



MINUTES

Great Western Highway Upgrade: Blackheath Co-Design Committee

Date	3 June 2020	
Time	6.30pm – 10.15pm	
Venue	Via Webex Webinar	
Chairperson	Alistair Lunn – TfNSW	
Committee members	Kirstin Fischer Kate Walsh Iain MacLeod Fire & Rescue NSW – Katoomba Glenn Sherlock Gary Parsons Peter Chudek Ally Drinkwater Ross Ingram Damien Mah Gary Moore Eva Johnstone Juliet Bourke Sally Hollis Steven Burger Adele Colman George Vergotis Gary McCue Mick Beltran Greg Nankervis	TfNSW TfNSW TfNSW NSW Fire & Rescue Blue Mountains City Council Blue Mountains City Council Blue Mountains City Council Blackheath Public School P&C Blue Mountains Historical Society Blue Mountains Cycling Safety Forum Blackheath Area Neighbourhood Centre Blackheath Area Community Alliance Save Centennial Glen Save Station Street (Primary) Save Station Street (Alternate) Blackheath Streetscape Group Blackheath Chamber of Commerce Blackheath Highway Action Group Community Representative Community Representative
Additional attendees	Paul Peters Tricia Wunsch (Facilitator) Veronica Kooyman Caroline Boyd Emily Mitchell Adam Hillard (Design) Jonathan Blizzard (Environment) Marcus McClintock (Property)	TfNSW KJA KJA TfNSW TfNSW TfNSW TfNSW TfNSW
Apologies:	Urban Design (Jenny Burge) NSW Ambulance – Katoomba NSW Police – Springwood	TfNSW NSW Ambulance NSW Police

1.	Welcome – Alistair Lunn (Chair)
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of Country • Thanked everyone for their collaboration, and positive interaction at the first meeting, acknowledged the current challenges and for being willing to meet online. • Reminded all participants of the confidentiality of information presented at the meeting and requested that all interactions remain respectful. Some comments made on social media about the first meeting were borderline [breach of the Code of Conduct]. TfNSW has entered this process in good faith. • Recapping that meeting 1 was an overview of the four broad options. Today's meeting (Meeting 2) will explore the detail around two of those options: the Outer Western Bypass and the Inner Bypass adjacent to the railway line. • The purpose of the Blackheath Co-Design Committee is to hear from the representatives of the Blackheath community on the best way to manage the increasing traffic flow in Blackheath. The discussion is focused on Blackheath specifically, rather than alternate modes and other factors, which will be explored through the Great Western Highway Upgrade Program strategic business case. • At the next meeting (Meeting 3), the committee will discuss the existing Great Western Highway corridor, options for tunnels under Blackheath, and any ideas put forward by the committee.
2.	Meeting Agenda – Tricia Wunsch (Facilitator)
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilitator thanked committee members and TfNSW subject matter experts on design, environment and property for joining. • An overview of the agenda was provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic Counting: presentation (5 mins) ○ Assessment Criteria and Process: Review, Q&A and discussion (30 mins) ○ Outer Western Bypass: presentation, Q&A, discussion and options assessment (55 mins) ○ Break (10 mins) ○ Inner Bypass Adjacent to Railway Line: presentation, Q&A, discussion and options assessment (55 mins) ○ Future Meetings: discussion and vote (5 mins) ○ Chair's close (5 mins) • Acknowledged submission of questions in the last day or two: some of those will be addressed through the presentations, and there will be an opportunity to raise them during the Q&A and discussions.
