

Attachment 3 to Item 152

Submissions - Email

Date of meeting: 13 September 2022 Location: Council Chambers Time: 6:30 p.m.

From:	
Sent:	Wed, 3 Aug 2022 11:36:16 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"
Subject:	Mr Andrew Kearns - Redbank

Dear Mr Kearns

I am writing to you with regards to Grose Wild and the impact the Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement.

I would like to know how/why the Hawkesbury Council is allowing the sprawl of Redbank to continue and now affect long standing villages that now are being impacted by this non environmentally friendly development.

The whole agreement is founded on a fraudulent swinging vote by a one time member of the council, as per ICACs findings.

The contract and vote would have been made null and void in any other business, yet here we are seeing their mission spread into neighbouring villages.

The new bridge will create noise, light pollution as well as adding heavy metals to the river system. Trees, dams, waterways and wildlife have already been damaged beyond repair in the development of this housing estate made for profit.

I would be very grateful if you could answer these questions from a council tax hawkesbury resident.

Yours sincerely

Get Outlook for iOS

From:	
Sent:	Mon, 1 Aug 2022 09:09:04 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"
Subject:	Proposed Amendments to Redbank Voluntary

Object to Proposed Amendment to Grose River VPA because the revised VPA exposes the Hawkesbury Residents to unknown additional costs. Highlighted are two areas the report contradicts itself.

SECTION 3 - Reports for Determination PLANNING DECISIONS

CP - Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement - Proposed Grose River Bridge - Location and Milestones - (95498)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the details of the proposed amendments to the Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) and recommend that the draft amended VPA be placed on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days. At the completion of the exhibition a further report will be presented to Council to consider adoption of the amended VPA.

3. Council staff work with the Developer and Roads and Maritime Services to draft a Memorandum of Understanding to confirm way forward, the key features of such a document to include:

a) Limiting Redbank's financial contribution to the cost of original "Navua" alignment (Grose River Road from Grose Valley Road to Springwood Road, via Navua Reserve) less expenditure (surveys, studies, plans, applications etc) to date

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There are no additional financial implications from the recommendation in this report.

The Memorandum of Understanding should be resolved prior to finalising the VPA and be embedded into the VPA as it is a critical component on who pays for the bridge.

From:	
Sent:	Wed, 3 Aug 2022 21:15:22 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"

Subject:HAWKESBURY CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REDBANKVOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT

Attachments: EE HAWKESBURY REDBANK VOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT.pdf, EE STANDARD DA CONDITIONS V4 JULY 2022.pdf, EE Drawing 86232 OH lines minimum clearances.pdf, EE FPJ 4015 Relocation Removal July 2013.pdf, EE FPJ 6007 Technical Review Request Aug 2019.pdf, EE General Restrictions OH Power Lines Apr 2020.pdf, EE MDI0044 Easements and Property Tenure.pdf, EE Safety on the job.pdf

The General Manager Hawkesbury City Council

ATTENTION: Mr Andrew Kearns, Manager Strategic Planning

Dear Sir or Madam

I refer to Council's letter of 29 July 2022 regarding the proposed amendments to Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) related to the construction of the Grose River Bridge linking Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River. Submissions need to be made to Council by 29 August 2022.

As per Endeavour Energy's previous requests, if possible could all notifications from Council for development applications, planning proposals etc. to be emailed to <u>property.development@endeavourenergy.com.au</u>. With the delays in sending letters via the post and given the large number of notifications received by Endeavour Energy (and which are generally dealt with in order of their receipt) being able to respond in the requested time frames can be difficult. Alternatively any notifications required to be made to Endeavour Energy under the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 (NSW), Section 2.48 'Determination of development applications—other development', should be made via the NSW Planning Portal.

Please find attached Endeavour Energy's submission which is based on the system being used for submissions to concurrence and referrals received via the NSW Planning Portal. The introduction of standard type conditions was required to keep up with the work load and expedite responses. I appreciate not all the issues in the submission may be directly or immediately relevant or significant to the VPA. However, Endeavour Energy's preference is to alert proponents / applicants of the potential matters that may arise should development within closer proximity of the existing and/or required electricity infrastructure needed to facilitate the proposed development on or in the vicinity of the site occur.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or the contacts identified in Endeavour Energy's submission in relation to the various matters. Due to the high number of development application / planning proposal notifications submitted to Endeavour Energy, to ensure a response contact by email to property.development@endeavourenergy.com.au is preferred.

Yours faithfully Cornelis Duba Development Application Specialist Sustainability & Environment M: 0455 250 981 E: <u>cornelis.duba@endeavourenergy.com.au</u> 51 Huntingwood Drive, Huntingwood NSW 2148 www.endeavourenergy.com.au



PS Please note that due to the 15MB size limit in accordance with Council's Email & Internet policy, I have resent this email but without all the public safety resources.

From:	
Sent:	Fri, 5 Aug 2022 14:39:08 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"

Cc:"nathan.zamprogno@hawkesbury.councillor.com.au"<nathan.zamprogno@hawkesbury.councillor.com.au>Subject:Redbank VPA

Mr Andrew Kearns, Manager Strategic Planning Hawkesbury City Council

Dear Mr Kearns,

I would like to make an informed submission to the Redbank Communities (RBC) Draft VPA. I have read a significant amount of documentation studied the plans and listened to the Council meeting especially the questions from Councillor Zamprogno.

There are several things I am confused about and would be grateful for your response by Friday 12th August to help clarify these points and allow me to complete my submission.

 Councillor Zamprogno stated that "the Developer is on the hook for the cost of the bridge and the approach roads regardless of what it costs....." The interpretation I have from the documentation seems to conflict in that the contribution under the VPA, RBC only need to pay the original contribution less expenses to date. I note Council's plan notes GRR resurfacing and roundabout is not part of the VPA but there is a monetary contribution.

Could you please confirm what is Council's estimated cost exposure or what works will Council pay for in the project (if any) between Grose Vale Rd and Springwood Rd?

2. Councillor Zamprogno also asked the staff "whether a compliant road in that has the right curves and cambers and all the rest of it could be constructed if the envelope of the property acquisition were changed. And if the answer to that question is yes in the Technical sense, then I would endorse that as an amendment to this motion"

The Mayor then added, ".....that options report that has been looked at recently, I don't believe and I'll ask you (GM) to confirm that there was any instructions to avoid any particular property in that options Analysis"

The GM's response in summary I guess was addressed to the plan put up on the screen showing a random yellow arc drawn back across the property to the East of the Wilcox farm. The GM stated in response to the Mayor that there was no instruction to avoid any property but that they were working from a fixed point on Springwood Road. Showing a plan of the road the GM stated "...is likely to require the alignment of the approach road on GRR a fairly substantial way

to the North on GRR potentially resulting in multiple partial acquisitions of GRR further out potentially 5, 6 or so properties up there."

Could you please confirm the 5 or 6 properties further up GRR that would be affected as described or at least which properties would be affected?

3. I note on the discussed RBC Options Report, the three options proposed by RBC all used the Northern end of the bridge as the fixed point rather than the roundabout at Springwood Rd, as did the plan discussed by the GM. This makes a significant difference to the available options and limits the outcomes compared to simply addressing the two fixed points (GRR/Ashtons Rd intersection and the point at RL20 on Springwood Rd).

Based on the confirmation there has been no instruction to avoid any properties could you please advise if there has been any option looked at which would in my view be the obvious connection between two points from GRR to the preferred (flood mitigation) point on Springwood Road. I would expect any experienced civil engineer to take up the route outside the eastern boundary of the Willcox farm and begin a modest curve about their Southern boundary to land at the desired point on Springwood Rd. This would require articulating the exit from the Springwood Rd roundabout a few degrees clockwise and then a modest bend and straight run to GRR (completely missing the Willcox home and farm) and I understand the properties on the Eastern side of GRR already have a substantial Road Reserve along the front of their properties which could be used to take up any deviation at the intersection if it were required. This wo

I appreciate your assistance in clarifying these three points. If you need to contact me please feel free to do so.





From: Sent: To: Cc:	Thu, 25 Aug 2022 21:12:40 +1000 "Elizabeth Richardson" "Hawkesbury City Council"
Subject: Attachments:	Submission VPA Redbank submission VPA Redbank VPA Aug 22.docx
Elizabeth Richardson	General Manager HCC,
Attached is a submiss	ion from the in opposition to VPA as proposed by Council.

has authorised me to forward the submission to you.

The

Submission, VPA amendments at Redbank.

The proposed amendments to the VPA relate to the construction of the Grose River Bridge linking Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River.

The proposed changes relate to the new proposed location of the Grose River Bridge, and timing for the delivery of the Grose River Bridge in 2025.

1.Council Meeting. The Council meeting at which this item was discuss revealed Minutes discussed at meetings between Redbank Communities, HCC and others, the minutes of the meeting dated the 12 November 2018 at 3.11 says in part<u>...... Arup to adjust where</u> <u>necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment</u> <u>accordingly.</u>

In the 30 January 2019 at point 3.06 the minute says,.....<u>which is to avoid the private land housing</u> the horse stud and 3.07, road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief.

