

2 MAY 2012

Foxground and Berry bypass – Berry north interchange and Berry bridge

The Berry north interchange and Berry bridge working group held its third meeting on Wednesday 2 May 2012 at the Berry School of Arts.

Attendees:

Jenny Clapham, resident
Rick Gainford, resident
Sally Lindsay, resident
Guy Mainsbridge, resident
Nick Nicholls, resident
Sue Nicholls, resident
Gwen Roberts, resident
Lucy Cole-Edelstein, Straight Talk Facilitator
Adam Berry, RMS Project Development Manager
Ron de Rooy, RMS Project Manager
Julian Watson, RMS Environmental Manager
Carla Brookes, RMS Project Communications
Angela Malpass, AECOM Community Consultant
Riley Dayhew, AECOM Graduate Engineer
David Appleby, Conybearne Morrison Urban Designer
Ken O'Neil, Aurecon Bridge Designer

Summary – Purpose of the meeting

Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) convened a working group of registered community members to review various community and design issues for the Berry north interchange and Berry bridge.

The session was opened and facilitated by Lucy Cole-Edelstein of Straight Talk.

Adam Berry, RMS Project Development Manager presented a summary of the actions from the previous meeting and an overview of the issues RMS has addressed, with outcomes to be discussed and agreed during this working group meeting. Mr. Berry reminded the group of the issues which were raised in the *Berry bypass alignment issues report, January 2012* and asked the group to discuss the way forward.

Meeting Notes



A copy of the *Berry bypass urban design strategy – Berry bridge and northern interchange precinct, draft concept design summary report (80% issues)* was handed to the working group for review and comment.

The following is a summary of the discussions held at the working group, responses and actions agreed to by RMS.

Discussion	Response / action
<p>Bridge design</p> <p><i>Previous action: Drawings representing the four short-listed bridge designs to be uploaded on the project website</i></p> <p>Adam Berry confirmed that the drawings for the short-listed bridge designs have been uploaded on to the project website on Monday 2 April and a poster was displayed in the Berry project office.</p> <p><i>Previous action: Working group to take away copies of the four proposed bridge designs and discuss these with other community members. Working group members to feed comments back to RMS and the working group.</i></p> <p>Adam Berry advised that RMS has received no formal feedback on the bridge options. From discussions in the project office no strong views were expressed to which design is finally adopted. Mr. Berry advised that RMS is happy to move forward with all four options as potential solutions.</p> <p><i>Previous action: Drawings representing the four short-listed bridge design to be amended to more clearly show the underside of the bridge.</i></p> <p>A working group member, who had an A3 printed copy of the drawings expressed concern that at this scale the drawings do not clearly show the underside of the bridge.</p> <p>Adam Berry advised that on the original A0 drawings the underside of the bridge options is clearly visible. It appears this detail is lost when printed at a smaller scale. An A0 copy of the drawings was available for the working group to view.</p> <p><i>Previous action: RMS to present design options for obtaining the desirable three metre bridge clearance</i></p>	<p>Action: RMS to advise the working group on the outcome of the technical meetings to discuss achieving a three metre bridge clearance at the western abutment by e-mail. Outcomes will also be posted on the project website and available at the project office for broader community information.</p>

Meeting Notes



at the western abutment to the next working group meeting.

Adam Berry advised that RMS does not have final options and this issue is still a work in progress.

Ken O'Neil advised that clearance at the western abutment is driven by flooding issues. RMS does not want to shorten the bridge if it causes issues with flooding. The team is looking at including a relief culvert behind the bridge or scraping away the ground to create clearance of 1.8 to 3 metres on the underside of the bridge. Alternatively, the road alignment could be raised locally at the abutment to allow the clearance underneath. Meeting will be held with road designers over the next week to discuss options.

Previous action: RMS to provide the group with solutions for the northern and southern abutments at the next working group meeting to address the issues raised by the community relating to flooding impacts.

Adam Berry advised that some issues were still being resolved by the project team, however some solutions were provided in the handout *Berry bypass urban design strategy – Berry bridge and northern interchange precinct, draft concept design summary report (80% issues)*.

Previous action: RMS to match cross section drawings with each of the four visual representation of the potential bridge design on the website. Cross section drawings to include annotations to explain design.

Adam Berry confirmed these drawings had been uploaded onto the project website and were available at the Berry project office.

Second north bound off ramp

Previous action: RMS to set up a meeting with Shoalhaven City Council and Berry Alliance to discuss a second north bound off ramp at Woodhill Mountain Road. This meeting is to occur prior to the next working group meeting.