3.	Traffic count response – Kirstin Fischer, TfNSW (Presenter)
3.1	<p>The facilitator invited questions about traffic into the chat for answering offline.</p> <p>The Traffic Count presentation was in response to a query raised at the last committee meeting about traffic numbers and volumes, and a particular reference to a discrepancy in figures.</p> <p>The presenter explained that there is a significant amount of variability in traffic numbers along the corridor. The closest permanent counting station to Blackheath is the heavy vehicle checking station. For particular projects, like the one that was recently completed at Blackheath, TfNSW also have separate surveys and counts done.</p> <p>The numbers vary between different surveys due to time of year and location. TfNSW adjust these results to make sure these are as averaged a number that can be deduced. These take into account seasonal variances and adjustments as well as locations of counting stations.</p>

	<p>There is considerable variability along the corridor, from 12,000 at Blackheath to 20,000 in Katoomba.</p> <p>There is also considerable variability each day, week and month, especially with peak events such as Easter. This will be taken into account and the project option will be designed to accommodate the peak periods, reduce congestion, and cater for future capacity.</p> <p>Consistently across the year, there is congestion in the middle of the day, especially on weekends but on weekdays too. This is consistent with feedback from local residents in Blackheath.</p> <p>When designing a solution, it is important to make sure that variability is catered for, both now and for the future, to enhance the outcome for everybody who is using the road.</p>
4.	Assessment Criteria Review – Kirstin Fischer, TfNSW (Presenter)
4.1	<p>Pre-reading materials were sent out in advance to allow Committee members time to consider the assessment criteria. Some of the feedback from the Committee has already been incorporated in terms of enhancing liveability, amenity and connectivity.</p> <p>It was important to keep the number of criteria to a manageable level to help the committee distinguish between the criteria, and to work with the project team and their knowledge and questions to apply the criteria against each of the options. It was not proposed to expand the number of criteria, but TfNSW are very happy to have Committee members' comments on the considerations that should be fed back into the criteria.</p> <p>It is not proposed to talk about criteria weightings at this stage. What is important is to understand the focus of the criteria and to understand each of the options first. Did not mean that weightings could not be taken into account later on, if that is what comes out in the Committee's discussions.</p> <p>Criteria 1: Improving safety. TfNSW made a change to this criteria following feedback that it was a benefit purely about road users. TfNSW wanted to assess an option based on safety and the impact to all customers including residents, commuters, drivers, pedestrians, etc. Factors included how an option impacts the mix of through and local traffic, does the upgrade separate the local traffic from pedestrians and cyclists, and what gradient does an option propose?</p> <p>Criteria 2: Minimising impact to the environment, both built and natural environment, taking into account some of the sensitive areas.</p> <p>Criteria 3: Improving congestion and travel time reliability – route length, is it longer or shorter than other options, does it offer improvements or alternatives to existing intersections?</p> <p>Criteria 4: Amenity, connectivity and liveability – ensuring the liveability of the built and natural environment, what is the noise or pollution impacts? Socio-economic impacts?</p> <p>Criteria 5: Resilience – feedback suggested this was considered double dipping on criteria about safety. To clarify resilience was not about safety but about ensuring that the corridor is able to provide continuity of service/accessibility during extreme weather events for essential and emergency services. It is also about future-proofing and making sure that this road endures well into the future.</p>
5	Assessment Criteria Discussion and Q&A – Tricia Wunsch (facilitator)
5.1	Has TfNSW formally consulted Aboriginal people and their representative organisations on the whole Katoomba-Lithgow project and the Blackheath options specifically?

