



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Colebrook Main Road, Richmond – Heavy Vehicle Link Road

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

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Mr Harriss (Chairman)
Mr Hall

House of Assembly

Mr Booth
Mr Brooks
Ms White

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	2
PROJECT COSTS	3
EVIDENCE	3
DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE	13
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	14

INTRODUCTION

To His Excellency the Honourable Peter Underwood, AC, 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: -

Colebrook Main Road, Richmond – Heavy Vehicle Link Road

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

BACKGROUND

This reference recommended that the Committee approve a heavy vehicle link road to skirt around the western side of the Richmond township between Middle tea Tree Road and the Richmond Recreation Ground. The principal purpose of such road is to remove as much heavy vehicle traffic from the Richmond precinct as possible.

The objectives are to:-

- Remove heavy and oversized vehicle through traffic from the Richmond township;
- Remove a large amount of heavy vehicular traffic in the Richmond township;
- Reduce vibration by heavy traffic damaging heritage buildings in the township;
- Reduce issues regarding turning movements at the junction of Colebrook Main Road and Bridge Street;
- Increase safety of pedestrians;
- Increase pedestrian amenity for the local community and tourists; and
- Lessen the ongoing issues with oversized vehicles coming into contact with overhead power lines at the entrance of the township directly after the existing Middle Tea Tree Road junction.

The full submission of the Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources in support of this reference is published on the website of the Committee at:

<http://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/ctee/Joint/works.htm>

PROJECT COSTS

The project is funded under the Tasmanian Community Roads Program.

The cost of the works has been estimated based on historical rates for similar works delivered by DIER. The main components of the base estimate are shown below. Note that the below estimate is as at the completion of the Preliminary Design Phase and will vary to the final Pre-Tender estimate.

Table 2 Base Estimate

Item	Estimated Cost
Project Specific	\$236,375
Earthworks	\$1,354,990
Drainage	\$249,147
Pavement	\$784,430
Bitumen Surfacing	\$263,380
Traffic Facilities	\$222,319
Landscaping	\$140,563
Miscellaneous	\$201,450
SUBTOTAL	\$3,452,654
Additional Items (e.g. acquisition)	\$1,130,000
Professional Fees	\$676,500
DIER Internal Overheads and Fees	\$377,500
DIER Supplied Materials or Services	\$178,118
TOTAL BASE ESTIMATE	\$5,814,771
P50 Estimate	\$6,524,000
P90 Estimate	\$7,045,000

The base estimate has subsequently been stochastically modelled and P50 and P90 estimates obtained. The P50 estimate notionally represents the project budget that will not be exceeded 50% of the time and the P90 estimate similarly represents the project budget that will not be exceeded 90% of the time.

It should be noted that as the base estimate is derived from historic rates, the P50 and P90 estimates by their nature already incorporate some allowance for risk and presume a stable market.

EVIDENCE

The Committee commenced its inquiry on Wednesday, 3 April last. The following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

- Adrian Paine, Senior Project Manager, Transport Infrastructure Services Division Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources
- Mark Iles, Project Manager, Project Management Planning & Design Division Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources
- Ald. Doug Chipman, Mayor Clarence City Council
- Andrew Paul, General Manager Clarence City Council
- Barry Chapman, President, Richmond Community Association
- Andrew Jones

Overview

Mr Iles provided the following overview of the proposed works:-

This was a commitment by the state government as part of the community roads program. We started the planning work on this almost three years ago with the initial engineering survey, Aboriginal ground survey, environmental reports, and doing some initial consultation with the Richmond community to work out an alignment and junction designs. Over that period the alignment was modified several times after complications with landowners, particularly Andrew Jones in relation to the impact on his agricultural property. Andrew is the only farmer we're impacting on. The other properties are mainly rural properties but will potentially be used for residential use.

The subsurface Aboriginal survey was done the December before last. We came across areas which had a high number of artefacts, so through consultation with the Aboriginal community, mainly the Aboriginal Land and Sea Council and Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, we modified the junction designs at the southern end and also the alignment slightly to minimise our impacts on Aboriginal heritage.

Then we were required to acquire the housing property which we were standing on the other day. We had some public displays with the Richmond community based on the current design and alignment. Our feedback from the community has been positive in both design and alignment. We have been doing extensive consultation with all the directly impacted landowners in relation to land acquisition impacts it will have on them, and future access arrangements.

