

## 5 Consultation

---

This chapter provides an overview of the consultation activities that have been, and will continue to be, carried out for the proposal.

Roads and Maritime considers meaningful and engaging community consultation an essential component of the proposal. Community and stakeholder engagement for the proposal has been prepared in accordance with:

- *Community engagement and communications: A resource manual for staff 2012* (Roads and Maritime, 2012).
- *Community engagement policy statement* (Roads and Maritime, 2012).
- *International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation* (IAP2, 2007).

Community and stakeholder engagement for the Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong and Bomaderry started in March 2006, through a series of community workshops and information days. In November 2007, Roads and Maritime displayed the route options and in June 2009 announced the preferred option. Since June 2009, the planning and construction of the Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong and Bomaderry has been carried out as three separate projects:

- Gerringong upgrade, Mount Pleasant to Toolijooa Road.
- Foxground and Berry bypass, Toolijooa Road to Schofields Lane.
- Berry to Bomaderry upgrade, Schofields Lane to Cambewarra Road.

Community consultation for the proposal, since the publication of a preliminary concept design in April 2012 has included:

- Telephone calls to 44 potentially directly impacted and 17 adjacent property owners along the proposal to advise them of the availability of the preliminary concept design for comment at the project office in Berry or from the project website.
- Letter to the householder and email notification to registered stakeholders to advise the availability of the preliminary concept design for comment.
- Three community focus group meetings attended by 76 (total) community members to provide an overview of the upgrade features and capture specific feedback from potentially impacted property owners and the broader community.
- A community information session attended by 20 community members to discuss opportunities and constraints associated with the development of the preliminary concept design.
- A community information session attended by 40 community members to discuss the proposed heavy vehicle rest area (now excluded from the proposal) and inspection bay.
- Meetings with Shoalhaven City Council (staff and elected council) and Transport for NSW.
- Interviews with 24 potentially directly impacted and seven adjacent property owners to discuss the preliminary concept design. Issues raised included property acquisition, local road and property access, heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay, noise and visual impacts, business impacts, drainage and run-off, heritage impacts, road safety (crashes) and noise attenuation.
- Meeting with residents and the local member to discuss the proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay (now excluded from the proposal) to be located at Meroo Meadow.

- Meeting with residents to discuss the proposed access arrangements for O'Keefes Lane.
- Two Aboriginal Focus Group (AFG) meetings.
- ISEPP consultation with Shoalhaven City Council.
- Letter to the householder and email notification to registered stakeholders to advise the availability of the refined concept design and design changes resulting from community feedback.
- Interviews with four potentially directly impacted and five adjacent property owners to discuss the refined concept design and design changes resulting from community feedback.
- Meeting with residents to discuss the proposed intersection and access arrangements for Strongs Road.
- Meeting with residents and the local member to discuss the proposed access arrangements for Boxsells Lane.
- Meeting with residents and the local member to discuss the proposed access arrangements for Croziers Road.

An overview of the consultation process and key activities carried out to date is provided in **Table 5-1**. Details for these consultation activities, including dates, locations and times can be found in Section 1.0 of **Appendix B**.

## 5.1 Consultation objectives and strategy

### 5.1.1 Consultation objectives

Community and stakeholder engagement aims to provide genuine opportunities for community and stakeholder involvement. Community consultation is guided by the following established consultation objectives:

- Update and inform the community on the review of environmental factors, submissions process and determination for the proposal.
- Address community and stakeholder concerns regarding potential issues such as changed access arrangements, traffic flow, location of the heavy vehicle inspection bay, environmental, social, economic and construction impacts.
- Maintain and build on relationships with the community, interest groups and stakeholders through access to the project team and regular targeted and timely communication, providing plain English information including visual and animated formats.
- Build community understanding and acceptance of the decision making process including proposal phases, implementation strategy and influencers, such as funding allocations, to manage expectations around proposal delivery times.
- Continue to foster understanding and acceptance of the broader objectives and benefits of the proposal for the local community and the wider South Coast region.
- Encourage community and stakeholder participation in the environmental impact assessment process.
- Proactively engage and consult with relevant stakeholders through targeted briefings and interviews to gain their input, build positive working relationships and strengthen the environmental impact assessment process and proposal credibility.

- Support potentially directly impacted property owners with proactive communication about concept design impacts, proposal determination and the property acquisition process. Provide a range of contact and engagement opportunities during the review of environmental factors display period and continue to provide access to the project team, maintaining a close working relationship on the proposal.

### 5.1.2 Consultation strategy

Community involvement has been an integral component in the development of the proposal. At each stage, Roads and Maritime has proactively engaged the community and stakeholders to increase public understanding of, and participation in, the development of the proposal. The proposal has benefited from the input of local knowledge provided through community engagement, which has helped identify issues, potential mitigation strategies and opportunities to improve proposal outcomes.

Based on the *IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum (2007)* the Community Involvement Plan has and will continue to be designed to inform and consult with the community and stakeholders in a constructive and transparent manner.

## 5.2 Consultation process and activities to date

### 5.2.1 Stakeholders

Stakeholders were identified from consideration of the proposal's potential direct and indirect impacts and from records of past and current contact with relevant government agencies, Princes Highway upgrade stakeholders and interest groups.

Stakeholders were grouped into the following categories:

- Potentially directly impacted property owners.
- Property owners who live adjacent to the proposal.
- Interest groups, such as community, business owners and business groups.
- The Aboriginal community and Local Aboriginal Land Councils.
- Government and non-government agencies.
- The wider community.

A list of stakeholder groups that have been consulted is provided in Table B-13 of **Appendix B**.

## 5.2.2 Consultation program tools

The following is a summary of the communication and consultation tools established for use across the life of the proposal. Roads and Maritime selected and designed these tools guided by consultation with the community from proposal commencement at the initial May 2006 workshops. These tools have been tailored to meet the current needs of the proposal and will continue to be evaluated for effectiveness through future stages of the proposal. They include:

- Project office at Broughton Court, 3/113 Queen Street, Berry. The project office is staffed various days and times during display periods. During the remainder of the year the project office is staffed Fridays 10am - 5pm (excluding public holidays) or by appointment.
- Toll free community information line (1800 506 976).
- Email address ([berrytobomaderryupgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au](mailto:berrytobomaderryupgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au)).
- Website ([www.rms.nsw.gov.au/bbu](http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/bbu)).
- Stakeholder database (Consultation Manager) used to record all correspondence relevant to the proposal, including contact details and issues raised during the life of the proposal.
- Emails to those registered on the stakeholder database.
- Community update newsletters, letters to the householder and correspondence (addressed, un-addressed and delivered).
- Community information sessions.
- Have your say forms.
- Face-to-face meetings with potentially directly impacted property owners, adjacent property owners and the wider community.
- Public issues register.
- Information displays (staffed and un-staffed).
- Advertisements in the local press and local radio announcements.
- Variable message signs.