At the same Council meeting Council resolved to hold a briefing session for Councillors only to review the minutes etc;

The **sector** is not aware of the outcome of that briefing session except to say, social media revealed a Redbank representative/s was/were present to answer question!

All documents from that briefing should now be made public.

Until the residents and ratepayers are made aware of the questions, answers, and documents that were discuss at the Councillor briefing session, the **secret** and the residents can only conclude secrecy between the developer and Council is not transparent.. Keeping pertinent information from resident is not transparency. Accordingly this application must not proceed

The Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2036, (HCSP) refers to the intent of the Leadership at p22 "Be a respected civic leader through, transparent and engaged decision making that the community can understand".

On that basis alone this application must not proceed.

2. Improved flood Immunity. At the community meeting organised by Council in North Richmond, several years ago, the then General Manager emphasized the need to move the Bridge upstream to improve flood immunity amongst other things.

There is no evidence in the July Business Papers that flood immunity will be improved so residents and ratepayers have access to work, health care and other services via Springwood Road to the Great Western Highway.

There is neither evidence nor plans, that the Creek crossings on Springwood Road (a State road) will be upgraded by anyone in the Business Papers. If there is, please provide the

advice in the report to Council along with the timeline for the delivery of the upgrades when this matter comes before Council for determination.

The GM at the July 2022 Council Meeting told the meeting, in a question from Councillor Zamprogno as the **sector and a sector and a sec**

Yet, turning left or right off the proposed road onto Springwood Road there is neither access to the great Western Highway or Castlereagh Road, in times of floods when the Bridges on Springwood road are under flood waters.

What is the point of building a bridge to nowhere?

Unless Council staff can provide evidence that the flood immunity will be significantly improved, with the upgrading of the Creek crossings on Springwood Road then this application must not proceed.

3. The Environment. Council has allowed environmental vandalism at its worst on the Yobarnie precinct. To continue with that vandalism on the Grose River precinct is reckless and irresponsible.

The HCSP at p26 Our Environment, there are three headings, **3.1 The natural environment** is protected and enhanced, **3.2to live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print**, **3.4 the sustainability of our urban environment is improved**.

There is an alternative for the site of the river crossing, which would protect the Grose River precinct from more environmental vandalism. Council should seriously pursue the construction of the third crossing of the Hawkesbury River, promised by state and Federal Government to be located where it will serve the Redbank commuter and others.

The logical location is on the eastern side of St John of God, Health Care Facility, a Jim Anderson via-duct on Crowley's Lane and then onto Castlereagh Road. The Driftway is about 100 metres away!

If Council staff cannot ensure the natural environment will be protected and enhanced and to ensure residents can live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print and as a result of the proposal the sustainability of our urban environment is improved, this application must not proceed.

4. Local Roads. The current conditions of Grose Vale Road, Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road are not fit for purpose now!

There is a serious safety questions around the Grose View School and the danger to parents, children and staff.

The VPA does not indicate exactly what the developer is proposing for local Road upgrades.

If Council staff cannot demonstrate exactly what the developer and Council will do and the timing to the satisfaction of residents, this application must not proceed.

The VPA. The VPA needs to be cancelled by agreement and re negotiated.

The has been critical of Councillors adopting the VPA all those years ago.

The sincerely hope our concerns are addressed. If they cannot, then the application must not proceed.

Authorised by

From:	
Sent:	Mon, 29 Aug 2022 12:34:11 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"
Subject:	Redbank Amended VPA Submission
Attachments:	Coffey Objection to VPA.pdf

Dear Madam/Sir,

Please find attached my submission objecting to the proposed amendment to the Redbank VPA in its current form. I would be happy to answer any request for clarification.

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

Regards

1. Summary

In my view the alignment of the proposed extension of Grose River Road (GRR) in the amendment to the VPA has been compromised by an instruction to the designer to avoid the Starr property where the road would be across vacant paddocks. Instead, it has been unnecessarily routed through the home, sheds and farm of the Wilcox family.

Whilst HCC and TfNSW are aware of a ¹design completed for Council in 1986 that crosses the vacant land with the same number of properties requiring acquisition but avoiding significant private assets there has been no reference to this work since the initial email from HCC Design and Mapping Services in 1917. There has been no option study to review this design and no attempt to review any option that crosses the vacant land of the Starr property.

I am of the opinion, based on the information provided to Councillors and the community it is not possible to make a properly informed decision on the amendment to the VPA.

According to legal advice provided by Wilcox's lawyer to HCC:

It is common practice when designing transport infrastructure corridors, particularly road infrastructure corridors, to consider corridors which minimise the impact on existing residential dwellings, wherever practicable. That practice was not adopted in this case; to the contrary, a road alignment was chosen – supported by Council – which favoured a neighbouring landowner over our clients' land.

I agree that "That practice was not adopted in this case" and find it difficult to understand why Council and TfNSW professionals would have continued with a selection of building the road through a home and farm without at least making the case for the 1986 Maunsell design.

During the review of potential options there seems to be no reference to the veracity or otherwise of the 1986 Maunsell design post Councils May 2017 email with RMS. The existence of the design has been ignored possibly because it crosses the vacant land that was precluded in the design brief.

To remove any doubt the only sensible resolution to this matter is that HCC initiate an independent engineering assessment of the two ²existing design options and or demonstrate to the community that the 1986 Maunsell design is unable to be built or modified to be built in accordance with the required Standards. The unnecessary demolition of a family home, sheds and destruction of a small farming business in preference to utilising vacant land is not an option that should even be considered valid.

¹ Design by Maunsell

² The Maunsell design and the Redbank design

2. Introduction

This assessment has been prepared after reviewing publicly available information, online documents, Library documents and information provided by ³Marian Wilcox, including information gained under freedom of information provided by ⁴TfNSW and Hawkesbury City Council (HCC). From examining this information, it appears the integrity of the process to arrive at the proposed amended road alignment and bridge design has been compromised so as to unfairly prejudice the Wilcox family.

I also believe the document posted by HCC on the HCC website titled "*Proposed Grose River Bridge and Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement fact sheet*" has inaccuracies and ambiguity that may compromise any decision by Councillors and/or members of the community who are seeking information to help them make a submission to Council on the project.

There are two elements that support this conclusion.

The design process and selection of the road alignment. The accuracy and/or ambiguity of the HCC "Fact Sheet."

The alignment of the road has been compromised by a constraint to the designer "to avoid the ⁵Starr Property" resulting in a limited choice of alignment options. Information provided by the HCC General Manager to Councillor's in response to a question by Councillor Zamprogno at a ⁶Council Meeting and generally reflected in the "Fact Sheet," is incorrect and may result in Councillor's deciding on the VPA amendment based on incorrect information and limited understanding of other options that may have been incorrectly refuted.

The basic premise to be able to make an objective and properly informed decision is subject to the accuracy of the information at hand.

- ⁵ John Starr Lots 18 & 19 DP250448
- ⁶ Council Meeting 19th July 2022

³ Owner 1 Ashtons Rd Lot2 DP1039224

⁴ Also previously referred to as DMR or RMS

3. Design Process and Selection of the Road Alignment

Two parameters of two designs are reviewed herein, being

The Redbank Design by ARUP and The Maunsell Design

The Redbank Design (RDA)

The RDA is the basis of the proposed amendment to the VPA prepared under instruction of Redbank and undertaken by ARUP. Based on Project Meeting Minutes this design appears to have been prejudiced to favour one landowner (John Starr) to the East of the Wilcox property by an instruction to *"avoid the Starr property per the design brief"*.

The evidence of this instruction is in Project Meeting Minutes taken during Project Meetings 3 and 4 with Redbank, their consultants, HCC and TfNSW (RMS) in attendance. There is no doubt that both HCC and TfNSW (RMS) were aware of this provision in the design favouring the Starr Property over the Wilcox farm.

Copies are attached (Attachment A 1&2) of Minutes from Redbank Project Meetings 3 & 4 which were held in November 2018 and January 2019 respectively. The attendees at those meetings were Redbank Communities (Redbank; the developer), their consultants, HCC and TfNSW.

NB: Statement in,

Project Meeting Nº3 Item 3.11;

"ARUP design based on 35m wide corridor. **RMS** (TfNSW) suggested that this is too wide and can be reduced to 21m wide. *Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment accordingly*"

Project Meeting Nº4 Item 3.06

"Small deviation of GRR at intersection with Ashtons Road to facilitate alignment with the new extension of GRR (link) which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud."

Project Meeting Nº4 Item 3.07

"Road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief"

The provision to avoid the Starr property is further evidenced by the final design alignment and the Options Study carried out. The final design alignment through the Wilcox home and farm appears to be less sensible than the obvious option which would mean joining the same two points, Intersection Ashtons Rd/GRR and Springwood Rd via the most direct route. Each of the road layouts in the Redbank Options Study (Attachment B) ignore any option to rotate the bridge a few degrees clockwise to establish an alignment that would take the road alignment across the vacant land known as the Starr Property. The Northern side of the proposed bridge is generally used as the fixed point rather than the point on Springwood Rd.

