



Meeting notes

Kenmore Bypass Planning Study

Community Reference Group (CRG) meeting 3

Date	3 November 2008	Time	6:30pm
Venue	Boulevard Gardens Function Centre, 284 Witton Road Indooroopilly		
Prepared by	Kenmore Bypass Planning Study (KBPS) project team		
Attendees	CRG members Kenmore Bypass Planning Study project team Facilitator		

Apologies: Apologies from two CRG members

Another CRG member was also unable to attend. This member sent a proxy in their place, however as they were selected to be on the CRG as an individual representative, the charter states they are not able to send a proxy. The facilitator explained the situation to the CRG and the CRG agreed that the proxy would be able to attend the meeting as an observer, however would not be able to participate in the meeting. It was agreed by all CRG members that this situation was a one-off and in future, a proxy could not attend in the place of an individual representative.

The project team explained the charter allowed proxies to attend in the place of representatives of community organisations where the nominated representative is unable to attend, but that a minimum of 24 hours prior notice must be provided to the project team. The proxy must also be a registered member of the community organisation they are representing.

Meeting purpose: To present the CRG with the results of the technical and environmental investigations to date and the Stage 2 draft planning options, and to enable the CRG to provide feedback on the options.

Action item	Who	When
--------------------	------------	-------------

Introductions

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The facilitator welcomed the CRG members and explained the purpose of the meeting. | Noted by all |
|--|--------------|

Presentation of draft planning options and technical studies overview

- The project team presented the draft planning options and a comprehensive overview of the results of the technical studies.
- The project team presented images of a typical cross-section, showing the off-road shared recreational pedestrian and cycle path and explained the key features of the cross section.



Key features of the presentation included:

- The design philosophy for the planning options was to minimise property requirements, without compromising design standards
- Planning options have tried to reflect community feedback from Stage 1, where possible
- The planning options primarily focus on how a Kenmore Bypass would connect with the existing road network
- Both 60km/hr and 80km/hr speed limits were considered; an 80km/hr limit was chosen because it minimises additional fill material and creates a more gentle road
- Moggill Road intersection – Option A shows a Moggill Road priority; Option B shows a Kenmore Bypass priority Both have similar land requirements
- The preferred option for the Moggill Road intersection will be selected based on further technical investigations
- Gem Road – three options were considered: over Gem Road, separation of Gem Road, under Gem Road
- A separation of Gem Road was chosen as the preferred option as it is the most technically and economically feasible
- Impacts of separating Gem Road include: access changes in the local area; increased traffic on Sunset Road; changes to bus services
- The project team is working with Brisbane City Council in relation to alternative bus routes, should the bypass proceed to construction
- There are three shared pedestrian and cyclist overpass options at, or near Gem Road, to maintain local access and connectivity
- The preferred shared pedestrian and cyclist overpass option near Gem Road will be selected based on community feedback
- The bypass would run underneath Kenmore Road
- On and off-ramps were considered at Kenmore Road, but were ruled out for technical reasons and because they would require additional properties
- There would be a shared pedestrian and cyclist ramp to enable access from Kenmore Road to the Kenmore Bypass shared path
- Kenmore Road movements would be retained during construction
- Kenmore Road over the Centenary Motorway would be realigned with a new bridge
- Centenary Motorway interchange options have changed from previous planning and a 'service' interchange is more appropriate
- A service interchange is a connection between a major and minor road, and is consistent with the other interchanges along the Centenary Motorway
- A 'service' interchange also requires fewer property acquisitions



- Centenary Motorway Options A and B are generally similar: both enable northbound and southbound movements; both have traffic signals where the bypass connects with the motorway on / off ramps; and both allow for safe pedestrian and cyclist access to the Centenary Bikeway from the Kenmore Bypass
- The Centenary Motorway interchange options differ in the following ways:
 - Option A uses the Fig Tree Pocket interchange to access the Centenary Motorway from the bypass; Option B has direct access from the bypass to the Centenary Motorway
 - Option A allows movement between the Kenmore Bypass and Fig Tree Pocket, whereas Option B does not
 - Option A would involve a minor upgrade to the Fig Tree Pocket interchange; Option B would involve a major upgrade
- There would be a shared recreational cyclist and pedestrian path along the length of the Kenmore Bypass, with access to and from Moggill Road, Gem Road, Kenmore Road and the Centenary Bikeway
- The planning options include the provision for commuter cyclists to use the bypass shoulders
- The Centenary Bikeway would be re-instated.

