

FEBRUARY 2012

Foxground and Berry bypass – North Berry precinct working group

The North Berry precinct working group held its first meeting on Wednesday 29 February 2012 at the Berry School of Arts.

Attendees:

Will Armitage, Better Option for Berry (BoB) representative
Dianne Bezant, resident
Col Bowley, dairy farmer
Yolande Buchan, resident
Rick Gainford, resident
Guy Mainsbridge, 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
Carla Brookes, RMS Project Communications
Stuart Dalziel, AECOM Deputy Project Manager
Kerri Hale, AECOM Communications Workstream Leader
Angela Malpass, AECOM Community Consultant
David Appleby, Conybeare 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 urban design and community issues for the North Berry precinct. This was the first in a series of community working groups which will focus on various design issues for the revised northern Berry bypass alignment.

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

Adam Berry, acting RMS Project Development Manager for the Foxground and Berry bypass, presented the issues relating to the North Street alignment which are outlined in the *Berry Bypass Issues Report, January 2012*. He asked the group to identify issues to be addressed by this working group.

The group was reminded that RMS has a preferred concept design for the north Berry bypass resulting from work done with the community review group last year. The objective of this Berry precinct working group was to address issues related to the North Berry precinct not the concept design.

David Appleby from Conybeare Morrison presented urban design treatments for the proposed noise wall, the residual land between North Street and the bypass as well as proposed pedestrian and cycle ways to connect recreational areas and other parts of town.

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

Discussion	Response / action
<p>Vertical alignment near North Street</p> <p>The community would like RMS to review lowering the road between Edward and Alexandra Streets by up to another two metres. This proposal was strongly supported by Will Armitage and Rick Gainford on behalf of Better Options for Berry (BoB). There was support from the other attendees for any efforts to further lower the alignment.</p> <p>It was stated that RMS has not met their commitment made in the Issues Report to further consider the lowering of the alignment.</p> <p>Dissatisfaction was voiced with the current RMS view that the grade has been fully optimised to the point of being nearly technically unacceptable and that it is unlikely it can be reduced any further without compromising safety or flood immunity.</p> <p>It was noted that Bruce Ramsey has developed a concept which reduces the alignment by a further 0.5 metres</p> <p>It was noted by a group member that the current concept design limits the impact of flooding. Any additional amendments need to be considered carefully in relation to their potential to increase flooding.</p>	<p>Adam Berry stated that since the last meeting with the community review group in November 2011, RMS has explored the concept of further lowering the alignment and the current concept design is at the margins of what is acceptable for drainage guidelines. Further lowering the alignment would require mechanical pumping for drainage which RMS does not countenance</p> <p>Action: It was agreed that RMS will present the work conducted since December 2011 on lowering the alignment and provide an explanation as to why the grade cannot be reduced further for discussion with BoB and the working group.</p> <p>Action: RMS to investigate its policy for utilising mechanical pumps and advise the group.</p> <p>Action: RMS will review the feasibility of further lowering the alignment by 0.5 metres.</p>

<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Response / action</i>
<p>Flooding</p> <p>It was noted that the community review group agreed to the proposal of diverting Town Creek to reduce the flooding impact on both the new highway and North Street. However, where would water pumped from a further lower alignment be diverted to?</p>	<p>It was suggested by a group member that pumped water from a lower alignment would be deposited in Bundewallah Creek.</p>
<p>Residual land between North Street and the bypass</p> <p>The future use of the proposed residual land between North Street and the bypass was discussed by the group.</p> <p>It was noted that Council owns the land along North Street up to the Auld's property, including the sports ground, dog off leash area, riding school, tennis courts and skate park.</p> <p>Scott Wells from Shoalhaven Council suggested the residual land could be used as overflow car parking for the town, including coach parking, along with additional parking for the sports field and the riding club. Council views this as an opportunity to provide the town / rate payer with low cost parking.</p> <p>Church parking has been removed which has put a greater pressure on remaining parking spaces along North Street.</p> <p>Suggestion was made that a master plan for parking be developed by Council.</p> <p>Scott Wells advised that Council would not, at this stage, be conducting separate community consultation on parking options. However, Council expects to consult with residents once the route is finalised.</p>	<p>North Street residents expressed their concerns over the impacts of using the residual land for overflow and/or coach parking.</p> <p>RMS advised the group that there are a couple of options for land swap with Council: straightforward land swap; or RMS retains ownership and Council manages the space. There is an opportunity to keep this area as public space.</p>