The Maunsell Design (MD)

The Maunsell design was commissioned by HCC in cooperation with the then ⁷DMR and finalised in 1986. This design and documentation is held by Council and it appears to have been the basis of Council engineers choice when first proposing an alternate route to the Navua Bridge Option.

This is evidenced by HCC email dated 31st May 2017 (Attachment C) initially sent from Chris Amit (Manager Design and Mapping Services – HCC) to Cathy Mills (??) and Jeff Organ (HCC), attachments were for Colin Langford ⁸RMS. The same email and attachments were then forwarded with explanation to Richard Vaby and Jeff Organ.

The explanation to Richard Vaby from Chris Amit states in part;

"I believe this is on the confidential side of things at the moment"

"The alternate link will be from Ashtons Road to Springwood Rd – *direct line* (see attachments). The plans attached are from 1986 and no ⁹BOQ is available".

This document demonstrates that the Council officers including Jeff Organ who was a member of the Redbank Project Group were aware of an optional road alignment and it appears that the same information was provided to Colin Langford from RMS also a member of the Project Group.

The attachments to the email were;

- 1. Proposed Grose River Bridge Route.pdf
- 2. Full Set Plans Mausell 1986.pdf.

The *Proposed Grose River Bridge Route (pdf)* is a HCC plan showing the proposed route connecting the intersection of Ashtons Rd/GRR and Springwood Rd in a direct line which traverses across the Starr property and the Grose River to land on Springwood Rd and is included with the attached email string ¹⁰referred to above.

⁷ Now TfNSW

⁸ Now TfNSW

⁹ Bill of Quantities

¹⁰ Attachment C

The full set of Plans from Maunsell is made up of a set of 24 drawings of Bridgeworks (Bridge Design Arrangement Drawings) and 12 drawings of the Approach Road Works (road and intersection details). The design detail shows the design was undertaken to provide a direct link between the intersection of Ashtons Rd/GRR and Springwood Rd.

The attached Maunsell ¹¹drawings (Attachment D) have been selected from the full set to show the alignment of the road through the Starr property to Springwood Rd and designed at a minimum 18.5m AHD so as to remain above the 1:100 year flood event ¹²18.3m AHD. The design is well advanced on the available preliminary drawings of the RDA.

Notwithstanding the emphasis around the importance of the road and bridge being above the 1:100 year flood event (18.3AHD) it should be noted that Springwood Rd is closed more frequently. Heading East, Yarramundi Bridge Deck is 5.4m AHD and floods more frequently than a 1:5 year event. Heading West bridges at Mahons Creek 14.9m AHD and Lynches Creek Bridge 15.65m AHD both have ~1.5m of water over them in a 1:20 year event.

It is disappointing to think officers from HCC and TfNSW were aware of the Maunsell design and ignored it allowing the Developers design to prevail that will result in the destruction of a family's home and farm in favour of vacant horse paddocks which are the basis of the original HCC/DMR (Maunsell Design).

If the acquisition of the Wilcox's home and farm is allowed to proceed without proving by independent investigation that the Maunsell design is unsuitable then it is not only a unprofessional and immoral decision it would subject the NSW taxpayers to significant additional cost of the acquisition of a home and business as compared to the value of the vacant horse paddocks.

¹¹ GRB 15685 201 - 204

¹² Slide 62, HCC Presentation "Grose River Bridge Crossing" (prepared 22/10/2017)

Prepared by

Comparison of the two routes

The Table below provides an overview of the primary affects and impacts of the two road and bridge designs.

Description	Arrup Design (RDA)	Maunsell Design (MD)	
Impact Wilcox Property	Yes	No	
Impact Starr Property	No	Yes	
Impact Lot 1 DP235341	Yes	Yes	
AHD at Springwood Rd	18.487m AHD	18.6m AHD	
Flood Resilience	1:100 years	1:100 years	
No of properties effected	3	3	
Acquisition Required	Lot 1 DP 235341 Lot 3 DP 1059691 Lot 2 DP 1039224	Lot 1 DP235341 Lots 18 & 19 DP250448	
Acquisition Assets	Family home and vegetable farm plus vacant land	Vacant Land	

Table 1 comparing information on both designs.

As can be seen from the above table both designs have the same flood resilience and a requirement to acquire land across three properties. The MD does not require the partial acquisition of 5,6 or so additional properties

Context of Local area and design Options

The map below is an extract from Six Maps showing the area subject to the proposed new road and bridge



Map extracted from the ARUP drawing showing the alignment of the road and bridge through the Wilcox home, sheds and farm.



This drawing has been cropped from a HCC Drg MR570-14 showing the proposed route shown in more detail in the Maunsell design.



4. The accuracy and/or ambiguity of the HCC "Fact Sheet."

The "Proposed Grose River Bridge and Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement fact sheet" (the Fact Sheet) downloaded from the Council website (Attachment E) was crated on 15th August 2022. The Fact Sheet includes some background information and generally supports statements made by the HCC General Manager when responding to Councillor Zamprogno at a Council Meeting on 19th July 2022.

Subject to the veracity of the Maunsell design which I am sure will also comply with Ausroads and National Road Standards or could be made to meet those Standards the Fact Sheet is inaccurate. Recognising the comparisons in the Fact Sheet only relate to the originally proposed Navua Bridge and the proposed amended VPA Bridge only the statements that have effect on the road alignment and design are addressed below.

What about private property acquisition?

The proposed bridge requires partial land acquisition of three (3) properties:

- DP 235341 (167-213 Springwood Road) (partial)
- DP 1059691 (67A Nutmans Road) (partial)
- DP 1039224 (1 Ashtons Road) (partial)

Property acquisition would be in accordance with the requirements of the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991.

I believe this statement is misleading in that it refers to *partial land acquisition of three* (3) *properties* ignoring the fact that acquisition of ¹³DP11039224 requires the demolition of significant private assets in a family home and farm sheds. I also believe that in relation to DP1039224 the term "partial" is a stretch.

Why does land need to be acquired?

Occasionally, compulsory acquisition of property is required for infrastructure projects that provide broader public benefit. In the case of the proposed Grose River Bridge, three properties are affected by the approach roads and the proposed bridge. Council has never requested that any particular property be avoided.

The statement "*Council has never requested that any particular property be avoided*" appears a deliberate attempt to dispel any discussion that the design may have been prejudiced by avoiding the Starr Property. It may be correct in fact that the Council did not give that instruction but I believe it is unrelated and misleading in the context.

¹³ Wilcox Home and Farm

Can a bridge be designed that avoids the properties listed for acquisition?

It is not possible to build a bridge along this route that does not result in the need for some private property acquisition.

Council has reviewed detailed options that would retain the dwelling house at No.1 Ashtons Road (see discussion on Options Report below).

It is possible for the proposed bridge and the approach road to be relocated so that the property at No.1 Ashtons Road does not need to be acquired. However, in order to do so there are compromises that would need to be made in terms of flood immunity (below the 1:100 flood level) and/or acquisition of additional properties in order to provide a design that met relevant standards.

The statement "It is possible for the proposed bridge and the approach road to be relocated so that the property at No.1 Ashtons Road does not need to be acquired" appears to be an attempt to avoid discussion on altering the route other than that disclosed by the Project Group to date.

The statement "However, in order to do so there are compromises that would need to be made in terms of flood immunity (below the 1:100 flood level) and/or acquisition of additional properties in order to provide a design that met relevant standards." This statement is wrong and disproved by the Maunsell design which has the same ¹⁴flood immunity and requires the acquisition of the same ¹⁵number of properties but does not impact on the Wilcox home and farm but rather only on vacant land.

Contrary to a statement made by the HCC General Manager in the Council Meeting on 19th July 2022 where the GM stated words to the effect "an alternate design not crossing the Wilcox farm would require *the partial acquisition of 5,6 or so additional properties* …. to the North along GRR. This assertion is also wrong and disproved by the Maunsell design demonstrating that the proposed road alignment would have very little impact on the existing road reserve at the intersection of Ashtons Rd and GRR and no impact on other properties North along GRR.

¹⁴ Designed to be above 18.5m AHD.

¹⁵ Refer Table 1

Options Report/Analysis

Earlier this year an options analysis was prepared by Redbank Communities in order to ascertain whether it was possible to avoid the property at No.1 Ashtons Road. This report is available under the 'Proposed Amendment to Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement' link at <u>www.yourhawkesburyyoursay.com.au</u>

There was no option in that analysis that kept the entirety of the property.

Transport for NSW looked at the three options, and in accordance with the recommendation of that report, advised that those three options introduced more complex road geometry, brought unnecessary complexity into the design that could compromise safety and considered the current design was more appropriate

Whilst this statement may be generally correct, when reviewing the drawings it is hard to believe the options study has not suffered from the same prejudiced instruction to avoid the Starr property. There has been no attempt to look at the obvious option that HCC and TfNSW are aware of; reflecting the 1986 Maunsell Design. Nor has there been any attempt to look at rotating the bridge clockwise to achieve satisfactory geometry to have a compliant road running across the vacant horse paddocks

To demonstrate the level of commitment to the 1986 design please find attached a copy of the survey drawing (*page 12*) introducing the boundaries for acquisition of land for the Northern approaches road corridor that extends across the Western boundary of the Starr property(s) without impact on the Wilcox home and farm.

