

Kayri Shanahan

Wantirna South

Victoria 3152

14-10-2019

Director – Transport Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney 2001

SUBMISSION COFFS HARBOUR HIGHWAY BYPASS EIS (SS1_7666)

I feel much better writing about the Coffs Bypass today compared with the same time last year because it seems common sense has prevailed and the design for the bypass is now for 3 tunnels, a lower gradeline and quiet asphalt. The research undertaken before buying my property might now deliver a bypass plan worthy of the dream, so many of us had when we chose to call this beautiful place home.

Before we built a house in Pearce Drive, we checked with a number of authorities about what form the Bypass would take. Everyone including the RMS told me there will be tunnels, and went onto explain the benefits of doing so.

I still see the risks of the RMS destroying the amenity of West Coffs as being high. On one hand I feel so fortunate that a job change saw us sell and move to Melbourne, however, on the other I'm heartbroken for my friends and neighbors whose dream will be left in ruins if you don't do the right thing.

The following is a list of my concerns regarding RMS's Coffs Harbour Highway Bypass Environmental Impact Statement September 2019.

Noise and traffic.

I'm disappointed with four main issues regarding noise.

How did the RMS decide that some houses should be treated and which ones should be left out. Because as residents, our main concern with the noise study is that many of the noise measurements in the RMS study seem very high from what we as residents actually

experience. It'd probably be a good thing if someone checks out the noise report and modelling?

Some of the traffic counts are ridiculous and out of date. The night-time readings for houses well away from the existing Pacific Highway seem very high and it appears that there is a lot of nighttime noise on local roads which is not what we hear? Do these high pre-existing noise readings mean the RMS won't have to treat these houses? How does that work? aren't there Ministers Consent Conditions that override what the RMA may wish to do?

On page 56 (Volume 4A Appendix G, 4.3.1) of the EIS is a table (table 29) of DA conditions of approval which state what each developer had to do in each estate to treat each house against noise. **But each condition of approval is different and how were home owners and developers supposed to know the speed of traffic on the new highway, the type of pavement, the traffic numbers (because these have not been provided and what there is was done years ago) and in some cases, that there was going to be a major interchange near houses?** The difference of designing a house that can block out road noise on a local arterial road with traffic speeds at 80kms and very low night traffic is vastly different to that of highway noise at 110kms and a significant amount of trucks during sleep hours. RMS seems to have put all the responsibility on us and Coffs Harbour City Council without providing any information prior to the release of the EIS so I ask again, how would've anyone know exactly what they're going to have to deal with?

Construction noise levels seem to be very high and there is no proposed treatment of houses for that noise, which may go on for years. This appears grossly unfair because at no time were home owners and developers required to treat their houses for that as part of the DA.

Dangerous Goods.

The Pacific Highway upgrade at Coffs Harbour was supposed to remove all heavy vehicles off the existing Pacific Highway which will then become a local road.

The RMS information update (September 2019) that accompanied the EIS, states that the issue of Dangerous Goods has not yet been resolved but the EIS states that a risk assessment has been done. Which is it?

How is it possible to put out an EIS and not deal with the serious issue of dangerous goods particularly in such a dense location as the existing highway through our town? At the

tunnel in Ewingsdale at the Byron Bay turn off, the signs say that only Class 1 and Class 2.1 dangerous goods cannot access the tunnel.

A dangerous goods risk assessment must have been completed for RMS to make any sort of decision in Coffs Harbour. Why has this important information been kept from everyone in Coffs Harbour (including Council)? Coffs Harbour residents want the same rules as apply to the Ewingsdale tunnel, i.e. that all dangerous goods except Class 1 and Class 2.1 can use the Coffs Harbour Bypass..

Consultation.

This project is a \$1.8 billion project and will take years to complete. The consultation with the community by RMS has been woeful. For years they asked us what we wanted and we agreed it was to be tunnels, then without any consultation they came out with a completely different design with no tunnels which we rejected and now we've had six weeks with school holidays in the middle of this, to comment on a 3000-page EIS.

The display booths RMS have set up are well away from where the affected residents are and nobody is going there.

Biodiversity.

The Coffs Harbour Bypass route is unique along the Eastern Seaboard because this is where the Great Dividing Range meets the Coast. This is why flora and fauna abounds to make Coffs Harbour a biodiversity hotspot. I'm pleased common sense has prevailed and we now have tunnels, a lower gradeline and quiet asphalt, which are all positive steps for a fauna.

Please make sure that when the Bypass is being built that only local native species is used during revegetation activities to ensure the best outcome for our environment.

Yours sincerely



I don't make political donations.