

28 MARCH 2012

## Foxground and Berry bypass – Berry north interchange and Berry bridge

The Berry north interchange and Berry bridge working group held its second meeting on Wednesday 28 March 2012 at the Berry School of Arts.

---

### Attendees:

Dianne Bezant, resident  
Col Bowley, resident  
Jenny Clapham, resident  
Rick Gainford, resident  
Guy Mainsbridge, resident  
Sally Nicholls, resident  
Nick Nicholls, resident  
Jude Radin, resident  
Gwen Roberts, resident  
Pat Stone, resident  
Scott Wells, Shoalhaven City Council representative  
Lucy Cole-Edelstein, Straight Talk Facilitator  
Adam Berry, RMS Project Development Manager  
Ron de Rooy, RMS Project Manager  
Julian Watson, RMS Environmental Manager  
Annette Beedles, RMS Graduate Engineer  
Angela Malpass, AECOM Community Consultant  
Riley Dayhew, AECOM Graduate Engineer  
David Appleby, Conybeare Morrison Urban Designer  
Ken O'Neill, 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.

# Meeting Notes



**Transport**  
Roads & Maritime  
Services

David Appleby from Conybeare Morrison presented the urban design treatments for the proposed bridge and north Berry interchange following the discussion / actions raised at the previous working group. A copy of the presentation will be uploaded onto the project website.

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

<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Response / action</b>
<p><b>Northern interchange</b></p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify the extent of the proposed access road connecting properties north of Berry to the northern interchange off-ramp.</p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify how these residents would travel north.</p> <p>Ron de Rooy advised that residents would be required to travel to a roundabout at Tannery Road to turn around and then join the north bound on ramp onto the highway.</p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify where the access ramp would be located.</p> <p>RMS confirmed that the access ramp would be located on the top of the cutting.</p>	<p>A copy of the latest concept design for the access road was handed out to the working group during the meeting.</p>
<p><b>Upgrade impacts on Woodhill Mountain Road</b></p> <p>RMS advised that between six and eight of the poplar trees along Woodhill Mountain Road would need to be removed to accommodate the upgrade.</p> <p>RMS confirmed that the poplar trees were listed on the Shoalhaven Council heritage register.</p>	
<p><b>Bridge design</b></p> <p>David Appleby advised that variations in clearance (between the super tee beams and ground level) along the length of the bridge will impact on the type of pier design RMS is able to adopt.</p> <p>Ken O'Neill confirmed that the current bridge design was based on pier spans at a distance of 33 metres.</p> <p>Adam Berry advised that RMS needed to review possible solutions to ensure no follow-on issues</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Drawings representing the four short-listed bridge designs to be uploaded on to the project website.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Drawings representing the four short-listed</p>

would result eg increased flooding impacts. Mr. Berry advised these issues were raised and identified as part of bridge workshops held in 2011.

David Appleby advised the working group that a number of potential bridge designs have been reviewed and the following four have been short-listed for consideration:

- Original Pier Option (refined)
- Floodplain Expressed Coursing.
- Contemporary Portal Frame
- Flared Capital / Integrated Headstock.

RMS clarified that although there are cost differences between the four designs, the four options presented were all feasible as part of this project.

Ken O'Neill clarified that any pier design could be matched with any parapet design.

A working group member expressed concern that the drawings do not show the carriageway / beams as they would be visible under the bridge.

Ken O'Neill clarified that the parapet on the side of the bridge could be extended however the beams would still protrude under the bridge.

A working group member queried whether the bridge would look better if the parapet was extended further down hiding the underside of the bridge. David Appleby clarified that an extended parapet would increase the side profile and perceived overall depth of the bridge.

David Appleby advised that a clearance of three metres under the bridge was preferred by RMS, but clarified that RMS would not be increasing the height of the bridge to obtain this clearance at the northern abutment . RMS will review alternative design options, for example, moving the southern bridge abutment.

David Appleby advised that the southern abutment of the bridge could be extended further towards the creek to counter potential anti social issues raised during the presentation (eg graffiti). Mr. Appleby advised that this could however have knock-on problems for flooding and would sterilise a residue piece of land at the other side of the bridge.

bridge designs to be amended to more clearly show the underside of the bridge.

**Action:** RMS to present design options for obtaining the desirable three metre bridge clearance at the western abutment to the next working group meeting.

**Action:** RMS to provide 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.

**Action:** RMS to match cross section drawings with each of the four visual representations of the potential bridge design on the website. Cross section drawings to include annotations to explain design.

Note: Urban design is a key element of the environmental assessment (EIS). It is RMS preference to have an EIS on display by the end of the year. Community comments would therefore need to be presented to RMS by the 24 April to meet this timescale.