Also attached is one extract (*page 11*) of several HCC minutes reviewed for the period 1980 – 1987 that outline the background of the project for a bridge over the Grose River. The final para states "On the 12th August 1986, plans for acquisition of land for the Grose River Bridge approaches were lodged at the Land Titles Office to allow for negotiation to proceed with affected land owners"

During this review it has not been possible to find further information on the outcome of that proposed registration on the title but clearly there was a serious and deliberate effort by Council and the DMR to finalise the project. Some discussion is recorded, musing that funds may be an obstacle.

Objection: Amendment to Redbank VPA Extension of Grose River Rd.

Prepared by

. 29th August 2022





Extension of Grose River Rd.





Attachment A

MINUTES OF MEETING

WT PARTNERSHIP

Time and Date:	12:30 - 15:30, Monday 12 November 2018
Location:	Redbank Communities
	76 Arthur Phillip Drive
	North Richmond
Purpose:	Project Meeting No 3 – Strategic Design

Presentation

Attendees:

Name	Position	Company	Present	Apol	Initials
Mark Regent	Project Director	Redbank Communities (Redbank)	X		MR
Robert Lumsden		Redbank Communities (Redbank)	×		RL
Jock Douglas		Redbank Communities (Redbank)	X		JD
Peter Conroy		Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X		PC
Jeff Organ		Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X		JO
Colin Langford		RMS	X		CL
Dylan Connell		RMS	X		DC
Ruhul Chowdhury		RMS	X		RC
Ankur Arora		RMS		X	AA
Greg Flynn		RMS		Х	GF
Rachel Cumming		RMS	X		RC
Kevin Davis	National Director	WT Partnership (WTP)	X		KD
Rudolf Rose	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)	X		RR
Amar Nagi	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)	X		AN
Andrew Jung	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)		Х	AJ
Emma Davies	Associate	ARUP	X		ED
James Webber	Design Manager	ARUP	X		JW
Luke Chipperfield	Project Manager	ARUP	X		LC

ltem	Торіс	Action
1.00	Introductions	
1.01	With some participants attending for the first time, each attendee introduced themselves and advised their respective roles.	
2.00	Previous Minutes	
2.00	Previous minutes were not discussed.	
3.00	Project Brief/Scope/Design	
	Grose Vale / Grose River Road Intersection: Works to existing Grose River Road	
3.01	LC (ARUP) presented the Strategic design starting from the Grose Vale Road/Grose River Road intersection where a new roundabout is proposed.	
3.02	The requirement of the roundabout is based on the current TMAP study and traffic numbers predicted by AECOM in 2013 up to 2021. JO suggested that if further studies conclude that a roundabout is not needed, this will be considered, but noted that current TMAP results are based on the release of all 1,399 lots developed by Redbank.	
3.03	Three options of the roundabout configuration were presented:	

Attachment A

WT PARTNERSHIP

ltem	Торіс	Action
X	Option 1 for 12m radius roundabout offset from the existing intersection to the south-west with significant retaining walls preventing batters spilling into adjacent lot. Option 2 for a 6m radius non-compliant roundabout in virtually the same position as Option 1, but with batters spilling into adjacent lot. This option was considered not acceptable by RMS as it does not conform to an 80kph environment as well as involving consultation with an additional landowner. Option 3 for roundabout spilling into Redbank land to the north of the existing intersection. This eliminates the need for any retaining walls. Redbank noted this will impact land sales by ±\$2m.	
3.04	Grose River Road is not a B-double route - only for vehicles 19m long max.	
3.05	Options 1 and 2 involves the removal of existing trees and HCC will provide ARUP information on this for the Environmental Assessment (REF) to be carried out during the next stage of the design.	HCC (JO)
3.06	Providing pedestrian access across GVR/GRR would impact design. No allowance for a shared path along GRR.	
3.07	RMS (CL) noted design speeds for all roads to be 10kph above posted speed limits and preferably 80kph for all roads. Redbank advised that the section between the sales office to the east of the GVR/GRR intersection and another intersection to the Redbank property to the north-west of the GVR/GRR intersection has been approved, by Council, through the DA process at 60kph.	
3.08	During general discussion it was noted that the current speed limits (especially on Grose River Road – 80kph) may be too high for the road topography. RMS will gather accident data for all roads for review of this. RMS will review posted speed limits of all roads in consultation with HCC.	RMS (DC)
3.09	Current road design based on HCC specification with lane widths 3.05m on GRR. Austroads standards suggests 3.5m lanes. RMS suggests 3.3m lane widths with narrower shoulders. ARUP to review in line with VPA requirements.	ARUP
3.10	VPA scope only allows for providing shoulders to GRR and not a road upgrade. Property boundaries should not be impacted.	
	Grose River Link Road (New Extension)	
3.11	ARUP design based on 35m wide corridor. RMS suggested that this is too wide and can be reduced to 21m wide. Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment accordingly.	ARUP
3.12	Headlight requirement dictates that a solution needs to be agreed for the area that dips towards Nutmans Creek i.e. either lighting to be provided or level raised to provide level road.	ARUP
	Bridge over Grose River	
3.13	RMS requested consideration be given to the inclusion of pedestrian crossing and cycle safe pathway. Suggested 3.3m lanes plus 0.9m bicycle safe lane on bridge plus 2m raised footpath rather than shared path and no need for barriers. RMS to advise appropriate lane width.	RMS (DC)
3.14	Bridge length maybe able to reduce i.e. 2 spans at abutments taken out but this is dependent on flood modelling and behaviour at abutments. ARUP to investigate and advise.	ARUP
8.15	HCC will arrange for access for ARUP when Geotechnical investigations are to be carried out. The two landowners (Rasmussen & Camilleri) involved in this will be approached by HCC in due course. ARUP to advise when this will be required.	ARUP/HCC
5.16	Design to consider a precast deck for bridge to save on costs.	ARUP/WTF
.17	Bridge alignment at 500mm radius which is minimum required by Austroads.	
8.18	Restriction around construction access / compound locations / access for Super-T's to be reviewed and allowed for pricing.	WTP

Attachment A

WT PARTNERSHIP

ltem	Topic	Action
	variance between minimum requirements, in accordance with intent of VPA, and upgraded product to be identified.	
8.00	Meetings	
8.01	Meetings are now arranged for Wednesday mornings at 10.30am, at Redbank, recurring fortnightly. Teleconference facility will be made available.	All
8.02	It is not necessary for RMS and/or HC to attend every meeting and they will be advised in good time whether attendance is needed or not.	WTP
8.03	The next scheduled meeting is for 28 November 2018.	All
9.00	Other Business	
9.01		
10.00	Next Meeting	
10.01	Next meeting - 28 November 2018 at 10.30am at Redbank noting that teleconference facilities can be made available (TBC)	All

MINUTES OF MEETING

Time and Date: Location:

10:30 - 12:00, Wednesday 30 January 2019 **Redbank Communities** 76 Arthur Phillip Drive North Richmond

Purpose:

Project Meeting No 4

Attendees:

Name	Position	Company	Present	Apol	Initials
Mark Regent	Project Director	Redbank Communities (Redbank)	X		MR
Robert Lumsden		Redbank Communities (Redbank)	×		RL
Jock Douglas		Redbank Communities (Redbank)	X		JD
Peter Conroy		Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X		PC
Jeff Organ		Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X	_	JO
Colin Langford		RMS		Х	CL
Dylan Connell		RMS	X		DC
Ruhul Chowdhury		RMS		Х	RC
Rachel Cumming		RMS	X		RC
Kevin Davis	National Director	WT Partnership (WT)		Х	KD
Rudolf Rose	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)	X		RR 🔎
Amar Nagi	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)		Х	AN
Andrew Jung	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)		Х	AJ
Emma Davies	Associate	ARUP		Х	ED
James Webber	Design Manager	ARUP		Х	JW
Luke Chipperfield	Project Manager	ARUP		X	LC

ltem	Торіс	Action	
1.00	Introductions	1.5 9 4	
1.01	Purpose of today's meeting is to catch up on where the project process is at and agree on the next steps	Note	
2.00	Previous Minutes		
2.00	Previous minutes were not discussed.	Note	
3.00	Project Brief/Scope/Design		
	The DRAFT Strategic Design Report and Estimate was presented to the meeting and emphasized the following scope allowances:	Note	
	<u>Grose Vale (GVR) / Grose River Road (GRR) Intersection:</u> <u>Works to existing Grose River Road (GRR)</u>		
3.02	The new roundabout mirrors the roundabout approve by HCC 800m away on GVR. This roundabout design decreased the height of retaining walls required which made it more cost effective.	Note	
3.03	Existing CRR only allows for shoulder widening both sides. There are no allowances for milling/resheeting or any further upgrades to this road.	Note	
3.04	The current speed limit on CRR (80kph) is considered too high for the road topography in accordance with current design standards. RMS will gather accident data for all roads for review of this. RMS will review posted speed limits of all roads in consultation with HCC.	RMS (DC	
3.05	RMS concerned that 'upgrade" (i.e. shoulders only) and then reduction in speed limit may create negative perception with the	Note	

GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 457 of 466

WT PARTNERSHIP

1temachm	Terrint A	Action
	community. To upgrade GRR to accommodate current posted speed limit will require a major reconstruction which is not allowed for in the current cost estimate. Small deviation of GRR at intersection with Ashtons Road to	
3.06	facilitate alignment with the new extension of GRR (link) which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud.	Note
	<u>Grose River Link Road (New Extension)</u>	
3.07	Road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief	Note
3.08	Vertical alignment designed to 70kph with posted limit of 60kph. This reduced earthworks considerably but is inconsistent with current GRR posted speed limit of 80kph. This vertical alignment required street lighting to be allowed at the GRR/Ashtons Road intersection due to sight line requirements.	Note
	Bridge over Grose River	
3.08	Bridge design allows for pedestrian and cycle safe pathway within the current total design width of the bridge.	Note
3.09	Opportunity may have existed to reduce the bridge length by removing 2 spans at abutments, but this is dependent on flood modelling and behaviour at abutments. PC advise that 1:100-year flood level is at 18.300. This need reviewing of the possible opportunity to reduce the number of spans.	
3.10	PC inquired about the bridge design load. RR requested info from ARUP during meeting and ARUP advised SM1 600 and HLP400.	
3.11	Laydown area for Super-T's during construction to be on the GRR side of the bridge. Laydown cannot be on Springwood Road side as Super-T's cannot be delivered from Yarramundi side of the site due to curve restrictions.	WT
	<u>Grose</u> Rive <u>r Ro</u> ad / Springwood Road Intersection	
3.12	Widening of Springwood included in design to facilitate dedicated right and left turn lanes onto GRR bridge.	
3.13	As per Treetops further down the road, this part of Springwood Road is designed for a 60kph posted speed limit.	
4.00	Community Engagement	
4.01	Community Consultation Meeting held on 5 November 2018. PC distributed list of questions and answers to the project meeting. This will be distributed to the wider team.	
4.02	PC reported community somewhat divided with some not wanting the project and some wanting it "tomorrow". Generally, the major issue is having a bridge above the 1:100-year flood level.	
4.03	Consensus at the meeting was that traffic is a problem. JO reported that SMEC is carrying out a Traffic Sturdy covering the whole network (not specifically on this project). This study serves to confirm that this project is a requirement to go ahead.	
5.00	Programme	
5.01	Allowance to be made in indicative program in WT report for VPA negotiations, DA and Land Acquisition processes.	WT
5.02	Timing of Land Acquisition to be discussed (whether done post- VPA or before any approvals, etc.	RMS
5.02	Current construction duration included in the estimate is for 12 months. This allows for different portions of the construction carried out simultaneously (i.e. GRR - new at the same time as GRR existing, etc.)	
6.00	VPA Requirements	
6.01	Due to changes to route and scope a new VPA is required.	
6.02	New VPA discussions/negotiations to commence as soon as possible. 13 February 2019 noted as the preferred date to next meet to commence discussions.	Redbank/ HCC/RMS
	GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 458 of 466	

WT PARTNERSHIP

Itemac	nmeent A	Action	
7.00	Project Cost Estimate		
7.01	Updated strategic design estimate issued by WT reflective of the new route. Estimate was presented to the meeting.		
7.02	Confirmed with RMS that 40% contingency is included.		
7.03	DC commented that current market is "expensive" as contractors capable of this type of project are all very busy. This can be reviewed once the project achieves tender stage.		
7.04	Redbank/WT to make changes in report (confirm the date of issue to be 30 January 2019) and issue DRAFT to the wider team. RMS and HCC will review report and comment where appropriate.		
7.00	Financial		
7.01	Redbank has incurred considerable expense to date which should be considered when agreeing contribution.		
7.02	PC requires a comparison between current estimate and previous costs estimated for the Navua Reserve option. Original proposal was priced by RMS.	WT/ Redbank	
7.03	All previous expenses incurred by Redbank to be included in the estimate of the Navua proposal to get a 'Total Cost' to compare against the current estimate and Redbank costs. This will identify cost of changes in scope between two different proposals will enable PC to advise to relevant stakeholders, community, etc. accordingly.		
7.04	It is noted that all information, reports, cost estimates, financial information, etc. that are issued to the team, are to be treated with strict confidentiality and only disclosed outside of the team with the express permission from Redbank Communities.		
8.00	Meetings		
8.01	Meetings are arranged for Wednesday mornings at 10.30am, at Redbank, recurring fortnightly. Teleconference facility will be made available.	All	
8.03	The next scheduled meeting is for 20 February 2019. It is preferred that this be brought forward to 13 February 2019 to commence VPA discussions.		
9.00	Other Business		
9.01	None		
10.00	Next Meeting		
10.01	Next meeting planned for 13 February 2019 dependent on availability of Colin Langford (RMS) for VPA discussions. Location to be confirmed but all agree that it can be in Paramatta (RMS offices) if required.		

GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 459 of 466

Alignment Options

Thursday, February 3, 2022 9:37 AM

Attachment B

Option A

- Offset northern boundary 10m
- Curve 154 radii encroaching on bridge

Note: Radii on bridge non-compliant



GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 411 of 466

Design Notes Page 1

Attachment B

Option B

- Offset northern boundary 10m
- Two arcs included to create straight bridge.
- Significant impact on northern property



GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 412 of 466

Attachment B

Option C

• Reduction in design speed to 60km (50km posted) - curve radii min 94m, length min 100m



GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 413 of 466

Proposed Bridge over the Nepean River

Sent: May 31, 2017 3:35 PM

From: Chris Amit

To: Richard Vaby; CC: Jeff Organ; BCC: Chris Amit;

2 Attachments

🖀 Full Set Plans - Maunsell 1986.pdf (2 MB); 📸 Proposed Grose River Bridge Route.pdf (398 KB);

Attachment C

Hi Richard

Just a heads up on this

Attachment C

This is the alternate plans for the Bridge over the Nepean River.

Jeff mentioned after the meeting that we may have to do an estimate of cost to compare this option to the one as part of the VPA.

I believe this is on the confidential side of things at the moment.

The alternate link will be from Ashtons Road to Springwood Road - direct line (see attachments). The plans attached are from 1986 and no BOQ is available.

It may be a case of looking at course square metre rates for the Bridge etc.

Please discuss when you have a moment - Thanks

Regards,

Christopher Amit | Manager Design & Mapping Services | Hawkesbury City Council P (02) 4560 4508 | M 0409 927 332 | F (02) 4587 7740 | E chris.amit@hawkesbury.nsw.gov.au | W www.hawkesbury.nsw.gov.au

Important: This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain legally privileged or confidential information, If you are not the intended recipient or believe that you may have received this communication in error, please notify the sender Immediately and then delete this message. You must not use, disclose or distribute this email without the author's prior permission. Hawkesbury City Council cannot accept responsibility for any changes that may be made to this message after it was sent.

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Chris Amit Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2017 3:28 PM To: Cathy Mills; Jeff Organ Subject: For Colin Langford

Hi Jeff

Plans required to forward to Colin

Regards,

Christopher Amit | Manager Design & Mapping Services | Hawkesbury City Council P (02) 4560 4508 | M 0409 927 332 | F (02) 4587 7740 | E christamit@hawkesbury.nsw.gov.au | W www.hawkesbury.nsw.gov.au

Important: This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain legally privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient or believe that you may have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete this message. You must not use, disclose or distribute this email without the author's prior permission. Hawkesbury City Council cannot accept responsibility for any changes that may be made to this message after it was sent.

Please consider the environment before printing this email






17

1.



Document Set ID: 8106029

Version: 1, Version Date: 29/08/2022



Document Set ID: 8106029

498

1

5

Version: 1, Version Date: 29/08/2022

	DISTANCE FROM TS ALONG BASE (OFFSET FROM BASE	POINT
	0	0	TS
	10	01	1
	20	015	
	30	0-20	1
•	40	0-30	CT 109
	50	040	
	60	0.45	1000
	- 70	0.50	
	80	0.60	SC



Document Set ID: 8106029 Version: 1, Version Date: 29/08/2022

Attachment E

Proposed Grose River Bridge and Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement fact sheet

Redbank background

Redbank is a 1,400 lot residential subdivision at North Richmond that commenced in 2014, and includes residential lots of various sizes, and includes a Retirement Village and Nursing Home. The development also includes the Redbank Shopping Village.

Who will be paying for the cost of the bridge project?

Redbank Communities will pay for the construction of the bridge project as part of the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) for the Redbank Communities development in North Richmond.