Table 5-1 Overview of consultation process and activities to date

Project phase	Activity undertaken by Roads and Maritime	Outcomes
<p><b>Gerringong to Bomaderry Princes Highway upgrade - March 2006 to August 2007</b></p> <p><b>Project familiarisation and route option development</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation conducted for project familiarisation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>March 2006</b> - the first community update announced the commencement of the Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong and Bomaderry and invited community involvement in the options and route selection process.</li> <li><b>May 2006</b> - the first workshops and displays for the Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong and Bomaderry focused on working with the community and stakeholders to establish a set of principles to guide the consultation process and the selection of communication tools.</li> <li><b>September 2006</b> - a planning focus meeting was held attended by representatives of key government agencies, local councils, utility companies and the emergency services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Consultation conducted as part of the route options selection study included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>February 2007</b> - community information sessions.</li> <li><b>February 2007</b> and <b>March 2007</b> - meetings with Illawarra, Nowra and Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Councils.</li> <li><b>April 2007</b> - interest group workshop.</li> <li><b>April 2007</b> - meetings with Kiama Municipal and Shoalhaven City councils.</li> <li><b>August 2007</b> - specialist information sessions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Specific activity details are reported in Table B-1 of <b>Appendix B</b>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation identified local priorities for the Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong and Bomaderry and what was valued by the community. The results are documented in the <i>Community Consultation Report</i> (RTA, 2006). This report is available on the project website.</li> <li>The community and stakeholder perspectives of the options and selection of the short list of options are documented in the <i>Route Options Development Report</i> (RTA, 2007). This report is available on the project website.</li> </ul>

Project phase	Activity	Outcomes
<p><b>Gerringong to Bomaderry Princes Highway upgrade - November 2007 to July 2008</b></p> <p><b>Route options display and value management workshop</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>November 2007</b> - the shortlisted route options between Gerringong and Bomaderry were displayed for public comment from 26 November 2007 to 29 February 2008.</li> <li><b>May 2008</b> - representatives of key government agencies, local councils, the emergency services, the Aboriginal community and the project urban and rural communities attended the route options value management workshop. Attendees reviewed the outcomes of investigations undertaken to date and recommended a direction for further investigation to progress the project development.</li> </ul> <p>(Specific activity details are reported in Table B-2 of <b>Appendix B</b>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community participation during the public display period resulted in 996 submissions being received. These are documented in the <i>Route Options Submissions Report</i> (RTA, 2008). This report is available on the project website.</li> <li>Community feedback from the public display highlighted the importance of the Berry access arrangements. As a result, a commitment was made to undertake community consultation on the access options for Berry and a value management study to assist in the development and selection of the Berry access arrangements.</li> <li>Workshop details are published in the <i>Value Management Workshop Report</i> (RTA, 2008). This report is available on the project website.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Gerringong to Bomaderry Princes Highway upgrade - October 2008 to December 2008</b></p> <p><b>Preferred option and Berry access options display and value management workshop</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>October 2008</b> - the NSW Government announced the preferred option between Gerringong and Bomaderry and the Berry access options. These were placed on public display from 13 October 2008 to 13 November 2008. The preferred option excluded a section through Toolijooa ridge which required further investigation.</li> <li><b>November 2008</b> - an access value management workshop was held with key stakeholders and community members. The workshop was attended by representatives of key government agencies, local councils, the Aboriginal community and the project urban and rural communities.</li> </ul> <p>(Specific activity details are reported in Table B-3 of <b>Appendix B</b>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community participation during the public display period resulted in 303 submissions being received which are documented in the <i>Access Options Submissions Summary Report</i> (RTA, 2009). This report is available on the project website.</li> <li>The community highlighted the importance of flood free access north and south of Berry during the access value management workshop. Details of the workshop are documented in the <i>Access Value Management Workshop Report</i> (RTA, 2009). This report is available on the project website.</li> </ul>

Project phase	Activity	Outcomes
<p><b>Gerringong to Bomaderry Princes Highway upgrade - June 2009</b></p> <p><b>Preferred option and preferred access options announced</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>June 2009</b> - the preferred option with the preferred access arrangements for Berry was finalised. The finalised preferred option was publicly displayed from 15 June 2009 to 26 June 2009.</li> <li>• <b>November 2009</b> - community update with arrangements for local road and property access. (Specific activity details are reported in Table B-4 of <b>Appendix B</b>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of design developments for the Berry access arrangements (arising since the access value management workshop) was published in the <i>Gerringong and Berry Preferred Access Arrangements Report</i> (RTA, 2009). The report is available on the project website.</li> <li>• A summary of findings on the investigations and analysis of the Toolijooa ridge options was published in the <i>Toolijooa Ridge Preferred Option Report</i> (RTA, 2009). This report is available on the project website</li> </ul>
<p><b>Berry to Bomaderry upgrade April 2012 to June 2012</b></p> <p><b>Preliminary concept design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>13 April 2012</b> - the project team telephoned 44 potentially directly impacted and 17 adjacent property owners to advise the availability of the preliminary concept design for comment.</li> <li>• <b>19 April 2012</b> - householder letter sent to 3000 residences in the study area advising the availability of the preliminary concept design for comment.</li> <li>• <b>19 April 2012</b> - letter sent to Shoalhaven City Council informing Council the preliminary concept design was available for comment.</li> <li>• <b>24 April 2012</b> - potentially directly impacted and adjacent property owners were invited to attend a series of focus group meetings.</li> <li>• <b>1, 3 and 10 May 2012</b> - a series of focus group meetings were held to present an overview of the proposal features, including the proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay near Meroo Meadow, changes to bus collection and drop-off arrangements and discussion on environmental issues and impact on road users.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team received 40 comments through 'have your say forms', emails and meetings with property owners. Issues raised were recorded in an issues register which is available on the project website.</li> <li>• A refined concept design was published in March 2013 following feedback received on the preliminary concept design. The refined concept design included a number of changes suggested during community discussion at the focus group meetings.</li> </ul>

Project phase	Activity	Outcomes
<p><b>Berry to Bomaderry upgrade April 2012 to July 2012</b></p> <p><b>Preliminary concept design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>28 May 2012</b> - householder letter sent to 3000 residences in the study area advising of an additional focus group meeting and a community information session to discuss the then proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay near Meroo Meadow.</li> <li>• <b>7 June 2012</b> - focus group meeting held to provide an overview of the proposal with the same content as the three focus group meetings held in May.</li> <li>• <b>21 June 2012</b> - community information session held to discuss the then proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay near Meroo Meadow.</li> <li>• <b>26 June 2012</b> - AFG meeting attended by registered Aboriginal representatives.</li> <li>• <b>11 July 2012</b> - meeting with residents and the local member to discuss the then proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay near Meroo Meadow (now excluded from the proposal).</li> <li>• <b>11 July 2012</b> - meeting with residents to discuss proposed access arrangements for O'Keefes Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In March 2013, Roads and Maritime announced the removal of the proposed heavy vehicle rest area from the proposal and the relocation of the heavy vehicle inspection bay to an alternative site at Jaspers Brush.</li> <li>• Priorities for the local Aboriginal community were identified.</li> </ul>

Project phase	Activity	Outcomes
<p><b>Berry to Bomaderry upgrade – February 2013 to March 2013</b></p> <p><b>Refined concept design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>21 February 2013</b> - meeting with residents to discuss proposed intersection and access arrangements for Strongs Road.</li> <li>• <b>March 2013</b> - community update sent to 3000 residences in the study area showing the refined concept design and detailing design changes resulting from community feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Email alert sent to registered stakeholders.</li> <li>- Publication of the refined concept design on the project website and at the project office in Berry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>21 March 2013</b> - Consultation undertaken with Shoalhaven City Council in accordance with clause 13 and clause 15 of ISEPP due to potential impacts on Council related infrastructure/services and flood liable land.</li> </ul>	

