

## 2. Preferred Route Display Stakeholder Submissions

### 2.1 Introduction

Public comments were invited during the preferred route display.

During and following the display a series of meetings and conversations have been held with key stakeholders, including affected landowners and government agencies. All comments and concerns raised at these meetings were recorded in a record of conversation.

Separate community liaison group and ecological focus group meetings were held and attendees were invited to make comment on the preferred route.

For the purposes of the corridor refinement workshop assessment the following are collectively referred to as submissions:

- ▶ Submissions made in response to the preferred route display; and
- ▶ Records of conversation from meetings and phone conversations.

### 2.2 Results Summary

Table 2.1 summarises the key issues and comments raised by the stakeholders that relate to the refinement of the preferred route in Section B.

Table 2.2 provides a concise summary of the issues raised by stakeholder category.

Submissions summarised in Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 are categorised as follows:

- ▶ Directly affected property owners – those whose properties are touched (including government agencies) by the preferred route corridor as exhibited (including the wider corridor) and that may be subject to property acquisition;
- ▶ Government Agencies – government agencies (not directly affected) that have made a submission regarding the preferred route; and
- ▶ Moorside Drive Stakeholders – residents in proximity of the preferred route corridor who are not affected by property acquisition.

**Table 2.1 Summary of Submissions in Section B**

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
<b>Directly Affected Property Owners</b>			
(Submission 41)	Access	Access to property is currently off Blackmans Point Rd via The Hatch Rd, however legal access to property is off Hacks Ferry Rd and the preferred route corridor severs the legal access. Legal access is currently an unformed road reserve.  Access for fire management another issue for property.	No specific preference expressed
	Property value	Would like compensation for severed land.	
(Submission 12)	Highway alignment / property impacts	Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.  Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties. Greatly disappointed about moving the highway closer to residents of Moorside Drive.  Cannot see any difference in Cairncross State Forest, and believes it does not matter where the highway goes [through it].  Keep the highway to the east where it was originally.  Cannot understand why tea tree land should not be used for the preferred route.	Orange
	Consultation process	Purchased home based on RTA advice that alignment would be 800m away.  Disappointed that encroaching on the properties of the residents of Moorside Drive has been considered.	
	Noise	Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade. The noise impacts of the upgrade will be horrendous.	
	Visual	Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route. The visual impacts of the preferred route will be unappealing.	
	Property value	Concerned properties will lose value. If this option is passed it will greatly devalue our property.  Had hoped to renovate and sell house after a 5 year period which has now lapsed – concerned announcement of the preferred route will no longer allow for this.	
(Submission 32)	Ground water	Concern over impact on water table – approx 1.0m down.  Any damage to the water table would be disastrous for tea tree farming.	No specific preference expressed
	Access	Concerned about access from highway - suggested access via East Rd.  Requires access for semi trailers, trucks, harvester.	
(Submission 15)	Highway alignment / property impacts	Concern about property impacts with highway being so close to property.  Impacts on property far more significant than expected.  Why is the preferred route so close to the floodplain when it could have gone across the floodplain?	Orange
	Noise	Resident very concerned at impact of noise.	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
	Property value	Owned property for 6 years now - lifestyle choice and investment for future.  Have long term plan to subdivide into 10 acre blocks (97 acre property).	
(Submission 2)	Agricultural lands and businesses	Concern over impacts to pastures.	Orange
	Property value	Concerned that property will lose value and lose opportunity to subdivide land.  Concerned properties will lose value.	
	Highway alignment / property impacts	A letter dated 30 August 2006 and attached plan suggested a possible variation to the original plan whereby it is possible that a larger portion of land is to be used. The suggestion is that the final alignment through the Bill Hill area could result in the resumption being totally within stakeholder's land, excluding the land to the rear of my property. Considers this proposal totally unacceptable and strongly objects to this proposal.  Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.  Concern over highway being closer to property than expected.  Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties.  Will accept original Orange Option proposed.  Appreciates that the improvements need to proceed for the benefit of all, and while not wishing to lose land, considers the original plan to acquire a 50m section from the rear of the property acceptable.	
	Flooding	Concern over property and house being inundated with water due to new highway structure.	
	Noise	Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade.	
	Visual	Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route.	
(Submission 49)	Highway alignment / property impacts	The route in Section B should follow the existing roadway, as in the other 3 sections.  Land was acquired for the Wilson River Bridge in 1974, most of the pavement is three lanes wide, and cannot be much less than now required - would be cheaper and less disruptive than a new corridor.  Use of existing road south of Wilson River Bridge would also negate further encroachment into the Cairncross State Forest and Rawdon Creek Nature Reserve, which has a Koala habitat, among others.  Rather than having to build two new bridges over the Wilson River has thought been given to increasing the capacity of the existing bridge?	Blue / Green

