



2000

---

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

---

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

**SOUTH-ARM SECONDARY ROAD—  
ACTON ROAD TO BAYVIEW ROAD—  
ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC  
MANAGEMENT WORKS**

---

*Presented to His Excellency the Governor pursuant to the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1914*

---

**MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

*Mr Wing (Chairman)*

*Mr Harriss*

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

*Mr Green*

*Mr Hidding*

*Mr Kons*

By Authority: Government Printer, Tasmania

To His Excellency the Honourable Sir Guy Stephen Montague Green, Companion of the Order of Australia, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Governor in and over the State of Tasmania and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

### **MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY**

The Committee has investigated the following proposal:-

#### **South-Arm Secondary Road – Acton Road to Bayview Road – Road Safety and Traffic Management Works**

and now has the honour to present the Report to Your Excellency in accordance with the *Public Works Committee Act 1914*.

### **INTRODUCTION**

This reference sought the approval of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works to approve road works necessary to improve the operational safety of that section of South-Arm Secondary Road between Acton Road and Bayview Road.

### **BACKGROUND**

A major asset strategy of the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) is to reduce the social and economic costs of road trauma through cost effective road safety and traffic engineering treatments, whilst maximising the economic and social use of the State Road Network. In the Southern Region of the State the subject section of the South Arm Secondary Road was identified as a candidate project for road safety and traffic management works in the 2000/2001 financial year.

The objective of the project is to widen the road, including the canal bridge, to provide sufficient sealed width to install two traffic lanes, a painted median strip, sealed shoulder on both sides, traffic islands, and right turn lanes at junctions and the shopping centre. Access rationalisation, other associated safety improvement works and drainage improvements also form a significant part of the project.

### **PROPOSAL**

The existing situation is unusual in that the western side of the roadway is a foreshore without the need for access/egress whilst the eastern side has been developed and has many direct access/egress points to residences and businesses.

This section of South Arm Secondary Road was identified under the Federal Blackspot program in 1996. A concept design in early 1997 revealed that the project would cost in excess of \$450,000. The Tasmanian Blackspot Consultative Committee did not approve the project to proceed on the basis of its high capital cost. It was then decided to include the project for consideration in the five-year roads program.

The sealed pavement width is currently 6.0 metres. Traffic volumes on this road north of Lauderdale are generally high. Based on counts undertaken in 1997 a representative Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume in 1999 is estimated to be 8800 with a commercial vehicle content of 4.3%.

There have been 31 reported accidents on this section (including junctions) of the South Arm Secondary Road in the five years 1993 – 1998. Nine were casualty accidents with serious injuries including two pedestrians. Casualty accidents per million vehicle kilometres travelled are 1.45, which is well above the State average of 0.80.

Accident analysis has revealed that angle collisions and rear-end accidents constitute 67% of the total clearly indicating that these accidents were associated with vehicles accessing/egressing the abutting properties

The proposed works include:

- Widen the existing Canal Bridge by 4.2 metres to a width of 11.0 metres.
- Rationalise current accesses and provide an additional access to the Lauderdale primary school.
- Widen the pavement by 5.0 metres to a width of 11.0 metres, improve drainage and landscaping.
- Resurface the entire length of the project and reduce roughness.
- Install median strip, traffic islands, thermoplastic linemarking, delineation and bus bays.
- Install right turn & left turn lanes, traffic signage and other related works at Ringwood Road, shopping centre, North & South Terraces and Bayview Road junctions.
- Pedestrian and cyclist facilities will be investigated as part of the detail design process.
- Relocation of the services such as Telstra and HEC within the limits of the existing road reservation.

## **COSTING**

The major components of the work and the estimated costs thereof, are as follows:-

Pavement widening and resealing	\$0.6 million
Drainage improvement works	\$0.1 million
Widening of the canal bridge	\$0.3 million
Traffic facilities and Landscaping	\$0.1 million
Access rationalisation	\$0.1 million
Planning and design cost	\$0.1 million
<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>\$1.3 million</b>

## **EVIDENCE**

The Committee commenced its inquiry on Friday, 26 May 2000. The Committee inspected the site of the proposal. Following such inspection, the Committee commenced hearing evidence. The following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:

- Vic Lukianenko - Manager Asset Programs, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources
- Greg Millar - Manager Projects, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources
- Elizabeth Anderson - Manager Land Transport Demand, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources
- David Rowell - Executive Officer, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources

## **DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE**

1. Submission by Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources entitled "South Arm Secondary Road – Acton Road to Bayview Road – Road Safety and Traffic Management Works – Evidence to the Standing Committee on Public Works, dated March 2000
2. Department of Transport – Tasmania, Road Safety Branch – Location List of Accident Details, dated 13 June 2000
3. Drawings (3 of) entitled "Proposed Rehabilitation Preliminary Layout", by Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd
4. Drawings (2 of) entitled "Tominex Pty Ltd – Lauderdale - Preliminary Proposal for Re-opening Ralphs Bay Canal. Including Increased Recreational areas, with Marinas, Housing and associated facilities and wetlands", by Peacock, Darcey & Anderson Pty Ltd.

