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Foreword

This document is the Kempsey Shire Council’s determined table of actions in response to the Pacific Highway Bypass of Kempsey.

Since 2008 Kempsey Shire Council has been considering the implications of the proposed upgrade of the Pacific Highway and the subsequent bypassing of areas of South Kempsey, the Kempsey CBD, and Frederickton.

Following the announcement of funding for Stage 1 of the Kempsey to Eungai Pacific Highway upgrade, Kempsey Shire Council resolved to allocate funding to the preparation of a Bypass Strategy. A focus group was constituted, incorporating key stakeholders within the community.

Kempsey Shire Council worked with the focus group to prepare a brief for distribution to consultants, to prepare a Bypass Strategy. The successful consultant was MacroPlan Australia Pty Ltd. MacroPlan met with the focus group in the preparation of the strategy and also met with key staff within Council.

The Background Issues Paper contains literature reviews and case studies of the impacts upon other towns and communities bypassed by major highways. The Background Issues Paper identifies several negative impacts of the bypass, but also identifies opportunities created by the Bypass.

Negative impacts included loss of trade for highway dependent businesses, such as service stations and motels. Positive impacts include opportunities for main street redesigns, to create more pedestrian friendly environments, and a more vibrant town center.

The recommendations of the Background Issues Paper, were expanded upon in the form of a table of actions, which, in effect, is the Kempsey Shire Council Bypass Strategy. The strategy indicates the priorities and timing of actions that Kempsey Shire Council intends to take to mitigate against the expected negative impacts of the Bypass, including steps to take advantage of the opportunities created by the bypass.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepared detailed project plans for each of the identified actions</td>
<td>Sustainable Environment</td>
<td>Commence by August 2011 complete by December 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political Engagement –Following through with political engagement.</td>
<td>Councillors GM Directors Senior Management</td>
<td>Commence immediately then ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development Approval Obligations – find conditions that relate to Council.</td>
<td>Sustainable Environment</td>
<td>Commence immediately in conjunction with the Kempsey Bypass Alliance committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacific Highway Assets includes:</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Commence immediate GIPA application submitted to obtain RTA report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban Design - Streetscape Revitalisation Program. 5 Precincts:</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Commence detailed project plans by August 2011. Determine scope of works that can be commenced before December 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(a)</td>
<td>CBD Smith Street</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Commence project plan August 2011 ready to commence works December 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(b)</td>
<td>Corridor Designs (Landscape only) Series of precincts within the corridors.</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Commence July 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(c)</td>
<td>South Kempsey Business Centre (Landscape and Street Treatment).</td>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Commence design December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(d)</td>
<td>Kempsey Town Centre and</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Commence June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kempsey Shire Council Bypass Strategy Table of Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Outskirts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority projects are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clyde Street Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Riverside Park precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which includes under the bridge along the river to Woolworths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(e)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Commence 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederickton Street Planting Replacement, footpaths kerb and gutter, bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(f)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Commence July 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Statements – Signage</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory, tourist and marketing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Commence April 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community consultation and/or community involvement/information.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Commence February 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Commence July 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various Town Centre and Place Based Development Control Plans</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Centre and Corridor Precincts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kempsey Place Based Promotions</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotional Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(a)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Commence investigations 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Strategy</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederickton and South Kempsey LEPs – e.g. opportunities on land in close proximity to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interchanges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(b)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Control</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the five identified precincts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kempsey CBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- South Kempsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fredericton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- North Kempsey corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gateway areas (interchanges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(c)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>To be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure Plans</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low Develop Marketing Strategy</td>
<td>Sustainable Environment and Community Engagement</td>
<td>To be developed following determination of revitalisation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Low Community Element – Calendar of events. Part of marketing, community cultural sporting etc.</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>As per Point 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Executive Summary

The development of a Council strategy is an important first step in addressing any negative impacts associated with the Pacific Highway deviation and positioning Kempsey so that it may maximise the potential positive benefits associated with the works.

Whilst the state government’s assessment/approval of the Kempsey Bypass project sufficiently addresses many of the physical and environmental consequences of the road’s construction, it also demonstrates, perhaps inadvertently, a lack of commitment to addressing the social and economic implications of the road.

This oversight cannot be addressed by re-assessing the impact of the bypass. In MacroPlan’s opinion it is best addressed by giving serious consideration to the manner in which Kempsey wishes to respond to the impact of the bypass, i.e. by focussing on the strategies that will help Kempsey remain a strong and prosperous regional centre well into the future.

Whilst other strategies undertaken for regional towns throughout NSW have incorporated a myriad of measures designed to address the potential negative town centre impacts of a highway bypass, most of the measures recommended and adapted at other locations have, in themselves, not had a significant effect on outcomes.

An exception to this rule is demonstrated in the positive approaches taken by Berrima and Albury-Wodonga to the opportunities that respective bypasses of the Hume Highway presented for these towns.

MacroPlan recommends a balanced approach to the development of a practical bypass strategy for Kempsey. The recommended approach:

- places an immediate focus on addressing Council’s obligations under the development consent (and potentially allows Council to leverage the consent’s lack of detail with respect to the socio-economic impacts of the bypass);
- recommends some town centre and access improvements;
- identifies placed-based promotional initiatives that could benefit Kempsey and Frederickton; and
- recommends that Kempsey give serious consideration to developing a strategy that considers the future role of Kempsey as a mid-north coast regional centre.

A Future Kempsey strategy would consider, for instance, whether Kempsey, situated halfway between Brisbane and Sydney, could provide a (truck based) transport logistics function for the distribution of goods across northern NSW and would also investigate other service and employment opportunities for the town.

This report prioritises a series of recommended actions for Council to pursue in response to the highway bypass.
2 Introduction

MacroPlan has been engaged by the Kempsey Shire Council to prepare a post-approval issues paper for the Kempsey to Eungai Pacific Highway Bypass.

The focus of the issues paper is on the town of Kempsey and what measures are appropriate for it to follow in response to the bypass.

A number of local area impacts (and opportunities) which will affect the Kempsey community and Council’s operations are expected as a result of the bypass.

Accordingly, it is important that Council and the Kempsey community are informed of, and prepared for, the highway bypass and fully understand the ramifications of the upgrade.

The development of a Council strategy is an important first step in addressing any negative impacts associated with the highway deviation and positioning Kempsey so that it may maximise the positive benefits associated with the works. This issues paper will assist in the creation of a Council Strategy.

2.1 Project Overview and Methodology

MacroPlan has undertaken the following tasks for the project:

- A review of the Minister’s Conditional Approval for the roadworks, including an assessment of the completeness of the consent and the priority assigned to specific conditions, including a review of obligations imposed by the consent on Kempsey Shire Council;

- A review of publicly available Development Application and assessment information relevant to the project, including assessment reports prepared by or on behalf of the Roads and Traffic Authority and the NSW Department of Planning;

- A review of approaches taken by other towns in response to other highway bypasses; and

- A consideration of potential funding sources that Council may be able to access to assist it in addressing the implications of the bypass.

More specifically, MacroPlan’s assessment of the implications of the bypass has involved an investigation of the extent to which the following matters were considered in the assessment phase of the project and the extent to which the project approval addresses these issues:

- The economic impacts associated with redirected traffic and potential trade catchment alterations;

- Potential retail, tourism and other opportunities that might arise from improved traffic mobility conditions;
• The potential for highway service centres (or highway service towns) to be established on or adjacent to the new highway route and the development of appropriate strategic and planning responses;

• Potential changes to the Kempsey town centre retail hierarchy (including the potential for new out-of-centre opportunities);

• Employment impacts (including mobility, job closure and job creation issues);

• Marketing (and general information) implications for the town of Kempsey and surrounding districts;

• Local infrastructure adjustments; and

• Potential town planning implications regarding and permissible and desirable land uses associated with the road bypass and existing commercial/employment sites that may be trade affected.

2.2 Project Objectives

The primary aim of the project is to identify actions and priorities (including potential funding sources) to ensure that Kempsey Shire Council is prepared in its response to the construction phase and opening of the new highway upgrade. The recommended actions and priorities are intended to provide a broad foundation upon which Kempsey Shire Council can build upon to create a strategy.

The project objectives are to:

• Identify impacts not ameliorated or mitigated in the approval for the bypass;

• List impacts required to be addressed during the construction phase and identify any actions to ensure RTA commitments and other are met;

• Identify indirect impacts that were not addressed, or were not adequately addressed, in the EIS or project approval;

• Identify potential benefits and opportunities that arise from the Bypass;

• Document the impacts and opportunities, and identify actions to address the impacts and take advantage of the opportunities; and to

• Recommend priorities and provide cost estimates for the identified actions.

2.3 Study Context – Scope of Approved Highway Bypass

The approved Kempsey to Eungai upgrade comprises the construction of approximately 40 km of four-lane divided highway south of Kempsey to north of Eungai Rail.
Stage One approval has been given to the Kempsey Bypass, a 14.5 km long section that involves the construction of a four-lane divided highway which bypasses the towns of Kempsey and Frederickton. The bypass is expected to be operational by 2014.

The approved stretch of road encompassed in the Stage One approval is shown in the map below.

Figure 1. Site Map

Source: RTA (2009)

2.4 Data Sources

The following data sources have been researched in preparing this report.

- Kempsey to Eungai: Upgrading the Pacific Highway – Environmental Assessment, NSW Roads and Traffic Authority, July 2007
- Kempsey to Eungai: Upgrading the Pacific Highway - Submissions Report, NSW Roads and Traffic Authority, March 2008
- Kempsey to Eungai: NSW Department of Planning Director-General’s Environmental Assessment Report, July 2008
- Kempsey to Eungai: Approval by the NSW Minister for Planning, July 2008
• National Building Program: The Plan for the Pacific Highway, December 2009

• Karuah Community & Economic Redevelopment Plan - Options and Opportunities – Karuah after the Bypass, Urban and Regional Planning Program, University of Sydney, and the Karuah Community and Economic Redevelopment Committee, July 2004

• The Karuah Bypass: Economic and Social Impacts – The 1 Year Report, University of Sydney, 2005


• Bypass of the Moree Town Centre, Egis / Roads & Traffic Authority, August 2002

• Evaluation of the Economic Impacts of Bypass Roads on Country Towns, NSW Roads & Traffic Authority and UNSW, 1996

• Great Lakes Highway Service Centre, Study and Strategy Report, ARUP, May 2004

• Macleay Valley Coast, Tourism Strategic Plan – January 2005 – December 2009, ATS Consulting Solutions, 2005

2.5 Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used throughout this report:

• RTA NSW Roads and Traffic Authority

• DOP NSW Department of Planning

• EIS Environmental Impact Statement

• EP&A Act Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (as amended)

• LGA Local Government Area

• KSC Kempsey Shire Council

2.6 Disclaimer

This study has been prepared by MacroPlan Australia Pty Ltd and is intended for the purpose described in this report and not for any other purpose. The contents of this paper should not be reproduced without the express permission of MacroPlan Australia Pty Ltd.
3 Project Assessment and Approval

3.1 Project Approval

The Kempsey to Eungai Highway Bypass project was declared to be a major project (s75B (1) (b) and critical infrastructure (s75C) under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act). All projects classified as Part 3A are determined by the Minister for Planning.

The Department of Planning received 49 submissions in relation to the project (40 from individuals, community groups or businesses and 9 from Government agencies and councils), which raised a number of key issues including: route selection, hydrology, noise, flora and fauna, visual impact and impacts on community infrastructure.

The Department assessed the RTA’s Environmental Assessment and Response to Submissions Report (including its Statement of Commitments) and recommended conditional approval of the project. These conditions outlined performance standards and monitoring requirements, mainly with regard to minimising the potential negative environmental impacts highlighted in the submissions.

A copy of the Minister for Planning’s approval of the project, issued in July 2008, is included at Appendix 1 to this report.

