Summerland Way – Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton

Route Selection

COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUP MEETING

Tuesday 3rd August 2004 5.30pm – 7.30pm

Grafton Community Centre, Duke Street Grafton

Minutes

Attendees:

Peter Black RTA Project Manager
Peter Collins RTA Regional Manager
Sonia Williamson RTA Project Team
Simone Garwood RTA Project Team
Monica Sirol RTA Project Team
Donna Martin RTA Project Team

Vicki St Lawrence Community Participation Coordinator

Greg Hayes Grafton Shopping World

Ron Bell Grafton Chamber of Commerce
Scott Flynn Susan & Elizabeth Islands Trust
Kel Kearns South Grafton Traders Association

Peter Morgan National Parks Association

Bill Noonan Clarence Valley Conservation Coalition Inc

Gordon Poynter Clarenza Community

Heather Roland Riverside, Bent and Through St Precinct

Amanda Steiner Fitzroy St Precinct
Karen Thompson Greaves St Precinct

Paul Covington Kent Street Action Committee
Frank Falkenstein Clarence Environment Centre Inc

Cecil Hyde Clarence Valley Council
Don McLeod Clarence River Yacht Club
Max Murray Clarence Valley Council

Mary Watson Schools

Apologies:

Shirley Adams Clarence Valley Council Robert Blanchard Road Transport Sector

Laurie Marchant South Grafton Residents Progress Association Inc

Maurie Mahar Ngerrie Aboriginal Land Council

Neil Payne Clarence Valley Council Chris Wheelahan McHugh St Precinct

Summerland Way – Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton Route Selection

1.0 Purpose of meeting

Vicki St Lawrence advised that the purpose of the meeting was for the RTA to inform CFG members of the current status of the project. RTA is still in the site selection stage and is currently carrying out investigations on the recommended route.

2.0 Project Information

Project update

The information in the background papers was explained to the meeting. A copy of the background papers is attached.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q Did the width of widening at the 'kinks' vary from the measurements shown at the Corridor Evaluation Workshop?
- A The widening is the same as shown at the Workshop.
- **Q** What was the previous cost for the modification of the 'kinks'?
- A \$5M. The estimate after further design of the modifications is \$9M
- **Q** The extra 4 million is it a contingency or extra cost?
- A The \$9M is the updated strategic estimate of cost to modify the 'kinks' and includes contingency.
- Q Will traffic be transferred to new bridge to remove kinks from existing bridge?
- A Yes.
- **Q** So there will still be congestion through the construction phase?
- A There will be less congestion as the traffic would be transferred to the new bridge which will eliminate the 'kinks' which cause the traffic delays in peak hours.
- **Q** Does the additional cost affect the BCR and has this been addressed?
- A The additional cost reduces the BCR's as shown in the Background Papers
- Q It was portrayed by the RTA at the Evaluation Workshop that the existing bridge wouldn't have any more modifications?
- A The amount of widening at the 'kinks' has not changed. The method of construction now requires additional piers to support the widening and as a result additional costs.
- **Q** What are the further detailed designs that have been done?
- A The designs are to a level of detail that would be suitable for submission to the NSW Heritage Office.
 - A copy of the bridge designs is attached.

Summerland Way – Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton

Route Selection

- **Q** How can the RTA get the cost so wrong?
- A The additional costs are as a result of a different method of construction for the modifications of the 'kinks'.
- Q Will a 3 lane bridge be closer to the existing bridge then a 2 lane bridge?
- A The 3 lane bridge would be marginally closer to the existing bridge.
- Q It was stated at the Evaluation Workshop that 4 lanes would not be considered when it was not possible at other locations?
- A The project is for an additional crossing of the Clarence River which would provide a total of 4 lanes.
- **Q** In the construction what about the profiles of the side, would it be enclosed.
- A The types of barriers at the sides of the bridge would be determined in the next stage of the project.
- Q 5 dB(A) is measured from the bridge and not houses?
- A The 5 dB(A) increase is the expected noise increase from the proposed bridge to existing residences.
- Q The existing bridge would not cater for double freight trains?
- A The existing bridge was originally designed for heavy locomotives.
- Q Do you see any logic in Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) with 7.1m clearance when the existing bridge will not cater for this clearance?
- A ARTC need to consider the long term strategy (60 years) for the rail infrastructure. Any decrease in vertical clearances will require further negotiations with ARTC.
- **Q** If the existing bridge was decommissioned who would be responsible for the upkeep?
- A This would be negotiated between RTA, Council, ARTC and Heritage.
- Q Will existing bridge get a paint job soon?
- A ARTC is responsible for the rail bridge. RTA maintains only the road bridge. RTA contributes 25% of costs for the maintenance of the rail bridge.
- Q What is submitted to the Heritage Council?
- A The Statement of Heritage Impacts Report is prepared in accordance with the NSW State Heritage Office Manual Guidelines. The report consists of a description of the local and regional history of the area, a discussion on the history of the bridge, design and architecture, a discussion on the architecture of the bridges and other bridges of similar design through Australia and the state, and the significance of the bridge.