Project phase	Activity	Outcomes
<p><b>Berry to Bomaderry upgrade – April 2013 to October 2013</b></p> <p><b>Preparation of review of environmental factors</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>6 June 2013</b> - meeting with residents and the local member to discuss proposed access arrangements for Boxsells Lane.</li> <li>• <b>4 July 2013</b> - meeting with residents and the local member to discuss proposed access arrangements for Croziers Road.</li> <li>• <b>July 2013</b> - consultation undertaken with Shoalhaven City Council in accordance with Clause 14 of ISEPP due to potential impacts on local heritage.</li> <li>• <b>25 July 2013</b> - AFG meeting attended by registered Aboriginal representatives. Members of the AFG were sent a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for comment prior to the meeting.</li> <li>• <b>12 September 2013</b> - meeting with local and district bus services to discuss relocated bus stops and access arrangements for the proposal.</li> <li>• <b>12 September 2013</b> - meeting with local haulage companies, cattle transporters and bulk feed transporters to discuss proposed access arrangements for the proposal.</li> <li>• <b>9 October 2013</b> - residents of Croziers Road, O’Keefes Lane and the Princes Highway in the vicinity were sent a householder letter accompanied by a Q&amp;A document which addresses the questions, comments and concerns raised about Croziers Road access arrangements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of the subsurface testing and a summary of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report were presented at the AFG meeting.</li>   <li>• Community members were invited to discuss the proposed Croziers Road access arrangements with the project team at the project office in Berry on 17 October 2013. The householder letter and accompanying Q&amp;A document are available on the project website.</li> </ul>

### 5.2.3 Community and stakeholder involvement in the concept design process

Community and stakeholder feedback has been integral to the development of the concept design for the proposal. A variety of activities have been used to provide information to and gather information from the community. The methods of community input are summarised in **Table 5-2**.

**Table 5-2 Methods of communication with community and stakeholders following the publication of the preliminary concept design in April 2012<sup>1</sup>**

Feedback method	Total
Householder letter / community updates	7
Community information sessions	5
'Have your say' feedback forms received	22
Telephone calls to project information line	18
Email updates to registered stakeholders	18
Emails and letters received	106
Specific Berry to Bomaderry upgrade visits to the project office in Berry	107
Meetings with resident groups	5
Stakeholder / property owner interviews	43
Government agencies, council and interest group meetings	10
AFG meetings	2

**Table 5-3** shows the key design considerations raised by the community during consultation held in 2012 for the preliminary concept design and how these were addressed by Roads and Maritime.

---

<sup>1</sup> Current as at 15 October 2013

**Table 5-3 Summary of community feedback and changes to the preliminary concept design as a result of community feedback received in 2012**

<b>Community concerns raised about the concept design</b>	<b>How feedback was considered in the development of the concept design</b>
<p>Opposition to the location of the heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay near Meroo Meadow primarily due to its proximity to residences.</p>	<p>The proposed heavy vehicle rest area has been removed from the proposal.</p> <p>The heavy vehicle inspection bay is now proposed to be located at Jaspers Brush. The site would be operated on an as-needs basis and would be staffed as needed and locked when not in use.</p>
<p>Impacts on local property owners due to the location of the Pestells Lane intersection.</p>	<p>The proposed Pestells Lane interchange has been re-aligned slightly to the north, reducing impacts on local property owners.</p>
<p>Community requests for cyclist facilities on the upgraded highway.</p>	<p>The proposal would provide a three metre wide shoulder along its length, improving safety for cyclists. The proposal would also include shared paths for pedestrians and cyclists at the grade separated locations.</p>
<p>Request to consider providing underpasses for safe pedestrian crossing of the highway.</p>	<p>Roads and Maritime has consulted with the community and no specific locations have been identified where there appears to be a strong demand for pedestrian access across the Princes Highway.</p> <p>The proposed local road overpasses and underpasses at Strongs Road and Jaspers Brush Road, Devitts Lane and Morschels Lane, and at the interchange at Meroo Road and Pestells Lane are able to accommodate the provision of pedestrian facilities to cross the highway if needed in the future.</p> <p>While there is potential to provide underpasses associated with the bridge crossings, such crossings would be flood prone and would present a risk of directing pedestrians to a potentially unsafe crossing location. In addition, pedestrians generally avoid using underpasses due to security concerns because they are hidden from view.</p> <p>Roads and Maritime proposes to proceed with the current design.</p>

#### 5.2.4 Aboriginal community and Local Aboriginal Council involvement

Roads and Maritime has undertaken Aboriginal community consultation and investigation since proposal commencement in 2006. Up until April 2010, this consultation was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the 'Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation' (RTA, 2008) and the 'Interim Guidelines for Aboriginal Community Consultation' (Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC, 2005)).

In April 2010, the OEH published the 'Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents' (DECCW, 2010). These replaced the 'Interim Guidelines for Aboriginal Community Consultation' (DEC, 2005).

In consultation with OEH, Roads and Maritime transitioned to and has substantially complied with the 2010 guidelines since their commencement. For example, the 2010 guidelines contain some different and additional requirements for consultation, including different advertising and notification requirements for inviting Aboriginal community involvement in the proposal. Consequently, in accordance with the 2010 guidelines, invitations were sent to the Aboriginal community and other relevant agencies and stakeholders (who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places in the proposal area) to register their involvement in the consultation process.

Advertisements in the Illawarra Mercury (22 June 2011), National Indigenous Times (23 June 2011), South Coast Register (24 June 2011) and Koori Mail (29 June 2011) enabled additional Aboriginal stakeholders to join the AFG for the proposal.

Roads and Maritime has undertaken an ongoing, open and public consultation program with Aboriginal stakeholders since 2006. There are around 132 listed stakeholders for the proposal, a number of which represent multiple people or groups. The stakeholder list has continued to grow as the proposal has progressed.

Roads and Maritime has notified a variety of organisations about the proposal including:

- The planning, Aboriginal heritage and operations sections of OEH.
- NSW National Native Title Tribunal.
- Department of Aboriginal Affairs.
- NSW Heritage Office.
- Southern Rivers Catchment Management Authority.
- Kiama Municipal Council.
- Shellharbour City Council.
- Shoalhaven City Council.
- Wollongong City Council.
- Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- Nowra Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- Merrimans Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- Batemans Bay Local Aboriginal Land Council.
- New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council.
- Jerrinja Consultants Pty Ltd
- South Coast Aboriginal Elders and Friends Group Organisation.
- South East Coast Gadu Elders Aboriginal Corporation.
- Walbunja Aboriginal Corporation.
- NTS Corp.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents' (DECCW, 2010) and the Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation (RMS, 2012) Aboriginal stakeholder involvement has included 20 AFG meetings since mid 2006 through the planning phases of the proposal. Eight of these meetings have been held since the announcement of the preferred option for the broader Princes Highway upgrade between Gerringong to Bomaderry in June 2009; and two have been held to discuss issues specific to the alignment for the proposal. Aboriginal stakeholder consultation has also included representation at two value management workshops, specific consultation for women's business, engaging local knowledge holders and site walks to gather cultural knowledge.

Aboriginal consultation continued during site investigations, with results of subsurface testing presented to the AFG, and the environmental assessment of the proposal, including a summary and discussion on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, and will continue as the proposal progresses.

Further details of the Aboriginal consultation process and activities, including dates, locations and times can be found in Section 2.0 of **Appendix B**.

### 5.2.5 State Government agency involvement

Since the publication of the preliminary concept design for the proposal in April 2012, meetings have been held with the following government agencies and government departments. For details on all consultation undertaken with government agencies please refer to Table B-8 of **Appendix B**.

- 5 June 2012, Transport for NSW, 18 Lee Street, Chippendale.