Adam Berry confirmed a meeting had been held with Shoalhaven City Council and the Berry Alliance on 1 May 2012.

Previous action: RMS and council to report back to

Meeting Notes



the working group following the meeting.

Julian Watson advised that RMS and Shoalhaven City Council / Berry Alliance still have different views on the need for a second north bound off ramp. Council provided RMS with information on why it believes a second north bound off ramp is required which RMS will include as part of its environmental assessment.

RMS will put forward its view in the environmental assessment and council will provide the Department of Planning with its counter argument. This is the agreed way forward.

Rick Gainford who had represented the Berry Alliance at the meeting stated he felt there had been a break through at the meeting as RMS finally understood what data council were requesting and the reason why. Council is required to abide by local traffic standards for local road impacts which do not apply to RMS.

Mr. Gainford advised that Berry Alliance's desire is still for RMS to include a contingency for a second north bound exit as part of the environmental assessment. Berry Alliance would like to see RMS make a commitment not to sell the land it owns in the vicinity of the proposed off ramp.

Previous action: RMS to provide Shoalhaven City Council with the complete traffic model following the Kangaroo Valley Road and Victoria Street precinct working group meeting.

Adam Berry advised that RMS are working closely with Scott Wells from Shoalhaven City Council and will endeavour to provide him with all the information he needs.

Visual and noise impacts

A community member asked RMS to give the working group a commitment that power lines at Woodhill Mountain Road will be located underground. This was an action from 1 March meeting which has not been addressed.

Action: RMS to confirm with the working group its preference for power lines at Woodhill Mountain Road to be relocated underground.

Signage

Previous action: RMS to contact Shoalhaven Tourism to discuss tourist signage and how this will fit in with

Meeting Notes



<p><i>the RMS signposting plan.</i></p> <p>Adam Berry advised that RMS has approached council (Tom Phillips) and spoke to Peter Adams who advised he is happy for RMS to commence discussions now.</p>	
<p>Northern interchange – Pulman Street</p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify how residents at the northern interchange would access the highway and what impacts this would have on the heritage precinct at Pulman Street / Tannery Road.</p> <p>The working group member believes that a modern roundabout located in a heritage precinct is inappropriate.</p> <p>Ron de Rooy advised that the competing issue for RMS is to provide the residents on the eastern side of the highway with access north. Can't do a right hand turn so need to drive into Berry to turnaround.</p> <p>The working group member advised that the location of the intersection aligns with the foundations of the original butchers shop and general store. Constable cottage is listed as No. 1 in the town plan.</p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify how many properties will need to be provided access?</p> <p>Post meeting comment – potentially up to 9 properties depending on the route adopted.</p> <p>Ron de Rooy advised that RMS had considered a roundabout at the Woodhill Mountain Road junction as well, but had selected the Tannery St junction because of the shorter travel distance. A roundabout at Woodhill Mountain Road providing a U-turn facility for these residents would be acceptable..</p>	<p>Action: RMS to investigate maintaining the heritage character of the intersection at Pulman Street junction and moving the roundabout to Woodhill Mountain Road.</p>
<p>Bridge aesthetics</p> <p>Adam Berry advised that in previous working group meetings the number of bridge joints had been discussed and RMS had suggested that a total of three bridge joints is achievable. Work undertaken since these working groups suggests there is a risk that four bridge joints may need to be used.</p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify that finger joints were still proposed.</p> <p>Adam Berry confirmed yes.</p>	<p>Action: RMS to upload a copy of the <i>Berry bypass urban design strategy – Berry bridge and northern interchange precinct, draft concept design summary report (80% issues)</i> onto the project website.</p> <p>Action: RMS requested community feedback on the <i>Berry bypass urban design strategy – Berry bridge and northern interchange precinct, draft concept design summary report (80% issues)</i> by Friday 18 May 2012.</p> <p>Action: RMS to undertake sensitivity testing on the noise reduction impacts of providing full concrete</p>

Meeting Notes



A working group member asked RMS to confirm the length of continuous pavement on the bridge.

Ken O'Neil advised that the running surface would be continuous between the expansion joints (200 to 250 metres). Expansion joints will be located at each end of the bridge, with either one or two joints in the middle section.

Mr. O'Neil clarified that the bridge pavement would be continuous with breaks at the joints.