	<p>TfNSW confirmed that Aboriginal community consultation has occurred for all sections of the proposed Great Western Highway Upgrade. Three Aboriginal Land Councils and one Tribal Council had been identified in the project area and each had been consulted. TfNSW had also engaged with the relevant title holder and related field surveys included direct engagement with members of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deerubbin Local Aboriginal Land Council (DLALC) - Bathurst Local Aboriginal Land Council (BLALC) - Darug Tribal Aboriginal Corporation (DTAC) - Gundungurra Tribal Council (GTC) <p>This process would be ongoing throughout the EIA and development of the routes.</p>
5.2	<p>What is the process in Meeting 4 to agree on the options? To what degree do the members of the BCC get a vote and to what degree is it actually the RMS taking it away to make a decision on our behalf?</p> <p>TfNSW response: There will be an assessment of each option against each of the criteria and there will be full transparency through the Poll Everywhere process. In Meeting 4, all Committee members will have the opportunity to re-visit their initial assessments from Meetings 2 and 3, because opinions may change or vary given the information that has been provided.</p> <p>This is one part of the process of determining a preferred option(s) arrived at and assessed by the committee and that will then be taken out to the broader community. TfNSW will work with that option, alongside all of the other considerations which Government has to take on board.</p> <p>To allay any concerns, TfNSW does not own the assessment process, it is the Committee's process.</p>
5.3	<p>To consider future congestion we would have to know the projected traffic modelling. Rather than just a projection of the average of history over the last 10 years (what we have already been shown) we need some reasonable analysis about sector growth, the consideration of smaller heavy vehicles into larger trucks (which reduces the number of trucks) and one off impacts like the Mt Piper Project, which would have a further impact of at least 1% of heavy vehicles and have demonstrated they will meet the 'code on Blue Mountains roads' which allows it to use 19 Metre B Doubles through the GWH Blue Mountain area. (See Traffic Impact Assessment of Mt Piper Energy Recovery Project.)</p> <p>[Note: this question was posted in the chat function and answered post-meeting rather than during live discussions]</p> <p>TfNSW response post-meeting: A detailed freight analysis will be part of the strategic business case. Strategic transport modelling will also look at future traffic forecasts out to 2036.</p>
5.4	<p>There is no discussion on whether the five criteria have equal weight. It is implicit they all have equal weight which is unrealistic.</p> <p>TfNSW explained that criteria had not been weighted at this stage but if weighting came up during the discussion of a route option it could be explored.</p>
5.5	<p>When you say resilience what does that mean?</p> <p>Resilience is the ability to have a corridor or connection that can cope during all types of weather and conditions, and preserves the ability for continuity of traffic, particularly essential services, in and through the mountains in a way that survives as long as possible into the future so things are only built once.</p>
5.6	<p>How have you assessed the existing works that have just been completed?</p> <p>TfNSW explained that the works referred to were safety works around local traffic congestion and safety. Resilience was a lot more than safety – it is the ability for the highway to remain</p>

	open during bushfire events, snow and ice, the ability to contraflow in an accident. A number of minor improvements to traffic management and safety have been undertaken so traffic can turn. But a lot more can be done for safety, for road users, locals, pedestrians, traffic. These recent improvements will make a big difference over the next few years to Blackheath but TfNSW is looking at something now that will make a difference over the next 20-50 years.
5.7	<p>Suggest we collapse similar criteria - e.g. resilience and safety - to ensure each are each really distinct.</p> <p>TfNSW noted the committee member had written in on the same subject. Safety was about improving safety for everyone in and around the corridor. It referred to gradients, management of through and local traffic. Resilience was the ability to have a corridor that is available during all weather events and accidents, that will last into the future. There was a need to keep the number of criteria manageable but TfNSW preferred to keep those two criteria separate. TfNSW invited views on whether there was anything that was not currently included but would be relevant in the considerations under each criteria.</p>
5.8	<p>I talked about safety in terms of wind, black ice and bush fires – there is a risk when motorists flick cigarettes out they will start a bushfire – and that would create a detriment to safety on the Outer bypass option. I am confused by the criteria referring to only an improvement to safety. I think there is a detriment to safety.</p> <p>TfNSW had taken onboard the committee member's feedback and had changed the scale of the safety rating to include the option for a decrease in safety.</p>
5.9	<p>The assessment criteria and considerations on the screen have already been sent to us. Can you please add value to each of these?</p> <p>TfNSW response: we have made a couple of adjustments based on feedback we received in the last 24 hours. We will send revised versions out to the committee following the discussion. We wanted the opportunity to address your feedback, show we have taken on the feedback and consider if there is more before we sent it back. The key feedback was in enhancing liveability and connectivity, and distinguishing why resilience and safety haven't been collapsed.</p>