The report includes a description of the proposed works to the bridge, a discussion on the options considered and justification for the preferred option, a discussion on the impacts and how the proposal is sympathetic to the bridge. The report must address three key questions set by the Heritage Office and include photos, diagrams and concept plans highlighting the design of the existing bridge overlain by the new designs.

Summerland Way – Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton

Route Selection

- Reading the Background papers for the options of a 3 and 4 lane bridge, the Heritage Office has little regard to cost, they are only concerned with heritage issues. They have priority to the presentation of the bridge instead of local needs. Also, the Heritage Office have had little input by not attending Corridor Evaluation Workshop
- A Heritage Offices position is to protect heritage items and the RTA must fulfil the requirements of the NSW Heritage Act. The Project Manager has briefed the Heritage Office on the process of the route selection. The Heritage Office will make a decision on the impacts of Option 2b based on the submission of the Statement of Heritage Impacts.
- **Q** The Statement of Heritage Impact, is it available to the community?
- A Normally, the community does not have input such as via a public display. The RTA will confirm the level of public consultation in the minutes

RTA Comment: The Statement of Heritage Impacts will be made available to the CFG.

- Q Are you looking at pier matching?
- A Pier matching will be confirmed in the next stage.
- Q Even with the new bridge, as the traffic gets down to the cross roads it will cause congestion?
- A The roundabouts have sufficient capacity for the next 20 to 30 years.
- Q Heavy traffic crossing the bridge crosses the centreline at the' kinks'. Hold up is the 'kinks' on the bridge and the heavy vehicles?
- A That is correct.
- Q Facts presented earlier regarding BCR have significantly changed. How can the RTA get it so wrong?
- A The change from 60km/hr to 50km/hr in urban areas has had an effect on BCR.
- **Q** Facts keep changing, community members don't feel the RTA is doing the process correctly?
- A This is part of the route selection process where assumptions that are made earlier in the project are confirmed or amended as the project proceeds.
- **Q** Are there sufficient funds for the Statement of Heritage Impacts?
- A Yes there is sufficient funding.
- **Q** Has the RTA employed a consultant to carry out the Heritage Study?
- A RTA Sydney office has a heritage expert who is compiling the Statement of heritage Impacts in accordance with the requirements set out by the NSW Heritage Office.
- Q Concern with bridge design, aesthetics impact on existing bridge for Heritage Assessment. Do the visual designs go the Heritage Office?
- **A** Yes they will be part of the submission.
- **Q** What is the time frame?

Summerland Way – Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton Route Selection

- Announcement of the preferred route will be later this year. The RTA will not announce the preferred route until all the issues from the Corridor Evaluation Workshop have been addressed. The Environmental Impact Assessment would follow the announcement of the preferred route and this would take 12 18 months.
- Q Concern with noise involved with the increase in height and grades of the bridge
- A The noise impact of raising the existing bridge further is being investigated. The removal of kinks will significantly reduce the high peak noises such as engine braking, gear changes, acceleration etc.

RTA Comment: An increase in the additional bridge height by 1.9 metres would have negligible impact on the overall emitted noise. However the effects of reflected noise from the new bridge structure alongside the existing bridge as well as the reduced barrier effect provided by the existing bridge for upstream residents would require investigation.

- Q Can we tell the community where the bridge is going?
- A Yes. The <u>recommended</u> site at this stage is downstream of the existing bridge.