Environmental

- The project team provided a detailed and comprehensive overview of the environmental process to date.
- Key features of the presentation included:
 - The Environmental Approvals Report (EAR) is currently undergoing internal peer-review and Main Roads review and will be placed on the Main Roads website once complete
 - The purpose of the EAR is to: assess the existing environment; assess the potential impacts of the proposed bypass; and suggest possible mitigation measures
 - Extensive environmental investigations have been undertaken in and around the preserved corridor
 - To date, these investigations have not identified the current presence of a koala population within the existing preserved corridor
 - Main Roads is committed to working with environmental organisations, local residents and independent ecologists with regards to environmental issues and specifically regarding koalas in the corridor and investigations are ongoing
 - CRG members were offered the opportunity to attend a presentation on how the Department of Main Roads manages projects in koala areas



- Other flora and fauna species of significance that have been identified include:
 - Tusked Frog
 - Lewin's Rail
 - *Lilaeopsis brisbanica* (a herb on the banks of the river)
 - Spotted Gum
- The EAR will outline the mitigation measures for these species should the bypass proceed to construction
- There would be no significant impacts to water, groundwater, soils and geology or land use planning and any impacts would be appropriately mitigated
- Detailed air quality modelling has been undertaken using existing baseline data from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- The project team is currently running scenarios to model potential air quality and this will be included in the EAR
- The visual impacts of the proposed bypass were discussed highlighting major cuts and fills, as well as proposed noise barriers

Noise monitoring

- The project team provided an overview of the noise investigations and presented a noise model for the potential Kenmore Bypass.
- Key features of the presentation included:
 - 43 sites were successfully monitored; 8 remain to be completed in early 2009
 - The proposed noise model was developed based on traffic volumes expected 20 years from now
 - Ground terrain and buildings were surveyed using aerial laser
 - Dwellings closest to the proposed corridor are forecast to exceed the 60dB(A) criterion if mitigation measures were not installed
 - A mitigation measure could involve using a quiet road surface pavement
 - Noise barriers will be required – noise barrier design options are currently being considered, as well as their height and location
 - Some properties may require additional noise treatments, such as air-conditioning and/or mechanical ventilation.



Group discussions

The CRG separated into small groups to discuss the planning options with other CRG members and ask detailed questions of the project team. Each group was asked to record feedback about the planning options and present to the larger group. The key issues raised during the group discussions are outlined below:

- Proximity of the bypass to residential properties
 - Noise impacts and mitigation
 - Visual impacts
 - Property acquisitions
 - Water flow
 - Safety
 - Impact on residents / isolation if Gem Road is separated (e.g. access, emergency services, would it impact on subdivisions, impact of future growth in the area and only one access road)
 - Impact to Sunset Road if Gem Road is separated – the general view was that is unlikely Sunset Road could cope with the additional traffic
 - Impact of the proposed UQ Moggill Farm expansion
 - Desire for smooth traffic flow at both the Moggill Road intersection and Centenary Motorway interchange
 - Traffic flow through Kenmore during school holidays versus traffic flow during the rest of the year
 - Potential future construction impacts
 - Concern that the Kenmore Bypass would replace Moggill Road.
 - **Action:** Record CRG feedback as formal feedback for Stage 2.
- KBPS team 10.11.08

General comments/questions and answers from CRG members

1. Is the Kenmore Bypass going to link directly to the Warrego Highway?
 - **Response:** the scope of the Kenmore Bypass Planning Study is to investigate whether the existing three-kilometre corridor between Moggill Road at Pullenvale and the Centenary Motorway at Fig Tree Pocket could provide a solution to existing congestion problems on Moggill Road through Kenmore. The Western Brisbane Transport Network Investigation (WBTNI) is looking at the strategic, long-term transport needs for the western suburbs, including the Moggill Pocket Sub-Arterial.
2. A comment was made that the preference would be to avoid encouraging additional traffic through the existing Fig Tree Pocket interchange as it is already very busy.



