

Members of the public have an issue with the alignment which is understandable but it is not what Geolyse has been engaged to consider.

**Public Comment - General Consensus**

It does not change the fact that the route has been adopted and Council has accepted this.

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse cannot comment on this.

**Public Comment - Warwick Stubbing**

Please refer to Figure 2 noted the aerial view is out of date, advised that 100% new homes have just been built on this land. – Issue regarding residential use and perception that a bypass would avoid residential areas? Boundary road and some degree Airport road, is part of a residential area with new development, Warwick is concerned about this.

**Geolyse Response**

David responds advising that he can only reiterate previous comments.

**Council Response – Mayor Bill West**

Mayor responds on behalf of Council, acknowledging he understand the public concerns regarding Boundary Road, Campbell Street and Airport Road. Council went through a process including public consultation, where a route has been identified and this is the route that we are discussing. Geolyse have been engaged by Council to undertake an REF, this REF will encompass many issues, which David will be able to present to you. It also incorporates the copy of questions that have been provided by the Boundary Road residents, which they want addressed and he will refer to those. Some of those questions may be answered tonight, some may be addressed in the next stage of the detailed design of the alignment. This is part of a process, please let Geolyse present the information. Questions may be asked at the end, once the presentation has been finished. Please show some courtesy.

Council has adopted the route and undertaken the necessary processes. Geolyse has been employed by Council to go through the process, let the presentation continue. So please let them go through the process.

Again this is part of a process, and to please show some courtesy and hear the presentation. Council adopted the route, whether right or wrong

**Public Comment - Ken Anning**

Advised that they (public) are responding to the findings and what is put in front of them (presentation).

**Public Comment – General Consensus**

Heated public discussion regarding GHD report and costings, the public believe that this is a flawed report. Truck data evidence is inaccurate; according to one public member a statutory declaration was provided from a highway patrol officer of times provided by Cowra Council. The public are extremely passionate about this topic because they believe Council have outvoted the public. Only 300 people wanted a bypass at all. GHD report specified that the public wanted a northern ring and that due to costings the southern ring was adopted, public advised it has not been costed properly. Public advised that they had suggested other routes to Council but they were not considered.

Ken Anning stated that the report has not been costed properly, and this is just another way in which council ‘another box ticking exercise’, asks why the public are here tonight?

**Council Comment**

Council advises that this is not just another box ticking exercise but a process that has been committed to and has now undertaken a process and engaged Geolyse to prepare an REF. Let the presentation continue. Mayor acknowledges that this conversation and complication will go on for some time, tonight allows the opportunity for issues to be raised in regards to inaccurate information.

Presentation to continue....

**Traffic Data**

In terms of traffic data Geolyse are logging information, current traffic data and collecting traffic data, not just GHD information a wealth of data collating historical data, noise loggers and traffic impacts as well as data from RMS. Our aim is to get the data as accurate as possible. Wealth of data, from RMS and us collecting ourselves

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

In regards to the data from roads that have been picked. Does it still encapsulate the Canowindra Road, that is not adopted on the southern bypass route, and one of the issues of the bypass is that it should actually encompass ALL roads that that are inclusive of truck use and access?

Public requested that a more in-depth study be undertaken, and from every avenue regardless of the route, looking to have as much data as possible. Understanding that this meeting is about a current route that has been adopted but for the sake of data consistent data, where the data is to capture each road that takes truck traffic. Another option if we continue with the current bypass route, do we assume trucks will be taking the same route on the main street, Sydney road to Canowindra Way?

**Geolyse Response**

David responds that the range of data is quite broad, and Geolyse is making every attempt to collate the data with the inclusion of RMS historical data, and as much data as possible.

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

Have to capture all the major roads, Major Roads that are included are the Sydney Road towards Grenfell Roads, Young and Canberra Road, but missed a big portion of the assessment relating to the Canowindra road. Important as part of the environmental impact study Geolyse also look at the congestion that is caused and the potentially of removing the full extent of trucks out of the main areas. It is noted that this is a pedestrian and retail area along Redfern Street.

**Geolyse Response**

Difficult for Geolyse to assess impacts that are not part of the alignment.

**Public Response**

1<sup>st</sup> stage of the bypass route around Cowra. Canowindra Road would possibly be picked up in the next stage.

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse cannot comment on staging.

**Public Comment – Anne Jeffrey**

Anne Jeffery requested the Boundary Road questions be addressed. , meeting have not had the questions, would like to go through the Boundary road questions.

### **Boundary Road Resident Questions**

Residents of boundary road, prepared a letter consisting of 7 questions in total to be addressed at tonight's meeting. The questions are outlined below.

1. How do we plan to deal with safety issues with school bus pick up and ands set down from many of the houses?
2. How do residents plan to turn into their property across fast moving highway traffic?
3. How do council plan to manage the intersections with the Young and Boorowa Roads?
4. What is the speed limit on the road going to be to assist the trucks on right angle bends currently?
5. What safety precautions for children and animals are to be taken if there is no speed limits?
6. Will there be parking for cars on the side of the road

What compensation will there be for persons who have property in good faith that that would remain for their lifetime.

### **Geolyse Response**

Preferred route is the most popular based on the GHD route, accept that there are issues with this. It was the most cost effective and most preferable.

### **Purpose of the REF**

Purpose of the REF is to address the impacts that are likely to affect the environment, it is a fairly wide area and the report will look at all issues associated with the construction and the operation of the bypass route, and the ways in which they may affect the environment. Looking to determine if the bypass will have a significant effect on the environment or affect threatened species populations or ecological communities or habitats, the environment as physical and social in a total sense.

If the likelihood shows a significant impact on the environment, an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required.

REF assesses a range of impacts that is not an exhaustive list as outlined below, but does incorporate the top end priorities.

Landscape character, Flora and fauna, Noise, Traffic, heritage, air quality, acquisition, surface and groundwater, socio economic, soils, utilities wastes and hazards, in terms of key areas of the investigation. Geolyse are looking at Flora and Fauna including aquatic ecology, noise and impacts associated with new traffic movements new traffic onto existing properties, traffic and access, indigenous heritage, air quality, surface and groundwater monitoring, visual amenity. Socio economics fits into this as well.

### **Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Public Question – Do you deal with the Sydney lands council in regards to indigenous heritage or local community?

### **Geolyse Response**

The process is outlined through and Aboriginal Cultural Heritage assessment (ACHA) as defined by National Parks and Wildlife, and advert has been placed in the paper and direct consultation with the local areal land council and local aboriginal groups are asked to express their interest in being involved in the process. The archaeologist is involved in direct consultation including field surveys to determine any impacts.

### **Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Public Response - Lands council did not know that this meeting was on.

### **Geolyse Response**

There is a separate consultation process that is occurring between the archaeologist and the LALC, directed consultation.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Aboriginal lands council send apologies.

**Presentation Continues**

The purpose of this meeting is to gain perception of the impacts associated with the construction and operation of the route.

Specialist's investigations and subcontractors have been engaged to deal with those particular areas.

Ecology, air traffic noise and vibration, air quality, traffic, indigenous cultural and hydrology.

Internal by Geolyse – traffic assessment and desktop assessments of landscape, visual, surface and groundwater and acquisition.

**Landscape and Visual Amenity**

There are 6 distinct landscape character zones within the visual catchment. Under the RMS guidelines. Character zones are defined yellow is airport red is residential and business areas, brown is industrial green is purple is recreational, and blue is infrastructure such as roads rail etc.

There will be a Degree of change, road structures such as bridge intersections especially significant at Lachlan Valley Way in regards to introduce new features in the environment. ***In terms of guidelines no massive impacts.***

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Red area is rural and business? Thought was zoned rural residential?

**Geolyse Response**

Red is zoned rural residential zoned in the context that people reside there

Green is zoned rural and that is zoned as predominately primary production, the character of that areas is rural in nature, even though there are residents there.

In terms of Acquisition lots that are potentially affected by the concept alignment, not areas that would be acquired – there are mostly green areas, and a 30-40m road corridor which would go through some of those lots, the median amount of acquisition is 500m. One area on left of the picture not affected by the alignment but may be sensible to acquire to reduce the 90 degree corner and introduce curve into the alignment. There is also an element of an endangered ecological community that could be avoided if the alignment was slightly changed and a curve placed on this route.

**Public Comment – Anne Jeffrey**

It is not showing any acquisitions along boundary road, but it is not wide enough for 30-40 m road corridor?

**Geolyse Comment**

The concept alignment that has been proposed fits within the existing corridor with room on either side. There is no acquisition proposed on concept alignment in boundary or airport road. – Still a two lane road, will be a degree of the vertical alignment, it will be straightened out, subject to detail design and would be investigated to the full extent

**Public Comment – Anne Jeffrey**

There is no service road to allow people to access their properties?

**Public Comment - Robert Gee -**

Mr Gee, angered that no one has consulted with him regarding his property. He would like Council to sit down with him and propose compensation. That is his purpose of attending this meeting tonight, and why was another route not proposed?

**Geolyse Response**

David acknowledge that public is frustrated. Encouraged to put concerns in writing and propose to council.

**Public Comment - John Waters**

Morality of taking homes and corner block of Airport Road and Boundary Road. John states the community should compensate those affected. As a community we (the people) should compensate if the town wants the bypass we have a moral obligation to ensure those affected are compensated.

**Geolyse Response**

Please put concerns in writing.

**Public Comment – Anne Jeffrey**

The people who have built the newest houses, prior to this members have approached council to ask if any developments would be going ahead, again frustration shown.

**Public Comment – Kerry Bailey**

Public question - Is the route set in concrete or can it be varied?

**Geolyse Response**

It is the alignment that we are assessing today. The fact that we are discussing this alignment does not mean that it will be built in this form. There will be recommendations that come out of this report that would suggest that it would be sensible to address certain issues. Geolyse will not be making wholesale recommendations to completely revisit the alignment. It does not mean it will be built and it may not happen at all, as per previous projects.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

Angered about meetings held if the proposed project will not go ahead, public issues regarding the building of the road.

Frustration between council and public, noting that it is stressful for the residents, and decisions that had been made.

**Geolyse Response**

Please provide in writing.

**Council Response**

Mayor addresses the public to say the meeting has been held in good faith, we expect people to put forward their point of view and issues that have justly concerns, this is the route, there may be movement within the alignment, and it could be slightly changed. Angered at some public response. Everyone is upset and concerned, we need to work through the process. Geolyse are employed to provide a report, the report will be made available.

**Public Comment**

If the idea of the REF is to identify the environmental factors, and if serious ones occur we would need to go to another EIS is this correct? And we still need to make provisions for access and services roads which would then be a bigger effect on the environment?

Identify properly what the impact is for access on the whole route, through the REF and EIS due to access, we need to make provisions the block needs legal access.

**Geolyse Response**

Agreed that the REF is a stepping stone to identify what the impacts are for access.

REF and EIA infrastructure project is outlined – it begins with a concept to identify constraints, the constraints then inform detail design. The detail design may change things significantly enough that another review of environmental assessment would be needed

It would be illogical to do a detail design without first considering the constraints of the landscape.

There will be controls and recommendations for this, the controls to access to land a slip road may be required or other engineering solutions to ensure residents can access their property safely.



Traffic engineers will look and make recommendations. There are lots of ways to respond.

What is the existing environment? What are the impacts associated and how will they change that environment and how do we respond to those?

The process to follow after this is done includes recommendation and if this is non-significant finding it then moves onto detail design. A full survey and response to constraints.