3.2 Project Assessment - Social and Economic Impacts

An assessment of the potential impacts on businesses in Kempsey and Frederickton as well as other businesses along the existing Pacific Highway was undertaken on behalf of the RTA for the project (July 2007). This included a socio-economic assessment, undertaken by UNSW Consulting for the RTA in 2005, and which included a survey of 79 local businesses.

The key findings of the socio-economic assessment undertaken by the RTA are documented as follows:

- Notwithstanding the community severance impacts of the deviation on several local communities, the re-routing of the highway to the east of Kempsey and Frederickton was generally found to result in greater community cohesion in these areas

- A loss of trade in the accommodation sector of Kempsey would occur as a result of the bypass, however this was considered likely to be “quickly compensated for” through additional visitors attracted to Kempsey due to its improved environmental and amenity conditions

- Assuming a similar level of impact to the Hume Highway bypass of Yass, the upgrade was estimated to cause a reduction in annual expenditure by stopping motorists of between $3.4 and $4.7 million.
• On the basis of the estimated reduction in gross annual trade (at 79 businesses that were
surveyed) a total of 176 jobs could potentially be lost (or 19% of the 919 workers
employed in these businesses)

• The business category with the largest estimated job losses – with a loss of up to 109
jobs – is the eateries category. The service station sector is the next largest in terms of
estimated job losses (50 jobs)

• The loss of jobs, particularly casual and part-time positions, could result in a marked
reduction of job opportunities for females in the area

• The loss of highway related trade in the main commercial shopping areas in Kempsey is
likely to be partly offset by the benefits to trade of an improved shopping environment

• The potential development of a highway service centre close to Kempsey would create
local employment for around 65-70 full-time equivalent positions, approximately equal
to 130 jobs

• The proposed upgrade would result in the loss of some agricultural lands and would
result in a direct reduction in farm productivity and incomes. These losses typically form
part of the resultant property acquisition negotiations

• The assessment also identified several key benefits of the project including:
  o Improved road safety and a reduction in road accidents
  o A reduction in the amount of heavy vehicle traffic in Belgrave and Smith Streets,
    Kempsey and Macleay Street, Frederickton, resulting in a reduction in noise and
    improvements to vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety
  o Improved state-wide and regional north-south access which would support
    tourism, access to markets and regional employment in NSW
  o Reduced highway travel times, and therefore a reduction in user costs
  o Improvements to the character and environmental amenity of towns
  o Opportunities for commercial and industrial development, particularly South
    Kempsey and Frederickton

The RTA’s socio-economic assessment concluded that:

“The overall potential downturn in gross turnover in the town of Kempsey is likely to impact
on the wider community with reduced employment prospects and flow-on economic impacts
from highway-generated revenue. To some extent the uncertainty in the job market may be
off-set by the inflow of revenue during the construction period and potential development of
a highway service centre at South Kempsey.” [RTA Environmental Assessment, July 2007,
p.330]

Furthermore, the RTA’s Submission Report (March 2008) notes that:
“One of the objectives of the RTA’s Pacific Highway Upgrade Program is to provide a route that supports economic development. The RTA would consult with Kempsey Shire Council and the community with regard to signposting and town entry statements to help identify the region to highway users and draw them into Kempsey following the completion of the proposed upgrade. This would be undertaken with the aim of minimising the social and economic impacts of the proposed upgrade ....” [RTA Submissions Report, March 2008, p.64]

The RTA assessment further considers a range of measures that Kempsey Shire Council and the local community may wish to explore in response to the bypass – new development opportunities (e.g. at South Kempsey and around the proposed Slim Dusty Centre), implementation of a Town Centre Master Plan, implementation of a suitable streetscape strategy and the development of a Town Entrance Statement.

Importantly, the assessment concludes that:

“There are no standard or project specific mitigation measures proposed for the management of social and economic impacts.” [RTA Environmental Assessment, July 2007, p.335]

This position is reflected in the development consent conditions imposed by the Minister. The conditions include a range of measures to address flora and fauna impacts, and noise and vibration attenuation, as well as ecological monitoring and biodiversity offsets. Not one of the 50 conditions imposed, however, refers to or requires any remediation or related works with respect to the economic consequences of the bypass on the townships of Kempsey or Frederickton.

Whilst the Department’s assessment/approval of the project sufficiently addresses many of the physical and environmental consequences of the road’s construction, it also demonstrates, perhaps inadvertently, a lack of commitment to addressing the social and economic implications of the bypass.

This represents a significant project oversight.

The issue cannot be addressed, however, by re-assessing the impact of the bypass. In MacroPlan’s opinion it is best addressed by giving serious consideration to the manner in which Kempsey wishes to respond to the impact of the bypass, i.e. by focussing on the strategies that will help Kempsey remain a strong and prosperous regional centre well into the future.

3.3 Project Update

The Frederickton to Eungai section of the Pacific Highway upgrade is Stage 2 of the broader 40 kilometre long Kempsey to Eungai project, with the Kempsey Bypass representing Stage 1.

The Australian and NSW governments have set aside $46 million to complete the detailed planning of Stage 2 and to begin preparing the site for the start of major construction activities in 2014, with this work getting underway early next year.

Preconstruction activities have commenced in the Kempsey to Frederickton section (Stage 1) of the project. These activities include flood modelling, preparation of the compensatory habitat offset strategy, field investigations, preliminary design and property acquisitions.
The recent approved funding for the Stage 2 of the bypass from Frederickton-Eungai is anticipated to have minimal implications for the townships of Kempsey and Frederickton.

Firstly, most of the potential social and economic impacts are expected to occur from the completion of Stage 1 – when Kempsey and Frederickton townships are actually bypassed. Secondly, although the extension of the bypass will make it easier to travel north of Kempsey and Frederickton, it is not expected to result in any meaningful relocation of jobs or trade toward the next northward comparably sized town (Macksville). Stage 2 of the bypass project primarily involves the construction of an alternate route around Clybucca and through the Tamban State Forest.

The following diagram provides an updated visual representation of the status of the various components of the Pacific Highway upgrade project, from Newcastle to Woolgoolga.
Figure 2. Pacific Highway Upgrade Status (RTA, June 2010)

Legend:
- Purple: Upgrade completed
- Purple/Pink: Upgrade approved, or preferred route identified, or route being prepared for project approval
- Yellow: Under construction
4 Literature Review and Case Study Analysis

This section of the report provides a review of key case studies and policy documents pertinent to other highway bypasses from around the country and their consideration of socio-economic impacts.

4.1 Karuah, Pacific Highway Bypass, Mid-North Coast, NSW

The Karuah Community and Economic Redevelopment Plan was developed in 2004 in response to the Pacific Highway’s bypass of the town. The Plan was prepared by the University of Sydney in partnership with Port Stephens and Great Lakes Councils, the Department of State & Regional Development, the RTA and representatives of the Karuah community.

An extensive Strategy, partly funded by a $200,000 RTA grant, was developed. It incorporated a wide range of responses, including:

- The creation of a New Town Coordinator position
- A ‘Marketing Karuah’ component, involving signage, vouchers and coupons, advertising through Tourism web sites and the investigation of annual festivals and a ‘signature event’
- The concept of a Karuah Rural Transaction Centre incorporating a Visitor Information Centre with services including Eftpos, post, phone, printing, secretarial, Medicare, Centrelink and other facilities for visiting professionals, funded through the Federal Regional Partnerships Program and Port Stephens Council
- Expansion of the Karuah Community Hall into a Community Hub, with youth services, family services, elderly day care, arts and crafts etc with capital works to be funded through Council and state agencies.
- Main Street Improvements incorporating landscaping, improved parking and pedestrian facilities
- Riverfront / Foreshore Improvements targeted at improved infrastructure and facilities
- Identification of the Opportunity to expand the Karuah Co-op Seafood Market

Of note, the Plan outlines a number of potential benefits arising from a bypass:

“The reduction in traffic through a town centre can have numerous benefits, including noise and air quality improvements, as well as improved quality of life, road safety, and pedestrian and retail amenity. This often has the effect of ‘returning the street’ to the local community, with the reduction in traffic providing greater encouragement for residents to utilise the main street of the town (Johnson 2003). This can lead to associated flow-on effects with re-oration or strengthening of service retail providers, with the potential for hinterland areas to utilise this retail centre instead of larger regional centres. These improvements are extremely vital in any future strategy to compensate the effects of a bypass due to the
enhancement to the future possibilities of a town relating to tourism, cottage industries, festivals and retail output. Often communities will accept any loss in Gross Annual Turnover based on the benefits to their quality of life.”

It is noted that the Karuah Community and Economic Redevelopment Committee Report (2004) undertook a comprehensive literature review at the time and found a number of direct and indirect negative impacts caused by highway bypasses, including:

- Loss of Gross Annual Turnover – dependant on the nature of the economic base, the ability to exploit alternatives to highway-generated trade and the successfulness of mitigation measures. For example, Berrima was able to reorientate the focus of its economy towards historical and bed & breakfast style tourism whereas Yass experienced a severe drop in motorists entering the town, with highway-generated trade dropping by 50%. It has been predicted that the Yass economy will never recover to pre-bypass levels.

- Loss of employment - while some cases indicated heavy losses in full-time positions within a rural town (e.g. Yass with 93 positions lost), studies indicate that businesses are more likely to reduce shift hours or operating hours than to offer redundancies. Casual and part-time employment opportunities were identified as the most likely to be lost, e.g. at Goulburn, Yass, Mittagong, Gunning and Berrima 70% or more of the total jobs lost consisted of part-time and casual positions.

- Business Closures - in particular, the closure of businesses orientated towards highway-generated trade (e.g. service stations, takeaways). Studies have indicated, however, that the accommodation sector of the economic base is not as severely impacted upon in comparison to retail businesses.

The social and economic impacts of the Karuah bypass were well documented in a paper that studied the effects one year after the opening. As expected there were a number of negative effects as a result of the bypass:

- Main street traffic declined significantly. Traffic surveys indicated that only 14 percent of northbound traffic and 7 percent of southbound traffic now enters Karuah from the new stretch of the upgraded highway.

- In the twelve months following construction six businesses closed with another seven reporting a decrease in revenue. As a result, 48 jobs or 21% of the total employment in Karuah was lost, comprising predominantly female, part-time workers.

- The RSL has demonstrated an ability to sustain pre-bypass employment levels.

- The impacts twelve months on were in fact less serious than originally predicted.

4.2 Moree Town Centre Bypass, Newell Highway, North-West NSW

The bypass project involved the construction and operation of a 4.4 kilometre two-lane bypass of the Moree town centre, connecting the existing Newell Highway between Bulluss Drive and a point to the north-east of Moree Racecourse, including a new bridge across the Mehi River. The Moree bypass just skirts the town entrance and, at its nearest point, is 650 metres from the town.
centre. This close proximity to the town centre has somewhat mitigated the extent of the economic problems typically associated with bypasses.

Figure 3. Moree Bypass Map

The EIS report prepared for the project identified a number of potential adverse effects including, inter alia:

- Increase in noise levels at properties adjacent to the proposed Bypass
- Demolition of 10 buildings that had been identified as having potential heritage significance
- A potential reduction of between 27% - 40% of highway trade, which represents about 1.4% - 2.1% of all retail trade for the area
- A potential loss of 10-15 jobs, from the total of 6,768 jobs in Moree, as a result of the reduction in highway-generated trade

The EIS outlined a number of environmental safeguards to mitigate the potential adverse effects, including:
• Provision of acoustic mitigation measures including a landscaped noise barrier and architectural modifications to some buildings
• Incorporation of urban design and landscape elements into the proposal
• Provision of signage and slip lanes before the proposed bypass to advertise routes to the town centre and services available therein
• Appropriate town entry statements to encourage continued light vehicle and tourist patronage of the town centre

The bypass was identified as offering the potential to facilitate development of a heritage precinct, improve the potential of the Moree Showground and enhance the Mehi River corridor, thereby improving the attractiveness of Moree as a visitor/tourist centre, and to improve the local economy.