A working group member asked RMS to clarify the number of 'beams' under the bridge (visualisations different on pages 16 and 19 of the report). Which is the most accurate pictorial visualisation?

David Appleby advised that the picture on page 19 was a pictorial representation of the treatment for abutment batter under the bridge rather than the beams underneath of the bridge. For reference the underneath of the bridge would look like the image on page 19 but would be twice as wide.

A working group member raised a question on the critical issues register for the suggested south Berry bypass cost review in relation to flooding impacts on structures to either the north or south of Berry.

Adam Berry clarified that the bridge height on the northern alignment is not controlled by flooding impacts.

A working group member raised an alternative proposal for the crash barriers on the bridge. Previous discussions had suggested concrete crash barriers with steel rails on top. The working group member queried whether solid concrete barriers to the same height would have a noise reducing impact. Is there any difference in cost?

Ken O'Neil advised that work on the Pacific Highway suggested that cost differential would be insignificant. Mr. O'Neil advised that what you would lose is the visual amenity of the bridge.

David Appleby advised that from an aesthetic view point it is not just the experience of the driver on the bridge who's view would change, but also the appearance of the bridge from Woodhill Mountain Road and surrounding properties would be much heavier and you would not get the linear quality of the rails running along the length of the bridge.

crash barriers rather than part concrete / part rails.

Action: RMS to review crash barrier options including a combination of concrete, handrails and Perspex.

Note: The working group confirmed that it was happy for RMS to adopt concrete crash barriers with rails if no noise benefits were achieved from alternative options.

Meeting Notes



Transport
Roads & Maritime
Services

A working group member asked if it was possible for RMS to include clear Perspex barriers between the rails.

RMS confirmed that it is possible to provide Perspex infill between the rails which would provide the same noise benefit as a solid concrete barrier.

Adam Berry advised that a downside with Perspex is that it does reflect the sun and gets a smoky appearance over time.

A working group member asked RMS to clarify what noise mitigation was proposed for the bridge.

Adam Berry advised that under the guidelines no noise barriers are required.

A working group member asked RMS to clarify the size and appearance of the pillars in the drawings. Why do the round pillars look smaller than the square ones?

Ken O'Neil advised that the difference between the pier thickness is aesthetics.

David Appleby advised that the width of the piers is driven by the fact that the Super-T beams need to sit on a bearing plate and there needs to be enough width at the top of the support to fit the bearings (minimum width at the top of the pier).

Berry bypass alignment issues report, January 2012

RMS clarified that noise studies have been undertaken based on the use of low noise pavement.

RMS clarified that its urban designers have spoken to the NSW Government Architect and have been encouraged to complete community consultation prior to commencing discussions with the NSW Government Architect.

A working group member asked RMS to clarify whether it had ever retrofitted noise walls post construction if noise levels were above legal requirements.

Julian Watson advised that to retrofit noise walls post construction is very expensive, and RMS may look to seek a solution with individual residents. Treatment would be driven by the number of homes impacted.

Ron de Rooy advised that noise walls were retrofitted

Meeting Notes



Transport
Roads & Maritime
Services

at Dapto and the F6, but the volume of residences generated the type of treatment.

Ron de Rooy clarified that the approach grades for the bridge in the current concept design would not exceed three per cent to limit the potential for truck braking and the need for trucks to change gear.

Miscellaneous discussion

A working group member asked RMS to clarify whether it will apply local council guidelines for noise and pollution levels.

Julian Watson clarified that the project has adopted the environmental standards stated in the Director General's Requirements, AusRoad and RMS guidelines rather than local government requirements. Mr. Watson advised that comments have been submitted by council for consideration in the Director General's Requirements.

A working group asked RMS to clarify why it is so stringent in its opposition to the inclusion of a second northbound exit at Woodhill Mountain Road.

Ron de Rooy advised that RMS's first point is the warrant in regard to traffic levels. RMS design shows that the Kangaroo Valley Road interchange has capacity. Council's argument is that RMS is changing local traffic movements / levels and a way of countering this is to include a second north bound off ramp to take traffic away from the Kangaroo Valley Road interchange. Secondary issues are cost and environmental impacts from the stream crossing.

A working group member argued that cost should not be a deciding issue.

Working group process

The working group agreed that the group's work was concluded and no further working group meetings will be held. RMS agreed to include an update of outstanding actions on the project website and will hold further community consultation on an as needs basis.

Action: RMS to provide the working group with e-mail updates on the status of outstanding actions from the working group. All outcomes will be posted on the project website.