#### **Public Comment – Albert Melchert**

Public Why is the Rail corridor is highlighted?

#### **Geolyse Response**

It is closed, John Holland is adamant that it won't be formally closed. So the chance of it being acquired from Transport NSW are pretty low, this area is highlighted in error.

#### **Public Comment – Manfred Melchert**

Resident would like the alignment moved east to provide a service land, near railway.

#### **Geolyse Response**

Always a capacity to look at this in detailed design; safety for people leaving their properties is a key consideration. You want the bypass to be efficient, it loses its efficiency with multiple individual access off the bypass. If there is a need to provide a slip lane it will be investigated and considered.

Presentation Continues....

#### **Surface Water**

Surface water – Lachlan River large constraint for this site and Waugoola Creek, both have flood impacts associated. Both have 1/100 yr. flooding, point of crossing the river significant area of flooding. The concept road alignment will be below the 1/20yr flood event. This bypass would not be operational in or beyond the 1/20 yr. event. The costs involved to raise the bridge height would be fairly significant. In a flood event trucks would still need to go through the main street. This area would be closed in any event.

Groundwater exists on the land, as high as 2m; there may be construction interaction with groundwater and potential for spills during construction or vehicle accidents controls they need to be managed,

#### **Flora and Fauna**

Vegetation communities through the concept alignment are predominately disturbed grassland, river red gum riparian corridor within the river and a small section of white box, yellow box Blakey's red gum woodland, on the corner of boundary and airport road; as mentioned earlier, softening the curve would protect the endangered community.

Aquatic environment, apparently is a fairly low temperature river that is shallow. Ecological assessment if a pier or piers were placed in the river, there would be no detrimental impact on the ecology of that area. This may then change the concept design through detail design.

At the bottom of Airport road, the recommendation of cutting the corner would prevent the removal of those endangered trees and would be beneficial arrangement as there would be capacity to redevelop the road that has been closed to improve the woodland. Importantly, the concept alignment would be unlikely to affect the flora and fauna or the ecological community under the states or commonwealth legislation.

#### **Soil contaminations**

One site shell depot, defined by EPA as a contaminated sited, there are approx. 32 groundwater monitoring bores, that will need controls through REF in regards to construction to ensure there is no risk to workers, may be an opportunity to improve that situation and remove some contamination through the construction process, depending on cut and fill for that area.

General Comment - Concept line does go through the front yards of land, detail design would correct and make better options available. Detail design would correct much more detailed fashion and address the problems re septic tanks and water.

### **Indigenous Heritage**

Direct consultation is undertaken at the moment with an archaeologist and the relevant aboriginal community. A field survey will be undertaken a draft report prepared and for Aboriginal comment and sign off, archaeologist has direct contact with relevant registered parties, an ad has been placed in the paper.

### **Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Do they know about the project as conversations with the LALC today showed they know nothing! The public shows concerns regarding the process of aboriginal consultation, especially in regards to advertisement in the newspaper. How do you know who purchases the paper. Aboriginal community members do not read the paper, and this is a problem with the assessment.

### **Geolyse Response**

Appreciate the point, we will talk to consultant.

### **Public Comment - Ken Anning**

Aboriginal community send their apologies, lands council Meeting.

### **Council Response**

A valid point has been raised Council has an aboriginal consultation policy, which includes all the aboriginal community members council are aware of, the aboriginal consultant has this list and it is an expectation the consultant will contact all relevant parties that they are fully aware

### **Geolyse Response**

The consultant will follow this process and it will be outlined in a report, how the consultation process was conducted. If there is an issue with the consultation the issue can be redressed.

### **Public Comment – Ken Anning**

There is an Aboriginal children burial ground where the proposed route is outlined. What happens in this instance? Do you just go around that part of the route or do you propose a new route?

### **Geolyse Response**

There is a process called ACHA (Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment). That assessment identifies any sites or artefacts, PAD and landforms and areas where things may be found. There may be subsurface excavation if warranted, there may be recommendations from the archaeologist for realignment OR an AHIP (Aboriginal Heritage impact permit), which comes from national parks. This permit is required before any disturbance or anything that would effect, destroy an item, if the permit is authorised then consultation with local community would be undertaken to confirm local requirements of what is acceptable for the item of significance. If permit is authorised there would be consultation in the local community and appropriate measures applied, there are stiff penalties for anything outside of this process. Understand this is a sensitive topic, from Geolyse perspective the appropriate process is being followed. If there is a suggestion that the LALC has not been involved the archaeologist will be informed. There may be recommendations that come from this in the REF. for the management of any identified heritage values.

Noted that Geolyse will advise the Aboriginal consultant of the issues addressed here tonight regarding the LALC not being involved.

### **Presentation Continues...**

### **Noise and vibration.**

Noise loggers were deployed and collected in conjunction with traffic loggers, used to calibrate the noise logger to determine the current level of traffic in that area, and the noise impacts associated with increased traffic.

**Public Comment – Barry Burns**

On increased noise from further development at the Airport? This will add to noise background in the area, and the bypass will have an increased noise? What will happen to the noise factor in that area?

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse are assessing the current situation but can take this into account what may happen in the future, and a cumulative effect as a result, but it is difficult to quantify in a modelling sense which is what the noise consultants are reporting on. Contour levels on maps were discussed, but this is not directly relevant to this alignment. From Geolyse perspective at the airport they have not done the Australian noise exposure forecast (ANEF) contours for that site, sporadic use of the airport, if usage is to rise according to the master plan, the ANEF process would need to be considered and noise impacts mapped as contours with decibel levels. If works at the airport are going to increase capacity, it is their obligation to provide an EIS and an ANEF contour assessment. Geolyse can only assess what has occurred. Not directly related to this project.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Where were the noise logging machines located? Are there any on Boundary Road at this point?

**Geolyse Response**

There were logging machines placed at corner of Airport and Waratah, Fishburn Street, Campbell Street, these are the locations stipulated by the noise consultant and advised which areas would be best location for the alignment.

**Public Comment**

Has the noise consultant been out there as those areas are flat?

**Geolyse Response**

Yes the noise consultant has visited the site and has detailed contours of the site, which will be added to the model reporting to determine flat and hilly areas.

**Public Comment – General Consensus**

Public-discussion Consensus agree that the airbrakes up and down hills would not be reported correctly as all those areas are flat, the public are worried about the noise that would be generated by trucks going up and down hills and using air brakes that are not currently being logged by the noise loggers. The noise of trucks are going to be substantial going up and down hills.

Logging should have been placed in more appropriate locations

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse are not air and noise engineers; we have taken advice from the people who are experts in their field and these are the areas they have identified

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

Public member proposes an expert in noise and trucks should be liaised with, Geolyse should speak with Mr Barlow a member of the Cowra community as he is an experienced truck driver, and is experienced with gradients on roads and truck movement. Geolyse would benefit from this experience as an opportunity to speak with people who drive on these roads consistently. A wide range of statistics and information would provide the best possible solution and provide a more detailed plan together with the experts Geolyse have engaged in their field. A suggestion of another 5 day noise logger study to be conducted, in order to provide more data, and lessen the concerns on gear change, volunteer of loggers to be placed on personal land.

**Geolyse Response**

All comments or issues are taken on board, the previous comment is very helpful for Geolyse and should be provided in writing in order for the noise consultant to review. And if there is a response that helps you in anyway Geolyse will ensure that this comes directly back to you and will be dealt with in the REF. This is the purpose of this meeting today, feedback is important so we can ensure that we can address the issues. It is noted that member of the public wants Mr Barlow to be consulted at

some stage as he is an expert in this field. Response – the noise consultant will be informed and reviewed and consider these options.

David advised Mr Barlow to provide his comments at this meeting.

**Public Response – Allan Barlow**

Mr Barlow responded with a description of the issues of compression brakes up and down hills, signs will not work, certain speed limits and the positioning of the noise loggers.

**Public Comment**

A resident of Bulkhead Road advised that many trucks pass his property and press on the brakes, this is not as much of a concern as motorbikes for this individual.

**Geolyse Response**

There is a point to be made that perception is subjective. Everyone will have a slightly different perspective on this issue. An example of a resident on airport road consulted in the last week advised that she liked trucks, although an unusual comment, everyone is slightly different in their opinion. The reason is why these assessments are undertaken via guidelines is to provide a consistent assessment. It is done the same way everywhere. Noise is complicated it is a difficult area, and very subjective. Noise consultant are engaged within their specialist fields. The REF is prepared under guidelines that are consistent.

**Public Comment**

Are we able to meet the noise consultant?

**Geolyse Response**

That could be arranged.

**Public Comment – Anne Jeffrey**

Public consensus pointed out that at the start of this meeting a truck went past and the speakers needed to raise their voices considerably. An indication of how loud the bypass will be to residents.

**Geolyse Response**

Yes that there is noise associated with bypass, complicated and subjective perceptions. Difference of opinion, people who live near the bypass don't always hear truck noise; it is very complicated thing. Difficult area There are a very small amount of acoustic engineers that are experts in their field and that is why we defer on to them to resolve the issues.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

There is one impact that affects the flat airport road, the hill may not be as big as other areas, but the gear change occurs outside their house.

Are we likely those of us who live on the bypass route like to be given the opportunity to have soundproofing for our homes at councils or whoever's expense?

**Geolyse Response**

Initial feedback from the noise consultant is that the observation so far is that it is likely that the bypass will trigger noise mitigation measures as it will likely exceed tolerances that exist, and those measures are likely to be architectural measure. Fences and urban bunds will not be acceptable where architectural measures could be considered such as double glazed windows and air conditioners that create their own hum and offset the noise, it is likely that in certain areas that will be necessary.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

Access discussion. Assuming airport road alignment is where it is proposed, would we assume that the road will come towards their fence line 2m?

**Geolyse Response**

A detailed version of the alignment is provided in hard copy and can be discussed after the meeting.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

There is placement of a large tree, already an obstruction, we need to stop and ensure the traffic is not coming on the highway coming, the potential for 80km road with the trucks, residents will not be able to come out safely. Will this impact system for us and anybody else will the council or whoever pay for the fence lines on the driveways to be moved back into their blocks, so the gates for the blocks can be moved 15-20 m into the block to allow difficult access re caravans?

**Geolyse Response**

Through detail design the road has to meet the relevant standards Austroads provides design of the road and provides clear zones and certain objects within a certain distance of the road that would cause accidents. The standards provide for clear zones and for property access. If the road is being upgraded to a current Austroad standard then it would include property accesses to the current standard.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

Will there be compensation for noise mitigation?

**Geolyse Response**

It is likely that the noise mitigation will exceed current levels. Architectural measures would then be taken into consideration such a double glazing windows, installing air-conditioning units to distract the noise,

**Public Comment – General Consensus**

The public stated that these standards are the minimum requirements not the best requirements that will be implemented by Council for this town and it is not good enough. Orange ring road was used as an example.

**Geolyse Response**

The project should be about a high quality assessment, reality is that it will be defined by economic constraints, ultimately the town will pay for this, where federal, or state funding may be available later? Can't comment anymore at this point.

Public advised that it was costed by GHD for \$20m.

**Public Comment**

Environmental questions, regarding the road down to the intersection of Boorowa road the express way where the bypass will occur. We don't know if this will be a roundabout a crossroad or give way sign on Boorowa Road and not the bypass.