4.3 Ballina, Pacific Highway Bypass, Far North Coast, NSW

The bypass involves the construction of a four lane carriageway road, which extends from the intersection of the Bruxner and Pacific Highways in the south to the intersection with Ross Lane at Tintenbar in the north. The bypass also required the construction of two bridges.

The environmental assessment identified a number of issues pertaining to the bypass, including:

• Land use and property impacts – altered access arrangements, minor trip acquisitions, major property severances, total acquisitions, agricultural impacts
• Town business impacts – the most severe effect was predicted to impact upon service stations and other businesses (such as food outlets) that have a high reliance on passing trade for turnover
• Noise – noise exposure for rural and residential properties, localised adverse noise impacts during construction, however a reduction in town centre traffic conditions was considered likely to result in reduced noise and dust and safety improvements
• The total dollar value of the anticipated reduction in annual turnover was estimated at 4% of the total turnover for food retailing, cafes and restaurants, service stations, accommodation and ‘other’ retail
• An employment reduction of 18% was anticipated by surveyed businesses

The EIS outlined a number of measures to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of the bypass:

• Inclusion of high standard access arrangements at the main town entries, a ‘gateway’ entry and careful signposting of Ballina for highway users
• Ameliorative noise measures such as barriers and house treatments, detailed planning and programming of works, controlled hours of construction and consultation with home occupiers
- Mitigating measures to address the predicted business effects including the design and provision of effective access between Ballina town areas and the bypass as well as advisory sign posting

Figure 4. Ballina Bypass Map

Source: RTA website (2010)
4.4 Goulburn Bypass, Hume Highway, Southern Highlands, NSW

The Goulburn Bypass was opened in December 1992 and resulted in the re-routing of the Hume Highway around the town. The following are some effects that have occurred since the bypass was introduced:

- The opening of service centres along the Hume Highway had a bigger effect on local trade than the actual bypass itself.
- A number of service stations and retailers closed, others scaled down their activities and put off staff. At the same time, the State Government closed offices and nearby Queanbeyan picked up health administrators and county council employees from Goulburn.
- Goulburn has ‘reinvented’ itself since the bypass – there have been positive tourism opportunities and changes to the main street, where the town has now become an attractive, quiet and peaceful place to stop over.
- Today, nearly 10 years after the bypass was opened, Goulburn’s population is about the same as it was a decade ago.

4.5 Albury-Wodonga Bypass, Hume Highway, Riverina NSW

The Albury-Wodonga bypass was opened in March 2007. Approval for the bypass was granted in 2004 and construction commenced in January 2005.
The Albury-Wodonga Hume Freeway links the Hume Freeway at Wodonga with the present Hume Highway at Ettamogah, north of Albury. The Albury bypass includes a freeway standard connection to the Murray Valley Highway at Bandiana, east of Wodonga.

The opening of the bypass in 2007 has seemingly created more positive impacts than negative ones. This is because the relatively large population (approximately 100,000 persons) creates a critical mass to support the town.

The following are several benefits of the Albury-Wodonga Bypass:

- Improved road links have facilitated increased demand for the industrial land, e.g. at Baranduda, Bandiana and Wodonga Logic
- High crash rates on the Hume Highway in the vicinity of Albury–Wodonga, where long-distance traffic mixes with local traffic, have been reduced
4.6 RTA Evaluation of Economic Impacts (1996)

In 1996 the RTA prepared a report which established a practical framework for the collection of data in the ‘before and after stages’ of assessing the economic impacts of highway bypasses. The study identified two common economic impacts resulting from highway bypass projects – (1) the reduction in the value of highway-generated trade and (2) impacts to the local community.

Some of the more pertinent findings of the report are:

- Studies undertaken at Goulbourn, Yass, Mittagong, Gunning and Berrima, show that the actual impacts were less than the predicted impacts
- Direct impacts were generally restricted to businesses reliant on passing trade such as service stations, eateries, and food stores. The largest number of jobs lost was from businesses directly servicing the needs of motorists. The accommodation sector did not appear to be as affected

The report recommends a number of alleviating strategies in response to these impacts, including:

- Initiatives to reduce loss of highway-generated trade (e.g. the development of service centres to offset potential job losses in the town centre)
- Main street improvements (e.g. streetscape and building beautification, tree planting, provision of additional parking spaces and provision of pedestrian thresholds).
- Business adjustment initiatives (e.g. increased promotions and advertising; greater emphasis on local trade by improving service, quality and opening hours; seeking of Government assistance).
- Post-bypass reporting (focusing on the after effects of the bypass).

4.7 Key Findings

MacroPlan’s literature review and analysis of specific NSW-based case studies has revealed a number of key findings of relevance to Kempsey:

**Negative Impacts**

- A clear majority of the negative economic impacts observed at other locations relate to a reduction in highway-trade, with flow-on effects to other areas of the economy
- Loss of employment, particularly in part-time and casual positions
- The closure of highway-related businesses, but a lesser impact on accommodation than on retail uses
• A variety of post-approval synopses, where actual impacts have been less than predicted but also cases where impacts have been worse

Mitigating Measures

• Gateways and effective signage are important in terms of directing highway traffic toward town centres. In this regard it is noted that the Slim Dusty Centre, currently under construction at South Kempsey, will assist in capturing the attention of motorists. Consideration should be given to managing traffic flows from the Centre, however, to maximise downtown penetration

• Improved urban design and main street treatments – used to good effect at Taree, Goulburn and Yass, attracting higher resident usage to take the place of motorists and visitors

• A reorientation of business focus or the discovery of new business opportunities, e.g. at Berrima which successfully transformed from a highway-trade town to an historic tourist centre or Albury which has benefitted from the attraction of several logistic industries attracted by the area’s good road access to major markets

• Highway service centres as a means of compensating for job losses, although some towns have reported negative consequences if highway traffic is not diverted to the town proper from these facilities
5 Developing a Strategy for Kempsey

Beyond its immediate statutory obligations, as outlined in the conditions of approval for the bypass project, there are number of other matters that Kempsey Shire Council may wish to pursue in response to the bypass.

Some of these matters relate to the actual hand-over of RTA road assets as the old Pacific Highway is “de-commissioned”. Other local issues might include the provision of signage and Main Street improvement works associated with promoting the towns of Kempsey and Frederickton. Others matters are broader in their outlook and relate to the future role of Kempsey as a principal regional service centre and how it might respond to the opportunities that a new major transport facility presents to a town located halfway between Brisbane and Sydney.

The following discusses Council’s obligations and recommended strategies for responding to the bypass.

5.1 Development Approval Obligations

The terms and conditions of the Minister’s planning approval for the bypass project are outlined at Appendix 1 to this report. These conditions are categorised, at Appendix 2, according to when their compliance is required – i.e. pre-commencement, during-construction or post-construction.

Appendix 2 also provides commentary on each of the conditions, highlighting Council’s obligations under the development consent. Council’s main responsibilities under the terms of approval relate to:

- Representation on a Community Liaison Group with responsibilities to monitor compliance and to be aware of complaints raised with respect to the road’s construction
- General monitoring of compliance with ecological, environmental, hydrological and noise abatement conditions
- Consideration of the RTA’s Urban Design and Landscape Plan for the project
- Overseeing and facilitation of specific community works involving the Frederickton levee bank and boat ramp and the Ferry Lane Memorial

Whilst the majority of conditions imposed relate to the carrying out of ameliorative works associated with the management of the ecological and hydrological impacts of the proposal, some conditions relate to specific matters that will affect the towns of Frederickton and Kempsey and are matters that Council may wish to voice its opinion on. These matters include:

- The final design of the highway interchanges – Council may wish to ensure that the final access arrangements are suitably designed and sign-posted to facilitate easy access into Kempsey and Frederickton
- The location and messages of any signage provided that may direct travellers to Kempsey and Frederickton – Council will need to ensure that the highway signs clearly state the availability of town services and may also wish to negotiate the location of separate
billboards to promote private facilities, or have such notification incorporated in the RTA’s signage

- The access arrangements associated with the Slim Dusty Centre at South Kempsey – Council may wish to stipulate the location of the proposed roundabout so as to encourage north-bound visitors to continue through Kempsey rather than re-join the highway

As noted previously, not one of the 50 conditions imposed for the project directly addresses or requires ameliorative work in response to the bypass’ impact on the towns of Kempsey or Frederickton. This oversight has been raised with the RTA and the Planning Minister by Kempsey Shire Council (see correspondence at Appendix 3).

Cost Expectations

The costs involved with Council’s monitoring of consent conditions are anticipated to be primarily administrative. Council may choose to provide its own community contact information service in relation to the project, although this is not considered essential. The nomination of a single Council point of contact, however, may be helpful.

5.2 Pacific Highway Assets

Once the new bypass is complete, management of the old Pacific Highway assets, including the Macleay River Bridge and Smith Street will transfer to Council. The state of these assets is largely unknown although some may be in a sub-standard condition (e.g. the Bridge paintwork and the Pacific Highway/Smith Street road surface). Accordingly Council will need to ascertain the state of these assets and to negotiate the transfer conditions or otherwise accept assets with a potentially large maintenance burden.

Cost Expectations

MacroPlan has not been made aware of the likely costs associated with Council’s take-over of these assets. If such costs are unknown then this should be a priority action for Council to take.

5.3 Town Centre Improvements and Place-Based Strategies

The strategies listed here either build upon work that Council has already commissioned, such as the development of a Master Plan for Smith Street, or relate to specific measures that may be adapted to counter any negative economic impacts associated with the bypass.

- Main Street Improvements – Council should complete its commission of a landscape master plan for the Kempsey Town Centre and consider the same commission for Frederickton. In doing so Council may wish to leverage a contribution from the RTA toward the delivery of this project[s]

- Gateways and New Bypass Access Arrangements – as stated previously Council may wish to stipulate the location of the proposed roundabout servicing the new Slim Dusty Centre so as to encourage north-bound visitors to continue through Kempsey rather than re-join the highway. Council may also wish to consider the treatment (landscaping and
otherwise) of the new link roads into and out of Kempsey and Frederickton to present the towns in the best possible light

- Other Local Infrastructure Adjustments – although not immediately recognisable in the development assessment or consent conditions, the bypass is likely to result in a series of minor infrastructure adjustments which will impact upon Council services – e.g. road closures, service adjustments, street signage or house numbering implications. To our knowledge Council is yet to consider or cost all of these matters

- The preparation of a Transport Strategy for Kempsey town centre and Frederickton. This strategy would address transport related issues such as the effects of the bypass on the local road hierarchy; determining how best to accommodate truck traffic through or around the town centre; the implications of any main street improvement strategy on pedestrian movements etc

- Kempsey place-based promotions – there are a myriad of promotional initiatives that could be investigated to assist in positioning Kempsey and Frederickton as tourist or business destinations. These initiatives could focus on:
  
  o The natural attributes of the town (e.g. the Macleay River, green space, proximity to National Parks and coast) and promoting it as an affordable Mid-North Coast holiday destination
  
  o Kempsey as a key stop-over on the Pacific Highway - a place for repose and lunch down by the river. The upgrading of river parkland (i.e. off Eden Street Park) may increase its desirability as a stopover
  
  o The promotion of town festivals and/or hallmark events. This could accentuate key comparative advantages of the town, such as the country theme (i.e. Slim Dusty Centre, Akubra factory) or could be created or other niche leisure-based markets, such as food, music or other recreation activities. Successful examples include: music festivals (Port Macquarie’s ‘Festival of the Sun’, Byron Bay’s ‘Splendour in the Grass’, Tamworth’s ‘Country Music Festival’, Parkes’ ‘Elvis Festival’ and Bellingen’s ‘Jazz Festival’); food festivals (Guyra’s ‘Lamb and Potato Festival’, Sawtell’s ‘Chilli Festival’, Casino’s ‘Beef Week’); machinery-based festivals (e.g. the Hunter Valley ‘Steamfest’, Bendemeer’s ‘Grey Fergie’); and cultural events (e.g. Glen Innes’ ‘Celtic Festival’, Tullamore’s ‘Irish Festival’ and Byron Bay’s ‘Fatherhood’ and ‘Writers Festivals’. A festival could have real potential to succeed in Kempsey due to its proximity to a main highway and the possibility to create a unique engagement with the travelling public
  
  o Various sporting events or tournaments – rugby sevens, touch football, netball, snooker etc – all billed as the respective code’s NSW Country Titles
  
  o The creation of facilities, for example sporting or business, that attract a high and/or frequent volume of people via conventions, field days or spectacles. Successful examples include the Tamworth Equine Centre and Gunnedah’s AgQuip convention.
Cost Expectations

Completion of the Kempsey Town Centre Master Plan is anticipated to cost around $40,000. Its extension to Frederickton is expected to cost another $30,000.