### 5.2.6 Meetings with Shoalhaven City Council

Since the publication of the preliminary concept design in April 2012, the following meetings have been held with council staff and/or elected councillors of Shoalhaven City Council. For details on all consultation undertaken with Council please refer to **Appendix B, Table B-9**.

- 19 June 2012, Shoalhaven City Council, 42 Bridge Street, Nowra.
- 7 February 2013, Shoalhaven City Council, 42 Bridge Street, Nowra.
- 9 May 2013, Shoalhaven City Council, elected council, 42 Bridge Street, Nowra.

### 5.2.7 State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) consultation

Under clauses 13, 14 and 15 of ISEPP, Roads and Maritime is required to consult with the local council regarding potential impacts on council-related infrastructure or services, flood liable land and local heritage for a consultation period of 21 days.

Accordingly, Roads and Maritime provided Shoalhaven City Council with formal written notice of its intention to carry out the proposal in a letter dated 21 March 2013. This letter was accompanied by a detailed description of the proposal and fulfilled the requirement to consult in accordance with clauses 13 and 15.

In July 2013, Shoalhaven City Council was consulted in accordance with clause 14. A copy of the heritage assessment was provided to Council.

**Table 5-4** provides Shoalhaven City Council’s response to consultation undertaken in accordance with clauses 13, 14 and 15 of ISEPP. Shoalhaven City Council’s comments have been considered and addressed in this review of environmental factors as shown in **Table 5-4**. Where comments have been considered and a specific response is not provided in the environmental assessment for the proposal, a response is provided in **Table 5-4**.

**Table 5-4 Shoalhaven City Council's response to consultation in accordance with clauses 13, 14 and 15 of ISEPP**

<b>Issue category</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Where issue is addressed</b>
Traffic and Transport	The level of access and equity of access proposed could be considerably improved.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	The removal of right turn access at six public road junctions would result in additional travel burden to reach u-turn facilities.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	No acceleration lanes are proposed for entering the highway at left-in / left-out ‘at grade’ movements.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Right turns from the highway are only at select locations. The logic of how these were selected is questioned. For example right turns are provided into some private properties but not into public roads. Either a right turn access is acceptable or it is not. The additional travel burden and inequity of access is unreasonable.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	Northbound traffic from Nowra wishing to access properties and businesses on the east side of the highway are required to travel an unreasonable distance to a u-turn bay just south of Abernethy’s Lane to turn around. Properties and businesses on the west side of the highway would also be required to travel these unreasonable distances when travelling south.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	Residents from Abernethy’s Lane and along the highway travelling from northern origins would have to travel an unreasonable distance to the Cambewarra Road intersection to turn around. This is an unacceptable level of impact to local accessibility.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	There is inequality in the level of access proposed across the 15 public road access points, and other dwellings and businesses.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>

Issue category	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	<p>A roundabout should be constructed immediately to the north of the Caltex Station to mitigate the impacts of additional travel from the construction of a median and the removal of existing right turn movements. A roundabout would also provide appropriate traffic / speed management upon entry to the urban area and reduce the potential safety impacts from traffic conflicts at the Cambewarra Road roundabout.</p>	<p>The Caltex Service Station is located between the Cambewarra Road roundabout and the proposed u-turn facility near Abernethys Lane. These facilities would allow for vehicles to access Caltex via a u-turn and a short amount of additional travel time, which is offset by the greater safety benefits of the central median and safety barrier.</p> <p>Roundabouts are used to control traffic at the junction of two or more roads and work best where there are balanced traffic flows. The Caltex Service Station is not located at a public side road and the introduction of a roundabout on the highway would introduce additional safety risks.</p>
	<p>Roads and Maritime owned property on the western side of the highway should be linked to Pestells Lane as opposed to constructing some additional 350 metres of service road and another access to the highway.</p>	<p>In the suggested alternative, a comparable service road would need to be constructed on the Roads and Maritime owned property on the western side of the highway to link the existing house to Pestells Lane. The service road would have to cross Tullian Creek requiring the construction of a new crossing structure and would also require the clearing of existing trees and vegetation within the creek corridor.</p>
	<p>An acceleration lane for southbound traffic should be constructed at the Pestells Lane interchange to accommodate the likely re-distribution of traffic from Boxsells Lane and Pestells Lane. A southbound on-ramp would maintain levels of safety.</p>	<p><b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.3 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b></p>
	<p>A full diamond interchange at Pestells Lane and cul-de-sac of Meroo Road is preferred.</p>	<p><b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.3 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>.</p>
	<p>Pestells Lane should be upgraded to the minimum extent required under AUSTRROADS guidelines based on the forecast increased traffic demand.</p>	<p><b>Section 3.3</b></p>

Issue category	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	Roads and Maritime should contribute to the connection of Lamonds Lane and Morschels Lane to add value to the grade separated interchange at Morschels Lane and Devitts Lane. This would improve the accessibility for residents of Lamonds Lane, removing at-grade turning movements and the need for unnecessary additional travel.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	A service road linking Turners Lane to Morschels Lane should be provided. This would remove another access to the highway, resulting in marked safety benefits. Alternatively, a right turn direct into Turners Lane should be provided. No right turn into Turners Lane creates an unacceptable impact to local accessibility.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	No direct right turn access into O’Keefe’s Lane creates unacceptable impacts to local accessibility, particularly in the absence of a grade separated interchange at Croziers Road.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	A full grade separated interchange at Croziers Road would provide an improvement to accessibility, a safe local access to O’Keefe’s Lane and remove unnecessary travel and unsafe turning movements from the highway.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	Construction of a full grade separated interchange at Croziers Road, with a service road linking Mullers Lane to Croziers Road, would improve safety and accessibility.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>
	Traffic volumes indicate Croziers Road interchange usage would be in the order of a combined maximum of 420 vehicles per day. This is 93 per cent higher than the figures for the Morschels Lane and Devitts Lane interchange. Traffic originating from Croziers Road alone is 28 per cent higher volume than the combined Morschels Lane and Devitts Lane interchange.	<b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3 and Section 2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>.</b>
	Given the proximity of Andersons Lane to Mullers Lane, there is an opportunity to provide a grade separated junction with direct access from Andersons Lane and Mullers Lane. This would eliminate the need for any grade turning movements on the highway in this area, improving accessibility and safety.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.1.3</b>

Issue category	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	Traffic from Mullers Lane and the Penwood Railway travelling north are required to make a left turn onto the highway, accelerate then immediately decelerate to use the right turn bay into Croziers Road. These movements are particularly hazardous given the traffic volumes and close proximity to Croziers Road. The provision of a grade separated interchange at Croziers Road, with a separate service road to Mullers Lane would remove traffic conflicts.	<b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at Appendix C.
Noise and vibration	Hours of operation are to comply with the requirements of the EPA's Noise Control Guidelines for road construction.	<b>Section 3.4.2</b>
Terrestrial and aquatic ecology	Assessments should comply with Roads and Maritime's 'Environmental Impact Assessment Practice Note for Biodiversity Assessments and Biodiversity Guidelines for Protecting and Managing Biodiversity on RTA Proposals' which address the requirements of Section 5A of the EP&A Act.	Section 2.2 and Section 4 of the <i>Technical paper: Terrestrial flora and fauna</i> at <b>Appendix E</b>
	Assessments must take into account any assessment guidelines (Section 5a 1(b)) which includes the 'Threatened Species Assessment Guidelines', The 'Assessment of Significance Guidelines' (DECC 2007) and the 'Threatened Biodiversity Survey and Assessment Guidelines for Developments and Activities' (DEC 2004).	Appendix D of the <i>Technical paper: Terrestrial flora and fauna</i> at <b>Appendix E</b>
	Assessments must be based on the results of a targeted flora and fauna survey of threatened species with potential to occur within the study area in consideration of the DEC 2004 guidelines.	<b>Section 6.3</b>
	Vegetation to be removed and/or modified and any habitat features to be retained must be shown on engineering plans.	<b>Section 6.3.4</b>
Surface water and groundwater	Earth works methodology must strictly comply with the requirements of the <i>NSW Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> and the <i>Blue Book – Managing Urban Storm Water: Soils and Construction</i> .	<b>Section 6.4</b>