**Geolyse Response**

We would assume this would be a roundabout as it is the most likely outcome

**Public Comment**

The proposed roundabout is going to be close to the river, what happens when there is a truck accident on the bypass with a truck coming down the hill?

**Geolyse Response**

Photos shown point to the Concept alignment of the roundabout of that location which in some way will need to interact with the rail bridge.

**Public Comment**

Roundabout coming off or on the bridge, it is known for truck accidents a truck will ultimately be in the river!

**Geolyse Response**

This is a valid point that we need to consider in the environmental assessment. It is a great point that needs to be considered.

**Public Comment - Peter?**

In regards to Wyangala road and Young roads, are we going to have a bypass there or a roundabout? This report will have recommendations on all those intersections about the appropriate level of treatment measures to modelling will be done to define on the intersection arrangement to give the best level of service for both roads?

**Geolyse Response**

Response All intersections will be looked at.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

None of those sections or bypasses have been costed in this or the previous report.

**Geolyse Response**

The reality of costing will not be known until detail design.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

The report indicated \$2.5m over 15 years maintenance cost that the ratepayers will be responsible for? If that is the case what is the projected cost to the ratepayer for the maintenance of this bypass? None of the costings included drainage?

**Geolyse Response**

You won't be able to see accurate costing until you have detailed design.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

At the moment the information has been given with no costs available and no design until acceptance of the route is given, and costings will be provided at the detailed design stage? Residents would leave the area over this matter.

**Geolyse Response**

The comments need to be in writing so please put the concerns in writing and send them in. Response, please put your concerns in writing. And they will be considered

**Public Comment**

Member of public states that he has lost respect for the Council and its members as he feels they don't go through the correct measures, would like written letters about matters rather than advertisements in the paper. Ultimately this will affect all members of the whole community as ratepayers they will be paying for it. Public meetings should be held other members of the community believe it won't affect them. Pensioners can they afford the additional costs?

**Geolyse Response**

The financial cost is an element of the consideration.

**Public Comment**

If the access can't be solved and provide adequate access, safety and noise problems with this preferred route it will not be going any further! .Until this report of the problems and how we can solve them it is hearsay, public agrees with the point that has been made until something is on paper, re yes to access or safety is ok standards the costs won't be finalised.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Considerations re roundabouts what processes are used to work out whether they are viable? How do work out in the report if it is good or bad?

**Geolyse Response**

There is a program that our traffic engineers use called SIDRA and the variables are entered and then you are able to model the different options of lane lengths, widths, speeds, traffic volume, all factors are fed into model, which gives an answer of level of service, queues length, delays to vehicles, Projects car numbers and trucks.

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

How did orange ring road go so wrong? If this is going to happen it needs to be done correctly.

**Geolyse Response**

In what sense do you think Orange got it wrong?

**Public Comment**

Negative camber, similar to Wyangala road, querying how it got approved?

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

Has to be done as best as possible, talking about safety, the truck example mentioned earlier is going to be one of the most difficult to address in the study looking at the orange ring road as evidence, the Cowra town does not want anything to be built like that. So how do we make sure it is better?

**Geolyse Response**

David advised he is not an engineer. We are not at that point yet. SIDRA analysis will look intersections and determine the best option, an engineer will then look at this and design the roundabout, currently we are not at this point yet. Roundabout or lights, are options that could be considered.

**Public Comment – Mr Albert Melchert**

Under the railway bridge, the pylons are too close, the Lachlan River on the other side of the railway bridge you come out at right angles.

**Geolyse Response**

Right angle on the railway corridor, John Holland would be difficult to arrange alternative with that railway line. Won't allow another crossing along the railway line. Very problematic, won't allow another crossing, notwithstanding that it is closed.

**Public Comment – Mr Albert Melchert**

Would it not go underneath the approach is high on the other side as well. Would make the alignment easier changes to John Holland.

**Geolyse Response**

Those sorts of refinement can be considered, within the current alignment and ensure the traffic engineers gets this feedback.

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

Rail to reopen, as tenders have been made to reopen the rail, what will happen if the bypass that does eventually have to cross the rail?

**Geolyse Response**

Intersects underneath does mean that it could go underneath it. John Holland have been approached and asked to what extent are you concerned about works happening here support structures of your railway. An engineering solution could be to remove piers and span the area to give enough space to get underneath of that particular section? One solution and different solutions and cost benefits that exist to that problem could be a lane on either side of the pier.

If they choose not to use that option, there would only be allowed to cross in one place? If you have to cross,

Again it comes back to the efficiency of the bypass. You don't want a crossing which will slow down and trucks to stop for a train the trucks will avoid this and go another way. Avoid that scenario.

**Public Comment - John Waters**

Under the bridge the pylon on the river side of the bridge is fairly close to the road, if a truck hit that, disaster would occur?

**Geolyse Response**

Responses John Holland will have a role and a responsibility and a part in that process, to determine how they interact.

Engineering solutions could be to span the area the one to take, there are many engineering solutions.

**Air quality**

There is an assessment that looks at existing air quality that is being undertaken that looks at air quality, meteorological conditions, emissions rates the point with air quality is that this is a bypass so we are not introducing additional volumes of traffic in to the environment it is relocating existing traffic from one area of town to another from a regional perspective is unlikely to see any significant changes in air quality by on a that is being modelled in a detailed fashion.

**Public Comment – Larry Walsh**

Are they talking in 10 years the volume of trucks were going to double?

**Council Response**

Heavy Vehicles projected in 23-25 years the trucks across the landscape may double. Would not all use this route

**Geolyse Response**

That is a factor in terms of air quality assessment and noise assessment there is a projection at 10 year and 20 years to determine level growth would be and there are calculations to determine how that works out.

The information is out there and would be factored into the assessment.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

Earlier discussed about changing gears, brakes enabled and project more trucks, how can you project asbestos coming from the truck brakes?

**Geolyse Response**

That is a valid point and a factor that we need to take into account if indeed they are still using asbestos in truck brakes and will talk to the air quality assessor.

**Public Comment**

Where is the answer?

It will be in the REF as you have raised the issue it needs to be reported on.

**Public Comment – Larry Walsh**

Has the direction of the wind be taken into consideration?

**Geolyse Response**

Yes this is factored into meteorological conditions. Models produce will look at wind factors and where air moves and the way in which emissions are distributed

**Public Comment – Mick Crowe**

Trucks have a difficult option to turn from 100km up Grenfell road, turn onto airport road, roundabout on Young then Boorowa Road and back to town, on the route, and roundabouts, costs to put a truck parking bay years ago near rose garden, Mobil, at night trucks will not use the bypass and use the main street, for the parking bay, very easy to detour.

**Geolyse Response**

Can't comment as this is the route we are assessing, but a valid point.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Is there a forecast for weight limit on the main street for trucks that are made to use the bypass?

**Geolyse Response**



This has not been made aware to Geolyse

**Council Comment**

Has not been discussed the situation of the Orange highway is still Summer Street as guided by RMS. Different options for different places.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Are the people of Orange paying for the bypass maintenance, or is RMS is responsible, for the bypass?

**Geolyse Response**

No Orange council is responsible because it is a local road

**Public Comment**

As this is a local road, we are a shire community and will be responsible for paying?

**Geolyse Response**

It will depend on RMS to what extent the highway will be rerouted. In Parkes they moved the highway, and redeveloped. Orange they have not

**Council Comment**

Future options could incorporate a regional road, Canowindra road and Lachlan valley way Darby falls, are regional roads, picked up by state government but not a highway

**Geolyse Response**

Unable to answer this question

**Public Comment**

Will Trucks from Canowindra still need to link up to the Boorowa's, Young Grenfell road, they still will need to come into towns via the bridge, and use the main street?

**Geolyse Response**

I assume that this was a consideration when Council looked at the various options, when a complete ring road was proposed that would have picked up that traffic. This route picks up some of the traffic, the majority but not all of the Heavy vehicle traffic.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

What the price tag is on Geolyse to do this to the community, the costs for paying for this?

**Geolyse Response**

Tenders went into council not sure if this is in the public domain, and am unable to comment.

**Council Response**

Mayor We can get the info to you, the other tenderers will not be able to be disclosed, but the winning tender can. The General Manager is finding this out and let you know.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Advised general public have mentioned that this is not affecting them but as a ratepayer they are paying for it, and should be advised - we want trucks out of the street ultimately.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

If this assessment is complete and it is found that it can't be done for a number of reasons?

**Geolyse Response**

If the REF doesn't get a finding of non-significance, then there is significance and an Environmental Impact Statement is required.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

If the conclusion is that couldn't be reached after the EIA, how much will all of this have cost to do the assessment up to this point? One of the complaints the public has with Council is that do not provide all the facts. The community should be made aware of where we are spending money and what it is spent on. It affects all ratepayers and people who live here, and maybe can't afford to.

**Geolyse Response**

This is a question for Council. Ultimately if you don't do the assessment and just build a road that is not acceptable. There is a difficult balance, the assessment has to be done which will cost money, or you build the road without the assessment and you have unmanageable impacts that you can't resolve.

**Public Comment – Barbara Tomlin**

Why the Young road was not considered, which would access the truck bay, and would not go where people live?

**Geolyse Response**

You would have to ask GHD, we can't answer this question.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

There are many issues to report back to us with, what process is there, will you send us all a letter? How will this be available to the public?

**Geolyse Response**

What will happen, and what was anticipated was that we would get quite a degree of feedback from the public meeting that would go into the draft report, we would respond to those issues individually and various parts through the report. A draft of that report gets issued to council and considered by council. This will be in the public domain, it may go on the web where people can view the draft, you may not see your name but the comments will be addressed there.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

What if you don't have the web?

**Council Comment**

Yes I am sure we can print a hard copy and leave downstairs in reception and a copy in the library as well. If someone can't access please call Council to have this resolved and a copy made available.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

Public request – When this is available, those that are on the route can they all please get a letter to let us know when it is available especially those who have shown interest? As some people do not buy the newspaper.

**Geolyse Response**

Yes contact details have been provided, and letters can be sent out from the mailing list. Council has details of all lots affected and those residents who it concerns directly.

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

Are you wanting us to draft a letter of concern to send in, after this meeting?

**Geolyse Response**

If you are happy that the way Geolyse have potentially interpreted your comments and written down in the way we respond to them then that is fine, if you would prefer that you are completely and inexplicably understood then suggest to put into writing

**Public Comment – Peter Wright**

If you are serious about your objections, you should put in writing and send concerns to the email provided. Then there is written copy of everything

**Geolyse Response**

We would hope that we have covered everything, considering that this is being recorded. The safest option for you to take the opportunity for you to get your point across then put into writing.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Is there any change, after you have drafted the concerns, that we can get a copy of those changes?

**Geolyse Response**

Should not be a problem

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

If we think of anything else we can add to them?

**Geolyse Response**

This is a not a never ending process, we could possibly provide you with a draft and if you have anything else please get back to us in 7 days as we are under time constraints,

**Public Comment – Amanda Anning**

This would be appreciated. Minutes from the meeting of what was said, and the issues addressed would then cover all basis.

**Geolyse Response**

No issue, Geolyse and Council will decide the appropriate action.

**Public Comment – General Consensus**

Public general discussion on land values and effect of Depreciation of 20% on land value. Orange was 30%. Orange releasing subdivisions directly to the frontage of the ring road at the current time. 50 to 100 lots which diminishes the efficiency of the bypass, by adding additional access points onto this.

