

Committee Secretary, Legislative Council Government Administration Committee “B”

Mr Stuart Wright – stuart.wright@parliament.tas.gov.au

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Legislative Council Government Administration Committee “B” in relation to the integrated transport options for Southern Tasmania. I understand that Council’s General Manager had contacted you previously and explained the issue of Council meeting times and sought a limited extension to lodge Council’s submission which you subsequently granted.

Council considered the matter and at its meeting on 6 August 2012 and resolved;

‘That Council authorises the General Manager to make a submission to the Legislative Council Government Administration Committee “B” in relation to the integrated transport options for Southern Tasmania based on the content of this report highlighting the following;

- A. The need for a report on the provision of Ferry Transport that examines inter alia;*
- new ferry terminals, including bicycle storage facilities to encourage the return of regular cross-river public transport and tourist ferry services linked to the Metro bus service;*
 - new cycleways linking existing tracks with bus and ferry terminals;*
 - the cost-benefit in the context of urban sustainability and city liveability objectives, including direct capital costs and indirect capital works avoidance and*
 - a service delivery model or framework (who does what).*
- B. From a regional perspective sustainable and integrated transport there needs to be a stronger emphasis given the proposal from the Australian Government for the State government to prepare long term strategic plans for the development of the capital city plan. Such a plan will provide the framework development to ensure consistent and sustainable development across all aspects of urban planning.*
- C. Address the policy issue of creating viable and sustainable Public Transport by creating a level playing field in relation to the similar treatment of Ferry Public transport and Bus Public transport subsidisation.*
- D. Amend the Roads and Jetties Act to make Councils responsible for Council road reserves and DIER responsible for state road reserves. In that way the responsibilities and accountabilities are aligned and the barrier to deal with active transport strategies is removed.’*

A copy of Council’s submission is attached. Should you have any further queries or require further clarification on any matter in the submission please contact me at jstevens@ccc.tas.gov.au

Johns Stevens

**GROUP MANAGER ASSET MANAGEMENT
CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL**

SUBMISSION DETAILS

1. Public Transport Services:

1.1 Metro Tasmania

Metro Tasmania made a presentation to a Council Workshop on 2 July 2012 setting out its planned approach to improve efficiency of their services with a renewed network plan. On that basis it is not proposed to make any comment about Metro as such comment would be pre-emptive of the review of service provision.

1.2 Inter-modal services infrastructure

As part of the lead up to the 2010 Federal Election the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority (STCA) adopted a package of measures, titled “A fair go for our public transport.” The plan aims to build an integrated network linking buses, trans-Derwent ferries, cycleways, satellite transport hubs and regional roads to reduce congestion, improve road safety and make public transport more efficient, safe and convenient for commuters.

The STCA plan included:

- New ferry terminals including bicycle storage facilities to encourage the return of regular cross-river and tourist ferry services linked to the Metro bus service;
- Modern comfortable, safe and convenient Bus interchanges at Huonville, Kingston, Sorell, Brighton and New Norfolk for “park and ride” commuters;
- New cycleways linking existing tracks with bus and ferry terminals; and
- Assistance to develop local community transport strategies in regional areas.

The STCA plan is based on, and consistent with, a large body of work by southern councils and the State Government over recent years, including the Kangaroo Bay Urban Design Strategy, the Kingborough Integrated Transport Plan, the Hobart City Council Sustainable Transport Strategy, the Regional Land Use Planning Project, the Southern Tasmanian Integrated Transport Plan 2010, and the State Government’s Urban Passenger Transport Framework.

I have attached a copy of the plan for your reference.

The STCA plan and its associated supporting documents place an emphasis on an integrated transport system. By definition such a system would have a seamless approach to the provision of public transport and encourage the transfer from one form to another and as such the provision of intermodal connections and infrastructure will be essential.

1.3 Ferry Public Transport

Clarence City Council has a history of supporting trans Derwent ferry transport and Council's latest submission on ferries was in December 2011. Council made a submission to the Australian Government's Liveable Cities Program for funds for a planning study that sought to deliver a report and recommended actions in relation to;

- the demand triggers, timing, and operational parameters required to successfully reactivate trans Derwent water transport;
- the specific infrastructure (on-shore and marine) required to meet current community expectations and service standards;
- opportunities for infrastructure and services supporting the needs of cyclists;
- potential new transport demand arising from commercial and residential growth in Rosny Park, Bellerive and other potential eastern shore locations;
- demand associated with major events and festivals (eastern and western shore, including Bellerive Oval and Sullivans Cove);
- integration with bus/coach services;
- economies of scope available across commuter, tourist, and event/recreational based demand;
- service delivery exclusivity options and competition policy;
- the cost-benefit in the context of urban sustainability and city liveability objectives, including direct capital costs and indirect capital works avoidance;
- a service delivery model or framework (who does what).