The costs associated with improving Kempsey’s and Frederickton’s gateways are anticipated to be in the vicinity of $100,000 (for design work and implementation). A Transport Strategy for Kempsey would cost in the order of $30,000-$40,000.

Council may wish to negotiate a contribution to these costs or seek to have them incorporated into the RTA’s Urban Design and Landscape Plans for the bypass project.

A separate report that considers the potential promotional activities that Kempsey might pursue would cost in the order of $40,000 - $80,000, depending on the level of investigation required. Various funding sources that might be useful in this regard are presented at Appendix 4.

5.4 Highway Service Centre

Although a highway service centre is anticipated, it is unclear whether consideration has been given to the desirability of such a project in terms of its potential draw of motorists away from the town centres of Kempsey and Frederickton.

It is noted that Great Lakes Shire Council chose not to opt for a service centre in response to the Karuah bypass and that our literature review of the Goulburn bypass suggested that the service centres there had detracted, or were seen to detract, from the town.

It is also noted that the South Kempsey interchange has been identified in the State Government’s s117 Directions as a preferred location for a service centre.

Council may wish to further consider the potential economic implications of a highway service centre at South Kempsey. This could be achieved by commissioning a separate Highway Service Centre Strategy, which would review the appropriateness and impact of other developed service centres and rank preferred locations (i.e. where and how to best cater for northbound or southbound traffic and which location would best serve the Kempsey township’s interest). Obviously such consideration would have regard for the implications and impact of the Slim Dusty Centre with respect to traffic movements.

An extract from the current suite of Section 117 Directions, depicting the South Kempsey Bypass as a future highway service centre follows:
LOCAL PLANNING DIRECTIONS
Section 117(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

Town Locality
Ballina • Teven Road interchange
Maclean • Northern interchange near the Clarence River or southern interchange near Ferry Park, but not both.
Woolgoolga • Northern interchange at Arrawarra or southern interchange south of Woolgoolga, but not both.
**Kempsey • South Kempsey interchange**
Port Macquarie • Oxley Highway interchange, east of the Pacific Highway
Taree • Old Bar Road interchange
Tomago • In the vicinity of Tomago Road / Southern Heatherbrae

Consistency
(7) A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the terms of this Direction only if the relevant planning authority can satisfy the Director-General of the Department of Planning (or an officer of the Department nominated by the Director-General) that the provisions of the planning proposal that are inconsistent are of minor significance.

Direction 5.4 – issued 29 November 2009

Cost Expectations
A separate report to consider the economic desirability of a highway service centre at Kempsey would cost in the order of $30,000.

5.5 Future Kempsey
Consideration should be given to the development of a strategy that seeks to stimulate economic activity both in the next 5-10 years and beyond whilst addressing the role of Kempsey as a mid-north coast regional centre.

This strategy would consider:
- Potential town planning implications regarding permissible and desirable land uses associated with the road bypass and existing commercial/employment sites that may be trade affected
- Potential changes to the Kempsey town centre retail hierarchy (including the potential for new out-of-centre opportunities)
- Whether Kempsey, situated halfway between Brisbane and Sydney, could provide a transport logistics function for the distribution of goods across northern NSW. Investigations should focus on both Kempsey’s potential as an intermodal site or as a
road haulage logistics site that potentially aligns with current north-south rail infrastructure investment strategies

- Formulating local policies (i.e. zoning, Section 94, local rate policies etc) that seek to maintain, attract and foster large business ventures or industrial projects. In particular, industries that have strong multiplier effects – such as the procurement of local materials and labour – should be encouraged. The identification of industrial uses that might seek to locate at the South Kempsey Industrial Estate would form part of the strategy’s investigations, as would the potential expansion of existing businesses and enterprises located within the Kempsey and Macleay Valleys

- Economic Adaption Strategies that identify service and employment needs and opportunities for the town, including an assessment of highway-related opportunities

- The possibility of attracting new residents with a focus on lifestyle living, seeking to attract ‘sea-change’ and ‘tree-change’ market segments, as well as retirees and downsizers. In particular, Kempsey and Frederickton could capitalise on a comparative advantage of abundant available (and affordable) land and a supply of a rural-residential offering. This could be a particularly palatable differentiation strategy that may attract city people looking to move to a quiet location proximate to the coast but one that also contains a range of government (schools, TAFE, hospitals) and consumer services (RSL, main street, recreational pursuits)

- The future role of the Airport as a viable and sustainable community and business asset, and the promotion of regional businesses that would benefit from proximity to the airport for the transport of freight or people

Cost Expectations

A separate report to consider both the immediate and long term role of Kempsey and to identify specific employment needs and opportunities for the town would cost in the order of $100,000 - $160,000, depending on the level of investigation required. Such a strategy would need to be developed in close consultation with the Kempsey community and business sector.

5.6 Grant and Funding Opportunities

The economic implications of the Pacific Highway bypass on the townships of Kempsey and Frederickton are many and varied. MacroPlan considers the lack of consideration given to these impacts as an oversight of the project assessment and approval process. Mitigating the potential adverse impacts of the bypass should not, in MacroPlan’s opinion, fall solely on the shoulders of Kempsey Shire Council.

Accordingly, Council may wish to access some of the national and state government grant monies that are available for regional and township development.

---

1 MacroPlan understands that recent investigations by Hastings Council concluded that intermodal facilities are more suited to heavy freight densities (coal & grain) rather than the non-bulk weight that is associated with the area and that rail transport cannot compete commercially with road haulage for such goods given the distances to Sydney (and Brisbane) involved. It is noted however that a current ARTC strategy, the North-South investment strategy, aims to deliver reduced transit time, increased reliability and increased capacity and reduced above rail operating costs between Melbourne and Brisbane and that substantial investment has already occurred on this initiative. It might be worthwhile therefore re-investigating Kempsey’s potential as an intermodal site or at least how its potential as a road haulage logistic centre may assist and align with ARTC’s north-south rail investment strategy.
Specific funding sources are included in the following web links:

- Regional Entry Point (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government) - http://www.regionalaustralia.gov.au/

Cost Expectations

These funding sources may assist considerably in meeting Council’s expenses in addressing the impacts of the bypass.

5.7 Post-Bypass Strategy Monitoring Program

In addition to the development of strategies to counter the impacts of the bypass, Council may also wish to consider the development of a post-bypass strategy to monitor progress made through the various initiatives identified and recommended at section 6.2 of this report.

The post-bypass program should establish a project management framework that outlines a checklist of required actions, their detailed time and cost estimates, necessary resource requirements and, importantly, a quality assurance plan. A single-point of responsibility should be allocated to manage this program to ensure a whole-of-council sign-off on key milestones.

Commitment to a strategy monitoring program is important to achieving the best outcomes for Kempsey in the shortest timeframe possible.

Cost Expectations

The monitoring of the various initiatives and their project deliverables could be undertaken in-house by Council.

If sufficient staff resources are not available the funding of such a position could be taken up with the RTA. Alternate funding sources are also identified at Appendix 4.

5.8 Community Liaison Strategy

A key component of managing the impacts of the bypass also revolves around managing the expectations of the broader community. In this regard Council may consider preparing and adopting a community liaison strategy to communicate the strong and responsible messages of
the various bypass initiatives and to foster a good working relationship with affected community members and business groups. Possible funding sources for such an initiative can be found at Appendix 4.

Cost Expectations

Again, the costs associated with the development and implementation of a community liaison strategy could be absorbed by Council, however, if insufficient resources are available the funding of such a strategy could be negotiated with the RTA.

Alternate funding sources may also be available, as identified at Appendix 4.
6 Summary & Recommendations

MacroPlan’s findings with respect to the strategies adopted for other towns and the recommended actions that Kempsey should consider following are provided in this final section of the report.

6.1 Findings and Recommended Approach

Whilst other strategies undertaken for regional towns throughout NSW have incorporated a myriad of measures designed to address the potential negative town centre impacts of a highway bypass, most of the measures recommended and adapted at other locations have, in themselves, not had a significant effect on outcomes.

An exception to this rule is demonstrated in the positive approaches taken by Berrima and Albury-Wodonga to the opportunities that respective bypasses of the Hume Highway presented for these towns.

Berrima, albeit blessed by a location within a day-trip distance of Sydney, successfully re-invented itself as an historic tourist centre.

Albury-Wodonga, on the other hand, has used its improved access arrangements to promote its relevance as an intermodal ‘port’, offering potential savings in supply chain logistics. Since its commencement in 2003 the Wodonga Logic industrial estate has secured Woolworths as an anchor tenant and six other tenants, who have purchased at total of 67 hectares of industrial land. Woolworths now operates a 58,000m² distribution centre on a 25 hectare site at the estate.

MacroPlan has recommended a balanced approach to the development of a practical bypass strategy for Kempsey. The recommended approach:

- places an immediate focus on addressing Council’s obligations under the development consent (and potentially allows Council to leverage the consent’s lack of detail with respect to the socio-economic impacts of the bypass)
- recommends some town centre and access improvements
- identifies placed-based promotional initiatives that could benefit Kempsey and Frederickton
- recommends that Kempsey give serious consideration to developing a strategy that considers the future role of Kempsey as a mid-north coast regional centre. This strategy would consider, for instance, whether Kempsey, situated halfway between Brisbane and Sydney, could provide a transport logistics function for the distribution of goods across northern NSW. It would also investigate other service and employment opportunities for the town
- identifies potential funding sources
- suggests both a post-bypass monitoring program to ensure expected action deliverables and a community liaison strategy to engage and coordinate the communication of
6.2 Recommended Actions, Priorities and Costs

The following table itemises, in a suggested order of priority, all necessary actions arising from the decision to build the bypass.