**Public Comment – John Waters**

Main comment, bought land when they did accepted the level of land re airport and gun range. Bypass will be another factor. Residence will now see a 30-40% increase in truck traffic. Noise will impact on residents, and value has depreciated. Boundary road residence 60-80km/hr. constant impacts noise on residents. Loss on values.

**Geolyse Response**

Valuation issue is taken on board, and will consider this to an extent and acknowledged.

**Public Comment – General Consensus**

Public Discussion on other options? There are so many other options?

**Geolyse Response**

The discussion on other options are endless, this route has been considered as being adopted, and this is what we are now assessing.

**Public Comment - Albert Melchert**

Could it be possible that they find the route is unacceptable?

**Geolyse Response**

The findings may show that it route is unacceptable, honestly that it is not looking like this will be the case.

**Public Comment - Albert Melchert**

Will there be an opportunity to address minor changes, in front of houses e.g. clearance and driveways?

**Geolyse Response**

Those findings will come out in the report under the various areas. Re traffic, air quality etc.

**Public Comment – Manfred Melchert**

The bypass is necessary, Main Street is very good, beautiful, but slows traffic

**Geolyse Comment**

This bypass may take the Heavy vehicles out of the Main Street and would be quicker for movement.

**Public Comment - Albert Melchert**

Going to Young would be quicker to use the bypass, Cootamundra bypass means that truck drivers do not need to go into the town centre. This applies to Orange as well. It would be slower on the bypass with roundabouts for truck use.

**Geolyse Response**

Lessons to be learned from the Orange bypass.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

Many of the public agree with the bypass, but the noise and pollution levels will I impact the residence on boundary, airport and Campbell Street. How do you stop the noise? Double glaze many not be the solution on the older houses.

**Geolyse Response**

Solutions will come down to individual negotiations between landowners and Councils.

**Public Comment - Albert Melchert**

There is a fear that there is not enough detail as yet.

**Geolyse Response**

It would be irresponsible to carry out detail design before the issues are figure out beforehand. Geolyse need to do a concept to figure out what the constraints are and then prepare detail design.

The meeting helps understand, from the public comments, the issues will be considered and detail design roads could be moved slightly etc., puts more people at ease.

One of the reasons for part of this process.

**Public Comment**

Campbell street driveway safety is a concern.

**Geolyse Comment**

Meeting is coming to a close, we appreciate your time and your views, we will put a submission summary together based on the comments, we have a mailing address that we can issued feedback.

**Council Comment**

Tim Long requests that everyone is to sign the consultation form, if they would like feedback.

**Geolyse Response**

Geolyse will endeavour to get the feedback to you and ensure we have all your concerns.

**Public Comment**

Will there be a follow up meeting?

**Geolyse Response**

It is not part of our scope but there is no reason why we can't do this, normally there is a presentation of the draft, it could be conceivable to do that as a follow up meeting.

**Council Response and Closure of Meeting**

Mayor thanks to the public and requests that please ensure that concerns are put into writing. To make sure that what you have said has been identified, contact lists are provided. Thank you to David at Geolyse and the public, it is part of the ongoing process, not the end game.

Geolyse tender \$100k for anybody who is concerned about Councils transparency through the budget, the draft operation budget is provided for next year. Available to anyone of the public.as a public document.

**Item 2 – Further Questions and Concerns**

- Questions and comments answered during presentation.

Meeting closed 7.33 pm

## Cowra Heavy Vehicle Bypass REF

### Meeting - 6 May 2015 - Attendance sheet

Name	Address	Phone	Email
Manfred Melchert	54 Parkes Street	63423276	<a href="mailto:noleneJM@bigpond.net.au">noleneJM@bigpond.net.au</a>
Albert Melchert	52 Parkes Street	63421783	<a href="mailto:albertm1@bigpond.net.au">albertm1@bigpond.net.au</a>
Frank Bridges	29 Fishburn Street	63423660	<a href="mailto:kikib1948@gmail.com">kikib1948@gmail.com</a>
Kerry Bailey	29 Fishburn Street	63423660	<a href="mailto:kikib1948@gmail.com">kikib1948@gmail.com</a>
Patti Brown	37 Campbell Street	63423455	
Robert Gee	32-34 Campbell Street	0437465056	
Peter Mallon	Mallon Road, Woodstock	63450317	
Jack Ford	Henderson Street	63422091	
Larry Walsh	4 Dawson Drive	63426562	
Peter Jeffery	78 Boundary Road	63413820	<a href="mailto:pj@springridgewines.com.au">pj@springridgewines.com.au</a>
Warwick Stubbing	58 Boundary Road	63421720	<a href="mailto:wandl.stubbing@bigpond.com">wandl.stubbing@bigpond.com</a>
Anne Jeffery	76 Boundary Road	63413820	
Doug Beer	46 Boundary Road	63423375	<a href="mailto:dougbeer@aapt.net.au">dougbeer@aapt.net.au</a>
Barry Burns	121 Waratah Street	63425063	<a href="mailto:bc.burns@bigpond.com">bc.burns@bigpond.com</a>
Steve Brown	37 Campbell Street	0412929901	
Craig Fisher	66 Boundary Road	0407076131	<a href="mailto:cfisher@cowra.nsw.gov.au">cfisher@cowra.nsw.gov.au</a>
Peter Muddle	Lot 27 Boundary Road	0428637366	<a href="mailto:peter@laceng.com.au">peter@laceng.com.au</a>
Mick Crowe	Lot 1 Fishburn Street	0427649827	<a href="mailto:crowesag@bigpond.com">crowesag@bigpond.com</a>
Barbara Tomlin	Dawson Drive	0427267506	<a href="mailto:tomlin-3@bigpond.com">tomlin-3@bigpond.com</a>
Russell Moodie	9 Day Street	63422746	
Suzanne Moodie	9 Day Street	63422746	<a href="mailto:suziemoodie3@bigpond.com">suziemoodie3@bigpond.com</a>
Ken Anning	82 Boundary Road	0409473276	
Amanda Anning	82 Boundary Road	0427290713	amkege012hotmail.com
Chris Waters	83 Airport Road	0427412070	
John Waters	83 Airport Road	0427412069	
Allan Barlow	72 Boundary Road	0449897887	
Ross Sharkey	44 Boundary Road	0428242114	<a href="mailto:ross.sharkey@raywhite.com">ross.sharkey@raywhite.com</a>
Lyn Sharkey	44 Boundary Road	0427891353	<a href="mailto:lyn.sharkey@raywhite.com">lyn.sharkey@raywhite.com</a>

**Cowra Heavy Vehicle Bypass Meeting - Public Consultation**

Meeting Minutes presented for Cowra General Public on behalf of Cowra Council

15 June 2016

Chair – Cowra Mayor - Mr Bill West

Presenter – Mr David Walker of Geolyse Pty Ltd

Public Attendees: Craig Fisher, Di Fisher, B Moriarty, John Waters, Chris Waters, Lorraine Stubbing, Warwick Stubbing, Kerri Bailey, Ken Anning, Albert Melchert, Manfred Melchert, Barry Burns, Jack Ford, Barbara Tomlin, Max Tomlin, Jane Tasker, Patti Brown, Anne Jeffery, Peter Jeffery, Esther Cutmore, Rebecca Ingram, Neville Williams, Eva Coe, Jason Minno, Ruth Fagan, Peter Muddle, Butch Barlow, Robert Gee, Ross and Lyn Sharkey

Councillors: Bill West, Judi Smith, Ray Walsh, Ian Brown, Peter Wright, Jack Mallon, Ruth Fagan.

Council staff: George Ridley, Graham Apthorpe,

Apologies: None received.

Meeting start at 5:32 pm.

**Item 1 – Presentation on Review of Environmental Factors**

- David Walker will provide a summary of findings of the draft Review of Environmental Factors for the Heavy Vehicle Bypass route for Cowra prior to the public exhibition of the draft.

Welcome from Mayor Bill West.

Request to leave questions and comments to the end of the presentation.

Mayor thanks all attendees for coming and that the meeting is to be recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes.

Council committed that they would talk to the public before the Draft Review of Environmental Factors for the Cowra Heavy Vehicle Bypass went out on public exhibition and this meeting has been convened to serve this purpose.

Councillors had a preliminary presentation of the presentation to be presented tonight. The matter will be discussed again at a council information meeting to go through more details in consideration to comments made tonight. From there it is proposed that it will go to the council meeting Monday week for council to approve and put it out on public exhibition for 28 days. This will give the public opportunity to make further comment. This will then go back to Geolyse for them to address the issues that are raised during public exhibition.

The document is not available tonight, however the outcomes of the draft will be provided for discussion.

Council agenda comes out on Wednesday before the council meeting, meaning this will be a public document as of this day. We will be putting the report on a thumb drive for anyone wanting a copy, please contact Council.

**Geolyse Response**

David responded to the Mayor with thanks and made clear that the recording and would be deleted after it had been transcribed.

A request for names to be stated when making comments or asking questions and attendance sheet to be signed.

We are now satisfied with the draft and that we can be confident in our outcomes. We have put it back to the public so comments can be made before Council finalises it. It will also be going to the relevant

regulatory stakeholders, Roads and Maritime Services, National Parks and Wildlife, Office of Environment and Heritage, etc. This will give these departments opportunity to provide comment.

### **Introduction by David Walker - Outlining the purpose of this meeting.**

The purpose of the meeting is to provide a summary of the REF draft which was provided to Council to run through all the impact areas, all the issues that have been assessed and the comments that we have received through the consultation process. Those have been addressed in these specific impact areas.

There is a section at the back of the document which summarises all the public consultation comments and a comment next to each one as to where they have been addressed in the document.

A reoccurring theme during the consultation process has been the route. The route is what we have been asked to assess and this is what the document assesses.

### **Purpose of an REF**

The purpose of a REF is to assist the determination of whether the proposed heavy vehicle bypass should be approved, taking into account to the fullest extent possible, all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment and determine whether the proposed heavy vehicle bypass is likely to have a significant effect on the environment or significantly affect threatened species, population or ecological communities or their habitats.

This has been taken straight out of the Act and forms the basis of what we are assessing.

### **Potential Impacts**

There are a range of impacts that we have assessed. At the outset these were categorised and run through a matrix to determine which were the most critical. Where it's been assessed as being critical we have gone through and done quantitative assessment and engaged specialists where necessary or done them in house where possible.

The key areas that were identified were potential impacts to surface water primarily around the bridge and its location and the potential to impact on floodwaters, the potential impacts on indigenous heritage, both known and unknown, noise impact from both construction and operation, potential for impact to flora and fauna, including aquatic ecology, traffic and access, air quality and landscape and visual considerations.

The presentation shows companies that assisted in the assessment. Unchanged from last meeting except SMEC have been included for the preparation of the hydraulic modelling.

### **Landscape/Visual Impacts**

There are six distinct landscape character zones within the route. These are identified in the slideshow presentation. These are unrepresentative of the zoning, they are representative of the way the land is currently used at the moment. They assist in guiding the assessment process. There is a Roads and Maritime standard document which provides the process of carrying out this assessment. There is the potential for some impacts, but we are satisfied that they will be mitigated and managed through the construction process and operation. We have dealt with comments that have come up regarding this.

### **Socioeconomic Impacts**

There is a range of potential impacts. We have recommended in the REF that Council periodically come back and review the status quo through a baseline survey and then come back and review how things are operating in the years post development. This will give a clear understanding of some of these potential impacts came to light, whether they have been properly mitigated, whether the news traffic needed to be put in to place to deal with them is they haven't been properly mitigated. We are satisfied they are able to be mitigated through controls.