Issue category	Details	Where issue is addressed
Surface water and groundwater	Acid sulfate soil management plans may be required where soil disturbance occurs near to or in some water ways identified as having a high probability of acid sulfate soils.	<b>Section 6.11.4</b>
Flooding	The proposal must be designed to achieve flood immunity during the 1 in 100 year storm. A flooding and drainage impact assessment should be prepared to evaluate impacts on associated flooding upstream and downstream of the proposal.	<b>Section 3.2.1 and Section 6.5</b>
Non-Aboriginal heritage	Avoiding direct impact on the Meroo Union Church is supported, including avoiding the pine trees and boundary of the church.	<b>Section 6.8.4</b>
	A federation farmhouse listed as a Heritage Item in SLEP 1985 and located about 830 metres from the existing highway boundary is considered a key component in the Berry Bolong Pastoral Landscapes near Bomaderry. The environmental assessment should include an assessment of the impacts of the upgrade on this item.	<b>Section 6.8.3 and Section 6.6.2</b>
	The highway alignment should be revised to exclude the Pomona homestead, grounds and entrance gateway from the highway easement. A no-go area during construction is supported to ensure impacts are minimised.	<b>Section 6.8.4</b>
	The impact on the former Meroo Meadow School and School Master's Residence including the grounds and curtilage should be avoided. The no-go area during construction should be as large as is feasible and reasonable.	<b>Section 6.8.4</b>
	The upgrade easement should be realigned to avoid impact to the Woodbyne Hotel, its grounds and bordering vegetation. The visual screening function of the vegetation should be maintained. Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory notes that plantings at the site include a number of mature trees that are estimated to be over 100 years old (not confirmed).	<b>Section 6.8.4</b>
Air quality	Windblown dust from stock piles should be minimised.	<b>Section 6.12.4</b>

## 5.3 Summary of issues raised

Issues identified during the consultation process for the proposal by government agencies, local government, the community, Aboriginal community, Local Aboriginal Land Councils and interest groups have informed the review of environmental factors and development of the proposal. A summary of these issues and the location in this review of environmental factors report where they are addressed is provided below.

### 5.3.1 Issues raised by government agencies

Key issues and requirements raised by government agencies about the proposal are detailed in **Table 5-5**. It also identifies the section of this review of environmental factors that addresses each issue.

**Table 5-5 Issues raised by government agencies**

Issue category	Details	Where issue is addressed
<b>Transport for NSW</b>		
Traffic and transport	Effect on strategic spacing of heavy vehicle rest areas as proposed by Transport for NSW Road Network Strategy through the removal of the proposed heavy vehicle rest area from the proposal.	<b>Section 2.7.2</b>

### 5.3.2 Issues raised by local government

Issues raised by Shoalhaven City Council, in addition to those raised through the ISEPP consultation, are detailed in **Table 5-6**. **Table 5-6** also identifies the section of this review of environmental factors that addresses each issue. Where comments have been considered and a specific response is not provided in the environmental assessment for the proposal, a response is provided in **Table 5-6**.

**Table 5-6 Issues raised by local government**

<b>Issue category</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Where issue is addressed</b>
<b>Shoalhaven City Council</b>		
Traffic and transport	Provide a roundabout at Abernethys Lane.	Roundabouts work best where there are balanced traffic flows and the roads meeting at the junction are of similar road type. Also, this section of the highway has a 100 kilometre per hour speed limit. The introduction of a roundabout on the highway would introduce additional safety risks. A left in / left out intersection would be provided to access Abernethys Lane. Drivers exiting Abernethys Lane wishing to head south would be able to access the southbound lanes of the highway via the Pestells Lane half-interchange. A u-turn facility would be provided along the southbound lanes of the highway for drivers wishing to access Abernethys Lane.
	Provide on and off ramps at the Pestells Lane interchange.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.3 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b> .
	Provide a cul-de-sac at the northern end of Meroo Road, consistent with the adopted Nowra Bomaderry Structure Plan.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Provide a grade separated interchange at Croziers Road.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Provide service roads to link local roads including Mullers Lane, O'Keefes Lane and Penwood Lane to an interchange at Croziers Road.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Provide a service road to link Lamonds Lane to Morschels Lane allowing access to the underpass.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Move the overpass at Devitts Lane / Morschels Lane 330 metres north and provide service roads between Devitts Lane, Morschels Lane and Turners Lane.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Provide acceleration lanes at Lamonds Lane, Boxsells Lane, Morschels Lane, Devitts Lane, Turners Lane, O'Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush Road and Strongs Road.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b> .
	Provide three metre wide sealed shoulders for the full length of the proposal.	<b>Section 3.2</b> and <b>Section 3.3</b>
	Allow right turn movements at every side road.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>

### 5.3.3 Issues raised by the community

An issues register was established in May 2012 to gather key issues raised by the community on the preliminary concept design at community information sessions, stakeholder and property owner meetings, visits to the project office in Berry, written correspondence and calls to the community information line. The register is publicly available on the project website to include new issues raised with the project team. The register summarises issues raised and provides responses from Roads and Maritime including any proposed mitigation measures.

Issues raised by community members and local businesses about the proposal are detailed in **Table 5-7** which also identifies the section of this review of environmental factors that addresses each issue. Where comments have been considered and a specific response is not provided in the environmental assessment for the proposal, a response is provided in **Table 5-7**.