5.10	<p>Kirstin has shown this slide of assessment of perceived outcomes and has read them through. But we can see them. Again, I would have liked some amplification other than, with respect, just having them read through.</p> <p>TfNSW response: it is hard to demonstrate the assessment without having an option to use as reference. The assessment will be brought to life by colleagues in the next sections when we talk about the options. I ask you to reserve judgement until we discuss an option and you can see how they might apply.</p>
5.11	<p>What about considering the broader living environment rather than the specifics alone?</p> <p>That is captured under liveability, amenity and connectivity. Committee members were invited to bring out concerns about the broader living environment under those criteria during the discussion on each of the options.</p>
5.12	<p>Community safety is also an important matter. This means how each option and its design affects areas that could encourage criminal activity, poor lighting and access, line of sight in public areas etc</p> <p>Community safety was partially covered under liveability and amenity but TfNSW agreed that it should be added to the general considerations for safety.</p>
5.13	<p>Considering earlier this week you sent a letter to Medlow Bath residents on the imminent design of the upgrade through that town for the first 'shovel ready' and build of this project, wouldn't you first need to know which option in Blackheath is finalised and gazetted as the design road in Medlow Bath? It will need to marry up exactly to the gazetted option in Blackheath.</p>

	<p>TfNSW response: In Medlow Bath, this refers to the section between Bellevue Crescent and the Rail Bridge, the section in front of the Hydro Majestic Hotel. We are not upgrading the rail bridge at Medlow Bath. There are already road issues at this section that Transport need to look at, including development works associated with the extended car park at the hotel, the crash record of Bellevue Crescent and how people get across to the rail station. This section is common to all options.</p>
5.14	<p>Question and ensuing discussion about weighting criteria before exploring the two options being presented at the meeting. Some committee members were concerned that the unweighted criteria favoured a bypass style road and were keen to weight criteria to be truly reflective of community sentiment towards particular issues. TfNSW was open to weighting criteria.</p> <p>Following discussion, the committee agreed to look at the general pros and cons for the two options presented here at Meeting 2, and then devote some time at Meeting 3 to looking at the weighting of criteria before looking at the other two options.</p> <p>It was agreed that committee members would be canvassed on the importance of each criteria offline and at the next meeting, the committee could collectively reassess the scoring for the two options from today if required.</p>
5.15	<p>Does the NSW Government own currently or has it bought any properties in Blackheath recently?</p> <p>TfNSW response: in relation to this project and projects in this area in the last few years, TfNSW has not bought any properties in Blackheath. This is different to what happened in the Valley because we put the alignment on the LEP of Councils and started acquiring properties when they came on the market. No properties have been bought to the east of the weigh station for the purposes of this project by the State Government.</p>
5.16	<p>I have a question about cost and future cost. When we get to Meeting 4 I would like to subject all of the options to a brief discussion about the financial future implications for the residents and businesses of Blackheath. I hope by then TfNSW will have some cost estimates on each of the four options.</p> <p>TfNSW explained that capital costs would not be discussed with this group. Some options obviously have greater ongoing operational costs, but that would be reviewed by TfNSW. There is no additional costs anticipated to residents at Blackheath, above and beyond costs to the NSW taxpayer of a road project. There is no expectation that a toll would be put on any part of this corridor.</p>
5.17	<p>I suggested that the assessment criteria include mention of compliance which refers to the impact of any of the four options on issues of legal compliance, i.e. Centennial Glen and Porters Pass are zoned E2 – Environmental Conservation. The objective of this zoning is to, inter alia, prevent development that could destroy, damage or otherwise have adverse effect on those values.</p> <p>TfNSW response: Anything we do will be compliant with respect to the environmental processes or any legislation in that respect. The land zonings that occur in LEP are generally in place for developments that are assessed by the local authority (i.e. councils). We won't be seeking approval from council for these works. We will be going to the Department of Planning through an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) process, which will take into account land zoning. We will consult with council about how we manage and mitigate impacts to land zonings, in particular E2. So we are seeking consent from a different authority that does not look after local land zonings.</p> <p>So you are not seeking consent of council in relation to the land around Centennial Glen because you are going to seek that consent through the Department itself?</p>

	TfNSW response: Yes. The EPA (Environmental Protection Authority) is split into different sections. This is a State Significant piece of infrastructure and will go to the State Government and its delegate authority, the Department of Planning, for consent. During that Department's process to give consent for any works they will seek consent and feedback, and invite consultation with the relevant authorities, one of which is council. The Department of Planning will seek compliance with that piece of legislation.