Who submitted the designs?

Redbank Communities was responsible for the detailed designs and associated studies submitted to Council for planning approval.

What are the community benefits from the Bridge?

The construction of the Grose River Bridge will link Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River. The location of the new bridge provides the highest level of flood immunity compared with the original proposal through the Navua Reserve.

How was the route chosen?

The original route for the proposed bridge was through the nearby Navua Reserve.

In February 2020, Council confirmed its in-principle support for the current route alignment based on the facts that it:

- a) Does not involve any loss of public open space;
- b) Provides greater flood immunity, above 1:100 flood level;
- c) Minimises impact on heritage and biodiversity;
- d) Affects only three private property owners;
- e) Complements a suite of other roadworks upgrades also required to be delivered in the same Voluntary Planning Agreement; and
- f) Assists in addressing current traffic levels/congestion

The road approach was chosen using appropriate designs and Australian standards to provide an approach with minimal curvature. It also takes into consideration a critical point with the intersection with Springwood Road that provides the highest level of flood immunity.

What about private property acquisition?

The proposed bridge requires partial land acquisition of three (3) properties:

- DP 235341 (167-213 Springwood Road) (partial)
- DP 1059691 (67A Nutmans Road) (partial)
- DP 1039224 (1 Ashtons Road) (partial)

Property acquisition would be in accordance with the requirements of the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991.

Why does land need to be acquired?

Occasionally, compulsory acquisition of property is required for infrastructure projects that provide broader public benefit. In the case of the proposed Grose River Bridge, three properties are affected by the approach roads and the proposed bridge.

Council has never requested that any particular property be avoided.

Attachment E

The design for the Grose River Road bridge was part of joint discussion between Hawkesbury City Council, Transport for NSW and Redbank Communities as all three are signatories to the Voluntary Planning Agreement that provides for the construction of the bridge by Redbank Communities.

Can a bridge be designed that avoids the properties listed for acquisition?

It is not possible to build a bridge along this route that does not result in the need for some private property acquisition.

Council has reviewed detailed options that would retain the dwelling house at No.1 Ashtons Road (see discussion on Options Report below).

It is possible for the proposed bridge and the approach road to be relocated so that the property at No.1 Ashtons Road does not need to be acquired. However, in order to do so there are compromises that would need to be made in terms of flood immunity (below the 1:100 flood level) and/or acquisition of additional properties in order to provide a design that met relevant standards.

Options Report/Analysis

Earlier this year an options analysis was prepared by Redbank Communities in order to ascertain whether it was possible to avoid the property at No.1 Ashtons Road. This report is available under the 'Proposed Amendment to Redbank Voluntary Planning Agreement' link at <u>www.yourhawkesbury-yoursay.com.au</u>

There was no option in that analysis that kept the entirety of the property.

Transport for NSW looked at the three options, and in accordance with the recommendation of that report, advised that those three options introduced more complex road geometry, brought unnecessary complexity into the design that could compromise safety and considered the current design was more appropriate.

Current design of the road corridor and the bridge

The current design of the road corridor and the bridge has been prepared to comply with Austroads which are the National Road Standards, and that this has dictated much of the proposed road alignment, rather than an intent avoid any one particular property.

Council continues to be transparent with the community, including affected landholders. The proposed bridge crossing has been the subject of Council consideration since the mid-1980s and in recent years Council has undertaken a number of community engagement activities including public meetings.

The application seeking approval of the proposed bridge has been the subject of extensive community engagement, and remains under assessment by an independent planning consultant at this time.

From:	
Sent:	Mon, 29 Aug 2022 14:50:54 +1000
То:	"Hawkesbury City Council"
Subjects	Submission to Droposed Amondmonts to Podbank VDA: Extension to Gross

Subject: Submission re Proposed Amendments to Redbank VPA: Extension to Grose River Road and Bridge Development

Attachments: HCC SUBMISSION 29TH AUGUST 2022.docx

Reference:

Revised DA PT50007/22

August 29th, 2022

The General Manager

Hawkesbury City Council,

366 George Street,

Windsor NSW 2756

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept this submission relating to documentation I received from Hawkesbury City Council regarding Public Exhibition of Proposed Amendments to Redbank Voluntary Agreement.

I am the owner of **Constant Constant Co**

Google Earth photo showing property boundaries complete with development proposal addresses: 1 Grose Wold, Grose Wold and Yarramundi is shown below.



I have supplied two submissions previously regarding this matter and my objection remains the same. Viewing many of the other submissions available for online viewing, it is obvious the majority of the community also feels the same.

Considering the points discussed at The General Meeting held on the 19th of July by Hawkesbury City Council, there are several Councillors who agree the extension of Grose River Road does not need to demolish a family home and crop producing property, when there is a vast amount of vacant land on the 70 acre property, used for horses to graze beside the Wilcox family home.

The General Manager Elizabeth Richardson even stated a couple of times in the meeting held on the 19th of July, that the Wilcox family did not need to lose their home if: 1) partial acquisition of properties running along The Grose River Road was obtained (and these homes are all a distance from The Grose River Road) and 2) if road design covered flooding from Nutman Creek. Both of these points are achievable with the assistance of Transport by NSW in the redesign of this two lane road. The set point General Manager Elizabeth Richardson mentioned at Springwood Road can still be met with a re-route of the road position.

I strongly favour this re-route as it would also benefit my 10 acre property adjoining the Wilcox property. The current road position is less than 96 metres from our families shed at the rear of the property. This would benefit us in regards to visual impact, noise levels, privacy and security from once a tranquil and peaceful environment.

I have attached several photos to show the 70 acre horse stud property sharing the side boundary with the Wilcox family property.

You will see in the photos a tall cream column: this is the side boundary for 1 Ashtons Road to the neighbouring 70 acre horse stud property.







I have also attached several photos showing the current view from the shed my family and I had built on our property that allows us to avoid the Sydney rat race for day escapes. Wanting to build a home on our property has always been a dream of ours. These photos highlight the tranquillity and peacefulness the property currently offers with the current outlook from our shed overseeing the Wilcox property and 70 acre Starr property Horse Stud.

Having the road a further distance from my property would be a benefit for us, instead of being such a devastating impact on all of our property, as well as the Wilcox family and Nutmans Road residence.





Yours Sincerely,

A Donney.

I, am one of the owners of amendment of the VPA for the following reasons:

Grose Wold. I strongly oppose the

- 1. This amendment should not be allowed as it is proposing that the roads required for the Grose River Bridge are built through the above property where we have lived for 22 years.
- This will mean the destruction of our family home and our 15 acres of fertile agricultural land, currently being farmed by my son and husband to grow vegetables to the Sydney population.
- 3. The selection of our property has not been a fair process as project meetings dated 30 January 2019 note the alignment of Grose River Road was designed to "AVOID THE PRIVATE LAND HOUSING THE HORSE STUD" and "ROAD DESIGNED TO AVOID THE STARR PROPERTY AS PER DESIGN BRIEF" and 12 November 2018 "ARUP TO ADJUST WHERE NECESSARY, CONSIDERING MINIMAL IMPACT ON THE STARR PROPERTY AND RATIONALISE ALIGNMENT ACCORDINGLY".
- 4. There is no evidence that the vacant land next door which consists only of horse paddocks and no residential buildings has been investigated for the roads for the current bridge proposal.
- 5. Through a FOI application we have obtained detailed advanced engineered designs and maps prepared for Council in 1986 for a road to be built through this vacant paddock to meet at the same junction on Springwood Road which is currently being considered.
- 6. The 1986 design through vacant land connects the same two points and does not change flood immunity.
- 7. These maps confirm that that property would have the same if not better flood immunity so there is no reason this property should not have been considered for this project.
- 8. Council were aware of this alternate route and we have correspondence dated 2017 stating that this route was to be kept "confidential" and obviously not to be considered as it was not an option put in front of the community during the community consultation.
- 9. A comparison of the current ARUP design and the 1986 Maunsell Design confirm that both designs have the same flood resilience and both designs affect 3 properties. However, the ARUP design requires the demolition of our family home and farming business whereas the 1986 Maunsell design only requires vacant land. Therefore the current amendment should not be approved as there is a better option.
- 10. Why did Council ignore this 1986 design and keep it confidential from the public and Councillors and allow Redbank to move the route to run through our family home and agricultural farm instead of through vacant land. We believe we have been prejudiced in the selection process.
- 11. The parties involved have refused to advise who gave the instructions to avoid the Starr property and the reasons for these instructions.
- 12. Using this route will not require the partial acquisition of any more than 3 properties and no dwellings will need to be demolished.
- 13. A road through the vacant paddocks can still be designed to meet Austroad standards and the number of properties that would need to be partially acquired are no more than the proposal in this VPA.
- 14. Due to the inaccurate information and misleading pictorial information being provided to the community and Councillors by Redbank and to be found in the Part 5 DA on public display at Council Chambers, this amendment to the VPA should not be approved.
- 15. The community should be provided with accurate information, and relevant information should not be withheld, and all discussions and processes should be transparent. This has

not been the case here. Decisions should be based on consideration of all options and accurate information and this project should not have been compromised by the constraint of the designer "to avoid the Starr property".