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
	Impacts on community	<p>If the new bridges are built and the existing highway becomes a local access road, does this mean Council will be expected to maintain this bridge?</p> <p>Ratepayers would prefer to have the many wooden bridges in the area upgraded rather than expending considerable funds maintaining this one large bridge.</p> <p>There is currently no severance due to west and east sections passing under the current pavement, as would be the case if the existing route was followed.</p> <p>In the last couple of years Coolongolook was not bypassed, as is currently the case with Nabiac which would have greater town population and a larger retail area than that of Telegraph Point.</p>	
	Noise	Sceptical about consideration given to noise impacts.	
	Visual	Sceptical about consideration given to visual impacts.	
	Commercial businesses	<p>Some consideration should be given to bypass effects on local commercial business. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The ski resort recently established with great potential for expansion as a caravan park would currently enjoy a lot of its trade from visual exposure to the highway, a loss of this would stymie growth and future employment opportunities.</li> <li>▶ Service station complex depends on passing trade. Loss of this could see the closure of the only service station in the town resulting not only in a loss of employment, but also meaning that locals would have to travel elsewhere to fill up.</li> <li>▶ The Butter Factory Complex is reliant on passing highway trade to continue trading.</li> </ul>	
(Submission 48)	Ecology	<p>Concerned about impacts of Section B of the upgrade in terms of loss of national parks [nature reserves].</p> <p>Concerned about impacts of Section B of the upgrade in terms of loss wetlands.</p>	Blue / Green
	Agricultural lands and businesses	Concerned about impacts of Section B of the upgrade in terms of loss of farming land.	
	Commercial businesses	Concerned about impacts of Section B of the upgrade in terms of loss of businesses.	
	State forest	Concerned about impacts of Section B of the upgrade in terms of loss of state forestry lands.	
	Highway alignment / property impacts	Believe RTA has sufficient land to widen and improve the existing route, rather than reroute the existing highway.	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
DPI – Forests NSW (Submission 56)	State forest	<p>Forests NSW prefer the Refined Orange (Western) alignment. It has a lesser impact on the area of commercially utilisable forest acquired (6 ha versus 11 ha). The area of state forest isolated between the new alignment and old Pacific Hwy is of a viable size for harvesting and should be accessible for harvesting machinery via a partial closure of the service road (Pacific Hwy) during harvesting operations. The eastern portion of state forest resulting from this alignment would need to be accessible for B-double trucks from Bill Hill Road and Blackmans Point Rd.</p> <p>The Orange option (Eastern) while not the preferred option, is an acceptable alternative for Forests NSW. Harvesting on the eastern and western side of the alignment under this option would require B-double truck access to the state forest via Bill Hill Road in the north and Blackmans Point Rd in the south. Forests NSW would also like to maintain if possible the existing internal tracks, which provide north-south access on the eastern side of the alignment if this option is chosen.</p> <p>There are 3 trees of significant value to Forests NSW as part of an ongoing research program into seed genetics, which are in the vicinity of both route options (data provided to the RTA). None of the options currently directly affect these trees however if the route alignment is altered and will require removal of these trees, please contact Forests NSW in advance.</p>	Refined Orange (although Orange would be acceptable)
<b>Government Agencies (not directly affected)</b>			
Department of Primary Industries (Submission 22)	Agricultural lands and businesses	<p>The proposed additional assessment of impacts on agricultural resources and enterprises in the vicinity of Cairncross State Forest is supported in order to find an alignment of best fit given competing needs and objectives.</p> <p>Better and higher quality agricultural lands should be avoided as far as possible and impacts on individual rural enterprises assessed and addressed in consultation with affected landholders. It is recommended that impact mitigation measures are documented for completeness and transparency purposes.</p> <p>The preferred route report has limited detailed land use information. The next phase should present accurate and detailed land use information with regard the impacts of the final route on land use in spatial and tabular formats. The next phase should also show how the alignment has been adjusted for land use issues and the biophysical and social factors related to individual parts of the overall project.</p> <p>Any planned acquisition of agricultural properties should be accompanied by an assessment of the impacts on the overall business performance and sustainability of the enterprise including assessment of impacts on income, costs of production, farm management, farm infrastructure and return on capital. Negotiations with landholders affected should include vehicle, machinery and stock movement and access arrangements including arrangements for stock movement to higher ground in time of a flood.</p>	No specific preference expressed
	Ecology	<p>The preferred route (orange) appears to be the most fish friendly route as it avoids in most instances wetland and also has the least amount of creek and river crossings.</p> <p>If the presence of “threatened species” like Oxleyan Pygmy Perch or their habitat is found in the new alignment further considerations to minimise impacts will be required.</p>	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC)	Noise	We note that the preferred route will result in substantially increased noise levels for residents in the vicinity of Moorside Drive and the Wilson River crossing area. The design for the highway in these locations should incorporate all reasonable noise mitigation measures to minimise noise impacts on these receivers.	No specific preference expressed
	Ecology	<p>Selection of the alignment location within the widened corridor areas should aim to minimise impacts to high conservation value habitats, including vegetation with 'old growth' characteristics, and any areas identified as habitat for threatened species or Endangered Ecological Communities.</p> <p>In refining the alignment, effort should be made to minimise creation of barriers affecting fauna movement areas, with the aim of retaining connectivity between habitat areas. Consideration should also be given to the cumulative impact of the location of the new highway, including evaluation of issues such as the location of the existing road network and the implications for biodiversity that result from creation of a new alignment versus adhering to the existing alignment.</p> <p>Where impacts are unavoidable, suitable offsets should be developed to compensate for losses to biodiversity values.</p>	