### **Land Acquisition**

There will be some land acquisition. The lots shown in the presentation are represented by the lots that are affected by the position of the alignment; it is not intended to suggest that the entirety of the lots will be enquired. We would certainly anticipate that detail design of the alignment would minimise



the acquisition as much as possible to keep the corridor as narrow as it needs to be. The acquisition process would be managed by Council. There are Roads and Maritime service guidelines of how the process should take place.

The recommendation is where possible acquisition is minimised, the design is adjusted as much as it can be to reduce the required area of acquisition. E.g. in this area (shown on presentation) there is some unnecessary road widths that encroach on properties which suggest acquisition that require changes to the detailed design. In the yellow area (shown on presentation) the proposed road alignment doesn't currently encroach into that lot however we are recommending that it be acquired so that a softer curve can be put in.

### **Flood Planning Area**

This mapping (shown on presentation) is derived from the Council local environmental plan, it shows the flood planning areas and is derived from a flood study that was done in 2006 by SMEC and it identifies the 1% of the flood levels. One of the concerns at the outset was the potential for the proposed bridge to impact that flood water and there is the concern that when you add that barrier into the river that water will back up behind it and that would raise the flood level. We have been through a few iterations of the design with SMEC and Council to adjust that bridge design to have the smallest impact possible to ensure that there won't be any significant impacts to properties. There is a detailed report that was produced by SMEC in the REF with findings.

There are two sensitive water courses: Lachlan River and the Waugoola Creek. There are two crossings. One here (on presentation) and one further up; this is an existing crossing and the existing situation will essentially be maintained. Detailed design will be the best way to achieve that. There is the potential for change to flood behaviours. We are satisfied that it is unlikely to impacts surrounding properties. We will keep re-running the model through detailed design to ensure that there is no unintended impacts.

### **Groundwater**

This is an LEP map (shown on presentation) showing groundwater vulnerable land. Given the nature of what we are proposing to do it is not anticipated there will be an impact to ground water. There is always potential through the construction process from spills, but subject to controls and environmental management there is no greater impact there than you would expect from any other construction project.

### **Ecology**

There are a number of vegetation communities through the corridors, including the aquatic environment, however predominately along the routes the community is disturbed grassland. There are not enough of the native species to consider impact to the ecological communities. There is a small population of white box and yellow box red gum woodland which is an endangered ecological community in the south-western corner (shown on the presentation). The softening of the curve (mentioned earlier) would achieve avoidance of any impact to that area of woodland. This is recommended in the REF. The finding with respect to ecology is that the project is unlikely to impact on the ecological communities and flora and fauna.

### **Contaminated Land**

There is a contaminated site, the former Shell depot affected by the alignment. The blue dots (on presentation) are groundwater monitoring wells which are monitoring contamination is not getting worse. There would need to be consideration of this through the construction program, dealt with through construction environmental management plan. Controls would be needed to ensure any contaminated soil that came out of here doesn't spread contamination.

### **Indigenous Heritage**

Indigenous heritage was something that took a bit of time to resolve. An initial survey was done where a few artefacts were found throughout the route and potential archaeological deposits found. This meant that further investigations were necessary.

### **Public Comment (Eva Coe of CLALC)**

When did this consultation happen in the community?

**Geolyse response**

That's been done over the last twelve months.

**Public Comment (Eva Coe of CLALC)**

Who with?

**Geolyse Response**

All the details are provided in the archaeological report.

**Public Comment (Eva Coe of CLALC)**

I have no knowledge of this.

**Geolyse Response**

I am happy to take your questions at the end and I know this is an area that is of concern to some people.

**Public Comment (Eva Coe of CLALC)**

You're saying that consultation with the Aboriginal Community has been completed, it hasn't.

**Geolyse Response**

Well it has to the extent that is required by the Act.

**Public Comment (Eva Coe of CLALC)**

Not from us black fellas though.

**Geolyse Response**

It is all outlined in the reporting which you will be able to see.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

Where is this report?

They were meant to get in contact with this guy, and gave John's phone number and he never saw him the whole day, so that consultation is b\*\*\*\*\*t.

**Geolyse Comment**

There is a whole range of consultation that has taken place you can see the details that live in the report, I would encourage you to read the report and see what was done.

**Presentation Continued**

As I said there were some archaeological deposits found with subsurface testing of those deposits done. The upshot of that is that development can proceed, there are some controls required, and there is the requirement for an Aboriginal heritage impact assessment.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

... of where you are intending to put this heavy duty bypass.

**Geolyse Response**

That sort of comment needs to come back to us through the consultation process.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

You've had the consultation process, Sir.

**Geolyse Response**

It is not completed, there has been a period of consultation. Were now going to public consultation of the draft document so you will have the opportunity to review that document.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

I should have had the opportunity then.

**Geolyse Response**

It is my understanding that the archaeologist made attempts to consult with the Local Aboriginal Land Council which were unsuccessful.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

Why haven't you presented this to the Cowra Land Council?

**Geolyse Response**

I believe details have been sent to the Land Council. The details are in the report, I encourage you to read it and I encourage you to comment. There is a requirement for controls and environmental management plan and there is a requirement for some monitoring during the construction process through the river while the bridge is being developed and there is a requirement for National Parks and Wildlife to issue an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit to enable potential impact to those sites.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

We've got a lot of sites down there, Sir. There are a lot of burial sites up there. You come in here and destroy it all, the artefacts in the space, there's trees and you just come and cut them all down.

**Geolyse Response**

As I have said I encourage you to read the report and provide comment. It will certainly be taken into account and provided to the archaeologist. If there is a need for more consultation to be done it will be done.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

I took the phone call from you that you needed a contact from the Lands Council which I gave to you and he actually just called me today that Dave's coming to town. I gave him the phone number and the address, has he seen you? This is the concern that these guys are having. It's all fabricated, this whole thing.

**Geolyse Response**

I appreciate that concern.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

We don't have a good relationship with the shire Council.

**Geolyse Response**

The full details of the consultation process are in the report. I strongly encourage you to read that and respond.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

Over there in the ... where the power went up and we weren't aware of that.

**Geolyse Response**

We do appreciate that.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

The frustration too is that the Council actually sent the letter to the Lands Council in Sydney, these people had no idea this meeting was even on. It's a bit rude that the Local Lands Council was not advised.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

You just destroy it. The growers, the trees, the animals, natural people do it the natural way. It would be unthinkable for our people to destroy.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

We have a lot of love. I live on the mission up there and I'm proud. We live with all that stuff you're talking about, we're breathing all that stuff in. Why aren't they moving all that stuff away from us? You are killing us all. You've been doing it for years. You have big gas things over there that will blow us

up too. So come on, be fair with us Aboriginal people. We're lovers of this land. That is a big concern for our health.

**Geolyse Response**

I appreciate your concern.

**Presentation Continued**

In terms of Non-Indigenous heritage there is a number of state heritage items and a number of local heritage items on the route. There is also an item down near the riverbank that the archaeologist took the view that it could potentially have a heritage value. There are a few stories told during the survey of what it was used for historically and its linkages to the bowel station we understand. There are a range of controls in the REF to deal with that if we cannot avoid disturbing it. Similarly the state heritage listed railway bridge, the design of the road bridge fairly significantly reduces the level of that bridge to take away the impacts, so there are a range of controls built in.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

I just want to know why you can't take it down a bit further from us. We put the children up there and all those trucks coming past. We're breathing enough s\*\*t in up there like I told you. We're going to breathe more.

**Geolyse Response**

We've been engaged, as I said, to assess the route.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

You don't care about us Aboriginal people. You just sit down here and make decisions. And that's wrong. When it comes to culture you don't give a s\*\*t about our culture. I am going to let the world know my concerns.

**Geolyse Response**

I encourage you to do that, that is part of this process. That is what is happening here, this is a public consultation process.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

My word against ... You know how I feel and the other Aboriginal people too.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

Where you going to put that road, that's where our people live.

**Councillor Response – Mayor Bill West**

I think there are a couple of issues. This is part of the consultation process. If people have been overlooked then that's our apology and I hope it's not going to happen again and we will continue to work with anyone who wants to talk to us. My understanding also, Neville, you were a site monitor on this walk through.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

Why would you sent the letter to the State Land Council and not the Local Land Council?

**Councillor Response – Mayor Bill West**

I am not in a position to answer that one. We have a list of Aboriginal groups who we contact.

**Public Comment (CLALC)**

You're sending out letters and leaving the office out.

**Council staff Comment – George Ridley**

Neville, you were a site monitor when they walked through.

**Presentation Continued**

So in terms of the Non-Indigenous heritage there are a range of controls. The NSW Heritage Council will be provided with a copy of the REF and provided with an opportunity to comment on it and those

will be taken into consideration along with your comments at the end of the public consultation process.

**Noise Assessment**

A quantitative noise assessment was done both for construction and operation that considers the impact that could occur or potentially occur in constructing and operating the route. At the last consultation meeting we suggested that that was going to be based on a current and plus 10 year scenario and it was quite roundly said that we should be looking at a 20 year scenario. The assessment was amended to deal with a 20 year scenario, and put the growth out to 20 years of projected traffic on the roads. There are expected to be some situations where the construction noise exceeds management levels so there will be a need to put a range of construction controls in place there to ensure that residents are not impacted during that construction process. The full details of that will be included in a construction and noise vibration manual plan which will be developed before the project commences.

**Public Comment**

How much impact will vibration have?

**Geolyse Response**

Vibration is not expected to have any impact on buildings but there is the opportunity that if vibratory rollers are used within 30 metres of the housing they could cause some discomfort to humans; in which there would be controls to ensure that vibratory rollers aren't used in that situation, or where it is used within 30 metres of housing or if it can't be avoided that arrangements are made with occupants of those properties to ensure they are not in residence at the time while the work is complete. In terms of operation there is a prediction there would be some impact to some of the houses along the route. Blue is houses that won't be affected, red is houses that have potential to be impacted (shown on presentation). Some of these buildings are not residential properties, the noise assessment was done conservatively so all buildings in close proximity to the route were considered from a noise perspective. Some of these properties will be discounted.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

What about the houses on Erambie?

**Geolyse Response**

There are a couple of houses at the bottom that have to potential to be impacted by operational noise so there would be a need to provide some architectural treatment to those properties.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

... (inaudible)

**Geolyse Response**

Well it's fairly localised there so we don't expect to impact. The vibration assessment is satisfied there won't be any impacts to buildings.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Could you show us the start of Campbell Street?

**Geolyse Response**

There are three properties there (shown on presentation) that have the potential to be affected.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Well I live in one of them, yes.

**Geolyse Response**

This is the curve that runs up and if I recall rightly that's your property. That is a property that would be affected.

**Presentation Continued**

There are some properties down here (shown on presentation) that have the potential to be impacted so there is the consideration of building a noise bunt alongside the railway line to deflect noise in that area as one potential mitigation option that needs to be designed to determine how high and wide it would need to be and there are a range of other options that are under consideration. In all properties that are shown to be impacted there are a couple of categories of impact under Roads and Maritime guidelines and these are all the lowest level of impact so there are recommended architectural treatments that can occur and those are all detailed in the reporting.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The line beside those buildings there, is that on the other side of the road?

**Geolyse Response**

The red line is the new road and the existing road is shown as well, so I think the existing road finishes a bit further down.