- 16. We have had legal advice that new roads are meant to be designed to minimize the impact on existing resident dwellings wherever possible. This VPA does not do this and therefore this amendment should not be allowed.
- 17. The Options study carried out by Redbank was flawed as the designers only considered the option of running roads through our property and not the surrounding vacant land consisting of around 70 acres. Therefore, as no true options study has been done without considering avoiding the Starr property, this amendment should not be approved.
- 18. There are other better options available that do not demolish our family home of 22 years and destroy our farming business and those options should have been considered and this property should never have been put forward for this project.
- 19. Please refer to the submission by Paul Coffey and his attached maps confirming the above and further elaboration on the comparison between the 1986 Maunsell design and the current ARUP design (the subject of this amendment to the VPA).
- 20. For all the reasons above THIS AMENDMENT TO VPA SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED.

Attachments to this submission will be sent separate as my submission bounced back yesterday with the comment it was too large.

MINUTES OF MEETING



Time and Date: Location:	12:30 - 15:30, Monday 12 November 2018 Redbank Communities 76 Arthur Phillip Drive
	North Richmond

Purpose:

Project Meeting No 3 – Strategic Design Presentation

Attendees:

Name	Position	T a la l		1	TRUTHER AND
Mark Regent	Project Director	Company	Present	Apol	Initials
Robert Lumsden	stoject Director	Redbank Communities (Redbank)	X	Арог	MR
Jock Douglas	in the second se	Redbank Communities (Redbank)	x		RL
	and provide the second s	Redbank Communities	X	an de Maria	ID
Peter Conroy	and the second second second	(Redbank)	in the second		10
Jeff Organ	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O	Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X	Contraction of	PC
Colin Langford		Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X	221-431-14	JO
Dylan Connell		RMS	X	English Land	CL
Ruhul Chowdhury		RMS	X	energi anti anti	the second s
Ankur Arora		RMS	X	All a contractions	DC
Greg Flynn	The second s	RMS	State Balling	X	RC
Rachel Cumming		RMS	1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	x	AA
Kevin Davis	National Di	RMS	X	^	GF
Rudolf Rose	National Director	WT Partnership (WTP)	x	Children and and	RC
Amar Nagi	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)	X	Conference of	KD
Andrew Jung	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)	X	California and a	RR
mma Davies	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WTP)	1	x	AN
ames Webber	Associate	ARUP	x	-	AJ
uke Chipperfield	Design Manager	ARUP	X		ED
and completitied	Project Manager	ARUP	x	Mar at 1	JW LC

Item	Topic	Action
1.00	Introductions	Action
1.01	With some participants attending for the first time, each attendee introduced themselves and advised their respective roles.	1.10
2.00	Previous Minutes	
2.00	Previous minutes were not discussed.	
3.00	Project Brief/Scope/Design	1.15
	Grose Vale / Grose River Road Intersection: Works to existing Grose River Road	
3.01	LC (ARUP) presented the Strategic design starting from the Grose Vale Road/Grose River Road intersection where a new roundabout is proposed.	
3.02	The requirement of the roundabout is based on the current TMAP study and traffic numbers predicted by AECOM in 2013 up to 2021. JO suggested that if further studies conclude that a roundabout is not needed, this will be considered, but noted that current TMAP results are based on the release of all 1,399 lots developed by Redbank.	
.03	Three options of the roundabout configuration were presented:	andrease and a second s

Item		RTNERSHI
	Topic	Action
	community. To upgrade GRR to accommodate current posted speed limit will require a major reconstruction which is not allow for in the current cost estimate.	COLUMN THE REAL PROPERTY.
3.06	Small deviation of GRR at intersection with Ashtons Road to facilitate alignment with the new extension of GRR (link) which is to avoid the private land housing the horse stud.	Note
201-201	Grose River Link Road (New Extension)	n an
3.07	Road designed to avoid the Starr property as per design brief	
教育内	veruid allonment designed to Jol 1	Note
3.08	This reduced earthworks considerably but is inconsistent with current GRR posted speed limit of 80kph. This vertical alignment required street lighting to be allowed at the GRR/Ashtons Road intersection due to sight line requirements.	Note
······································	Bridge over Grose River	
3.08	Bridge design allows for pedestrian and cycle safe pathway within the current total design width of the bridge	
And States	Opportunity may have evict of the bridge.	Note
3.09	removing 2 spans at abutments, but this is dependent on flood modelling and behaviour at abutments abutments are abutment on flood	ARUP
	flood level is at 18 300 This section of advise that 1:100-year	
3.10	opportunity to reduce the number of spans. PC inquired about the full	
A DE Maint - Contra	PC inquired about the bridge design load. RR requested info from ARUP during meeting and ARUP advised SM1600 and HLP400. Laydown area for Super-T's during and SM1600 and HLP400.	17 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1
3.11	Laydown area for Super-T's during construction to be on the GRR side of the bridge. Laydown cannot be on Springwood Road side as Super-T's cannot be delivered from Yarramundi side of the site due to curve restrictions.	WT
A CARLES AND A	Grose River Road / Springwood Road Intersection	
3.12	Widening of Springwood included in the	
	right and left turn lanes onto GRR bridge.	1994 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
3.13	As per Treetops further down the road, this part of Springwood Road is designed for a 60kph posted speed limit.	
4.00	Community Engagement	TOTAL OWN AND INCOMENTATION
4.01	Community Consultation March	
	This will be distributed to the answers to the project meeting	
4.02	PC reported community somewhat divided with some not wanting	$c_{\rm M} = -40^{2} m$
	issue is having a bridge abase of control . Generally, the major	
4.03	reported that SMEC is carrying out a Traffic Sturdy covering the	
5.00	is a requirement to go ahead	
1	Programme	
5.01	Allowance to be made in indicative program in WT report for VPA negotiations, DA and Land Acquisition processes.	
5.02	Timing of Land Acquisition to be diverses.	WT
William Providence	Current construction de cité de la construction de constructio	RMS
5.02	months. This allows for different portions of the construction carried out simultaneously (i.e. GRR - new at the same time as GRR existing, etc.)	
6.00	VPA Requirements	
.01		
	Due to changes to route and scope a new VPA is required.	Redbank/ HCC/RMS
.02	New VPA discussions/negotiations to commence as soon as possible. 13 February 2019 noted as the preferred date to next meet to commence discussions.	Redbank/
	GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 458 of 466	HCC/RMS

MINUTES OF MEETING

Time and Date: Location:

10:30 – 12:00, Wednesday 30 January 2019 Redback Community WT PARTNERSHIP

Redbank Communities 76 Arthur Phillip Drive North Richmond

Purpose:

Project Meeting No 4

Attendees:

Name Mark Regent	Position	Company			1414
Robert Lumsden	Project Director	Redbank Communities (Redbank)	Present X	Apol	Initials
Jock Douglas		Redbank Communities	x		MR
and the state of the second		Redbank Communities	H LINE B		RL
Peter Conroy Jeff Organ		(Redbank) Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	x		JD
Colin Langford	ALC: NO POLICE AND A CONTRACT	Hawkesbury Council (HCC)	X		00
Dylan Connell	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT OF	RMS Council (HCC)	X		PC
Ruhul Chowdhury	and and the second	RMS	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	X	JO
Rachel Cumming		RMS	X	~	CL
Kevin Davis	Next	RMS	E. Contraction of the	X	DC
Rudolf Rose	National Director	WT Partnership (WT)	X	^	RC
mar Nagi	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)	1 Barriston	x	RC
Andrew Jung	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)	X	^	KD
mma Davies	Senior Cost Engineer	WT Partnership (WT)		V	RR 🍃
ames Webber	Associate	WT Partnership (WT) ARUP		X	AN
uke Chipperfield	Design Manager	ARUP		X	A
ompperfield	Project Manager	ARUP		x	ED

Item	Торіс	X LC
1.00	Introductions	Action
1.01	Purpose of today's meeting is to catch up on where the project process is at and agree on the next steps	
2.00	Previous Minutes	Note
2.00	Previous minutes were not discussed.	inge i
3.00	Project Brief/Scope/Design	Note
3.01	The DRAFT Strategic Design Report and Estimate was pre-	
	Works to evicting Grose River Road (GRR) Intersection	Note
3.02	800m away as a firrors the roundabout approximation	
3.03	Existing CPP and required which made it more cost of the height	Note
	The current and the	Note
3.04	will review posted speed limits of all roads in conversion of this. RMS	RMS (DC)
1.05	RMS concerned that 'upgrade" (i.e. shoulders only) and then reduction in speed limit may create negative perception with the	Same State
	GIPA Application 22T 0207 D	Note