#### Moorside Drive Stakeholders

(Submission 23)	Highway alignment / property impacts	<p>Believe the altered orange option will have an environmental impact in the vicinity of Moorside Drive.</p> <p>Initially chose the orange option, as it was considered to have the least amount of impact on the people that reside in Telegraph Point and Moorside Drive.</p> <p>Find it hard to believe that moving the alignment further to the west would be less of an impact to the environment - Do not want any changes made to the original orange option.</p>	Orange
	Property value	Believe the preferred orange option likely to have a significant financial impact on the value of our property.	
	Noise	In the original orange option concerns of noise impacts were null and void.	
	Visual	In the original orange option concerns of visual impacts were null and void.	
	Consultation Process	<p>Feel the community has been deceived and manipulated with regard to changes made to the orange option.</p> <p>Urges that consideration be given to the submission regarding the preferred route selection.</p> <p>Urges that conscious ethical thought be given to the individuals who will be severely affected if the original orange route is sabotaged.</p>	
	Health	Concerned that community health will be affected due to the additional noise, pollution and unwanted sight of the highway.	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
(Submission 10)	Highway alignment / property impacts	Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.	No specific preference expressed
		Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties.	
	Property value	Concerned properties will lose value.	
	Visual	Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route.	
	Noise	Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade.	
(Submission 20)	Highway alignment / property impacts	Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.	No specific preference expressed
		Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties.	
	Property value	Concerned properties will lose value. Rejects the proposal of the preferred orange option based on the loss of property value it would result in.	
	Visual	Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route. Rejects the proposal based on grounds of visibility of highway from property.	
	Noise	Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade. Considers the noise impacts of the preferred orange option to be most disturbing, and rejects the proposal based on this.	
	Consultation process	Rejects the proposal of the preferred orange option based on the short notice given for compiling a written submission. Rejects the proposal of the preferred orange option based on the lack of communication from the RTA to all Moorside Drive residents regarding the project.	
(Submission 26)	Highway alignment / property impacts	Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.	Orange
		Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties. Hopeful that the final corridor will be back to the original proposal from Moorside Drive east to Blackmans Point Road intersection. Residents agree that further consideration should be given to the land north of the tea tree farm up to the river for the preferred route. Believes that the issues raised on p. 149 of the Preferred Route Report of impacts on Rawdon Creek Nature Reserve, Cairncross State Forest, The Koala Habitat, Tea Tree farming, and east and south of Moorside Drive would be best served by the original orange option.	
		Property value	
	Visual	Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route.	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
	Noise	<p>Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade.</p> <p>Consider that expanding the corridor west and impinging seriously on land at the eastern end of Moorside Drive will create noise issues.</p>	
	Agricultural lands and businesses	<p>Question the viability of the Tea Tree Farm, given references to it being key or productive agricultural land.</p> <p>Believe the only land that fits the criteria of key and productive land, lies north of the tea tree farm up to the Wilson River.</p>	
	Consultation process	<p>Concerns previously expressed about political, or vested business interests exerting pressure on the decision making process have been denied by the RTA. Pages 149, 157, 159 of the August report undermines this denial, and leaves a credibility gap as to the real reasons that further alternatives (I.e. refined orange option) be investigated, despite projected increased cost of this option.</p>	
(Submission 21)	Highway alignment / property impacts	<p>Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.</p> <p>Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties.</p> <p>Concerned about the now much wider corridor to the southeast of Moorside Drive, Telegraph Point - Section B of the OHK Pacific Highway upgrade.</p> <p>Would like to keep the new highway as far east as possible to minimise impacts to my property and the combined Moorside Drive community (of 12 other houses).</p>	Orange
	Property value	<p>Concerned properties will lose value.</p>	
	Visual	<p>Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route.</p>	
	Noise	<p>Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade.</p> <p>Concerned about the noise impacts of the possible closer alignment.</p> <p>Concerned the highway upgrade will have significant noise impacts on place of residence.</p>	