**Presentation Continued**

Running through the construction vibration impacts. Continuous monitoring will occur to make sure the impacts are not unreasonable or significant.

**Traffic Assessment**

A very detailed traffic assessment was completed. It looked at the new roads, all of the design, all of the intersections. There are seven new intersections that need to be built. Roads and Maritime Services have said that the Roads and Maritime roads that cross the bypass will need to maintain priority, the only way to do that is to put roundabouts at each of those intersections. There will need to be intersections along the bypass which have intersections with any other roads. There will need to be detailed design. The arrangement here (refer to presentation) is that it sweeps down underneath the railway bridge, it will need detailed design to make sure it can work without impacting on the bridge.

**Air Quality Assessment**

An air quality assessment was done for both construction and operation. Construction impacts are primarily related to dust, however this changes to traffic movement and changes to omission levels as a result of the reordering of traffic levels and the way people are using the roads. They are about 25% that the EPA provide for omissions in NSW, so it is a very low level of impact.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I thought you said the potential impacts would be localised?

**Geolyse Response**

The potential impacts during the construction process would be localised so when you're physically constructing a section of road there would be dust generated which would obviously be wet down through standard processes. But that local impact would occur and then stop and then as the construction moves along.

**Public Comment (unknown)**

What sort of controls?

**Geolyse Response**

There are a range of things that can be done including wetting down and not working in windy conditions. Those will all be detailed in the construction environmental management plan. There are recommendations in the REF as to the type of control that need to be implemented to ensure that controls are reduced to a non-significant level.

**Presentation Continued**

Consultation is a bit of a sore point here. Consultation has been done. Stakeholder consultation with the local aboriginal groups in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife requirements. I take on board the comments here that people are not satisfied with the consultation that has occurred. You obviously need to read the report and see the attempts that were made and see the information that

was provided. If you disagree then certainly feel free to tell us and we will take that up with the archaeologist.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

The stakeholder comments, who are they from? What stakeholders?

**Geolyse Response**

There were a number of stakeholders that registered. I think there was four.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

Who are the stakeholders?

**Public Comment (CALC)**

There are some of the workers who don't know anything about our ancient culture and our heritage.

**Geolyse Response**

Well those were the people who registered to take part. So there was an attempt to contact eight in terms of the Council's policy and those were the ones that came back and wanted to be involved. All the names are detailed.

**Council Comment – Mayor Bill West**

Neville, you registered. This document, which I assume is part of the public exhibition, is part of the aboriginal cultural heritage assessment. It lists the four registered aboriginal parties, Wiradjuri Men Group, Yaraworra Aboriginal Corporation and two others. It lists that this year there have been discussions with Neville, Brendan Ingram, and an email sent to CEO of Cowra Local Aboriginal Land Council.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

Out at the airport we were unaware of what was going to happen out there, I drove out there and had a look around, and we were unaware of what was going to happen and now all around NSW and were irrespective of someone else's property, but we still won't. Irrespective to it being owned by and that's what happens. I went various places.

**Geolyse Responses**

As I said we very much encourage you to get in touch; if you feel that the consultation hasn't been adequate you need to let us know. The archaeologist who was engaged to do this job has provided the details of the attempts he made to undertake consultation. If you have an issue with that then you need to let us know.

**Public Comment (unknown)**

My complaints weren't listened to before.

**Geolyse Response**

How were those complaints provided to us?

**Public Comment (unknown)**

I rang you.

**Councillor Comment**

I think in fairness let's read the report and then give a definitive comment of answer to the report and what it says. I think that's the fairest way to go because this document goes out on public exhibition that gives everyone the opportunity to make comment and provide further assessments for the comment back to council in terms of the route itself and the assessment that has been done by Geolyse and if anybody has missed the public exhibition or hasn't had a chance to comment it gives you a chance to comment through that public exhibition process because it will only be a draft form which gets set out for comment.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

Where are all the Aboriginal stakeholder groups who are in agreeance with this Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment and a matter of fact said they weren't and I was one who guessed it?

**Geolyse Response**

Those that registered and took part in the surveys and the sub-surface testing were provided with a copy of the draft report.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Why didn't you notify of that then.

**Geolyse Response**

I don't believe it is wrong information. I believe it is accurate information. I encourage you to read the report. If you take issue with anything that is written in there this is your opportunity to say so and it will be taken into account and if it needs to be reviewed or reassessed then it will be.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

I have a problem with that consultation and who you have actually spoken to. There have not been available copies, it's the land council that own the land here. You have to come and talk to us at some stage. That's what we're getting upset about. This consultation process closes and has been complete. We weren't even included as part of it. You've talked to someone else who doesn't even own the land.

**Geolyse Response**

So in terms of the land owner consultation there was 140 letters sent out to resident directly adjacent to the route which as far as I am aware included those properties as part of the land council land.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

Yes but you should have talked to the land council, instead you talk to the people who live there who don't actually own the land. Understand that the land council is the land owner.

**Geolyse Response**

I understand and now is the opportunity if you feel like it hasn't been done adequately to let us know. I encourage you to read the report and let us know detail. We're taking note of what we're saying right now, we will be talking to the archaeologist about it after this meeting so I encourage you to put it in writing because it helps us to deal with in more detail but we are taking note of what you are saying and we will be transcribing minutes and providing details of it into the final document. That's the best I can tell you at this point. This is a consultation process. We're handing you a draft document which were open for comments. So that's the consultation process. There were 23 written submissions received, we sent out 140 letters. We had a similar number of people as this at the public meeting that we held last time. We received 23 written submissions, a few phone calls. We have recorded all those details addressed in the appendix to the REF so I encourage you to look in detail of that section and see how your comment has been specifically dealt with and if you are dissatisfied you need to let us know.

**Presentation Continued**

The end of the process we ascertain the view that the REF is examined and has taken into account to the fullest extent possible all of the matters affecting the likelihood of affecting the environment. There are a number of impacts from the proposal that have either been avoided or reduced through measures that have been imposed or through changes to the project. The proposal best meets the project objectives. The project objectives are what the council is trying to achieve with the project as it's been conceived to us.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

It says here the proposal may .... Noise and vibration, changes to flood behaviour and aboriginal heritage. ... is not aboriginal heritage, were protecting that. You need to get a permit to destroy it.

**Geolyse Response**



That's why we're saying there that there will be some impacts, not that there will be no impacts. There will be impacts but those impacts have been determined through the assessment process.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

... Destroyed any heritage that we may have covered.

**Geolyse Response**

Impact means both relocate or destroy. So impact may mean to come on board and relocate things as you see fit and there is a requirement for monitoring during the construction process.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

There won't be any road there. Move it down to another section down the road. Council just wants to take over.

**Geolyse Response**

Those are the comments you need to be making then.

**Public Comment (CALC)**

You don't care about our next generation that's smelling all that s\*\*t up there. They have asthma so they are going to be dying up there.

**Geolyse Response**

We encourage you to provide comments, that's what this consultation process is about.

**Presentation Continued**

**Minimising Impacts**

There will be mitigation measures detailed that remove or minimise impacts. The proposal will improve the safety in the city centre by removing heavy vehicle traffic. Council's proposal is considered to be justified and an EIS is not required.

So, to clarify, if the determination has got to this point and said yes there would be a significant impact, then the next step would be an environmental impact statement which is an even more detailed assessment document but the determination at the end of this process is that is not required.

**Public Exhibition**

So the next thing is to provide an REF for public exhibition and regulatory stakeholders for people to review and comment. There is a requirement for the concurrence of Roads and Maritime Services and that means that they need to agree and sign off with Council's proposal and there is a need to gain an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit from National Parks and Wildlife Service. Once the REF is finalised then there is a need to move on to detailed design, prepare updated flood maps which will take into account potential impacts of introducing that bridge, determine if heritage office approval is required, we don't know if it will be but there will be consultation with the heritage council to determine that and because of the interaction with the rail corridor there is a need to include John Holland Rail in the process. There are agreements that they have with Council that will need to be updated and there are approvals that they need to sign off on for building through corridors.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Have you been up there and visited?

**Geolyse Response**

I have been along the route, yes.

**Public Comment – Annette Jeffery?**

You mentioned the mission levels would be 25% of acceptable levels, acceptable levels for what area? Country town or?

**Geolyse Response**

In terms of the EPA guidelines, they provide initial details. The details are included in the assessment, there is a fairly detailed air quality report.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Was that a model of the middle of Sydney or country towns?

**Geolyse Response**

They are state wide regulations.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Where have they taken these regulations?

**Geolyse Response**

They apply to all of NSW.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

What we're trying to say is we live in a country town ..... Boundary Road wasn't susceptible to noise and vibration anywhere near like down ... There is a lot less noise and vibration in this town.

**Geolyse Response**

You can see the details, all the mapping is recorded in the report so you can see those areas that are identified as being affected.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I just need to know the old trains used to go over there, next to the mission.

**Public Comment – Max Wes**

From Campbell Street from the Dudley's Falls at the end of Campbell Street, that's very narrow, what's your plan there?

**Geolyse Response**

The concept alignment that has been developed is going to try to ... back.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The area there won't be low enough.

**Geolyse Response**

The alignment doesn't follow the existing Campbell Road and further to the south it could be considered to be moved.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I thought it would follow Campbell Road

**Geolyse Response**

It is to a degree but it is a line of best fit. The line will need to be refined and find the one with least impact. This is the concept that we have been asked to assess. To my way of thinking you would only want to deal with one land owner. If you have to deal with acquisition you don't want to have to be trying to acquire land off multiple landowners on the western side of the road. The logical thing if you need to acquire land would be to realign so you are only dealing with one or two land owners.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

How long are we talking in years till this bypass goes through? If you go there to my house where you're going straight through the middle of it. I haven't had any consultation from Council and you're saying acquiring land. Regarding this bypass, no one has come to me and said Robert. You're taking my house, you're taking everything I have worked for, I built that house, now I've got nothing and you're saying oh this won't happen for 5 years, 10 years.

**Geolyse Response**

I can't talk timeframes unfortunately.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

Why doesn't Council come and buy me out? There is a house, two sheds and a flat, Council could offer me \$500,000 but I can't replace it. So if you're going to wipe me out, wipe me out now. Stop saying oh this isn't going to happen for 20 years.

**Geolyse Response**

And I would be upset in your situation. It is an emotional issue which I can appreciate entirely.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

This is where the Council needs to talk to everyone, the psychological effect that it is having on everyone is what no one gets.

**Public Comment**

And their talking about this bypass when it originally went out they got 400 people that actually give a damn about putting a vote in on this. Council are making all this trouble for not even 400 people in a township the size that we've got that give a s\*\*t about a bypass. They already had their mind made, you've got all these people here to listen to what you have to say but it's a waste of time.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

You can't tell us when you're going to do this. Is this going to be in 5 years' time, well were still going to be here in 5 years' time. If it's going to be in 30 years' time, maybe I'm not going to be here so I could be upset for nothing. But the Council has not approached me in any way or form and said look this is the route were going to take, we want to buy you out. And then you've got to come up with money. As I say there is a house, 2.5 acres there. I can't replace that with \$500,000. And the council has to realise that people say I'm sitting on a gold mine because that's where the road has to go so the council have to give you what you want. But then there are people who say no the council only have to give you what the land is worth. Now the thing is, I don't know where I stand. And that's the frustrating thing about it. Same with the people on the mission, they don't know where the road is going, they don't want it going through their burial grounds and that's fair enough, but the thing is it's like smoking mirrors, there is the road, it's going to affect every person on Campbell Street, not just one person, everyone. It is going to go straight past their house and that's the problem. We don't know, when they first put it up it was going to past the front of my house and they said we will put a noise wall in, that's fine but this latest route it's going to go straight through the back of my house. That way I can live there.