That funding application was unfortunately unsuccessful, but there remains a need for a detailed study and report on the provision of Ferry Transport that examines the issues raised above.

2. Governance Matters:

2.1 Capital City Plan for Greater Hobart 2011-2040

Sustainable and integrated transport needs to have a strong emphasis within the proposal from the Australian Government for the State Government to prepare long term strategic Capital City Plan for greater Hobart. Such a Capital City Plan can provide the framework to ensure consistent and sustainable development of transport services across the region.

While the above planning work will be important to our community for actions to happen, there needs to be a commitment from the State Government not only to the principles of Sustainable Transport but to actively support and implement associated measures such as the Capital City Plan.

2.2 Public Transport subsidisation

In previous discussions with State Government Agencies there has been reluctance to treat Ferry Public Transport on a level playing field with Bus Public Transport which is subsidised by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER).

Any discussion on the viability and long term sustainability of Ferry Public Transport needs to resolve the issue of subsidisation.

2.3 Roads and Jetties Act

DIER has issued a “Tasmanian Walking and Cycling for Active Transport Strategy” which quotes inter alia;

"The State Government, through the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources, is responsible for the development of strategic transport policy and planning frameworks, the provision and management of infrastructure and the safe movement of people including cyclists and pedestrians within the State road network. The State Government recognises that it needs to take a more active role in the provision of policy and planning advice in relation to cycling and walking.

.....

The Walking and Cycling for Active Transport Strategy has seven priority areas to support the vision and overarching objectives are:

- *supportive land use systems that encourage walking and cycling;*
- *improved infrastructure and facilities to support walking and cycling;*
- *improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists;*
- *improved policy and planning that ensures that walking and cycling needs are considered;*
- *better coordination and collaboration with stakeholders.*
- *better understanding walking and cycling needs and pattern ; and*
- *creating a walking and cycling culture.*

The State Government, through the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources, will take the lead in implementing these actions over the next three years, in conjunction with other State Agencies and interested organisations.

.....

We will work to maximise the useability of existing and future walking and cycling infrastructure on State Roads for all users, including provision and maintenance of infrastructure to an appropriate standard”.

While the above document says all the right things in terms of promoting active integrated transport, the reality from a Council operations perspective is different. The Roads and Jetties Act (Act) is a barrier to the effective implementation of active transport alternatives such as walking and cycling.

The relevant section of the Act is section 11 which is quoted below;

“11. Maintenance of State highways, &c., in cities, &c.

Where in a city, town or village there is a footpath on one side or both of a State highway or subsidiary road –

(a) the Minister is required to maintain and reconstruct –

(i) the carriageways and the surface lying between them, in the case of 2 paved carriageways divided by a median strip;

(ii) the carriageway and the overtaking lane, in the case of a single paved carriageway incorporating an overtaking lane;

(iii) a paved carriageway not exceeding 7.4 metres in width, in the case of a single undivided paved carriageway;

(iv) a paved carriageway not exceeding 4.3 metres in width, in the case of a carriageway providing a traffic lane to a traffic interchange; and

(v) the culverts and bridges over which the State highway or subsidiary road runs; and

(b) the remainder of the State highway or subsidiary road, including drainage and shoulders but not culverts and bridges, shall be maintained and reconstructed by the local authority”.

The effect of this legislation is to make the Council (local authority) responsible for the maintenance of the footpaths and any other cycleways not incorporated into the road pavement.

It has been this Council’s experience that officers of DIER also interpret this Act as implying therefore, that as footpaths and associated pedestrian activity are the responsibility of local government, any construction of footpaths in a State Road reservations is also the responsibility of local government. Council takes the view that this is akin to cost shifting.

A far more transparent and responsible approach would be to amend the Act and make Councils responsible for Council road reserves and DIER responsible for state road reserves. In that way the responsibilities and accountabilities are aligned and a barrier to deal with active transport strategies is removed.

ATTACHMENT – STCA - “A fair go for our public transport.”



STCA- Federal
election bid 2010v2.1