**Table 5-7 Issues raised by the community**

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Design	Consideration needs to be given to how the proposal would integrate with the existing network and the proposed future development of both Bomaderry and Nowra.	<b>Section 2.1 and Section 6.9</b>
	The proposal provides an opportunity to achieve the best result in terms of the location of the highway for the long-term future.	<b>Section 2.5</b>
	Rest areas for motorists and truck stops should be incorporated into the proposal. Consideration should be given to the provision of a 24 hour service station.	<b>Section 2.7.2</b>
	Noise, visual and emissions impacts due to the close proximity of the proposed heavy vehicle rest area and inspection bay to properties in Meroo Meadow.	<b>Section 2.7.2, Section 6.2.4, Section 6.6.3, and Section 6.12.3</b>
	The proposed northbound heavy vehicle inspection bay should be designed to have minimal impact on nearby residents.	<b>Section 3.3.9 and Section 6.6.3</b>
	Relocating the Pestells Lane / Meroo Road intersection further north to Meroo Road and narrowing the proposed road boundaries would reduce impacts on property boundaries.	<b>Section 2.7.1 and Section 6.2</b>
	Property access points / driveways are not shown on the concept design plans.	<b>Section 3.3.6 and Section 6.9.3</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Design	Provision of an overpass / underpass at the intersection of Croziers Road and the Princes Highway, allowing right turn access into and out of Croziers Road.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	How would the access to the Penwood Railway safely connect to the upgraded highway and the proposed right-turn in to Croziers Road?	<b>Section 3.3.6</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Considerable visual and noise impacts on residences located along the highway near Strongs Road from the proposed overpass.	<b>Section 6.2.4</b> and <b>Section 6.6.3</b>
	Consideration of alternatives for the Strongs Road intersection, including moving the intersection to the south of the existing entry / exit point away from the immediate vicinity of properties and driveways.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b> and <b>Section 6.9.3</b>
	Provision of a service road to connect nearby properties to Strongs Road.	<b>Section 6.9.3</b>
	Provision of a right turn bay into Boxsells Lane.	<b>Section 2.7.1</b>
	Provision of cycling facilities along the proposal.	<b>Section 3.3.1</b>
	Provision of acceleration lanes to overcome the lack of visibility over two hills at Devitts Lane and Morschels Lane, one in each direction for a distance of about 300 metres.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Establishment of access plans for emergency services along the proposal.	<b>Section 3.3.8</b>
	Construction impacts on the fibre optic cable running along frontages on Lamonds Lane.	<b>Section 3.5</b>
	A route following the railway line from Gerringong to Bomaderry would be preferred.	<b>Section 2.5.2</b>
	Impact of the proposed Nowra bypass on the proposal.	<b>Section 6.16.2</b>
Consultation process	Community involvement in the development of noise mitigation measures such as urban design and landscaping.	<b>Section 5.4.3</b>
	The current design for Strongs Road was not discussed during previous community consultation.	<b>Section 5.2.2</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	The proposal does not address the impact of heavy vehicles travelling to the Bomaderry industrial area along residential streets. Consideration should be given to re-routing heavy vehicles onto extensions of existing roads north of Bomaderry to avoid residential streets.	<p>Meroo Road and Cambewarra Road currently provide local connectivity between the highway and the Bomaderry industrial area within the traffic impact footprint of the proposal. There is currently full access between these roads and the highway which the proposal would not change. There are no connections between the highway and the eastern Bomaderry local road network in the section between Meroo Road and Cambewarra Road.</p> <p>Therefore no major change to heavy vehicle routes between the highway and the industrial area is expected. Existing issues with heavy vehicles travelling along residential streets is a local traffic management matter that is most appropriately handled by council.</p>
	Northbound trucks make use of an informal stopping opportunity on the Princes Highway north of Cambewarra Road. This will result in traffic conflicts and reduced visibility for residents trying to access the highway at these locations.	Section 3.1.1 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport at Appendix C</i>
	Potential increased congestion in Nowra, particularly on Nowra bridge following completion of the proposal.	The proposal would not generate additional traffic, but rather accommodate the predicted growth in travel demand. It is acknowledged that some existing traffic on the 'Sandtrack' would transfer to the proposal. However, the Nowra Bridge is south of the 'Sandtrack', so the volume of travel demand at this location would be the same with or without the proposal.
	How does the proposal account for predicted increased traffic volumes from vehicles currently using the 'Sandtrack'?	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport at Appendix C</i>
	Slow moving vehicles, for example tractors, may be restricted on the upgraded highway.	The proposal would increase the capacity of the Princes Highway from two lanes to a four-lane divided carriageway. The additional lane in each direction would take the pressure off slow moving vehicles by allowing faster moving vehicles to pass more easily. Only registered motor vehicles should be using the public road network including the highway.

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	Increased distance of travel and inconvenience for residents wanting to turn right in and out of Boxsells Lane.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Provision of right turn facilities at both Boxsells Lane and Lamonds Lane would reduce travel times and distance.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Inconvenience to residents of Mullers Lane from additional traffic using the southbound u-turn facility.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Safety and inconvenience of left in / left out only access at Croziers Road requiring southbound exiting traffic to travel north, merge onto the highway traffic, moving at 100 kilometres per hour, weave across two lanes of traffic, over a short distance, to enter the right turn bay at Mullers Lane. Vehicles would be required to cross a total of four lanes of traffic travelling in both directions to turn around at Mullers Lane.	<b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Left in / left out access at Croziers Road should be upgraded to allow all movements, to accommodate tourist attractions (winery) and allow commercial operators and residents ease of access.	<b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Provision for heavy vehicle turning at intersections, particularly Croziers Road, such as horse floats, milk trucks, buses and B-double trucks which currently operate locally in a commercial capacity.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b>
	Proposed u-turn facilities should be designed to accommodate heavy vehicles. Alternative is to travel to nearest intersection adding significant kilometres onto each journey.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b>
	Agricultural property accesses should be designed to accommodate delivery vehicles including milk, feed and cattle trucks.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b>
	Removal of right turn access into and out of O'Keefes Lane would result in potential traffic queues at right turn bay facilities at Mullers Lane and Jaspers Brush Road, particularly following functions at the Woodbyne Hotel.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b>
	Details should be provided on predicted local road traffic volumes at the Strongs Road overpass.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	Left in / left out only access into Boxsells Lane requires additional travel distance of 3.4 kilometres from the north via Pestells Lane and 2.4 kilometres heading south via Devitts Lane, inconveniencing residents, businesses, services (mail, garbage collection and deliveries) and a church.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the Technical Paper: Traffic and transport at Appendix C.
	Pestells Lane is currently unsealed and prone to flooding. Surface should be upgraded to a sealed road to accommodate increased traffic using the new intersection.	<b>Section 3.3.4</b>
	Provision of right turn access to the caravan park in Bomaderry for northbound traffic, including emergency vehicles, elderly residents and large vehicles (caravans, trailers etc). This would increase ease of access and reduce travel times and distance.	<b>Section 2.7.1, Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at Appendix C
	The 100 kilometre per hour speed limit would be unsafe for elderly residents crossing the road outside the caravan park in Bomaderry and for emergency vehicles accessing the property if a right turn access was included.	<b>Section 3.2</b>
	Provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes from side roads, particularly Croziers Road and O'Keefes Lane, to improve accessibility to the highway during peak traffic periods.	Technical Paper: Traffic and transport Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5
	Provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes at right turn bays to improve accessibility to the highway and reduce queues during peak traffic periods.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Data should be provided to demonstrate sufficient breaks in traffic to enable vehicles to perform safe right turns into designated u-turn facilities.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Relocation of bus stops along the alignment and ability for pedestrians / school children to access these safely.	<b>Chapter 3</b> and <b>Section 6.1.3</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Traffic and transport	<p>Provision of underpasses to enable pedestrians and school children to access bus stops on both sides of the highway.</p>	<p>Bus stops would be incorporated at three u-turn facilities; and also at the Morschels Lane / Devitts Lane and Strongs Road grade-separated facilities. The relocation of bus stops to local roads away from the main carriageway would provide safer access and drop-off facilities for local residents.</p> <p>Roads and Maritime most recently consulted with bus operators that provide bus services in the proposal area in September 2013. The operators made the comment that school bus services are very flexible and regularly change. Therefore it is almost impossible to design for all potential pick up / drop off points. The bus operators recommend that Roads and Maritime restrict drop offs / pick-ups on the highway and direct all parents to take their children to the nearest designated bus shelter.</p> <p>Roads and Maritime has consulted with the community and no specific locations have been identified where there appears to be a strong demand for pedestrian access across the Princes Highway.</p> <p>While there is potential to provide underpasses associated with the bridge crossings, such crossings would be flood prone and would present a risk of directing pedestrians to a potentially unsafe crossing location. In addition, pedestrians generally avoid using underpasses due to security concerns because they are hidden from view.</p> <p>There are no dedicated underpasses to the highway proposed for pedestrian access to the bus stop facilities.</p>
	<p>Provision of dedicated right turn lanes to some but not all businesses is unfair.</p>	<p><b>Section 2.7.1</b></p>
	<p>Concern proposed upgrade would compromise local traffic access in favour of local businesses.</p>	<p><b>Section 2.7.1</b></p>