## BACKGROUND

The Manager Asset Programs, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources, Mr Vic Lukianenko briefed the Committee on the background of the proposal:-

*"It arose as a project through the process that has gone through for the Federal Black Spot Program because of the accident rate that was occurring in this area. The accident rate on this section of road was twice the level of the average accident rate on roads of this type around the State.*

*The project was first submitted in 1996 for consideration as a black spot project from the Federal Government and did not get a guernsey for that because of the high capital cost. At that stage it was decided, because of the general feeling of people in the area because of the accidents that were occurring, that it would be fed into the State program as a safety issue. It has now come forward as a project on the State program but also, at the same time, is being considered by the Federal Government for contribution of funds from the Federal arena as well. The concept being that it be, hopefully, a shared program if we get Federal funds - so funds would be shared between the State and the Federal Government.*

*The accidents generally through this area are related to vehicles entering or leaving the properties that abut this section of road on the eastern side of the roadway. The solution to address those concerns is to provide auxiliary turning facilities into many of those properties and also the junctions that are in that area. We believe that's the appropriate solution to it.*

*As I said, the plans basically run from Acton Road through to Bayview Road. The existing road pavement in that area is approximately six metres. The intention is to widen that out to approximately eleven metres and provide two three-metre lanes with a central three-metre lane for the turning facilities and two sealed shoulders of approximately a metre each. There are right-turn facilities being provided for every junction between Bayview Road and prior to getting to Acton Road. So there is a right turn into Bayview Road, South Terrace, North Terrace, right turns into the shopping areas and the service station. The access to the Foreshore Tavern, there is another road there isn't there - Ringwood Road is the other road where right-turn facilities are to be provided for.*

*... At this stage we are still looking at several options ... for the bridge, which possibly could range from a large culvert to retaining the existing bridge and tacking on an additional section to it.*

*The traffic volumes generally through that area are in excess of 9 000 a day. South of Bayview Road the traffic volume is almost half, it goes down to about 4 500 to 5 000.*

*As I said, the black spot contribution from the Federal Government we don't know at this stage but that, hopefully, will be forthcoming later in the year."*

## BRIDGE

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to the proposed treatment of the bridge, Mr Lukianenko responded:-

*"We have a report on the existing bridge. It is suffering from the intrusion of chlorides because of the environment that it's in. It was built in the early 1950s, I think, so it's about the age of the other bridge a bit further south on the Midway Point. It has serious problems and the estimated remaining life is probably somewhere between five to twenty years at this stage - this is from ... investigations. The decision we need to make is whether we completely replace the bridge with something that will perform the requirement of flushing the canal and still retain water in there - which would probably be in the form of a twin or triple-cell culvert which would be a lot cheaper - or, alternatively, retain the bridge and hope that it'll achieve somewhere in the vicinity of twenty years and tack on a piece to it.*

*It's evaluating putting a substantial structure beside one that has a limited life and the effect that has on traffic when we're building it and knowing that we might have to go back in five to ten years. So it's an assessment of all those things: whether we just do it all up-front or have to plan to come back somewhere in that range of between five and twenty years."*

The Manager Land Transport Demand, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources, Elizabeth Anderson added:-

*"The most important issue is there are problems with the bridge but it does not present a safety problem as such. It is just a structural issue to do with the expected life of the bridge."*

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to what, if any, consultation had been undertaken with the local community in relation to the proposed project, in particular the shopkeepers. Mr Lukianenko responded:-

*"It is intended to have consultation with all the general public and all the people who will be affected by this and the closure of that access is in the vicinity of South Terrace into that service station for safety reasons - it's so close to the existing junction - but that would be negotiated with the landowner."*

## TOMINEX PTY LTD –PROPOSAL FOR RE-OPENING RALPHS BAY CANAL

The Committee questioned the witnesses in relation to a proposed private development at Ralphs Bay, which would entail 'canal style' residential allotments, marinas and the re-opening of the canal. The Committee was concerned that the treatment of the bridge in this project should not prejudice the canal development were it to proceed. Ms Anderson submitted:-

*"... We've received drafts of the plans showing what the development would possibly look like. We are aware that a draft report has been done by the developer so he can work on the feasibility and at some stage soon he will be working out the infrastructure requirements ...*

*There has been some information in the media recently that gives an indication that he will be seeking contribution from government for some of the major infrastructure components and the bridge has been identified as an issue. As you'll note from the plan that you have there he proposes to open the canal all the way through, as it was when it was originally constructed and then closed off by natural water movements and weather fluctuations.*

*If the ultimate vision, as he shows in his plan, is to have marinas, he would be looking at some fairly significant dredging requirements to get some of these medium-size boats through and given that he is looking at opening the canal all the way through there would be an expectation to have boats moving through the canal.*