Submission No.	Issue	Comments	Stakeholder Preferred Route
(Submission 25)	Highway alignment / property impacts	<p>Upset and concerned about preferred route now including a wider corridor in Section B.</p> <p>Upset and concerned about preferred route now being closer to Moorside Drive properties.</p> <p>After assessment of the latest information regarding the deviation of the highway near Moorside Drive, residents of the street are now highly critical of the route under consideration.</p> <p>The people of Moorside Drive strongly protest the new preferred route option and call for a change of decision regarding the preferred route.</p> <p>The earlier route did not interfere with nearly as many residencies and their occupants.</p> <p>Alignment could be immediately next to resident's property.</p> <p>Believes the original considered route to have less impact on properties.</p> <p>Believes the new alignment will greatly impact on at least 17 residencies and consequently the quality of life of their residents.</p> <p>Concerns about the economic and practical outcome of this latest assessment.</p> <p>Believes the original preferred route to have less impact on the environment.</p>	Orange
	Property value	<p>Concerned properties will lose value.</p> <p>Believes the new alignment will greatly impact on at least 17 residences and consequently their value.</p> <p>Believe the value of their 11 acres of land will depreciate.</p>	
	Visual	<p>Concerned about visual impacts of the preferred route.</p>	
	Noise	<p>Concerned about noise impacts associated with the upgrade.</p> <p>Noise is a major concern. The street is not noisy at present - however the highway will be closer, and mounted on fill.</p>	
	Flooding	<p>The 1:100 year flood RL is 4.1 at the southeast corner of stakeholder's property – how will this be managed?</p>	
	Agricultural lands and businesses	<p>Believes the original preferred route to have less impact on local agricultural land.</p>	

**Table 2.2 Issues Raised by Stakeholder Category**

Issue / Stakeholder Preferred Route	Stakeholder Category		
	Directly Affected Property Owners	Government Agencies (not directly affected)	Moorside Drive Stakeholders
No. of submissions	8	2	6
<b>Issues raised</b>			
Access	2		
Property value	3		6
Highway alignment / property impacts	5		6
Consultation process	1		3
Noise	4	1	6
Visual	3		6
Ground water	1		
Agricultural lands and businesses	2	1	2
Flooding	1		1
Impacts on community	1		
Commercial businesses	2		
Ecology	1	2	
State forest	2		
Health	1		
<b>Stakeholder Preferred Route</b>			
Refined Orange	1	Nil	Nil
Orange	3	Nil	4
Blue / Green	2	Nil	Nil
No specific preference expressed	2	2	2