

Attention: Director – Transport Assessments
Planning and Assessment
Department of Planning Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

26 October 2019

FROM: Nicole Yeates
6 Bolwarra Road
Coffs Harbour NSW 2450

*Please delete my personal information before publication

Dear Sir/Madam

REF: - SUBMISSION FOR COFFS HARBOUR BYPASS – SSI _7666

I am writing a submission, in response to the current EIS presented September 2019.

My concerns relate to a lack of certainty regarding the effectiveness of the current plan in addressing community concerns raised, and a lack of transparent information, due diligence with reporting on impact studies which I believe have been undertaken by RMS, but not provided for public review despite numerous requests for this information. Any agreed tunnels need to protect the environment, and the community with regard to preservation of minimal noise impacts, vibration impacts, pollution, indigenous heritage, livelihood and personal investment. The value of our homes which could be negatively impacted by the current design need to be considered; Particularly those of us in West Coffs Harbour. For many of us, our properties form part of our retirement plan, and any controlled negative impact on our investments is unacceptable particularly given the options which were previously considered, have included tunnels and an actual bypass, therefore, the current Coastal Inner Route is unacceptable.

Recent changes to the Coastal Inner Route have seen the removal of three proposed tunnels. These tunnels were strategically located to minimise impacts across all identified problem areas including noise, lights, pollution, livelihoods, indigenous heritage and the environment. The construction of tunnels serves as an important mitigation but is considered as the very bare minimum given the route follows a valley that in effect amplifies noise and will consequently deliver excessive noise pollution, potentially devaluing properties, and put at risk, the current quality of life and enjoyment of living where we do. 90% of the Inner Coastal Route would be open road and the construction of tunnels would offer no mitigating respite. Residents of the previously completed Urunga bypass have also reported the very real impact of vibration from use of machinery such as Rollers, so close to residential premises, and the long-term structural impact. This is very real evidence of sanitised information being provided to residents prior to completion of works, and further evidence of the importance of having a 'construct only' contract. Mitigating controls are required to prevent history repeating.

The original plan of the far Western Coastal Bypass, was considered in 2000-2004, and is what the community thought they were getting. I request that this plan be reconsidered with appropriate and genuine consultation. This would benefit West Coffs Harbour plus Korora, Sapphire and other residents effected by this unwanted ring road. I believe this original plan would be of higher benefit to the natural environment for the flora and fauna, and to the general community of Coffs Harbour.

It would also be more respectful of our local Aboriginal heritage. The CRW proposal would also cause minimal property remediation and environmental impacts on the entire community.

The current ring road design does appear to be a plan for future growth in Coffs Harbour, and even from a layperson's perspective, and with local knowledge of the growth Coffs Harbour has already experienced in the 14 years since I have lived here, I can see that this plan is short sighted and will outgrow itself within five years with no scope for being able to adapt to the increased volume of traffic without negatively impacting neighbouring properties. Further information regarding the mitigations to minimise disruption to road access given the close proximity to residential properties is needed.

A Western bypass, as originally proposed is a longer-term design as there is space on either side of the highway to widen roads necessary in the future, without remediation of numerous properties.

In regard to '**construct only**' advantages, there is minimal risk to contractor, constructs are in line with the design completed by principal, architects and engineers. Advantages are that the design cannot be greatly modified during the building process, unless defects of design are noted. My vote is for 'construct only'.

The primary risk **re Design and Construct** contracts mean that the principal has minimal input during the construction. Often referred as 'package deal' contracts. Whereby the principal has minimal input throughout the entire process, and when construction is complete turns up to use the works for intended purpose.

Also, because of the higher risks for the contractor, as is responsible for design and construct, not just construct, they require higher costs to compensate. The contractor assumes the time and cost risks associated with modifying a design which may be impractical or employing a different method of working which becomes necessary to achieve completion.

In conclusion, the Coastal Inner Route is not an acceptable and I propose that the RMS terminate plans for the Inner Coastal Route and recommence a project based on the preferred Western Bypass route.