It also provides a cost estimate for these actions and, where applicable, possible funding sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>HIGHWAY BYPASS – POTENTIAL RESPONSES &amp; ACTIONS</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>POSSIBLE FUNDING/COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political Engagement</td>
<td>KSC</td>
<td>Recommendation already actioned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As part of Council’s implementation of its obligations under the terms of the project approval, it is recommended that Council to write to RTA (and DG of DOP, and relevant planning and transport Ministers) expressing concern about lack of socio-economic consideration in the planning assessment and approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up to letter required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council to follow up letter, possibly through State and Federal Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grant and Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>KSC</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Administrative costs (in preparing applications) borne by Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In conjunction with above action Council may wish to target/apply for national and state government grant monies that are available for regional and township development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May require professional assistance in background justification report(s) for funding applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Task would need to be allocated – could be undertaken by Council’s Economic Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible sources of funding, as well as the types of projects that could receive funding are provided at Appendix 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development Approval Obligations</td>
<td>KSC</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Primarily Administrative Costs to be borne by Council; however RTA assistance with respect to the delivery of specific strategy outcomes and monitoring requirements might be able to be negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to understand obligations under development consent and have processes in place for liaison with RTA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Single Council point of contact is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council’s main responsibilities relate to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Representation on a Community Liaison Group with responsibilities to monitor compliance and to be aware of complaints raised with respect to the road’s construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- General monitoring of compliance with environmental and noise abatement conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consideration of the RTA’s Urban Design and Landscape Plan for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overseeing and facilitation of specific community works involving the Frederickton levee bank and boat ramp and the Ferry Lane Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Following the correspondence suggested in Option 1, it might be possible for Council to negotiate specific outcomes regarding conditions relating to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscape Plans (particularly the treatment of new link roads or ‘gateways’ and Kempsey and Frederickton townships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Highway signage and town access points – content of messages and possible need for ‘private’ billboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access arrangements for the Slim Dusty Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other strategy monitoring and community liaison expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacific Highway Assets</td>
<td>KSC &amp; RTA</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Unknown at this stage but purpose of action is to minimise initial (and ongoing) costs to Council and to negotiate hand-over in ‘good working order’. May require some cost acceptance by RTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider needs to consider the process and detail associated with any hand-over of Pacific Highway assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council will need to tabulate likely costs &amp; timing of hand-over and begin to negotiate outcomes with RTA, e.g. Council may wish to specify standard of asset that it would be prepared to accept or negotiate an up-front compensation for maintenance if Council is to ‘inherit’ sub-standard assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5 Town Centre Improvements and Place-Based Strategies

- Commission completion of Town Centre Landscape Master Plan and consider same for Frederickton – and negotiate possible contribution toward design and work with RTA
- Gateways and New Bypass Access Arrangements – e.g. access for Slim Dusty Centre; gateway landscaping
- Other Local Infrastructure Adjustments (e.g. road closures, street signs, house numbering etc)
- Development of a Transport Strategy to address transport related issues such as the effects of the bypass on the local road hierarchy; how to best accommodate truck traffic through or around the town centre and the implications of any main street improvement strategy on pedestrian movements
- Kempsey place-based promotion – to increase tourism the natural attributes of the town could be promoted as well as town festivals, sporting tournaments, business or related conventions and supporting facilities
- Council should consider working in conjunction with its local/regional tourism office to commission a specific report to identify appropriate promotional initiatives for Kempsey and Frederickton
- Development of a Marketing Strategy for Kempsey once key promotional initiatives have been decided
- Potential funding sources for these initiatives and strategies can be found in Appendix 4

### 6 Highway Service Centre

- Consider the economic desirability of a Highway Service Centre (assuming decision to build facility has not already been made)
- Commission a separate Highway Service Centre report/strategy to review the appropriateness and impact of other developed service centres & to rank preferred locations (i.e. where and how to best cater for northbound or southbound traffic and to select which location best serves the Kempsey township’s interests). Such consideration would have regard for the implications and impact of the Slim Dusty Centre with respect to traffic movements and town visiting implications

### 7 Future Kempsey

- Consider the development of a Future Kempsey Strategy that addresses the future role of Kempsey as a mid-north coast regional centre
- Consider potential town planning (LEP & DCP) implications regarding permissible and desirable land uses associated with the road bypass and existing commercial/employment sites that may be trade-affected
- Implement necessary changes to the Kempsey town centre retail hierarchy (including the potential for new out-of-centre opportunities) as required
- Investigate Kempsey’s potential as an intermodal site or as a road haulage logistics site that potentially aligns with current north-south rail infrastructure investment strategies
- Consider implementing local policies that foster innovative business projects
- Consider local policies and incentives to attract strong multiplier industries e.g. industrial uses that might seek to locate at the South Kempsey Industrial Estate or the potential expansion of existing businesses and enterprises
- Explore the possibility of an economic adaption strategy that focuses on the service and employment needs of the area
- Promote Kempsey as an affordable sea-change / tree-change destination place of residence

### KSC & Consultancy

- Within 6-12 months
- Within 1-2 years, but preferably to coincide with opening of the bypass.

### KSC & Specialist consultancy, e.g. landscaping & marketing

- Some of these matters require consideration in short term (within 6 months) to enable negotiation with RTA about consent compliance. Local works will need to be completed prior to completion of bypass. Consultancies can be scheduled now, to be finalised before bypass completion
- Some matters require agreement of other issues, and possible contribution from KSC, possibly with RTA or NSW Government assistance

### Potential funding sources

- Some of these matters require consideration in short term (within 6 months) to enable negotiation with RTA about consent compliance. Local works will need to be completed prior to completion of bypass. Consultancies can be scheduled now, to be finalised before bypass completion
- May cost in the order of $30,000 - $40,000
- Could involve post Slim Dusty Centre monitoring of traffic & interviewing of visitors to ascertain ‘real’ information about its impact on visitations to Kempsey and use of town facilities and services

### Up to $100,000 - 160,000 for initial ‘futures study’ depending on the level of investigation required

### Up to $100,000 - 160,000 for initial ‘futures study’ depending on the level of investigation required

### Subsequent planning implications studies could be undertaken in-house or with consultancy assistance
- Investigate the future role of the Airport as a viable and sustainable community and business asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Post-Bypass Monitoring Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the development of a Post-Bypass Strategy to monitor progress made through the various actions &amp; initiatives adopted by Council in response to the bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The post-bypass program should establish a project management framework that outlines a checklist of required actions, their detailed time and cost estimates, necessary resource requirements and, importantly, a quality assurance plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSC</td>
<td>Immediately upon completion of bypass works and as part of the implementation of the respective initiatives adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSC, with possible assistance from identified funding sources or RTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Community Liaison Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A key component of managing the impacts of the bypass also revolves around managing the expectations of the broader community. Council may consider preparing and adopting a community liaison strategy to communicate the strong and responsible messages of the various bypass initiatives and to foster a good working relationship with affected community members and business groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSC</td>
<td>Could be developed as part of or as an extension to Council’s development consent obligations and would therefore require immediate attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSC, with possible assistance from identified funding sources or RTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Conclusion

The actions listed and prioritised above are intended to guide Council’s response to the highway bypass. Whilst several actions require further analysis, these investigations can be scheduled to occur at the same time as the more immediate actions take place.

Importantly, MacroPlan considers that the development assessment and approval process has failed to properly account for the potential economic impacts of the bypass on the towns of Kempsey and Frederickton. This is reflected in the lack of relevant approval conditions.

The correct response, however, is not to go back and reconsider these potential impacts. It is to move forward by identifying the necessary work that needs to be completed to secure Kempsey’s future role as an important mid-north coast regional centre.

The actions recommended in this report will assist Council to progress this cause.
7 Appendix 1 - Minister for Planning’s Final Approval
8 Appendix 2 - Approval Conditions Prioritised
### Kempsey-Eungai Planning Approval - Priority of Conditions & Council Action

#### Administrative Conditions - Scope & Limit of Approval

**Terms of Approval**

1. The Proponent shall carry out the project generally in accordance with the:
   a) Major Projects Application 06_0224;
   b) Kempsey to Eungai — Upgrading the Pacific Highway: Environmental Assessment (Volumes 1 and 2), prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff Australia Pty Limited and dated July 2007;
   c) Kempsey to Eungai — Upgrading the Pacific Highway: Submissions Report, prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff Australia Pty Ltd and dated March 2008, including the Statement of Commitments contained therein; and
   d) the conditions of this approval.

2. In the event of an inconsistency between:
   a) the conditions of this approval and any document listed from condition 1.1a) to 1.1c) inclusive, the conditions of this approval shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency; and
   b) any document listed from condition 1.1a) to 1.1c) inclusive, and any other document listed from condition 1.1a) to 1.1c) inclusive, the most recent document shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency.

3. The Proponent shall comply with any reasonable requirement of the Director-General arising from the Department’s assessment of:
   a) any reports, plans or correspondence that are submitted in accordance with this approval; and
   b) the implementation of any actions or measures contained in these reports, plans or correspondence.

4. The Proponent may build and operate the project in stages with commensurate staging of compliance with the conditions of this approval. Where the project is to be staged, the Proponent shall submit details of the staging prior to construction to the Director-General, including details of how compliance with the conditions of this approval will be ensured across and between the stages of the project.
## Limits of Approval

1.5 This approval shall lapse ten years after the date on which it is granted, unless the works the subject of any related project approval are physically commenced on or before that date.

### Conditions to be addressed Prior to Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Information, Consultation &amp; Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Subject to confidentiality, the Proponent shall make all documents required under this approval available for public inspection on request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Liaison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The Proponent shall establish and maintain a Community Liaison Group for the duration of construction of the project. Membership of the Group shall comprise representatives of the Proponent, the Environmental Representative, Council officers representing the relevant Council(s) through which the project passes and community representatives (equal to or greater in number than Proponent representatives), identified and drawn from relevant community and business groups, individual members of the community adjoining the project. The first meeting of the Group shall be held prior to the commencement of construction, unless otherwise agreed by the Director-General. The Proponent may review the Group’s members and/or the need for the Group at any time during construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues for discussion by the Group include: dissemination of information to the community, design issues related to the Conditions or mitigation measures, the CEMP and construction activities. Comments made by the Group regarding these issues must be considered by the Proponent.

5.3 With respect to the Community Liaison Group referred to under condition 5.2 of this approval, the Proponent is required to:

- a) provide meeting facilities for the Group and arrange for documentation of meetings;
- b) arrange for a Chairperson for the Group, who may be an independent third-party or may be a non-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action / Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Approval limited in time to 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relates to approval conditions &amp; subsequent assessments, reports and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council needs to nominate representative(s) &amp; ensure Liaison Group is operating effectively prior to the commencement of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active &amp; ongoing involvement – includes community information &amp; liaison &amp; ongoing feedback to RTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arrangements to be put in place prior to Group’s first meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing participation required by Council; may involve use of Council premises for meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council will need to be aware of complaints procedures put in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proponent member of the Group;
c) provide regular information on the progress of construction and related environmental performance;
d) provide any information that the Group may reasonably request concerning the project’s environmental performance;
e) provide for site inspections by the Group;
f) where reasonably requested by the Group, arrange consultant(s) and/or expert(s) to present and explain technical information to the Group; and
g) where reasonably requested by the Group, invite representatives from relevant Government agencies or other individuals to attend Group meetings from time to time.

Complaints and Enquiries
5.4 Prior to the commencement of construction of the project, the Proponent shall ensure that the following are available for community enquiries and complaints for the duration of construction:
a) a telephone number on which complaints and enquiries about the project may be registered.
b) a postal address to which written complaints and enquiries may be sent.
c) an email address to which electronic complaints and enquiries may be transmitted.

The telephone number, the postal address and the email address shall be published in a newspaper circulating in the local area prior to the commencement of construction and prior to the commencement of operation. This information shall also be provided on the Proponent’s website.

5.5 Prior to the commencement of construction of the project, the Proponent shall prepare and implement a Construction Complaints Management System consistent with AS 4269: Complaints Handling and maintain the System for the duration of construction. Information on all complaints received, including the means by which they were addressed and whether resolution was reached with or without mediation, shall be included in the construction compliance reports referred to under condition 4.1c) and made available to the Director-General on request.

Provision of Electronic Information
5.6 Prior to the commencement of construction, the Proponent shall dedicate pages within its project website for the provision of electronic information associated with the project. The Proponent shall, publish and maintain
up-to-date information on these dedicated pages including, but not necessarily limited to:

a) a copy of the documents referred to under condition 1.1 of this approval, and any documentation supporting modifications to this approval that may be granted from time to time;

b) a copy of this approval and each relevant environmental approval, licence or permit required and obtained in relation to the project;

c) subject to confidentiality requirements, a copy of each strategy, plan and program required under this approval; and

d) the outcomes of compliance tracking in accordance with condition 4.1 of this approval.