5.18	<p>Additional question from the chat:</p> <p>Comment: The traffic data that was given for Blackheath also includes all of our local trips to the shop, petrol station etc, where the Mt Boyce figures almost never go above 13,000 movements in a day, which more truly represents the traffic flow on the GWH, not movements at the GWH/Govetts Leap traffic light. I hope your traffic modelling is not including this local traffic as it skews true traffic flow on the highway itself.</p> <p>Post meeting clarification: Traffic modelling is done for each separate section of the highway i.e. Blackheath volumes are used for Blackheath and Mt Boyce volumes are used at Mt Boyce. The traffic modelling will need to incorporate all users of the road, locals inclusive.</p>
6	Overview of the Outer (Western) Bypass route option – Presentation by Iain MacLeod and Adam Hillard
6.1	<p>We are considering the west side of the highway because of constraints on the east side that incur higher levels of impact on residences, the national park, and the topography - it is also on the edge of a large arc that would require a significantly longer route.</p> <p>The role of the lead designer is to investigate the potential upgrade or bypass of options, assess that against design criteria and establish the geometry of different options. What you will see tonight looks quite detailed but I want to reinforce that these are preliminary options and require a lot of refinement optimisation to confirm the feasibility and impacts.</p> <p>AH orients the map and route for the audience, and then shows plan and modelling for the Outer bypass. It includes a series of tunnel, cuttings and bridge spans.</p> <p>This western option is at the extreme western edge of the shaded areas shown previously. This is the best effort to avoid impacts on residences, but any further west would result in terrain that is extremely steep.</p> <p>IM runs through a sample template of how you might want to consider the assessment criteria.</p> <p>The purpose of this presentation is to describe features of this option so you can make the decision against the criteria on how you would assess it.</p>
7	Q&A session – Tricia Wunsch (facilitator)
7.1	<p>Can you point to the meditation centre [on these plans]?</p> <p>The Vipassana Centre was highlighted on the plans for the Committee.</p>
7.2	<p>Would trucks with flammable materials be able to use this route?</p> <p>TfNSW response: Current NSW rules do not allow hazardous goods in tunnels and there is a tunnel on this route. If they were considered hazardous goods they would need to be transported at street level through the town. There is a lot of work being done at the moment around tunnels, technology and hazardous goods which have been led by a lot of the work on the Pacific Highway. These tunnels also aren't substantially long, so it could be quite feasible that you could pass through a tunnel of this style and length.</p>
7.3	What about noise?

	TfNSW response: Whatever option proceeds, there will be a noise assessment as part of the environmental assessment process. That will look at modelling the design with current and future traffic projections. If there is a need to undertake some mitigation measures then that is what will be done.
7.4	Is there a need for tunnel ventilation that isn't shown? TfNSW response: That would be part of the study that we would do.
7.5	How does local traffic get on and off this road? TfNSW response: This would be subject to traffic modelling, if this option were to be investigated further.
7.6	Why are impacts on Centennial Glen recreation area under environment rather than under liveability? Can I get those to be put into both those criteria? TfNSW response: The impacts on Centennial Glen recreation area were seem primarily as environmental impacts when it comes to doing assessments of these different options. Sometimes these impacts will fit into a couple of criteria and that is the sort of thing to discuss when we do the assessment. We would have to decide how it impacts on one or other or both criteria. TfNSW is not being strict about what sits under each criteria. I think the way we are considering it is that it would sit under both. We have included recreation under the liveability criteria and considerations as amended, to take this feedback into account.
7.7	Do you intend to engage any of the tunnel experts from Sydney? Have you accounted for the cost of sounds walls or barriers? TfNSW response: We will consult with a range of tunnel experts. TfNSW has a tunnel expert who is providing advice as well. As this project progresses into more detailed design, we will learn more about specific elements and apply costs to them. That is standard practice.