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Where issue is addressed</b>
Traffic and transport	Safety of the community and users of the Princes Highway needs to be considered.	<b>Section 6.1.3</b> and Section 7.2.7 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
Noise and vibration	Increased traffic noise resulting from the proposal.	<b>Section 6.2.4</b>
	Increased daytime noise during construction and operation due to the elevation of the highway. This would have a negative impact on shift workers.	<b>Section 6.2.4</b>
	Elevating the highway would increase noise impacts.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b> and <b>Section 6.2.4</b>
	Noise impacts from the proposed overpass and introduction of a new local access road directly in front of properties on Strongs Road. Request for consideration of noise reduction bridge expansion joints and reduced speed limit.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b> and <b>Section 6.2.4</b>
Terrestrial ecology	Request for information on location and type of fauna crossings.	Section 6.3.4 and Section 6.1.4 of the <i>Technical paper: Terrestrial flora and fauna</i> at <b>Appendix E</b>
Surface water and groundwater	Increased highway run-off resulting from the proposal.	<b>Section 6.4.4</b> and <b>Section 6.4.5</b>
	The existing culvert at Meroo Meadow should be moved or redirected away from residences to reduce water run-off from the highway onto properties in the area.	<b>Section 3.3.7</b>
Flooding	Increased risk of flooding from water run-off due to changed conditions on local roads.	<b>Section 6.4.3</b>
	The proposal should avoid exacerbating flooding on productive agricultural land.	<b>Section 6.4</b>
Landscape character and visual amenity	Consideration of the visual impact and provision of alternative mitigation measures to noise walls.	<b>Section 6.2.4</b> and <b>Section 6.6</b>
	Reduction in privacy and amenity due to the elevation of the proposed highway and proximity of the upgraded highway road reserve to properties. Consideration should be given to screening as remediation, plants are preferable.	<b>Section 6.6</b>
	Impact on residences from light spill from the Meroo Road intersection.	<b>Section 6.6.3</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Landscape character and visual amenity	How would headlight glare from vehicles using the highway be addressed?	Headlight glare from vehicles would occur in both existing and upgraded situations. As the upgrade is primarily following the existing highway corridor it is not expected that headlight glare from vehicles using the highway would be much greater. There is a potential change to headlight glare experienced at properties next to the proposed interchanges. However, no concern has been raised for any specific property near to the interchanges.
	Visual impacts from the proposed overpass and introduction of a new local access road directly in front of properties on Strongs Road. Request for the new road alignment to remain at existing level, careful consideration of placement and design of street lighting, and screening of properties to reduce headlight glare.	<b>Section 3.2.1 and Section 6.6</b>
Non-Aboriginal heritage	Impact on heritage listed properties along the proposal alignment and proximity of the road reserve boundary.	<b>Section 6.8.3</b>
	The proposal should minimise impacts on heritage qualities.	<b>Section 6.8.4</b>
	Impact on existing views from the Meroo Union Church could reduce bookings and revenue received by the church needed to maintain this heritage building.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
Aboriginal cultural heritage	The process for the identification and assessment of Aboriginal and cultural heritage requires explanation.	<b>Section 6.7.1</b> and Appendix D of the <i>Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</i> at <b>Appendix I</b>
Land-use and property	Proposal impacts on land zoning and future development applications. An explanation on when properties need to be acquired should be provided.	<b>Section 6.9</b>
	Compensation should be provided for proposal impacts on private assets, for example entries, driveways, fences and other structures.	<b>Section 6.9</b>
	Timing and the process for property acquisition and negotiation needs to be explained.	<b>Section 6.9</b>
Socio economic	Compensation should be provided to property owners who experience indirect impacts and hardship due to a reduction in property value resulting from the proposal.	<b>Section 6.10</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Socio economic	Proposal would impact on the sale of properties in the area and would decrease property values.	<b>Section 6.10</b>
	Negative property value impacts for properties along Strongs Road due to the proposed overpass and new local access road.	<b>Section 6.10</b>
	Social costs associated with property loss should be addressed, including loss of home, lifestyle, sense of belonging, fragmentation of land and devalued property.	<b>Section 6.10</b>
	Compensation should be provided to business owners who experience a loss of revenue due to the widening of the highway (loss of land) and changes to access arrangements.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	Acquisition of the best agricultural land on a property would impact on the viability of the business.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	Prime crop, dairy and agricultural land needs to be preserved and recognised as a valuable resource.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	The rural environment should be protected for the enjoyment of current and future generations.	<b>Section 6.6</b>
	Social impacts have not been adequately considered in the concept design.	<b>Section 6.10</b>
	How would anti-social and unsafe road behaviour at the proposed u-turn bays be managed?	Lighting would be provided at the proposed u-turn and bus facilities. The concept design for the proposal shows indicative lighting arrangements. Final lighting arrangements would be determined during the detailed design phase of the proposal and would be designed to provide 'flag' standard lighting levels in accordance with 'AS/ NZS 1158 Public Lighting Code'.
	Safe, convenient access and the maintenance of connectivity to local roads from the highway, including provision for larger vehicles, should be maintained to protect commercial and tourist business viability.	<b>Section 3.2.1</b>
The proposal should minimise impacts to agricultural land and farming businesses, including land fragmentation, severance of high value agricultural land and impacts to the viability of long established dairy farms.	<b>Section 6.10.3</b>	

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Socio economic	The proposal may impact the viability of the South Coast Dairy and the Shoalhaven Dairy Co-operative through impacts on individual farms, reduced business from local residents and supply of agistment from local rural land.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	The proposal may make it more attractive for visitors to travel to a further destination resulting in reduced passing trade and job losses.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	Business impacts from left-in / left-out only access at O'Keefes Lane, resulting in increased travel time and costs.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	Removal of the right turn access to some businesses could result in a reduction in passing trade.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
	Delays during construction and the loss of visual amenity may impact the tourism industry.	<b>Section 6.6.3 and Section 6.10.2</b>
	Community needs should be considered including impacts on existing community facilities and amenities from the proposal.	<b>Section 6.10</b>
Air quality	Increased emissions resulting from the proposal.	<b>Section 6.12.3</b>
Maintenance	Who would be responsible for the maintenance of the road reserve on proposal completion?	<b>Section 6.14.3</b>
	Who would be responsible for maintaining Pestells Lane? The road is currently unsealed with increased traffic proposed following the upgrade. This could become a burden to Shoalhaven City Council and taxpayers.	Pestells Lane would accommodate a small amount of additional traffic from Boxsells Lane following the proposed upgrade of the Princes Highway. The proposal includes an upgraded section of Pestells Lane adjacent to the highway. However, it does not include further upgrades of remaining sections of Pestells Lane due to the low volume of additional traffic and minimal impacts. Hence, the existing road structure and function would remain and would be maintained by Shoalhaven City Council.

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Maintenance	Could the footprint of the highway be decreased by reducing the width of the maintenance corridor?	<b>Section 3.2 and Section 3.3</b>
	Who would be responsible for reconnecting utilities if issues or interruptions are experienced during construction and operation?	<b>Section 3.5</b>

### 5.3.4 Issues raised by the Aboriginal community and the Local Aboriginal Land Councils

Key issues raised by the Aboriginal community about the proposal are detailed in **Table 5-8**. The table also identifies the section of this review of environmental factors that addresses each issue.