*At this stage he is in his preliminary work. We do know that it is happening and we will continue to keep note of how that development is progressing and the impact that it will actually have on the works that we are proposing for you today.*

*... The amount of work that would need to go into changing the bridge significantly to be able to allow a larger range of vessels under it would be more significant than what will be done for this because we're replacing an existing bridge. It would probably, ideally, be something that would be integrated with the overall development proposal that was going in because you are affecting the same environment - the environmental work would need to be the same."*

At its next Meeting, the Committee called Mr Max Darcey of Peacock Darcey & Anderson Pty Ltd. The Committee questioned the witness as to his role in the proposed Ralphs Bay development. Mr Darcey submitted:-

*"My clients are Tominex Holdings Pty Ltd. It is a Melbourne-based company and its principal shareholder is Neil Thomas ... His dream, as an ex-Tasmanian - he was here as a youngster and went to school here - his dream as a Tasmanian is to have the Ralphs Bay canal reopened for the benefit of the population as a whole, particularly from a tourism and boating and holiday recreation point of view. He believes that the concept of having Ralphs Bay canal was correct - the original concept back in the 1920s when it was built - because the sea voyage from the River Derwent round into Frederick Henry Bay, which is generally a sheltered bay, you have to pass through Storm Bay and that can be difficult, to put it mildly, at times.*

*So he sees the opening of the Ralphs Bay canal for the traffic of boats, yachts, ferry, steamer - and that was the concept, the original ferry steamer - the Cartela-type vessel - went through the canal, when it was open, and of course in those days it provided a means of transport and freight and public transport to the peninsula and other ports down in the coast there. So that is the catalyst - that is what started him off - and then he said to me, 'To support this, to sustain it, to create it, we need a development that will generate enough money, on-going funds and so on to make sure it remains open'. So he engaged me to draw up a development plan ... there are 700 residential lots with the canal open"*



The Committee questioned Mr Darcey as to the engineering issues related to the re-opening of the canal. He submitted:-

*"Keeping it open is a problem. The eastern end of it ... was blocked off and it was caused by the south-easterly gales that come in here - nothing from the west or anything; it was the south easterly gales that built the sand up. Back in those days, as the written reports go, they didn't have the facilities or the capital to keep it open by the methods used in those days. There is a Dutch company, Van Ord, who are consulting to Tominex about this and they understand, they have techniques and equipment like in your swimming pool to collect the dirt - they travel around - all computerised and so on and they can suck the sand up and put it wherever you want it ... rehabilitate the beach, for instance.*

*... Here we have put to you a new swing bridge and that is the concept like perhaps you see down at Dunalley with the bridge."*

The Committee sought the view of Mr Darcey as to the South Arm Road works, and the impact, if any, it had to the Tominex proposal. Mr Darcey responded:-

*"From a study of the plans I am very enthusiastic about the plans; I can see what you are proposing to do. In the more difficult parts it seems to be creating two lanes with medians down the middle and from various places. Our interest in that area of course is on the seaward side mostly, except for the bridge itself and the stormwater outlets.*

*In our preliminary investigations, we have learnt from council documents, papers that have been provided, that there has always been a stormwater problem up in here - up in this flat area and all up in around here - and that is why you have so many stormwater outlets at present coming out through here.*

*There will be environmental questions to be answered and that is something that plan doesn't tell me: whether Transport are proposing to do anything about the stormwater outlets other than just extending the existing pipes. I take it from the plans that they are not, they are just going to extend the existing pipes.*

As to the bridgeworks, Mr Darcey submitted:-

*"My view of that is, all right, you spend \$300 000 and you do all that with the bridge plan, if our proposal gets up then that will all have to be taken away and a new swing bridge will have to be put there at our cost.*

*...We have put some figures into a model initially - there's not much point in me saying what that figure is because it still needs a lot more technical work on it - but we put some figures into a model for a swing bridge as a new thing because the whole of the sides of the canal itself are going to have to be reconstructed right through. That includes the abutments for the bridge and so on, so it will be a totally new thing. I don't see a problem with that."*

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The evidence presented to the Committee clearly demonstrated the need for the community concerns about the operational safety of this section of the State road network to be addressed. The works will provide a safe and efficient environment for the travelling public for the next twenty years.

In evidence, Mr Darcey brought to the attention of the Committee an apparently enduring problem associated with the treatment of stormwater in the area of the works. It would appear that the works will provide for an extension of the existing pipes, but were the Tominex Pty Ltd project to eventuate, more extensive treatment of stormwater run-off from the roadway would be necessary. Accordingly, the Committee strongly recommends that the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources consult with the Department of State Development, Department of Primary Industries, Water & Environment and the Clarence City Council in respect to the stormwater design requirements of the Tominex Pty Ltd development proposal.

The Committee recommends the project, in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted, at an estimated total cost of \$1 300 000.

**Parliament House  
HOBART  
29 June 2000**

**Hon Don Wing M.L.C.  
CHAIRMAN**