## COMPLIANCE MONITORING & TRACKING

### Compliance Tracking Program

4.1 The Proponent shall develop and implement a Compliance Tracking Program to track compliance with the requirements of this approval. The Program shall be submitted to the Director-General for approval prior to the commencement of construction. The Program shall include, but not necessarily limited to:

- provisions for periodic review of the compliance status of the project against the requirements of this approval (specified under condition 1.1c);

- provisions for the notification of the Director-General prior to the commencement of construction and prior to the commencement of operation of the project;

- provisions for periodic reporting of compliance status to the Director-General during construction;

- a program for independent environmental auditing in accordance with ISO 19011:2003 - Guidelines for Quality and/or Environmental Management Systems Auditing;

- mechanisms for recording incidents during construction and actions taken in response to those incidents;

- provisions for reporting environmental incidents to the Director-General during construction; and

- mechanisms for rectifying any non-compliance identified during environmental auditing or review of compliance.

- Relates to overall monitoring of all conditions.

- Council likely to be required through Community Liaison Group to ‘keep watch’ on monitoring program.

- This condition is likely to inform the Community Liaison Group.
ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT

Urban Design and Landscaping Management Plan

6.3 Prior to the commencement of construction of the project, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General, the Proponent shall prepare an Urban Design and Landscape Plan in consultation with relevant Council(s), relevant Government agencies and the Community Liaison Group (refer to condition 5.2 of this approval). The Plan shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a) sections and perspective sketches;
b) location and identification of existing and proposed vegetation including use of indigenous and endemic species where possible;
c) location of mounds, bunds, structures (noise walls, bridges) or other proposed treatments, finishes of exposed surfaces (including paved areas);
d) progressive landscaping strategies incorporating other environmental controls such as erosion and sedimentation controls, drainage, noise mitigation; and

e) monitoring and maintenance procedures.

Ferry Lane Management Plan

6.2 Prior to the commencement of any construction activities that may impact on Ferry Lane, the Proponent shall prepare a Ferry Lane Management Plan in consultation with the Department’s Heritage Branch, Kempsey Shire Council, Kempsey Returned Services League (RSL) sub branch and adjoining property owners in order to ensure ongoing integrated management of the site. The Plan shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a) an integrated plan for the public interpretation of the memorial avenue, including signage, memorial and interpretive walking tracks between the two separated portions of the avenue;
b) procedures for construction of the project within the vicinity of the site to ensure preservation of historic features wherever possible;
c) mechanisms to improve the condition of existing plantings which may include the pruning, removal of weeds and unwanted vegetation and the identification and planting of suitable replacement trees;
d) an appropriate plan of management for the site including long-term replacement and maintenance program;

- Council input into landscaping specifications will be required.
- Extent of work could be expanded to include ‘Main Street’ works. Council to ensure Town Centre Masterplan is able to be activated if such works were to be included.
- Will likely involve Community Liaison Group.
- Could affect private property & therefore involve Condition 2.6.
- May involve Council & RSL in ongoing management role.
e) protocols and procedures for future works that may be proposed by the Proponent as part of this project within the vicinity of the site; and
f) details of long-term management and responsible parties.

Environmental Representative

6.1 Prior to the commencement of construction of the project or each stage of the project, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General, the Proponent shall nominate for the approval of the Director-General, a suitably qualified and experienced Environmental Representative(s) independent of the project design and construction personnel. The Proponent shall employ the Environmental Representative(s) for the duration of construction, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General. The Environmental Representative(s) shall:

a) be the principal point of advice in relation to all questions and complaints concerning the environmental performance of the project;
b) monitor the implementation of all environmental management plans and monitoring programs required by the conditions of this approval;
c) monitor the outcome of all environmental management plans and advise the Proponent upon the achievement of all project environmental outcomes;
d) ensure that environmental auditing is undertaken in accordance with all relevant project Environmental Management Systems;
e) have responsibility for considering and advising the Proponent on matters specified in the conditions of this approval, and all other licences and approvals related to the environmental performance and impacts of the project; and
f) given the authority and independence to require reasonable steps be taken to avoid or minimise unintended or adverse environmental impacts, and failing the effectiveness of such steps, to direct that relevant actions be ceased immediately should an adverse impact on the environment be likely to occur.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

6.4 Prior to the commencement of construction of the project or each stage of the project, the Proponent shall prepare and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan to outline environmental management practices and procedures to be followed during construction of the project. The Plan shall be prepared in consultation with relevant Government agencies and local councils, and in accordance with Guideline for the Preparation of Environmental Management Plans (DIPNR, 2004) and shall include, but not
The Plan shall be submitted for the approval of the Director-General no later than one month prior to the commencement of any construction works associated with the project, or within such period otherwise agreed by the Director-General. Construction works shall not commence until written approval has been received from the Director-General.

6.5 As part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan for the project required under condition 6.3 of this approval, the Proponent shall prepare and implement the following sub plans:

- a) a **Construction Flora and Fauna Management Plan** to detail how construction impacts on ecology will be minimised and managed. The Plan shall be developed in consultation with the DECO and include, but not necessarily be limited to:
  - I. details of work practices (such as fencing and construction worker education) to minimise the potential for damage to vegetation and native fauna during construction;
  - II. weed management measures focusing on early identification of invasive weeds and determining effectiveness of management controls;
  - III. procedures to install and monitor mitigation measures, such as nest boxes, relocated hollows and fauna fencing for effectiveness and maintenance; and
  - IV. an auditing program for construction work practices to ensure that there is no impact on threatened species or their habitats additional to that already permitted.

- Component of EMP required by Condition 6.4

- Component of EMP required by Condition 6.4
b) **Construction Heritage Management Plan** to detail how construction impacts on Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage will be minimised and managed. The Plan shall be developed in consultation with the Department’s Heritage Branch, the DECC, Kempsey Aboriginal Land Council and the Dunghutti Elders group and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

I. results and recommendations arising from investigations into Potential Archaeological Deposits;
II. a strategy for the salvage and curation of salvaged Aboriginal objects;
III. an education program for construction and project supervision personnel on their obligations for Aboriginal cultural materials;
IV. procedures to be implemented if previously unidentified Aboriginal objects and/or Non-Indigenous heritage items are discovered during construction; and
V. a program for construction work practices to ensure that there is no impact on heritage items additional to that already permitted.

c) **Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan** to detail how construction noise and vibration impacts would be minimised and managed. The Plan shall be developed in consultation with the DECC and include, but not necessarily be limited to:

I. details of construction activities and a schedule for construction works;
II. identification of construction activities that have the potential to generate noise and/or vibration impacts on surrounding sensitive receivers, particularly residential areas;
III. a detailed description of what actions and measures would be implemented to ensure that these works would comply with the relevant noise and vibration criteria/guidelines;
IV. procedures for notifying residents of construction activities that are likely to affect their noise and vibration amenity, as well as procedures for dealing with and responding to noise complaints; and

a description of how the effectiveness of these actions and measures would be monitored during the proposed works, clearly indicating how often this monitoring would be conducted, how the results of this monitoring would be recorded; and, if any non-compliance is detected.
## SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

### Flooding and Hydrological Impacts

2.1 The Proponent shall subsidise any new or necessary update(s) to the relevant Kempsey Shire Council, Nambucca Shire Council and State Emergency Service plans and documents to reflect changes in flooding levels, flows and characteristics as a result of the project.

2.2 The Proponent shall undertake further flood modeling during detailed design to ensure that the project is designed and constructed with the aim of not exceeding the afflux and flood-flow velocity performance criteria specified for the Macleay River Floodplain in Section 10 of the Kempsey to Eungai — Upgrading the Pacific Highway: Environmental Assessment and Section 2.2.8 of the Kempsey to Eungai — Upgrading the Pacific Highway: Submissions Report, referred to in condition 1.1 of this approval.

2.3 Should modeling required by condition 2.2 identify changes to drainage patterns along the existing Pacific Highway that are directly attributable to the project, the Proponent shall alter or install drainage structures on the existing Pacific Highway to preserve or maintain current hydrological flow paths and flood regimes upstream of the existing highway.

2.4 The Proponent shall employ a suitably qualified and experienced independent hydrological engineer approved by the Director-General prior to commencement of construction to assist affected property owners in negotiating reasonable and feasible mitigation measures.

2.5 Prior to commencement of construction, the Proponent shall submit a hydrological mitigation report to the Department detailing all reasonable and feasible flood mitigation measures for all properties where flood impacts are predicted to increase as a result of the project. The report shall:

   a) identify all properties likely to have an increased flooding impact and detail the predicted increased flooding impact;
   
   b) identify the at residence and/or general property protection measures to be employed to mitigate the predicted increased flooding impact;
   
   c) identify measures to be employed for directly impacted commercial/agricultural properties to assist in the

### Key Points

- Will require Council input. Timing not specified. Likely to be considered by Community Liaison Group.
- Timing not specified – ongoing but also part of hydrological report required by Condition 2.5.
- Council to be notified of independent appointment.
- Council to be consulted in the preparation of the flood mitigation measures – engineering input & assessment likely to be required.
- Frederickton levee & other ‘measures’ may require
| Protection of critical farm infrastructure and evacuation of stock during flood events;  
| d) Identify measures to be implemented to minimize scour and dissipate energy at locations where flood  
| velocities are predicted to increase as a result of the project and cause localised soil erosion and/or  
| pasture damage;  
| e) Detail construction methods and landscaping treatments for the Frederickton levee;  
| f) Be developed in consultation with the relevant branches of Kempsey Shire Council, DECC, State  
| Emergency Service and directly-affected property owners; and  
| g) Identify operational and maintenance responsibilities for items a) to e) inclusive.  

The Proponent shall not commence construction of the project on or within areas likely to alter flood conditions on the Macleay River floodplain until such time as works identified in the hydrological mitigation report have been completed, unless otherwise agreed by the Director-General.

2.6 The Proponent shall prepare a schedule of flood mitigation measures for each directly-affected property in consultation with the property owner. The schedule shall be provided to the relevant property owner(s) no later than two months prior to the implementation of the mitigation works, unless otherwise agreed by the Director-General. A copy of each schedule of flood mitigation measures shall be provided to Council and the Department prior to the implementation / construction of the mitigation measures on the property.

2.7 In the event that the Proponent and the relevant property owner cannot agree on reasonable and feasible flood mitigation measures to be applied to a property within one month of the first consultation on the measures (as required under condition 2.6), either party may refer the matter to the Director-General for resolution.

**Ecological Impacts – Design Requirements**

2.8 The Proponent shall, in consultation with the DECC and DPI (Fisheries), design, construct and maintain reasonable and feasible fauna management measures to:

- a) Facilitate safe fauna movements across the project; and  
- b) Encourage fauna movements across the project at the key crossing locations referred to in 2.8 a).

**Ecological Impacts - Translocation and Offsets**

- Conditions 2.8 & 2.9 go with Condition 2.10 which requires preparation & submission of Biodiversity Offset Strategy prior to commencement of construction.
2.9 The Proponent shall, in consultation with DECC:
   a) investigate the potential for the translocation of Maundia triglochinoides plants impacted by the project.
   b) if investigation under 2.9 a) reveals translocation of Maundia triglochinoides is reasonable and feasible, the Proponent shall prepare and implement a Maundia triglochinoides translocation plan for plants impacted by the project.
   c) consider including appropriate compensatory habitat for the Maundia triglochinoides in the Biodiversity Offsets Package referred to in Condition 2.11 should the information obtained during the investigation referred to in Condition 2.9 a) find that translocation is not reasonable or feasible.