# Meeting Notes



<p>Two working group members expressed greater concern over possible flooding impacts of extending the northern abutment further towards the creek rather than any possible anti social behaviour.</p>	
<p><b>Bridge aesthetics</b></p> <p>A community member asked RMS to clarify throw screen requirements.</p> <p>RMS advised that throw screens would not be required on the Berry bridge, but would be required on the Kangaroo Valley Road bridge.</p> <p>RMS clarified that there was also a requirement for some form of physical barrier along North Street to prevent pedestrians accessing the highway.</p> <p>David Appleby advised that for Berry bridge RMS is proposing a safety barrier comprising two safety rails at the top with a small concrete upturn at the base.</p> <p>Adam Berry clarified that a higher concrete barrier would improve noise mitigation, however in this case benefits would be marginal.</p>	
<p><b>Visual and noise impacts</b></p> <p>A working group member asked RMS to clarify what would happen to the power lines along Woodhill Mountain Road? If the power lines were placed underground then the poplar trees would be able to grow unrestricted to shield the town from the bridge.</p> <p>Adam Berry advised that RMS has still to make a decision. Discussions still need to be held with the electricity supplier and a decision would most likely not occur until the detailed design stage</p>	
<p><b>Second north bound off ramp</b></p> <p>RMS advised that they had not yet met with either Shoalhaven City Council or the Berry Alliance to discuss the off ramp at Woodhill Mountain Road.</p> <p>RMS advised that it did not have the requested traffic data for tonight's meeting, however data would be available for the Kangaroo Valley Road and Victoria Street precinct working group on 29 March 2012. RMS clarified that previous data has concentrated on highway traffic and more time was needed to evaluate traffic movements on local roads.</p> <p>A member of the working group challenged RMS as</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> RMS and council to report back to the working group following this meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> RMS to provide Shoalhaven City Council with the complete traffic model following the Kangaroo Valley Road and Victoria Street precinct working group meeting.</p>

# Meeting Notes



to why traffic data was not available. Advised that they understood that some extra work was required to obtain data for local roads, but RMS should have at least provided the group with data previously given to council.

Scott Wells, Shoalhaven City Council representative, clarified that although council has seen the input into the traffic model, RMS has never provided the output data, particularly in relation to local roads. Mr. Wells advised that it was a significant development that RMS will extend the traffic model to include local roads.

Lucy Cole-Edelstein clarified that the traffic data was important to council as it would be responsible for managing the local roads following the upgrade.

A member of the working group stated that the provision for a second off ramp at Woodhill Mountain Road was an important community issue and a petition with over 1000 signatures in support of the proposal has been collected. A request was made for this issue to remain on the agenda for this working group.

Adam Berry advised that this working group was for the Berry bridge and the northern interchange and this group was therefore not the correct forum to discuss this issue.

Several community working group members disagreed and expressed concern that this issue was not being covered by any of the other working groups.

Scott Wells advised that council were concerned that without the provision of a second off ramp Berry could be faced with a similar situation to Kiama where community members lobbied council to add a second ramp for 18 years after the initial works.

A working group member raised concern that without a second off ramp, all traffic travelling to Beach Road, the hospital, Pulman Street etc. would be forced to leave the highway at Kangaroo Valley Road interchange and travel along Queen Street. A second off ramp would remove this traffic from the centre of town.

A working group member advised that council traffic studies show traffic growth resulting from the Huntingdale Park development would produce higher

# Meeting Notes



**Transport**  
Roads & Maritime  
Services

traffic levels than RMS guidelines allow in around five to 10 years time along Kangaroo Valley Road.

Scott Wells emphasised council's concern that the interchange at Kangaroo Valley Road would also change traffic patterns forcing more traffic down local roads.

A working group member advised that North Street is currently the main feeder road from Kangaroo Valley Road, however following the upgrade this link will be removed forcing traffic to use alternative routes.

Lucy Cole-Edelstein clarified that it is important for RMS and council to hold a meeting off line and then report back to the working group. The group needs to understand both RMS and council's opinion on how traffic will behave following the upgrade.

A working group member stated that the town wants the best option now and doesn't accept RMS's argument that 'it will be better than now' but rather Berry should get the best option now.

A working group member raised the issue that it is not just volume of traffic through Queen Street which needs to be considered but also the type of traffic.

A working group member asked RMS to clarify if the bridge is able to accommodate an off ramp at a later stage and if so who would pay for it. Scott Wells advised that it would be council cost.

A working group member expressed concern that if provision for an off ramp is not made now the town could end up with a similar situation to Kiama with a non complaint retro fit ramp fitted 18 years after the original upgrade.

## Signage

David Appleby advised that the David Berry and Alexander Berry memorial would need to be relocated and a new location needs to be agreed with the community.

Scott Wells advised that Shoalhaven Tourism is developing a masterplan which will include tourist signage and there is an opportunity for RMS to discuss signage for the upgrade with this group.

A working group member advised that they would like to see a tourist drive sign for Berry in addition to the standard RMS signage.

**Action:** RMS to contact Shoalhaven Tourism to discuss tourist signage and how this will fit in with the RTA signposting plan.

# Meeting Notes



**Transport**  
Roads & Maritime  
Services

## **Working group process**

The next working group meeting will be held 2 May 2012.