**Geolyse Response**

Well it may well fall out that the detailed design can avoid going through there

**Councillor Response – John Waters**

I have spoken to two of these people and I have spoken directly at council meetings on two occasions and on both occasions I spoke about the model responsibility of the town to compensate you, efficiently well enough to allow you, if they take your land, to allow you to move to the same style of property and size that we cover you. Now, that's a moral obligation. If we as a town want this bypass where it's going to go and where people are affected by you are, maybe not to the same extent. If this town wants the bypass where it has to go they have got to buy you out at a morally correct price, not a GB price. And I will put that to this whole meeting. If you agree with me say yes.

**Public Comment – Robert Gee**

I agree.

**Councillor Response – John Waters**

No, to the whole meeting, if you agree that he is going to be bought out that it has to be at a morally correct price.

**General Comment**

All in agreeance.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Is Council buying all the land? Is it just Council building this road?

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

How many Councillors are here?

**Councillor Response**

There are six Councillors here.

**General Comment (unnamed)**

How could you make a decision with 6 people that affects families and their livelihood?

**General Comment (unnamed)**

You talked about land acquisition with the road I'm gathering you're not acquiring any land down there. As I understand that from previous conversation that you need 40 metres to make the road, I measured between the two fence lines and its 30 metres.

**Geolyse Response**

The concept of a line that fits within that road reserve so I can only assume that little impact.

**Councillor Comment**

The road reserve was measured in submission

**Geolyse Response**

The traffic assessment goes into that in quite a bit of detail and you can see the recommendation that have been made in terms of the road corridor width and the need for parking, turning lanes coming off the bypass so people can safely enter their properties. All those recommendations are included in the traffic report. Providing safe intersections.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The traffic report is in your draft, isn't it?

**Geolyse Response**

It certainly is.

**Public Comment – Warwick Sutton**

There are a lot of efforts gone into environmental impacts but there hasn't really been any thought put in the impact of the people who have new homes in a very strict standard who have got a little bit of land around them and there have been some pretty smart homes built and it just seems to me, which I can see aren't your thoughts, if you want to cross the river by all means do it, why wouldn't you go straight down Boorowa Road it is an existing highway, from the bridge right back down to the tennis courts, there are no homes either side of the road, there is a golf course and sporting fields and then turn left onto Grenfell Road which is an existing highway. I just don't understand why we would want to spend all the money to go down Boundary Road and Airport Road when we've got existing roads there ready to go. The impact on the people who have built homes in that area, it just doesn't show any thought put in towards that. I think that's really disappointing because the people have paid money to build really nice homes.

**Geolyse Response**

I take your point and I can only reiterate that we have been asked to assess the route but I will take exception to the fact that we have looked in a lot of detail the environmental impacts and the environmental impacts include things like air quality, noise and those sorts of things that are specifically aimed at making sure the amenity of peoples properties is unfairly diminished. So those things are considered.

**Public Comment – Warwick Sutton**

There are 19 driveways coming out now from Boundary Road we are on the top side of it so we can see both sides but I can tell you the neighbours either side of us have no idea what's coming up from the other side of the hill.

**Geolyse Response**

That's the rationale for a turning lane to be provided at the edge of the travelling lanes.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The red line (on presentation) is the basic route. Council can probably answer this better, the minor details of alignment are yet to be settled. We are on the corner of Parkes and Campbell so when we exit our driveway we are going to get cleaned up by another vehicle or something like that. Could there be a turning lane put in or something like that.

**Geolyse Response**

That's the recommendation in the traffic assessment that there be sufficient width at the edge of travel lanes so you can pull off at the edge or pull out safely to enter the traffic lane.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

My driveway is also facing Campbell Street, so I am wondering if we are going to get a service lane. The green one is acquisition to our property, they could go a little bit further east.

**Geolyse Response**

That's what I was saying a minute ago, that was the point I made. All those properties along there, the amount of impact in some instances is 50 centimetres. The road reserve is anticipated and that's essentially because the concept line was put down to the line of best fit with an adopted standard width. The reality is the detailed design will look at that and say well that's not logical. It's so much effort to acquire land and so much effort to deal with land owners, you want to minimise that to the greatest extent possible.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

So at the moment there is no shoulder what so ever, the traffic that comes down from the Lachlan Valley Railway and Campbell Street from the depot, they hug our driveway. It's just that it's a dead end at the moment so it's nice and quiet.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

There was a message up there earlier about the impact over 20 years. I can see in 15 or 20 years' time it could be residential where we are and all of a sudden they say there's going to be a bypass in here. That's what has to be put in now or send it out. You can't have a bypass going through a residential area. I know speaking from personal experience, when I bought that block the local people said to me you will never ever see that develop in your lifetime, that was the thought and the attitude of the local people and I don't think we're looking far enough ahead, I think we need to look a long way ahead and do it for 50 or 60 years

**Geolyse Response**

It's a reoccurring theme that we've had through the public consultation process.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

With Airport Road if you need 40 metres, which way are they going to go? Are they going to go out onto the airport and take land down there?

**Geolyse Response**

At the moment it fits within the road corridor that exists.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

So I imagine areas where they take out the lumps and fill up the holes and fix Airport Road so it's a nice flat road.

**Geolyse Response**

If you look at the concept alignment it's actually got some cross sections and in a lot of areas along Airport and Boundary Road it actually shows minor filling.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

If there is some cut away as is going to happen in our particular case, then we're going to have to cut back into our land to make a driveway flat enough to be able to get trucks in.

**Geolyse Response**

Well that will be part of the construction process.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

But once it hits that part it's too late.

**Geolyse Response**

The detailed design needs to deal with that. It's not something that's ignored, you don't design the road and ignore access to the property.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The other thing is I had a letter from Russel Turner back in 2000 congratulating Cowra Shire for accepting the design of a bypass and hoping to see it finished by 2010 and that bypass went right out around the outside of the town. Why was that not carried on? The price on this one is so far out of whack it doesn't matter, if they could do that one for under twice the price.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The route went down past the abattoir somewhere.

**Councillor Comment**

They were look at the rail and going out past Wyangala Road, that's the only one I am aware of.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

This one went down Sydney Road, across the paddock.

**Council Comment**

Was that done by Graham Dunn was it? Graham Dunn did one of his own back, I dunno if that ended up being agreed.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

You have said a couple of times here that Council got a view of this before we did, so what did Council get that we didn't?

**Geolyse Response**

Very little, the only thing that has changed in the intervening period was the Aboriginal heritage cultural assessment went out to the registered aboriginal parties and came back with some comments so we updated it. We changed the title page to say June, there is very little that has changed.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Are any councillors being affected by this land acquisition?

**Geolyse Response**

That lot there (shown on presentation) is owned by a councillor.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

His house isn't there though.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

That land is going to be acquired?

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

By a councillor or Council?

**Geolyse Response**

As far as I understand it is owned by a Councillor. And there will be a need to acquire a road reserve width along the parallel to the railway line.

**Council Comment – Mayor Bill West**

I think apart from one Councillor who owns land that is not residential no other Councillors has any interest in land, houses or assets on that route.

**Public Comment**

They aren't on that route and that's why they aren't upset about it.

**Council Comment – Mayor Bill West**

I just draw a line at the fact that Councillors don't care or aren't interested and I think the fact that we have had this public meeting again which we promised we would do before it went to public exhibition to give you a chance to comment is a display of good faith. Let's let the process go through. Please make your observations and responses to the draft REF.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

At the first meeting here you chose this particular route, and you said this is just preliminary and we are open to suggestions to other routes. We have actually come we have spoken about coming in a northern route and coming in the tip road to the northern road, one bridge across coming in there hugging inside the racecourse, putting a big round-a-bout are McDonalds, we approached the tennis court, we approached the golf club that would connect to Canowindra Road and all the infrastructure. Before I got the words out of my mouth you said no it wouldn't be viable so you don't care, mate. This is what we're getting from you guys, you just don't care. We're talking about a vote of people. Smile then, its fine, but you just don't care.

**Public Comment – Ken Anning**

Bill I proved to you. I came to you with going through that first document how you said that Council said in there specifically that it shows that this route due to being cost effective, compared to the Northern route. Then I went further than that and went through and you hadn't even purchased Mr Mallon's land yet. Acquisition up there and put curb and guttering in, so you can't put apples with apples. Just like your truck statistics that were supplied by Cowra Council. I produced documents from two local highway patrols and I'm a paramedic myself, and in that time frame there wasn't one truck accident. So this is all forged right through and you wonder why we're getting upset with it.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

On Campbell Street you're talking about the bridge off Campbell Street, at the last meeting it was just going to be a culvert.

**Geolyse Response**

That's still the case.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

What happens if it floods? We have a massive flood in 2011, it came two thirds of the way up our paddock. What's going to happen if it's just a culvert?

**Geolyse Response**

There will need to be a reasonable amount of work done there and the requirement is that it has to maintain the existing level of capacity. If you look at the concept it's a fairly large culvert from looking at the plans. It does need to be detail designed, the recommendation in the REF is that the flow level that currently exists needs to be maintained, if it can't be maintained then that assumption has to be revisited. So the detailed design will look at it and if it can't achieve that level then they will need to come back to it.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

How come there is a big area of green near the road? (On presentation)

**Geolyse Response**

These are the lots, the entirety of the lots that the alignment passes through in way, shape or form, even if we only encroach it by 50 centimetres. We've shown the whole lot because if we didn't you

wouldn't be able to see it all. It is showing the lot that would be affected by acquisition, not that the entirety of those lots would be acquired.



**Public Comment (unnamed)**

You're showing the potential land acquisition and you've coloured all that big area in green.

**Geolyse Response**

Look I apologise if there is any confusion but I can clear up without showing a doubt that it's not the intention to acquire all those lots and all of that land will not be acquired, the minimum necessary will be acquired.

**Public Comment – Gary Byrnes**

You mentioned the corner of Airport and Boundary Road, you have to knock down a few squeaky gums there.

**Geolyse Response**

No, if we acquire that land we would not need to knock them down.

**Public Comment – Gary Byrnes**

What about all the nice ironbark's all the way down Airport Road, they will have to go? Council has a hissy fit if you want to cut a tree down and they're cutting them down and if that goes ahead you will have to take the whole lot out.

**Geolyse Response**

Again I would have to look at the detailed design. The ecological assessment goes through that section and walked the whole route and looked at impact so it is dealt with in the ecological assessment.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Have you been up the route lately?

**Geolyse Response**

Not since I first came out here.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Well their putting a new development at the airport. What about the new development started at the airport?

**Geolyse response**

Well similar to all the individual properties the access into that would need to be designed in the detailed design the same way as all the properties are affected.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Well that DA for the development at the airport has already been before the RMS and they've drawn up intersections at Grenfell Road. The traffic has already been factored in to what's going on there.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

It would appear to me that maybe that's why they've been existing on the Boundary Road and Airport Road to fit in with the new industrial subdivision.

**Public Comment – Allan?**

You're talking about noise, where did you take the noise level from?