7.8	The meditation centre will be severely impacted by this route proposal. Why aren't they allowed to participate as members of the BCC? They are a major part of the economy in this town and from the look this it is going to heavily disrupt their activity. Thousands of people stay here beyond the time they are at the meditation centre. Have you costed in the affects into the economy of the town to interrupt their business? TfNSW response: We made a conscious decision early that we wouldn't be inviting individual businesses to be part of the BCC. We will be meeting with them in the coming weeks about the project. There are a number of businesses affected by the different routes. During the preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment there will be an intensive socio-economic study undertaken to understand how the local businesses operate, what percentage of their business is reliant on passing trade and those that are reliant on regional and local trade. During that process we will come up with a range of measures to mitigate the impacts on local businesses that arise from such a bypass. The impact of the Vipassana Centre is something we are conscious of and is something that we will work through with all the options. We understand it is important to the community and we have received lots of feedback about it.
7.9	What are the impacts on properties from Evans Lookout Road to Hill 33? There is also a matter of water catchment there. It is quite an important water catchment area. The alignment against the properties was highlighted on the map. TfNSW response: The water catchment area was acknowledged as important. TfNSW has had preliminary discussions with Water NSW and will look at what the impacts might be and mitigations for them. Similarly with the views there will be a landscape and visual assessment study completed on whatever option proceeds, which will give more information about the precise impacts.

7.10	<p>Several questions were asked and concerns raised about around property acquisition, the number of properties directly affected by the option, property prices, compensation and the impact on the local economy of removing land, housing and critical businesses.</p> <p>TfNSW explained that the precise number of directly impacted properties had not yet been calculated as the project was at a very early stage in the planning process. The speaker reiterated that the Committee was not expected to decide on a final design, but provide feedback on the different options under consideration, to help TfNSW refine the broad corridor and alignment before going back to the wider community for further consultation with more specifics. This was the normal iterative process a project would go through.</p> <p>As the planning process progresses, there are a lot of hard decisions to be made and authorities need to look at those and weigh what is the best outcome for the Blackheath community. Property impact is one of those as is the town's amenity, safety and environmental impacts.</p> <p>If land was required for the project that would be assessed under the <i>Just Terms Compensation Act</i>. Land outside of the project corridor did not have the same compensation and the project would try to mitigate impacts. TfNSW would try to minimise the acquisition area and the effect on property as much as possible.</p> <p>Additional comments were received from the committee that without details of where acquisitions would occur, it was difficult for the BCC to make decisions to reduce the route to one or two options. It was suggested this process should be happening in 1 – 1.5 years from now when more information is available. The BCC is being asked to make grave decisions for their community with no information.</p> <p>TfNSW response: We are still in the early stages of this process and the routes are currently lines on a map. The alignment process needs to continue. These are big and complicated decisions, but the BCC is being asked to advise TfNSW from the community's point of view and input. The BCC is not making the final decision; that is the responsibility of TfNSW and the NSW Government.</p>
7.11	<p>Is it possible that the railway can be slightly moved at the Evans Lookout Road end of the project so the highway can be aligned not to affect those properties?</p> <p>TfNSW response: we need to look at the detail of that, but we certainly can look into it.</p>
7.12	<p>Travel savings will be impacted by the traffic lights. Currently TfNSW is boasting 10 minutes savings for the project. At what point will it be unviable - 5 minutes, 7 minutes?</p> <p>TfNSW response: The time saving has been cited as at least 10 minutes, so is expected to frequently be more, particularly for heavy vehicles. The travel time savings are for average travel times for every day of the week. As explained earlier, traffic volumes and times vary. Additionally, there is not a benchmark where any travel time savings make this project viable or not. Time savings is just one in a suite of benefits to be considered.</p>
7.13	<p>Can TfNSW guarantee that once the final option is decided, negotiation for any acquisition can begin immediately rather than waiting until Blackheath is shovel ready? We don't want a preserved corridor put over it and then a big delay. The values of our properties were affected from November last year and the publicity around this.</p> <p>TfNSW response: As soon as the project has an alignment, is approved and funded, the Property Department is given instructions to start the acquisition process. That is in accordance with the Land Acquisition (<i>Just Terms</i>) Compensation Act. Generally it is a timeframe of about 18 months.</p>
7.14	<p>I would like to ask [a specific member of the BCC] about the additional impacts of bushfires would be with this route?</p>

	Community BCC member response: There are pluses and minuses. Wherever there is people and vehicles there is a fire risk. The western side of Blackheath out to the Shipley Plateau is a bit of time bomb waiting to happen. It depends on how wide the construction works are and what the maintenance works are.