2.10 The Proponent shall develop and submit for the approval of the Director-General, a Biodiversity Offset Strategy. The Strategy shall provide a framework for developing the Biodiversity Offsets Package required by Condition 2.11 and shall be developed in consultation with the DECC. The Strategy shall:
   a) include a minimum requirement to provide 382 hectares of native vegetation to offset direct and indirect impacts of the proposal
   b) identify the extent and types of habitat/vegetation communities that would be lost or degraded as a result of the project;
   c) describe the quality of the habitat/vegetation communities identified in point a);
   d) identify the objectives and outcomes to be met by the final Biodiversity Offset Package;
   e) consider the biodiversity management measures or activities identified in the documents set out in condition 1.1 or elsewhere in these Conditions of Approval, including:
      I. fauna crossing structures and associated fauna fencing to be installed as part of the project.
      II. revegetation measures.
      III. translocation plans.
      IV. any other fauna mitigation measures such as nest boxes and frog breeding ponds.
      V. any ongoing biodiversity or threatened species monitoring requirements.
   f) provide details of available compensatory habitat in the region to offset the loss of Freshwater Wetlands, Swamp Sclerophyll Forest, Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest, River Flat Eucalypt Forest and Mahogany Dry Sclerophyll Forest and habitat for threatened fauna species as a result of the project. This may include other non land based management measures or actions to deliver a beneficial outcome for the region;
   g) provide a decision-making framework to be used in selecting the priority ranking of compensatory habitat options available in the region; and

- No direct role for Council, as nominated consultation is with DECC.
- Council role to monitor compliance & to check whether management measures may require separate approval.
- Also need to identify any potential ongoing management responsibilities for Council.
h) consider the linkage between compensatory measures and floodplain natural resource management.

Unless otherwise agreed, the Biodiversity Offset Strategy shall be submitted to the Director-General for approval no later than 6 weeks prior to the commencement of any construction that would result in the disturbance of Endangered Ecological Communities or threatened fauna species' habitat or not later than 12 months from the date of this approval. To avoid any doubt, disturbance of Endangered Ecological Communities or threatened fauna habitat cannot commence until the Director-General has approved the strategy.

Nothing in this condition or this approval precludes the Proponent from implementing a suitable offsets package which addresses impacts from multiple Pacific Highway Upgrade Projects (including the Kempsey-Eungai Upgrade) within the North Coast Bio-region (Manning-Macleay sub region). Any such agreement made with the Department of Environment and Climate Change must be made in consultation with the Department and approved by the Director-General.

2.11 Within 12 months of the approval of the Biodiversity Offset Strategy, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General, the Proponent shall submit the Biodiversity Offset Package for the approval of the Director-General. The Package shall be developed in consultation with the DECC and:

a) shall detail the final suite of biodiversity offset measures selected in accordance with the Strategy; and
b) include a program (timeline) to achieve the implementation of the final suite of measures.

Where possible, this should include purchase of land, development of agreements with identified land management authorities (e.g. DECC, local council etc.) for long term management and funding of offsets and mitigation measures, and installation of identified mitigation measures.

ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING & AUDITING

Ecological Monitoring

3.1 Prior to the commencement of construction, the Proponent shall develop and implement a Monitoring Program to target the effectiveness of the mitigation measures identified in Condition 2.10(d) for the listed threatened species directly impacted by the project. The program shall include (but not necessarily be limited

- 2.11 - not strictly required to be completed prior to construction but goes with 2.10 & will require early liaison & negotiation.
- Final offset strategy is likely to involve land acquisition & longer term management response.

- Needs to be read in conjunction with Biodiversity Offset Strategy required by Condition 2.10.
to) the monitoring of Maundia triglochinoides, Green-thighed Frog, Glossy Black Cockatoo and the Brush-tailed Phascogale. The Program shall be developed in consultation with the DECC and suitably qualified ecologist(s) and shall include but not necessarily be limited to:
g) the monitoring of threatened species in and adjacent to the project footprint. The methodology shall be decided in consultation with DECC;
h) an adaptive monitoring program to assess the effectiveness of the mitigation measures identified in Condition 2.10 (d) and allow their modification if necessary. The monitoring program shall include targets against which effectiveness will be measured;
i) monitoring shall be undertaken during construction (for construction-related impacts) and from opening of the project to traffic (for operation/ongoing impacts) until such time as the effectiveness of mitigation measures can be demonstrated to have been achieved over a minimum of three successive monitoring periods, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General in consultation with DECC;
j) provision for the assessment of the data to identify changes to habitat usage and if this can be attributed to the project;
k) details of the contingency measures that would be implemented in the event of changes to habitat usage patterns directly attributable to the construction or operation of the project; and
l) provision for annual reporting of monitoring results to the Director-General and the DECC, or as otherwise agreed by those agencies.

The Program shall be submitted to the Director-General prior to the commencement of construction and shall be updated to incorporate the monitoring methodology for threatened species, once agreed to, in accordance with condition of this approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Aboriginal Heritage**

2.21 Unless otherwise agreed with the Kempsey Local Aboriginal Land Council, the Dunghatti Elders and DECC, the Proponent shall salvage any identified artifacts from sites KE14, KE15, KE16 and KE42 in consultation with the DECC, Kempsey Local Aboriginal Land Council and Dunghatti Elders group prior to the commencement of construction works that may impact on those sites.

2.22 Unless otherwise agreed with the Kempsey Local Aboriginal Land Council, the Dunghatti Elders and DECC, the
Proponent shall undertake subsurface testing for sites KE PAD 1 to 12 inclusive, and salvage any artifacts of
significance identified at those sites in consultation with the DECC, Kempsey Aboriginal Land Council and
Dunghuti Elders group **prior to the commencement of construction works that may impact on those sites.**
The approach to salvage shall be in accordance with a methodology developed in consultation with the
Kempsey Local Aboriginal Land Council, the Dunghatti Elders and DECC.

### Non-Aboriginal Heritage

2.23 An archival record shall be prepared by an appropriately qualified heritage expert for sites KEH3, KEH6, KEH7
and Ferry Lane Memorial Avenue (KEH1) **prior to commencement of construction works that may affect
those items.** A copy of the record shall be provided to Kempsey Shire Council.

### Ancillary Construction Facilities

2.29 The Proponent shall ensure that ancillary facilities are located so as to satisfy the following criteria, unless
otherwise approved by the Director-General:

- a) located within or directly adjacent to the project;
- b) have ready access to the road network;
- c) be located to minimise the need for heavy vehicles to travel through residential areas;
- d) be sited on relatively level land;
- e) be separated from nearest residences by at least 200 metres (or at least 250 metres for a temporary
  batch plant);
- f) not be within 100 metres of, or drain directly to, a wetland listed under State Environmental Planning
  Policy No, 14 — Coastal Wetlands;
- g) be located above the 20 year ARI flood level in other areas unless a contingency plan to manage
  flooding is prepared and implemented;
- h) not require vegetation clearing beyond that already required for the project;
- i) not impact on heritage sites beyond those already impacted by the project; and
- j) not affect the land use of adjacent properties.

The location of the Ancillary Facilities **shall be identified in the Construction Environmental Plan required
under condition 6.4** and include consideration against the above criteria. Where the above criteria cannot
be met for any proposed Ancillary Facility, the Proponent shall demonstrate to the Director-General that
there will be no adverse impact from that facility's construction or operation.
## Conditions to be addressed *During Construction*

### SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

**Noise Impacts - Construction and Blasting Restrictions**

2.12 The Proponent shall only undertake construction works associated with the project, other than blasting, during the following hours:
   a) 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Mondays to Fridays, inclusive;
   b) 8:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays; and
   c) at no time on Sundays or public holidays.

2.13 Notwithstanding condition 2.12, construction works associated with the project, other than blasting, may be undertaken outside the hours specified under that condition in the following circumstances:
   a) the works do not cause construction noise to be audible at any sensitive receiver; or
   b) for the delivery of materials required by the police or other authorities for safety reasons; or
   c) where it is required in an emergency to avoid the loss of lives, property and/or to prevent environmental harm; or
   d) as approved through the process outlined in condition 2.14 of this approval.

2.14 The hours of construction activities specified under condition 2.12 of this approval may be varied with the prior written approval of the Director-General. Any request to alter the hours of construction shall be:
   a) considered on a case-by-case or activity-specific basis;
   b) accompanied by details of the nature and justification for activities to be conducted during the varied construction hours;
   c) accompanied by written evidence to the Director-General that appropriate consultation with potentially affected sensitive receivers and notification of relevant Council(s) has been and will be undertaken and all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures have been put in place; and
   d) accompanied with evidence of consultation with DECC on the proposed variation in construction times.

- Ongoing construction requirement – an issue to be incorporated into overall compliance monitoring.

- Matter of ensuring compliance during construction.
2.15 Blasting associated with the construction of the project is only permitted during the following hours:
   a) 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Mondays to Fridays, inclusive;
   b) 9:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays; and
   c) at no time on Sundays or public holidays.

This condition does not apply in the event of a direction from police or other relevant authority for safety reasons.

2.16 The Proponent shall consult with affected educational institutions and ensure that noise-generating construction works in the vicinity of the institutions are not timetabled during examination periods, unless other arrangements acceptable to the affected institutions are made at no cost to the affected institutions.

Noise Impacts - Construction and Blasting Limits

2.17 The construction noise objective for the project is to manage noise from construction (as measured by a LA10 (15-minute) descriptor) so that it does not exceed the background LA90 noise level by:
   a) more than 20 dB(A) for a construction period of equal to or less than four weeks;
   b) more than 10 dB(A) for a construction period of greater than four weeks, but not exceeding 26 weeks; and
   c) more than 5 dB(A) for a construction period greater than 26 weeks.

Any activities that could exceed the construction noise objectives specified under this condition shall be identified and managed in accordance with the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan specified under condition 6.5c) of this approval. If the noise from construction is substantially tonal or impulsive in nature (as described in Chapter 4 of the NSW Industrial Noise Policy), 5dB(A) shall be added to the measured construction noise level when comparing the measured noise with the construction noise objectives. The Proponent shall implement all reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures with the aim of achieving the construction noise objective.

2.18 The Proponent shall ensure that air blast overpressure generated by blasting associated with the project does not exceed the criteria specified in Table 1 when measured at the most-affected residence or other sensitive receiver.
Table 1 - Airblast Overpressure Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airblast Overpressure (dB(Lin Peak))</th>
<th>Allowable Exceedance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>5% of total number of blasts over a 12 month period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.19 The Proponent shall ensure that ground vibration generated by blasting associated with the project does not exceed the criteria specified in Table 2 when measured at the most affected residence or other sensitive receiver.

Table 2 - Peak Particle Velocity Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity (mni-1)</th>
<th>Allowable Exceedance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5% of total number of blasts over a 12 month period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise Impacts - Operational Noise

2.20 Unless otherwise agreed to by the Director-General, the Proponent shall submit for the approval of the Director-General a review of the operational noise mitigation measures for the project **within six months of commencing construction**. The Review shall take into account the detailed design of the project and shall be prepared in consultation with the DECC. Consideration of operational noise mitigation measures shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, those operational noise mitigation measures specified in section 16.5 of the document referred to in condition 1.1b) of this approval.

For the purpose of this condition, the Proponent is only required to consider reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures to meet the noise criteria stipulated in Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise (EPA, 1999) and the Environmental Noise Management Manual' (RTA, 2001).
### Community Infrastructure and Services

2.24 The Proponent shall replace the boat ramp, access road, parking and amenities removed as part of the Frederickton Levee construction. The replacement facilities shall be located and constructed in consultation with Kempsey Shire Council and the NSW Maritime Authority.

2.25 The Proponent shall consult directly affected property owners (as defined in Chapter 15 of the document referred to under condition 1.1b)) in relation to the design and location of reasonable and feasible measures to permit movement of livestock and agricultural machinery between the parts of their properties that may be separated by the project. Those measures shall be installed and function so that farm operations are not disrupted by either construction or operation of the project.