<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Response / action</i>
<p>Pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>It was noted that community members at the community meeting on 8 February 2012 had expressed concern over potential pedestrian, cycle and traffic conflicts resulting from all through traffic utilising the bridge at Kangaroo Valley Road.</p> <p>The BoB group representatives stated that the current pedestrian / cycle arrangements proposed at the Kangaroo Valley Road interchange are unacceptable and requested RMS consider a separate pedestrian / cycle overpass.</p> <p>A community member suggested that Rawlings Lane may be suitable for pedestrians and cyclists following the upgrade.</p> <p>David Appleby the urban design consultant advised that a bridge accommodating pedestrians will need to have three metre high throw screens.</p> <p>The representative from Shoalhaven Council suggested that a pedestrian / cycle overpass at a 90 degree angle from Rawlings Lane should be considered.</p>	<p>RMS acknowledges that the project would result in a disruption to current pedestrian and cycle arrangements. However, RMS does not believe a separate pedestrian / cycle overpass is necessary.</p> <p>RMS referred to the time spent by the community review group in getting the alignment along North Street as low as possible to reduce visual impacts. RMS advised that a separate pedestrian / cycle bridge connecting North Street could have an impact on visual amenity, particularly for residents of North Street. .</p> <p>RMS proposes that cyclists and pedestrians can be safely accommodated within the Kangaroo Valley Road interchange, which is located approximately 150 metres from North Street.</p> <p>Action: RMS to look into alternative pedestrian / cycle access by reviewing designs of the roundabouts at Huntingdale Park Road and Kangaroo Valley Road.</p> <p>Action: RMS to provide the group with a cost comparison for providing a separate pedestrian / cycle overpass.</p> <p>Action: RMS to provide the group with visuals of potential pedestrian / cycle connectivity across North Street.</p>
<p>Kangaroo Valley Road interchange</p> <p>A BoB representative raised concern that if an accident closed the bridge at Kangaroo Valley Road there would be no access for residents along Kangaroo Valley Road into Berry.</p> <p>RMS was asked if they are considering an additional north bound off ramp at Woodhill Mountain Road which could double as an alternative emergency route.</p> <p>The representative from Shoalhaven Council raised his concern that the presentation on urban design given by David Appleby excluded connectivity between the future growth area around Huntingdale Park Road and Victoria Street / Berry township.</p>	<p>RMS advised that the North Berry precinct and the Kangaroo Valley Road / Victoria Street working group were initially going to be held together, however community members at the 8 February 2012 meeting had expressed a preference for these to be split into two separate groups.</p> <p>The access arrangements between Kangaroo Valley Road / Huntingdale Park estate and Victoria Street and the commercial centre of Berry will be discussed as part of the Kangaroo Valley Road / Victoria Street working group which will be held on 8 March 2012. RMS invited interested members of this working group to also attend the 8 March meeting. .</p>

Meeting Notes



<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Response / action</i>
<p>The group suggested that the issues being considered for the North Berry precinct were closely related to the Kangaroo Valley Road / Victoria Street precinct working group. The suggestion was made that the two workshops should be merged.</p>	
<p>Noise Walls</p> <p>David Appleby, the urban design consultant from Conybeare Morrison, presented various noise wall treatments including the ha-ha concept (gradual covered mound), screening, and planting to minimise the visual impacts of the noise walls. It was noted that the noise walls would be approximately four metres above the carriageway (ie road surface).</p>	
<p>Plantings</p> <p>Examples of planting treatments along the roadside were presented by David Appleby for the group to view and discuss.</p> <p>The group agreed that green landscape is what attracts tourists to the area it would be important to select the right vegetation including controlling for height.</p> <p>It was noted that what the driver sees along the roadside is also important to visual amenity</p> <p>A member of the group commented on the tree line and the view to the escarpment from North Street and how the trees along the creek line had grown in the last few years. Visual montages should take into account future growth of these trees they will have grown in a few more years.</p> <p>A question was raised regarding who would be responsible for maintaining trees and plantings.</p> <p>The representative for BoB asked if Conybeare Morrison had reviewed the BoB submission suggesting terraced walls with plantings.</p>	<p>RMS advised that the responsibility for the maintenance of trees and plantings along the constructed upgrade depends on where the boundary is set. RMS would be responsible for the roadway and drainage system and Council is responsible for looking after everything else.</p> <p>RMS confirmed that the BoBs submission had been read and was considering all suggestions received during the submissions period.</p>

Meeting Notes



Transport
Roads & Maritime
Services

<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Response / action</i>
<p>Noise Mitigation</p> <p>RMS was asked if noise studies had been conducted on the northern side of North Street and requested this be data available for the group to review. Of concern was noise travelling up Bundewallah Creek and the impact on residents.</p> <p>A resident commented that there will be less noise following the highway upgrade and personally would prefer not to see noise walls on the northern side of the highway.</p> <p>A community member asked if rules for noise were more stringent for the church on North Street versus the residents.</p> <p>The BoB submission includes suggestions for noise mitigation and the representative asked if RMS had read the submission and are the suggestions achievable</p> <p>A concern was raised about truck / road noise being funnelled up Kangaroo Valley Road and into Huntingdale Park Road Estate.</p>	<p>No noise walls will be required on the northern side of North Street. However, some properties may require architectural treatments to mitigate noise.</p> <p>The environmental assessment will address noise levels and necessary mitigation. RMS is regulated by strict guidelines.</p> <p>Legislative guidelines require the RMS to treat hospitals, churches and schools with particular consideration.</p> <p>RMS confirmed that the BoB submission had been read and was considering all issues received during the submissions period.</p> <p>Action: RMS to provide results of noise study adjacent to North Street to the group.</p>
<p>Urban Design</p> <p>A group member asked what RMS's budget for urban design is and requested that RMS only present options to the group which are economically viable.</p>	<p>RMS agreed that it will flag any suggestions from the group that may not be economically feasible.</p>
<p>South Berry bypass review</p> <p>A community member asked if the cost of impact mitigations discussed tonight will be considered as part of the cost comparisons between the northern and southern routes.</p>	<p>RMS stated that the northern option for the Berry bypass was further progressed than the southern option and any comparisons with the proposed southern option need to be fair. Proposed mitigations, as outlined in the EA would therefore be included in the northern option cost comparison.</p>