7.15	Discussion around how to manage weighting of criteria. It was agreed that committee members would undertake some work offline to write down their impressions for each criteria and send through to the facilitators. The feedback received would be discussed as part of the weighting discussion that would take place at a future meeting.
8.	Overview of the (Inner) Bypass Adjacent to Railway Line Route option
8.1	<p>Presentation from Paul Peters and Adam Hillard.</p> <p>Reminder it is still early days for this option. AH walked the committee through the alignment. Because this option is in the built up area of Blackheath, it has many more property and business impacts than the previous option presented. There are various local heritage items and a potential indirect impact on the Blackheath Railway Station. So one option has less of an impact on the built up area and this one has a much greater impact on the built up area. In terms of the benefits, it offers similar ones for traffic and resilience as the outer western option.</p>
9	Break – 5 minutes
10	Inner Bypass Q&A session
10.1	At a member's request, the committee was taken through the maps and plans again, and spent time at each connection and portal. It was noted there were a lot of constructability constraints for this route. It maintained Station Street and there would be some reconstruction over the top of one tunnel.
10.2	<p>Does the road parallel to Station Street remain the same level as Station Street?</p> <p>TfNSW response: It is lower in this plan. There is a retaining wall that retains Station Street. We are tying in with the existing levels on the outside of the northbound carriageway.</p>
10.3	<p>How do we get across to town from the west? It is cut off. What about around Bundarra Street to get into town?</p> <p>TfNSW response: If this option were to proceed any further, we would look at options to connect to the local network. For Bundarra Street, you can use the local network, come up Murri Street and use Station Street where it is reconnected.</p>
10.4	<p>Do these roads surface because they are cheaper to construct? If they remained underground there wouldn't need to be property acquisitions.</p> <p>This route developed through an evolutionary process, it is still early days and it could evolve further to just one long tunnel. Tunnel options would be explored at the next meeting and that might be one option the committee puts forward.</p>
10.5	<p>Between Bundarra Street and Shipley, how far down does the road come? Are houses squashed between the newer road and the railway?</p> <p>TfNSW response: [takes the screen to this section]. We don't know at this section what would be acquired. The road option could shift further one way to maintain the properties.</p>
10.6	<p>It is hard for us to comment when you don't really know where the road is going.</p> <p>TfNSW response: We need to start somewhere so we can give you some idea of what it looks like. We can say this option would have a big impact on the built up area.</p>
10.7	<p>Why would you even consider an option in a built up area like this when there are other options? It is so destructive of a large part of Blackheath and its essential services and so many houses. Why would you waste money looking at it?</p>

	TfNSW response: Our starting point is to look at everything. We want to understand from your viewpoint what impacts each option would have on your community. We are here to get the committee and the community's feedback.