GIPA Application 22T-0807 Page 457 of 466

Item	Topic	PARTNERSH
		12 STATESTATEST
	Option 1 for 12m radius roundabout offset from the existing intersection to the south-west with significant retaining on the preventing batters spilling to the source of	Action
The Robert	intersection to the south-west with significant retaining walls preventing batters spilling into adjacent lot.	
	preventing batters spilling into adjacent lot.	
	Same a for a 6m radius non-compliant lot.	
	Option 2 for a 6m radius non-compliant roundabout in virtua same position as Option 1, but with batters spilling into adia lot. This option was considered	lly the
	same position as Option 1, but with batters spilling into adja lot. This option was considered not acceptable by RMS as it not conform to an 80kph environment as well as involving	cent
	consultation with ookpri environment as well as it is	does
	Option 3 for round an additional landowner	
	the existing interest about spilling into Redbank land	
	retaining walls. Redbank and eliminates the need for any	rth of
the second second	retaining walls. Redbank noted this will impact land sales by ±\$2m.	
3.04	Grose River Road is	
	Grose River Road is not a B-double route - only for vehicles 19 long max. Options 1 and 2 is a second secon	
a second second	Options 1 and 2 involves the removal of existing trees and HCG will provide ARUP information on this for the Environment (REC) to	m
3.05	will provide ARUP information on this for the Environmental Assessment (REF) to be carried out during the power of the design	the second s
Section 1	Assessment (REF) to be carried and this for the Environmental	HCC (JO)
3.06		, ince ((0))
5.00	Providing pedestrian access across GVR/GRR would impact desi No allowance for a shared path along GRR. RMS (CL) noted desited path along GRR.	
	No allowance for a shared path along GRR. RMS (CL) noted design created of the start of the star	gn.
	Posted speed line is speeds for all roads to be told	
3.07	posted speed limits and preferably 80kph for all roads. Redban advised that the section between the sales office to the east of t GVR/GRR intersection and another intersection to the Badker of	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
	GVR/GRR intersection between the sales office to the east of t property to the north-west of the GVR/GRR intersection to the Redbank	k
	property to the north-west of the intersection to the Redbank	ne
and the second	property to the north-west of the GVR/GRR intersection has been approved, by Council, through the DA process at 60kph	
	approved, by Council, through the DA process at 60kph. During general discussion it was noted that the second	a file of a fill have
.08		1
	for the road topography. RMS will gather accident data for all roads for review of this. RMS will review posted created for all	RMS (DC)
	Current road design based an USE	1
.09	Current road design based on HCC specification with lane widths 3.05m on GRR. Austroads standards suggests 3.5m lanes. RMS suggests 3.3m lane widths with narrower shoulders. ADMS	
Par Start Bars		ARUP
10		
10	VPA scope only allows for providing shoulders to GRR and not a road upgrade. Property boundaries should not be in a should not	and the second second
	road upgrade. Property boundaries should not be impacted.	
el marcala a	(New Extension)	- Aller and a second
	ARUP design based on 25	
1	this is too wide and can be reduced to 21m wide. Arup to adjust where necessary, considering minimal impact on the provider of the second seco	Contraction of the second
	where necessary considering the still while. Arun to adjust	ARUP
Sold The states	and fallonalize alignment of the start mean	
2	Headlight requirement dictates that a solution needs to be agreed for the area that dips towards Nutmans Creek in a labor to be agreed	
	for the area that dips towards Nutmans Creek i.e. either lighting to be provided or level raised to provide level road.	ARUP
	Bridge over Grose River	the second se
	RMS requested consideration be given to the inclusion of pedestrian crossing and cycle safe pathware inclusion of	
	pedestrian crossing and cycle safe pathway. Suggested 3.3m lanes plus 0.9m bicycle safe lane on bridge shuggested 3.3m	and the second second
	lanes plus 0.9m bicycle safe lane on bridge plus 2m raised	PMC (DC)
	advise appropriate lang with and no need for barriers PMS to	RMS (DC)
Sale of the second	Bridge length maybe able to	
	Bridge length maybe able to reduce i.e. 2 spans at abutments taken out but this is dependent on flood modelling and behaviour at abutments. ARUP to investigate and advise	
	at abutments APUP to investigation modeling and behaviour	ARUP
	HCC will arrange for access far to und advise.	a fair a fair an
	investigations are to be carried out. The two landowners (Rasmussen & Camilleri) involved in the two landowners	APUDALOS
	(Rasmussen & Camilleri) involved in this will be approached by HCC in due course. ARUP to advise when this will be approached by	ARUP/HCC
1 - 1 - N	to dovise when this will be required	
a the second	Design to consider a precast deck for bridge to save on costs.	
a service and	Bridge alignment at 500mm radiu	ARUP/WTP
all and the	Bridge alignment at 500mm radius which is minimum required by Austroads.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Restriction around construction access / compound locations / access for Super-T's to be reviewed and allowed for pricing.	

y



 \mathbf{X}





Submission, VPA amendments at

Redbank.

The proposed amendments to the VPA relate to the construction of the Grose River Bridge linking Grose River Road through to Springwood Road, including a new river crossing of the Grose River.

The proposed changes relate to the new proposed location of the Grose River Bridge, and timing for the delivery of the Grose River Bridge in 2025.

1.**Council Meeting.** The Council meeting at which this item was discuss revealed Minutes discussed at meetings between Redbank Communities, HCC and others, the minutes of the meeting dated the 12 November 2018 at 3.11 says in part<u>...... Arup to adjust where necessary, considering</u> <u>minimal impact on the Starr property and rationalize alignment</u> <u>accordingly.</u>

In the 30 January 2019 at point 3.06 the minute says,.....<u>which is to avoid the</u> private land housing the horse stud and 3.07, <u>road designed to avoid the Starr</u> <u>property as per design brief.</u>

At the same Council meeting Council resolved to hold a briefing session for Councillors only to review the minutes etc;

The NRDCAA is not aware of the outcome of that briefing session except to say, social media revealed a Redbank representative/s was/were present to answer question!

All documents from that briefing should now be made public.

Until the residents and ratepayers are made aware of the questions, answers, and documents that were discuss at the Councillor briefing session, the **secrecy** between the developer and Council is not transparent.. Keeping pertinent information from resident is not transparency. Accordingly this application must not proceed The Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan 2036, (HCSP) refers to the intent of the Leadership at p22 "Be a respected civic leader through, transparent and engaged decision making that the community can understand".

On that basis alone this application must not proceed.

2. Improved flood Immunity. At the community meeting organised by Council in North Richmond, several years ago, the then General Manager emphasized the need to move the Bridge upstream to improve flood immunity amongst other things.

There is no evidence in the July Business Papers that flood immunity will be improved so residents and ratepayers have access to work, health care and other services via Springwood Road to the Great Western Highway.

There is neither evidence nor plans, that the Creek crossings on Springwood Road (a State road) will be upgraded by anyone in the Business Papers. If there is, please provide the advice in the report to Council along with the timeline for the delivery of the upgrades when this matter comes before Council for determination.

The GM at the July 2022 Council Meeting told the meeting, in a question from Councillor Zamprogno as the NRDCAA understands, that the best option for entrance onto Springwood Road to obtain the maximum benefit for flood immunity was the Grose River Bridge and the proposed Road that is in the current position in the plan before Council.

Yet, turning left or right off the proposed road onto Springwood Road there is neither access to the great Western Highway or Castlereagh Road, in times of floods when the Bridges on Springwood road are under flood waters.

What is the point of building a bridge to nowhere?

Unless Council staff can provide evidence that the flood immunity will be significantly improved, with the upgrading of the Creek crossings on Springwood Road then this application must not proceed.

3. The Environment. Council has allowed environmental vandalism at its worst on the Yobarnie precinct. To continue with that vandalism on the Grose River precinct is reckless and irresponsible.

The HCSP at p26 Our Environment, there are three headings, **3.1 The natural** environment is protected and enhanced, **3.2to live sustainably and** reduce our ecological foot print, **3.4 the sustainability of our urban** environment is improved.

There is an alternative for the site of the river crossing, which would protect the Grose River precinct from more environmental vandalism. Council should seriously pursue the construction of the third crossing of the Hawkesbury River, promised by state and Federal Government to be located where it will serve the Redbank commuter and others.

The logical location is on the eastern side of St John of God, Health Care Facility, a Jim Anderson via-duct on Crowley's Lane and then onto Castlereagh Road. The Driftway is about 100 metres away!

If Council staff cannot ensure the natural environment will be protected and enhanced and to ensure residents can live sustainably and reduce our ecological foot print and as a result of the proposal the sustainability of our urban environment is improved, this application must not proceed.

4. Local Roads. The current conditions of Grose Vale Road, Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road are not fit for purpose now!

There is a serious safety questions around the Grose View School and the danger to parents, children and staff.

The VPA does not indicate exactly what the developer is proposing for local Road upgrades.

If Council staff cannot demonstrate exactly what the developer and Council will do and the timing to the satisfaction of residents, this application must not proceed.

The VPA. The VPA needs to be cancelled by agreement and re negotiated.

The has been critical of Councillors adopting the VPA all those years ago.

The sincerely hope our concerns are addressed. If they cannot, then the application must not proceed.

Authorised by