- Will involve Council in determining location of facilities & proposed construction methods & quality.
- May involve Council in community consultation.

### Air Quality Impacts

2.26 The Proponent shall construct the project in a manner that minimises dust emissions associated with construction works, including wind-blown and traffic-generated dust.

- A matter of ongoing monitoring & compliance checking.

### Soil and Water Quality Impacts

2.27 The Proponent shall take all reasonable and feasible measures to minimise soil erosion and the discharge of sediments and pollutants from the project during construction and operation in accordance with Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction (Department of Housing and Landcom, 2004);

2.28 Where available and of appropriate chemical and biological quality for its proposed purpose, the Proponent shall use stormwater, recycled water or other water sources in preference to potable water for construction, including concrete mixing and dust control.

- A matter of ongoing monitoring & compliance checking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions to be addressed</th>
<th>Action/Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Construction (during operational phase of the project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Operation Environmental Management Plan

6.6 Prior to the commencement of operation of the project, or each stage of the project, the Proponent shall prepare and submit for the approval of the Director-General an Operation Environmental Management Plan to detail an environmental management framework, practices and procedures to be followed during the operation of the project. The Plan shall be consistent with the Department’s Guideline for the Preparation of Environmental Management Plans (DIPNR 2004), and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a) a description of all activities to be undertaken during operation of the project including an indication of stages of operation, where relevant;

b) statutory and other obligations that the Proponent is required to fulfill during operation including all approvals, consultations and agreements required from authorities and other stakeholders, and key legislation and policies;

c) details of how the environmental performance of the operations will be monitored, and what actions will be taken to address identified adverse environmental impacts. In particular, the following environmental performance issues shall be addressed in the Plan:

  I. measures to monitor and manage ecological factors, including effectiveness of fauna crossings;

  II. measures to monitor and manage noise impacts;

  III. measures to monitor and minimise soil erosion and the discharge of sediment and other pollutants to lands and/or waters;

  d) a description of the roles and responsibilities for all relevant employees involved in the operation of the project; and

  e) complaints handling procedures during operation.

Nothing in this approval restricts the Proponent from incorporating the above operational environment plan into existing management systems administered by the Proponent.

The Plan shall be submitted for the approval of the Director-General no later than one month prior to the commencement of operation of the project, or within such period otherwise agreed by the Director-General.

Council input should be required as part responsibility for ongoing environmental management may fall to Council.
Operation of the project shall not commence until written approval has been received from the Director-General.

ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING & AUDITING

Noise Auditing

3.2 No later than one year after commencement of operation of the project, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General, the Proponent shall undertake operational noise monitoring to confirm the predicted noise performance of the project against actual performance and prepare an Operational Noise Report. The Report shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a) noise monitoring to assess compliance with the operational noise outcomes predicted in the documents specified under condition 1.1 of this approval;

b) a review of the operational noise levels and in terms of criteria and noise goals established in the Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise (EPA 1999) and the Environmental Noise Management Manual' (RTA, 2001);

c) methodology, location and frequency of noise monitoring, to be undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Noise Management Manual' (RTA, 2001);

d) identification of monitoring sites at which background noise and project noise levels can be ascertained, with specific reference to locations indicative of impacts on sensitive receivers;

e) details of any complaints and enquiries received in relation to operational noise generated by the project between the date of commencement of operation of the project and the date the report was prepared;

f) any required recalibrations of the noise model taking into consideration factors such as noise monitoring undertaken and actual traffic numbers and proportions; and

g) an assessment of the performance and effectiveness of applied noise mitigation measures together with a review and if necessary, reassessment of all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures; and any additional noise mitigation measures required and timetables for implementation.

3.3 Within 60 days, or as otherwise agreed by the Director-General, of completing the operational noise monitoring referred to under condition 3.2 of this approval, the Proponent shall provide the Director-General and the DECC with a copy of the Operational Noise Report.

If the Report identifies any non-compliance with the noise objectives specified in the Environmental Criteria for
Road Traffic Noise (EPA 1999), the Proponent shall detail what additional measures would be implemented to ensure compliance, clearly indicating these measures, when these measures would be implemented, and how the effectiveness of these measures would be measured and reported to the Director-General.
9 Appendix 3 – Council Correspondence
10 Appendix 4 – Possible Funding Sources


This website is the most comprehensive website for local government, community groups and small business funding. It provides links to numerous other sources of funding. Under the funding and awards section there are some useful tabs including:

- Awards & Scholarships: A list of awards and scholarships for individuals, businesses and community groups
- Other Sources of Support: Provides a comprehensive list of links for other funding programs and websites
- Submission Writing: Provides various links on how to write submissions
- Fundraising: Provides various links on fundraising guides and tips

**Funding programs**

All NSW Government grants are currently being added to this site, but selected grants only from other types of funders are available. Identified purpose grants include:

- Aboriginal people
- Agriculture
- Arts & culture
- Awards & scholarships
- Business & industry
- Carers
- Children & families
- Community development
- Crime prevention & safety
- Drugs & alcohol
- Education & training
- Emergency services
- Employment
- Environment & heritage
- Financial counselling
- Health
- Housing
- IT & Communications
- Legal
- Multicultural
- Older people
- People with a disability
- Rural & regional
- Sport & recreation
- Women
- Young people


AusIndustry delivers more than 35 business programs including innovation grants, tax and duty concessions, small business development, industry support and venture capital to more than 12,000 businesses and 5,000 individuals each year.

Incentives to help small businesses grow, take up new technology, conduct R & D and apply for tax or duty concession for R & D.

Some examples include:
Small Business Online - helps small businesses to go online by offering training seminars on e-business, advice on establishing an online presence and the development of other e-business resources.

Small Business Support Line - Small Business Support Line provides an initial 'single' point of contact to access information and referral services that assist small businesses including:

- Finance and cash flow management (including loan and banking products)
- Marketing and promotion, including research and statistics
- Business planning and diagnostic services
- Legal, accounting and taxation services
- Personal stress and hardship counselling
- Registration and licences
- E-Business and online assistance
- Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S)
- Government initiatives, grants and assistance
- Employing staff
- Home-based business
- Importing and exporting
- Tenders and contracts
- Intellectual property
- Franchising
- Insurances
- Retail leasing guidance
- Government regulation
- Human resource management.

Small business advisory services - Low cost advisory services are available to individual small businesses. Applications are closed to service providers.


A subscription website to receive a copy of Easy Grants each month containing a comprehensive list of all Government, philanthropic and corporate grants funding available in Australia - with grant outlines, requirements, links and closing dates.

More of a normative ‘how to get grants’ website, than a descriptive ‘these are the grants’ website


A free and comprehensive searchable listing of grant and funding programs for community-based and not-for-profits organisations.

5. **Local Government Association** -
The Australian Local Government Association’s website provides access to a range of national policy, resources and programs that are relevant to local government across Australia in fostering stronger regions. Most funds are allocated for community infrastructure programs.


This website supplies information about a range of Australian Government programs, funding and services for individuals, families, communities, farms and businesses in rural, regional and remote Australia.


Festivals Australia is an Australian Government program which funds Australian regional and community festivals to present quality cultural projects. Funding is available to add a new or special sort of cultural activity. To be eligible for funding, an activity must not have been previously presented and must be one that could not be afforded without the funding.

**Some Funding Examples**


  Funder: NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet

**Program Summary**

The $35 million Community Building Partnership Program provides funds for the building and improvement of vital social, recreational and environmental infrastructure that will enhance the wellbeing of local communities throughout the State.

Key dates: Applications close 23 July 2010

**Who can apply?**

- Organisations that are an incorporated not-for-profit organisation.
- Local Councils.

**Who can’t apply?**

- Individuals.
- Groups of individuals.
- Unincorporated organisations.
- For profit, commercial organisations.
- State and Federal Government agencies
What will be funded?

Applications should demonstrate how they will deliver positive results for communities, especially community social, recreational, environmental or employment outcomes. Funded projects will provide community benefits through:

- construction of new capital works;
- refurbishment, repairs and maintenance to existing capital facilities; or
- the purchase of capital equipment with a life expectancy of 15+ years that enables the delivery of new or enhanced community services.

What will NOT be funded?

- Non capital equipment (e.g. chairs, computers, IT equipment, sports equipment etc).
- Projects that have commenced prior to August 2010.
- Projects that involve the development of private or commercial ventures including licensed areas of registered clubs.
- Projects that seek funding for the organisation's operating recurrent expenses (eg: staff, consumables etc).
- Projects that seek funding to stage events, exhibit a display or for filming.
- Projects to undertake studies or investigations.
- Purchase of land or buildings is generally not appropriate.

How much funding is available?

$300,000 is available to every NSW electoral district and $400,000 for those with higher levels of social disadvantage

- **Coles Local Community Support Program** -

Funder: Coles Group Community Fund

**Program Summary**

Coles aims to assist the development and wellbeing of the local communities in which we operate and through our Local Community Support Program we are able to give back to the communities that support us each day.

Through this program our supermarkets are supporting their communities, helping out where they can with local events, fundraisers and causes.
**Key dates:** Various closing dates or always open - see information below

**Who can apply?**

Every week, Coles receives many requests for support from the many groups and activities taking place in our local communities and we aim to assist the following groups where we can:

- Schools and kindergartens
- Hospitals
- Sports clubs
- Guides and scouts groups
- Community and church groups
- Welfare groups
- Fairs, events and shows
- Aged care
- Community emergency organisations eg CFA, SES etc

**Who can’t apply?**

Unfortunately, we are unable to accommodate all of the requests we receive and we would prefer not to support the following:

- Fundraising for overseas appeals, charities and travel
- Medical, university and general research projects
- Advertising
- Building projects and capital fundraising
- Travel and study expenses
- Conferences and seminars
- Donation of goods or product

**What will be funded?**

Coles aims to assist the development and wellbeing of the local communities in which we operate and through our Local Community Support Program we are able to give back to the communities that support us each day.


Funder: Clubs NSW

**Program Summary**

The Community Development and Support Expenditure (CDSE) Scheme is designed to ensure that larger registered clubs in NSW contribute to the provision of front-line services to their local communities; and to ensure that the disadvantaged in the community are better positioned to benefit from the substantial contributions made by those clubs.
**Key dates:** Various closing dates or always open - see information below

Deadline dates to each Local Committee (based on local government areas) is available through the Local Committee Index.

**Who can apply?**

Not-for-profit incorporated organisations

CDSE, particularly Category 1, is specifically aimed at promoting community support at a local level and as a result, interstate projects are allowed as Category 1 funding only in the cases of:

- services to disaster victims in other Australian states or territories;
- local activities in border areas, such as a facility located on the Gold Coast that provides substantial services to the Tweed area and other NSW residents; OR
- national organisations with a presence in NSW; this category includes many of the major charities in Australia.

Applications from interstate or nationally based organisations should specifically address these requirements.

**What will be funded?**

Category 1 - expenditure on specific community welfare and social services, community development, community health services and employment assistance activities; and Category 2 - expenditure on other community development and support services

Eligible expenditure can take many forms, including (but not limited to):

- one-off funding to buy equipment, such as a vehicle for an aged care centre;
- extended or one-off staffing costs, such as training or wages for a new counsellor for a youth drop-in centre; and
- in-kind support, such as occasional or ongoing use of club facilities for meetings or other activities.

However, it is important that funding be assigned to a specific purpose. General, non-specific allocations are not appropriate, and applicants need to identify how any funding sought under CDSE will be expended.

There is no standard state-wide closing date for CDSE Category 1 or 2 funding. Category 1 funding is allocated on the basis of local government (council) areas, and Local Committees set their own deadlines, which vary from area to area.

Clubs allocate Category 2 funding and while some clubs set deadlines, most accept and consider Category 2 applications year-round. Category 2 applicants should contact the individual clubs for more information.