- **Response:** the Centenary Motorway Interchange Option B directs Kenmore Bypass traffic straight on to the Centenary Motorway instead of through the existing Fig Tree Pocket interchange, as shown in Option A. Feedback on both options will be taken into consideration.

3. A question was raised regarding how Main Roads mitigates noise when it reaches a level over 60dB(A), which is outlined in the Main Roads Noise Code of Practice as the acceptable criterion for new roads.

- **Response:** in such circumstances Main Roads would consider house treatments for affected properties, such as window glazing or air-conditioning.

4. A question was raised asking why Main Roads has already purchased some properties in the area.

- **Response:** Main Roads has purchased some properties where there is a potential land requirement for the bypass, as part of the hardship policy. Those property owners made a case to Main Roads outlining that they had experienced hardship as a consequence of the planning study. Hardship applications are assessed on a case-by-case basis and only apply to properties where there is a potential land requirement.

5. A question was raised regarding the impact on local connectivity and community values if Gem Road is separated.

- **Response:** a pedestrian and cycle overpass will be constructed at, or near Gem Road to maintain local connectivity. A social impact analysis is being undertaken as part of the Environmental Approvals Report (EAR) for the planning study. The EAR will be uploaded to the Main Roads website once completed.

6. A question was raised about cycle connectivity to the Centenary Bikeway.

- **Response:** the shared recreational cyclist and pedestrian path would connect with the Centenary Bikeway.

7. A concern was raised regarding flooding on Sunset Road and what impact this would have if there is no alternate road access.

- **Response:** that feedback will be taken into consideration.

8. A question was raised regarding whether a tunnel had been considered at Gem Road.

- **Response:** the preference is generally to adopt the previous planning at this location as it was the most technical and economical solution, however the team encourages feedback from the community regarding alternative solutions as the purpose of the Stage 2 community comment period is to gather feedback on the planning options.

9. A question was raised asking if there could be on/off ramps at Kenmore Road.



- **Response:** it would be difficult but not impossible to include on and off-ramps at Kenmore Road. The decision not to provide ramps in the planning options was based on not wanting to affect the existing local road network. However, the team encourages feedback regarding alternative solutions as the purpose of the Stage 2 community comment period is to gather feedback on the planning options.
10. A question was raised regarding what determines the preferred option and whether it is predominantly based on cost.
- **Response:** a number of factors are involved in determining a preferred option in addition to cost, including community feedback and further technical and environmental investigations.
11. A question was raised regarding how much the planning options would cost.
- **Response:** As a preferred option has not yet been identified, it is not possible to speculate on how much the bypass would cost.
12. A question was asked to clarify why the bypass will not affect the current land use.
- **Response:** the area has been zoned as a future transport corridor for more than 30 years.
13. A question was raised asking if the project team had considered CRG applications from the Fig Tree Pocket area.
- **Response:** the selection of CRG members followed a formal process that included independent advice from an ethics professor from Griffith University. Based on the applications received, Main Roads is confident the process used to select members has ensured the CRG provides a balanced representation of viewpoints from within the study area.
14. A question was raised regarding when the preferred option would be completed.
- **Response:** the study team will present a preferred option to the community as soon as possible in 2009.

Meeting conclusion

- The facilitator asked each CRG member to provide feedback on the CRG meeting format. The majority of CRG members expressed satisfaction with the meeting format, the level of information provided and the opportunities to interact with other CRG members and the project team. Two CRG members expressed their dissatisfaction with the process. The project team will take all feedback into consideration for future meetings.

Date and topics for next meeting

- No date was set for the next meeting, but the Project Manager advised it would be in early 2009 after the completion of the Stage 2 community comment period. CRG members will be notified in due course.
- Meeting closed 9:00pm.