10.8	<p>If a full tunnel option is a possibility for this route, it represents a more minimal impact on residents and businesses. Would it be seen differently as a tunnel on the other side all the way to the end?</p> <p>BCC response: That would come down to the engineers. Where I live there is a steep narrow hill. I imagine a tunnel would need to go very deep and assume it would cost more. Also need to consider where the portals come out for noise and pollution factors. But obviously that would be a lot better than this. Taking out Station Street really impacts on the economy of the whole town, as well as impacting the liveability and connectivity. This would really cut the west side of Blackheath off from the east side – connectivity is a major issue.</p> <p>TfNSW response: That is why we are here and this is the feedback we want on the options. It is very valid. If a tunnel is decided on, then tunnels can go anywhere. We can talk about this at the next meeting.</p>
10.9	<p>What are the designed road speeds for both options discussed tonight? Does the concept involve breakdown lanes?</p> <p>TfNSW response: Both options presented will be sign posted at 80 km/ph. The design speed is usually 10 km above the posted speed limit, depending on the constraints. The governing factors include the critical alignment through the rail intersection and grades. Locations for break down bays have not yet been identified, as we have focused on the alignment and horizontal and vertical geometry first.</p>
10.10	<p>Why does the tunnel need to surface though the centre of town if you can't turn off into Blackheath there?</p> <p>TfNSW response: There is a low point in this route as there is a small valley on the horizontal alignment and we will struggle to get under this. We don't want a steep grade in tunnels and can't get enough clearance there. This is a starting point for a horizontal alignment and we will go through a process to refine it based on pros and cons.</p>
10.11	<p>Can you give us your opinion of the pros and cons and the viability of the two options we have seen so far?</p> <p>TfNSW response: From a geometric perspective both achieve the same sign speeds, there is a lot of constructability issues with both options for different reasons. From a geometric and road safety perspective they are not too different. The local network at the end of construction for either are pretty much the same, with the exception of Wombat Street.</p>
10.12	Discussion around the minutes from the previous meeting. A committee member lodged a formal complaint that the minutes from the last meeting had not been accurate. TfNSW responded that draft minutes were circulated one week after the meeting and all members were given seven days to provide comments, which was the opportunity to raise any concerns about accuracy. There was a request to include more detail from presentations in future minutes.
10.13	<p>The section from Bundarra Street to Murri Street, how does that happen? Do you disturb all the properties on top, put the road underneath then cover it up? What happens to the properties on top?</p> <p>TfNSW discussed the likely impact to the properties located on top of the tunnel.</p>
10.14	<p>What happens to historic buildings in this area? Are they destroyed?</p> <p>TfNSW explained the process for assessing historic properties. Some places are archaeologically recorded and there may be other mitigating measures. If a permit is granted, the building may be destroyed but buildings have also been moved in the past.</p>

10.15	The new highway width is much wider than Station Street. If cut and cover is used then it will still impact on many properties. Taken as a comment.
10.16	Why are you re-aligning Station Street from Bundarra to Murri Street? TfNSW explained that this was to improve the operation of the intersection of Bundarra Street and the Great Western Highway.
10.17	What would be the speed on the Outer bypass? Answered at 10.9.
10.18	How do the houses that remain close by the original road reach the railway station? The houses between Bundarra Street and Shipley, will you acquire those or leave them valueless? How do they connect to the town? TfNSW explained that the existing connections would be maintained. To reach the station from Shipley, turn into Station Street as now and cross at the level crossing. There is a pocket of houses left, will they have the railway on one side and the noise wall on the other? Will you acquire those houses? TfNSW response: the drawings are conceptual only at this stage. If this option went forward, the next stage of design would look at the impact on properties. If the noise impact would make the properties unliveable, then TfNSW would acquire them. But this option may not go forward for further investigation.
10.19	That section of Station Street between Murri and Bundarra Streets, is that cut and cover? TfNSW response: In this drawing it is. Further investigations could change that if more vertical clearance can be achieved.
11.	Future Meetings
11.1	Discussion around future meeting options. It was agreed that the preferred option was for monthly meetings, face-to-face if Covid-19 restrictions permit, with a facility to allow people to join from their own homes via technology if required. It was agreed that Meeting 3 would be a presentation and discussion around Options 3 and 4. The meeting would also include a scoring discussion on criteria weightings. Meeting 4 would be a discussion of alternate options and an opportunity to refine the decisions that had been taken by the Committee.
12.	Thanks and Close
12.1	The Chair and Facilitator thanked everyone for participating. The Chair issued a reminder to maintain confidentiality around the information that had been presented in the meeting, as the options were still subject to change and public consultation would follow in due course.