**Geolyse Response**

There was one outside ... Campbell Street, there was one outside the property around this corner, and there was another one somewhere just here (shown on presentation) near the industrial area.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I don't understand that because if it's a heavy vehicle route that noise level you took would mean jack crap because you're going to have heavy vehicles going up there so the noise level you took, for me, is irrelevant, it's got nothing to do with the bypass.

**Geolyse Response**

Well the purpose of taking the noise level reading is to find out what the current noise level at that property is and then the modelled impact level is compared to the current level. So there is no point in taking readings on a completely different road that is currently affected by heavy vehicles because that doesn't tell us anything about what the level of impact is going to be to the route alone. So the purpose of putting monitoring locations on the alignment is to find out what the current noise levels are so that we can compare the future levels to this.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I disagree with that because you said a while ago that every intersection is going to be a round-a-about, is that correct?

**Geolyse Response**

The majority of the ones on the main road will be round-a-bouts, well that's the recommendation.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

So therefore every heavy vehicle coming in there now will be on the compression break so the noise level goes sky high.

**Geolyse Response**

So again, there is a need for a construction noise and vibration management plan and that would need to look at the detail design and update the model. That will happen as part of the detailed design process. It's not that this was done in isolation, it was done on the basis of concept and it will be done on the basis of detailed design.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I have come and sat here and listened to everyone. I live on Boundary Road with everyone else. Even if I didn't live on Boundary Road I can't see the sense of this bypass. I can't understand why they didn't take the land way up further on Sydney Road, take the paddock and then go all the way around and then as everyone else said, stop on Taboowra Road and then it doesn't really effect anyone. I can't understand why Council would do it and if there are any Councillors that lived on this route would they pass it? Because I don't think they would.

**Geolyse Response**

I can't comment on that.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

No, I know you can't comment. They say that they listen and that they take into account everything that they say and I don't believe that they do. I think that they've got it set and that they just do it whichever way that it's going to happen and I've got a son who catches the bus on Boundary Road, he's 12, so I don't know he may be already left school by the time this is over, but Ken Anning has two little kids and there's more little kids that are going to come. You cannot physically see any trucks, busses, whatever, from my house as they come over the hill so I just see an accident waiting to happen and to the poor person that it happens to it will be absolutely devastating. It just doesn't work. Not at all. Not for anybody.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

They're putting lives at risk.

**Geolyse Response**

I encourage all of you to read the document, there will be areas that you're interested in and areas that you're not. I do encourage you to look straight to the section where we dealt with public comments and that will direct you to the area in the REF and if you are or aren't satisfied with what's written please let us know.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I realise that but also it was said at the previous meeting that they'd have bus stops on main roads. We didn't buy our home on a main highway, we bought it on a country road so it was nice and safe for our son to grow up on.

**Geolyse Response**

Any perception that this is going to be a highway with 100 or 110 kilometre speed limit is

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

But what are trucks going to do? Trucks aren't going to slow down, they are coming across all the main highways. They're not going to be able to slow down sufficiently to go on a round-a-bout.

**Geolyse Response**

The recommended speed in the traffic assessment is between 60 and 70 km.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I see trucks going down Boundary Road and I reckon they would be doing about 80 or 100 now.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

There is definitely going to be a death on that road.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Yes, there already has been.

**Geolyse Response**

The details are in the draft report, you can see it for yourself. Have a look and comment.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Most of the trucks that come in from the west could probably go down Boorowa Road.

**Geolyse Response**

There is quite a detailed model of where traffic is coming from and going to.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

There won't be much going down Boundary Road and Airport Road that way.

**Geolyse Response**

Have a look at the number that are there. There is a very detailed model of where traffic is coming from and going to.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Why have they not taken their noise levels from coming up from the airport and at the top of the hill on Boundary Road? That's where the most noise is going to generate.

**Geolyse Response**

As I said, that would make it counter intuitive. You wouldn't want us to find that the current noise level is very high because that would make it easier for us to justify that more noise is going to be acceptable. The best outcome in a noise assessment is that the current noise levels are very low and in that way any difference in them is going to be apparent and there will be a significant impact.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

The noise assessment is done at both levels, at what point are we going to say there is going to be unacceptable or high levels of truck noises? If it becomes a bypass and if heavy vehicles start using it they will be using exhaust brakes they will be accelerating at round-a-bouts and so forth. When we come to detailed design when do we pick that up?

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

What is an acceptable level?

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I'm not even going to say what's acceptable, because acceptable in my mind might be different to another person's mind. There is going to be more trucks on it so at what point do we assess impact of the exhaust brakes, accelerating and so forth.

**Geolyse Response**

That's assessed in the model. That's the point of the model.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

It affects everyone in Campbell Street, so are you going to put a noise wall along Campbell Street to stop the noise?

**Geolyse Response**

It's not recommended.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

I know it's not recommended but they are going to come up the Darby's Falls Road and there is going to be a round-a-bout so the engine break goes on, everything goes on, so all those people that are living within 300-400 yards on the Sydney side on Campbell Street are going to hear that noise and when they going through the round-a-bout on the other side going towards Parkes Street their going to hear the motors of the truck changing gears. I mentioned this at the start of the meeting last time, you wouldn't have all these people here if you took the road back up Sydney Road, or through Mr Johnson's place, you've got virtually the same route but you're not affecting the houses in this area. And that's me, I'm talking about me. I can't help the people on Boundary Road. The people on Boundary Road have the right idea to send the traffic back down Boorowa Road, onto the Grenfell Road, it doesn't affect, there are sporting ovals, there's a golf course, there is no one living there. If you're going to have a truck bypass why go up through the mission, why go up through Boundary Road and Airport Road? Send them down the Boorowa Road and onto the Grenfell Road, they go up the Young Road and there are no houses there. You wouldn't have any of these people here whinging and carrying on. And I'm one of the biggest whingers because it is going to go through my house and that's why I'm here because I want to know, is this a two year thing, a five year thing, a twenty year thing? No one can tell me you're going to build it.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Do you have any idea of when it's going to happen?

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

So were all here getting upset about something that might not happen in our lifetime?

**Public Comment – Barry?**

I've been 50 years in the transport industry operating heavy trucks and on that route there is a lot of hard pulling and hard breaking, this is where the excessive noise is going to come into play. You've got uphill from Grenfell Road, up Airport Road. Then you turn into Boundary Road and you've got uphill along Boundary Road and downhill to the Young Road and everything in reverse going the other way and this is where the noise is going to be unbearable with breaking and trucks pulling harder. I live on the corner of ... and they're still pulling hard coming up Airport Road from Grenfell Road at our place and I can hear them still pulling up the hill on Boundary Road from my place.

**Geolyse Response (unnamed)**

I encourage you to read the noise assessment and form your own conclusion.

**Public Comment – Craig Fisher**

Once the bypass is built and the main street is still designated as an RTA road, what's stopping a truck coming straight through the main street and going straight through Grenfell Road, Boorowa Road and not worrying about the bypass because it's just too much hard work?

**Geolyse Response**

Nothing, unless Council lobby RMS to take off the restricted access vehicle route designation.

**Public Comment – Craig Fisher**

But the trucks that need to use the Canowindra Road are still going to have to come down the main street.

**Councillor comment**

There are actually stages, this is the first stage of the round-a-bout plan. There is still a northern plan.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

How did you come to a conclusion to put a round-a-bout on the Darby's Falls intersection?

**Geolyse Response**

That is a regional road from RMS perspective and they expect that their roads will maintain priority and the only way of achieving that is to put a round-a-bout.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Will the design of the round-a-bout be similar to the latest one they put in in Wagga? If you're going to put those in, then you're going to put in about 5 major accident stops.

**Geolyse Response**

The design I have seen in recent years of round-a-bouts have a built in flatter section so that the longer heavy vehicles can cut in and over the round-a-bout.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

That's about 5 degrees. You get a cattle truck going through there at 5 degrees and something goes wrong and you've got one coming down the hill past the mission at the moment to go under the bridge and he rolls over he will clean those pylons up from the bridge.

**Geolyse Response**

There is a lot of design work that needs to be looked at.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

From Campbell Street to Grenfell Road is a waste of time and a waste of money and a waste of the hassle we have done for it. Maybe Bill or one of the Councillors can answer this for me, how much money have we spent on this project so far?

**Geolyse Response**

This was discussed and disclosed to the last meeting in terms of our engagement fee, which is part of the public record information .

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

You're just moving a risk from the CBD into a residential area. Kendall Street is the designated highway, and now you're shifting the noise, pollution, dust and everything into the residential area. I can see the point of a bypass for Cowra, it will need it eventually but a proper bypass. The northern route when we had the GHD thing and there were the three options the ring road, the southern and the shorter circuit of that, why not just build the northern part of that?

**Councillor Response**

The reason why I put the intersection first is because it picks up the three highways where the major part of the traffic is. You have one road of Canowindra Road which is only picking up one road with the Northern Road. This will pick up the Boorowa, Young and the Sydney Road traffic. You have three major traffic if you're going through this and I felt this was the simplest first one to go and whatever we do, were doing planning now. We have probably spent \$250,000 on this, it is called planning for the future and making a decision now as you have all said in 50 or 60 years' time when we need something. To go out past the abattoir now is not going to be cost effective. The trucks could come up and go round there legally now and they don't cause trouble. But the other trucks are going to cause trouble and we have tried to make a safer road for those other trucks.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Going down Boorowa Road, I would like to see the money that could be saved with Airport Road and Boundary Road. You could build a proper truck stop with facilities and encourage the trucks to come there and spend their money.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

And those other roads are already highways.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Thank you David for coming to explain to everybody because it has taken some time. I am curious that this project meets the Council objects. I am just wondering that perhaps Council will say it meets the objectives but let's prove it's impossible to do because the people who are here and the information that people have given the council it shouldn't go ahead. So your object might be to prove that it's not possible.

**Geolyse Response**

Your comments will be taken into account and I will reiterate that I do encourage you all to ring or write or email if you want to make your thoughts more known then please do so. We will certainly take them into account and they will be included in the document if you have to opportunity to review it. If you have any questions you can call and speak to us.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

When does all this start?

**Geolyse Response**

First of July it will become public and it will be public for 28 days.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Where at?

**Councillor Response**

It will go in the Council agenda hopefully next Wednesday that's when it becomes Public. We indicated earlier that we are happy to do thumb drives because it is a fairly big file and you can take it home and review it yourself. If you have any questions David and Council staff will be happy to answer them. As far as Council is concerned we have got a fair way to go yet. We appreciate the concerns of the residents. I take John's point that there has got to be fair compensation.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Basically what the Council has to do is replace the same amount of land and the same amount of buildings at least.

**Public Comment (unnamed)**

Where is the display going to be?

**Councillor Response**

It will be on Council's website, we have a couple of copies in the front foyer at Council and we can provide you with a thumb drive.

**Councillor Comment**

I would urge people to act on the purpose of this meeting with matters made quickly that they may or may not agree with and the second stage of the exercise, if they then agree with the route that is selected then address that issue as a separate thing. This first thing is addressing this report.

**Geolyse Response**

I do reiterate that because whilst the comments regarding the route will be included there is very little we can say in terms of our assessment. So it is best to separate the issues and direct any comments in terms of the route to Council, they would be best placed to respond to it.

**Councillor Farewell**

Thank you everybody. There is an attendance sheet going around if you could sign. Thank you very much and I think we made it clear to what the process is. If you have any comments about what the process is ring us or chase us or talk to us about that.

Meeting Close: 7:04pm