Submission relating to upgrade options for Taylors Lane, Cambewarra
Council Ref. 50301E (D20/161770)

My wife and I and the majority of the residents who will be affected by the upgrade to Taylors Lane have attended two meetings with the Council Project Control Group on the four options proposed for the upgrade and we and others have also made submissions in relation to same. On reading the agenda for your meeting next Tuesday it would appear that none of our submissions have been addressed - my wife and I certainly have not received any correspondence covering our concerns. To this end I include the details of our previous submission which I would ask that you review if for no other reason than to ensure you are fully informed of our concerns. I think I should also note that at the two meetings we and others attended there was no support from the floor for the Project Control Group's preference for Option 4. Instead, all those who spoke to the matter were in favour of Option 2.

The following were observations my wife and I made in our previous submission.

1. In relation to the 'Explanatory Statement' submitted with the proposed documents put on Public Exhibition by the Council in March 2020 in relation to the 'Taylors Lane Upgrade as part of the Far North Collector Road Project'.

Page 2: Background

It is stated that the FNC project project 'will resolve local access problems during construction of the Moss Vale Road (South) URA'. We believe it is most important that no construction traffic be allowed to use Taylors Lane for construction purposes and that this should be one of the conditions of approval for any DA approved in the Moss Vale Road (South) URA.

Pages 3 - 7: The Alignment Options for Taylors Lane
Table 1: Comparison of Options 2 & 4

- Future Growth of the Area: We consider the reasons given for Options 2 & 4 are based on a premise that the higher the density of development the better the outcome. This would appear to be inconsistent with the provisions of Clause 228 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 Parts 2 (a), (b), (d), (e), (i) and (k).

- Safety and Maintenance: As stated for Option 4 'Removing the trees removes the risk of branches falling'.

All green spaces involving trees will require maintenance - does something make this area less desirable? We note that council has already decreed that there are trees to be retained in the subject URA - what makes these trees different? Not only that, there is a general community concern to have green spaces in...
new developments so why remove a beautiful example which contains mature trees that are well over 100 years old? With regard to the 'Safety' item, to date we have not seen any indication that the Council was concerned about the safety of the current residents in relation to any of the trees/branches. We believe the arguments for these two points (i.e. Safety & Maintenance) to be rather spurious and may be an attempt to try and support a pre-conceived outcome.

- Last paragraph in the discussion of the 'Alignment Options'.
  The argument presupposes that future generations will not leave the trees in place (...it is unlikely that they will be retained in the long term.) We do not believe we should make assumptions about the decisions of future generations but rather we should try to minimise the unnecessary destruction of those parts of the existing environment that define what makes the South Coast such a desirable location.

2. In relation to the report prepared for the Council by Peter Dalmazzo covering the the Environmental and Legislative Aspects of the upgrade of Taylors Lane (of date 05-Feb-20):
   
   Page 4, second to last paragraph:
   We particularly refer you to the fact that in this paragraph it is clearly stated that option 4 is not based on it having the least environmental impacts.

   Page 5, Section 3.1.2 Part 5 Environmental Assessment, 1st paragraph:
   We refer Council to the sentence 'Council will need to consider ..... aesthetic values will be important issues.' We consider this to be most important and sincerely hope that due consideration be given to this and the residents thoughts in relation to them.

   Page 13:
   We would hope that the opinions of the author in this paragraph are appropriately addressed.

3. Other considerations
   Despite having mentioned the problem of access for existing residents whilst the upgrade is being carried out at a meeting with Council staff on 26-Aug-19 it would appear the matter had still not been addressed by the time of the 'Information Meeting' of 24-Feb-20. This is of great concern to all the residents. If access is properly addressed we believe that any perceived cost difference between Options 2 and 4 may be reduced considerably.

In conclusion, we would strongly recommend Council adopt Option 2. The adoption of Option 4 will certainly cause more disruption to the residents and will greatly decrease the aesthetic value of the area.

Yours faithfully,

Russell & Marie Field.