**Table 5-8 Issues raised by the Aboriginal community and Local Aboriginal Land Councils**

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
Aboriginal cultural heritage	Aboriginal cultural heritage significance is placed on all artefacts. This is particularly in relation to monitoring / digging where consideration of significance varies between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people.	<b>Section 6.7.4</b>
	Increased Aboriginal presence and involvement during construction in the location of sites identified to monitor construction impacts and recover and/or manage artefacts <i>in situ</i> .	<b>Section 5.4.3 and Section 6.7.4.</b> Appendix D of the <i>Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</i> at <b>Appendix I</b>
	Continued Aboriginal participation and employment through all phases of the proposal.	<b>Section 5.4.3 and Section 6.7.4</b>
	Employment of Aboriginal workers across the proposal should be fair and equitable.	<b>Section 5.4.3</b>
	Potential to encounter and impact on Aboriginal burials, both generally and within areas with archaeological potential or areas remembered as sensitive in this regard.	<b>Section 6.7.3</b>
	Management of artefacts which remain on site after archaeological salvage is complete.	Appendix D of the <i>Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</i> at <b>Appendix I</b>

### 5.3.5 Issues raised by specialist interest groups

Issues raised by specialist interest groups about the proposal are detailed in **Table 5-9**. It also identifies the section of this review of environmental factors that addresses each issue.

**Table 5-9 Issues raised by specialist interest groups**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Where issue is addressed</b>
<b>Berry Landcare</b>		
Consultation process	Request for ongoing consultation with Berry Landcare.	<b>Section 5.4.2 and Section 5.4.3</b>
Terrestrial ecology	Impact on vegetation and wildlife corridors.	<b>Section 6.3.3</b>
	Revegetation should use local indigenous species.	<b>Section 6.3.4</b>
	Fauna connectivity measures between wildlife corridors segregated by the proposal.	<b>Section 6.3.4</b>
<b>Berry Rural Co-operative Society</b>		
Socio-economic	Reduce adverse impacts on dairy farms by maintaining economic viability and reducing land take.	<b>Section 6.9.3</b>
<b>PHocus and Shoalhaven Business Chamber</b>		
Traffic and transport	Minimise access points leading directly onto the highway to increase road safety.	<b>Section 3.3.6, Section 6.1.3 and Section 6.9.3</b>
	Minimise curves and grades to increase road safety.	<b>Section 3.2</b>
	Provide incident management and emergency service vehicle access.	<b>Section 3.3.8</b>
Flooding	Potential flooding impacts from the highway upgrade should be minimised.	<b>Section 6.5.3</b>
Landscape character and visual amenity	Protect visual amenity of the area.	<b>Section 6.6.4</b>
<b>Kiama State Emergency Services</b>		
Traffic and transport	Provide access for emergency service vehicles.	<b>Section 3.3.8</b>
<b>Friends of Meroo Union Church</b>		
Landscape character and visual amenity	Negative impacts on the views from the Meroo Union Church would impact on the number of bookings received, reducing revenue which is needed to fund the maintenance of the building as a heritage item.	<b>Section 6.10.2</b>
<b>Local and district bus services</b>		
Traffic and Transport	Provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes from side roads, to improve accessibility to the highway, especially during peak traffic periods.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Provision of bus stops on the northbound and southbound carriageways of the highway.	<b>Section 3.1</b>

Issue	Details	Where issue is addressed
<b>Local haulage companies, cattle transporters and bulk feed transporters</b>		
Traffic and Transport	Provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes from side roads, to improve accessibility to the highway, especially during peak traffic periods.	Section 7.2.3 and Section 7.2.5 of the <i>Technical Paper: Traffic and transport</i> at <b>Appendix C</b>
	Provision of a three metre wide shoulder for tractors and farming vehicles.	<b>Section 3.3.1</b>
	Pestells Lane is currently unsealed. Surface should be upgraded to a sealed road to accommodate increased traffic using the new intersection.	<b>Section 3.3.4</b>

## 5.4 Future consultation

### 5.4.1 Consultation during the display of the review of environmental factors

Roads and Maritime has encouraged community and interest group engagement in all phases of the proposal. Members of the project team have been readily accessible to meet or speak with community members as individual or groups to understand and address their concerns and will continue to do so during ongoing community engagement, as the proposal develops.

The review of environmental factors will be advertised and placed on public display for a period of not less than four weeks (between 1 November and 29 November 2013) and will be available for viewing at the following locations:

- Shoalhaven City Council, 44 Bridge Road, Nowra  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm
- Nowra Library, 10 Berry Street, Nowra  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 9.30am to 7pm and Saturday 9.30am to 3pm
- Office of Gareth Ward MP, 125 Terralong Street, Kiama  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm
- Office of Shelly Hancock MP, 1/57 Plunkett Street, Nowra  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm
- Roads and Maritime Wollongong office, 90 Crown Street, Wollongong  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 8.30am to 5pm
- Gerringong upgrade community display centre, 446 Princes Highway, Gerringong  
1 November to 29 November, Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm
- Berry project office, (Broughton Court) shop 3/113 Queen Street, Berry Friday 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29 November from 10am to 5pm, Saturday 9 November from 10am to 2pm, Thursday 14 November from 4pm to 7pm and Saturday 23 November from 10am to 2pm.
- Nowra Showground Pavilion, West Street, Nowra Tuesday 12 November from 10am to 5pm and Thursday 28 November from 4pm to 7pm

Staffed displays will be held during the display of the review of environmental factors to enable community representatives to ask questions and to provide further information for consideration in the assessment process. During the display of the review of environmental factors, the community, government agencies and other interested parties are invited to make written submissions on the proposal to Roads and Maritime.

Information on how to make a submission and details of the static and staffed display dates, times and locations will be advertised in local papers, on the project website, emailed to registered stakeholders and provided in a community update that will be distributed to the letter boxes of the local community (around 14,000 residents) prior to the display of the review of environmental factors.

#### 5.4.2 Consultation following display of the review of environmental factors

Following the display of the review of environmental factors, Roads and Maritime will prepare a submissions report to summarise and respond to the issues raised. The submissions report will also detail any design changes deemed necessary to properly address issues raised. The submissions report will be published on the project website.

Roads and Maritime will continue to identify and manage issues of interest or concern to the community during the display of the review of environmental factors and preparation of the submissions report. Subject to determination of the proposal, identification and management of issues would continue through the detailed design and construction phases of the proposal. The aims of ongoing communications and consultation are to provide the community with:

- Accurate and accessible information about the processes and activities associated with the proposal.
- Information in a timely manner.
- Appropriate avenues for providing comment or raising concerns.
- A high level of responsiveness to their issues and concerns throughout development and delivery of the proposal.

#### 5.4.3 Consultation during detailed design and construction

If the proposal proceeds, a Community Involvement Plan would be developed and implemented during the detailed design and construction phases of the proposal. It would describe the community consultation objectives, stakeholders, strategies, activities and evaluation for the proposal.

At a minimum, consultation during the detailed design and construction phases of the proposal would include:

- Ongoing consultation with the community and stakeholders including potentially directly impacted and adjacent property owners, interest groups (business, the Aboriginal community and specific interest groups), government and non-government agencies and the wider community.
- Regular updates to the community throughout the remainder of the planning and construction phases.
- Development and maintenance of a comprehensive complaints management system.
- Toll free community information line (1800 506 976).
- Email address ([berrytobomaderryupgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au](mailto:berrytobomaderryupgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au)).
- Website ([www.rms.nsw.gov.au/bbu](http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/bbu)).
- Maintaining a presence at the project office in Berry.