Aboriginal heritage

The Committee requested elaboration of the work performed to assess aboriginal heritage. Mr Iles submitted:-

There are two parts to the Aboriginal survey. When we initiated the project we did a ground survey, which is a walk-over to identify, first, what is actually on the surface and, two, really looking at the landscape itself. The subsurface work was held off for nearly 18 months, mainly because of the bans at the time due to the controversies at Brighton. It was November before last when we initiated the subsurface work, with extensive work done in areas based on the ground survey. These were identified as potential areas of interest and potential areas where artefacts could be found. From that ground survey, that was what we actually

thought it would be. That is when we were working with AHT and what was the Land and Sea Council at the time; we negotiated to move the alignment of the southern junction in particular to minimise our impacts as much as possible.

... artefacts on the properties have been potentially moved from other parts of the property as a result of agricultural activity. The archaeological report has shown that the sites themselves are not of high significance from an Aboriginal heritage perspective in the sense that they are low to medium. It was area where Aboriginals passed through and may have stayed overnight because of the wetland area, but it was not an area where they were permanently camped. That was more down at the Coal River itself. It was an area they would passed through. There has been modification of the site and it was not an area they used. They would have used it on periodic basis rather than a more permanent basis.

Speed limits

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to why the subject road will be designated 80 kph rather than 100 kph. Mr Iles responded:-

Mainly because of noise. Also, DIER's policy normally is that we change from 60 to 80 to 100 in relation to speeds. What we would not want is a 100 kph speed limit coming into that junction at Colebrook Main Road at the southern end. They will have the priority at the northern end. The idea is to give heavy vehicles a priority at the northern end so they do not have to stop. Then they have to stop at the southern end. The main reason we have done that is to maintain the entrance into the town. One of the key issues coming from the Richmond community is that they did not want a bypass. That is why we have always referred to it as a link road. Coming from the south, you would turn into it - make a left-hand turn to come in. However, from the north you will have the priority. There was a bit of pressure on us at the northern end from some of the business community to have it so you would have to make a right-hand turn to go onto the link road. However, if you were doing that, if you were driving a truck, you would take the normal route because you would only have to turn once, whereas if you had to make a right-hand turn onto the link road, then make a right onto Colebrook Road, it would take the whole idea of getting trucks to use it in the first place.

... (A roundabout) was considered. When we first started this project, the first part of the consultation was based on junction design. This is even before we had an alignment. There is an alignment in the Clarence planning scheme, so it goes right back to the 1970s and 1980s when a bypass was investigated off Richmond. One of the initial designs there was potentially for a roundabout. However, one of the issues which came out of initial consultation was that a roundabout would impact on the historic entrance to the town. That came from the community itself. It would also have a lot more impact on properties. There were a number of potential concepts earlier in the piece for a roundabout.

Community consultation

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to what, if any, consultation with the community had occurred. Mr Iles responded:-

Since I have been involved in the project, which is almost two years, we've had two community consultation processes - public displays which were held at the Richmond hall. They usually went from 2 o'clock in the afternoon through to 7 o'clock at night, so we could get the afternoon traffic. We also had numerous

meetings with the Richmond Advisory Committee, which is the committee that advises Clarence Council on planning issues. Consultant John Worsley was dealing with other groups within Richmond, including a group that deals directly with businesses. There are three distinct Richmond committees, but the one we have done the most work with is the Richmond Advisory Committee. They are fully supportive. They have representatives from the business community.

When we went through the public displays, there have always been several business owners who have concerns. The tourist operators themselves seem to be quite positive. The owner of the chemist, the service station and the supermarket - three businesses - feel as though it would potentially impact on passing trade. In other words, people who live at Colebrook or Campania and who would normally have to pass through Richmond may choose to use the link road and may not go in. However, we have specifically - and it will be signposted - made sure we never mentioned the word 'bypass' in all our consultation. It has always been the Richmond heavy vehicle link road and will be signposted in that way. That is one of the reasons we have done the junction design at the southern end, so if you are driving into Richmond you look up into Richmond, particularly tourists. However, we still can't predict a person who may stop at the supermarket, the chemist or the service station at the moment who lives at Campania or Colebrook. They have a local shop and a service station out there anyway and they probably use those, but we can't predict.

Cost estimate/Tendering

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to what was the estimated cost of land acquisition for the project. Mr Iles responded:-

I will have to check as I do not have the breakdown with me. We had the Valuer-General's department heavily involved in all our initial acquisition costs. We have also met all the landowners in relation to that. We have a contingency as part of acquisitions because there is also the compensation part. With these estimates there is always quite a high contingency. That is the whole idea of the P50 and P90 estimates. Hopefully, we would envisage bringing this under that price but we do not know until we get tender prices at this point.

The Committee subsequently sought a written response from the Department as to the details of the land capability of the agricultural land to be acquired for the project. Mr Paine provided a response by letter dated 17 April last which, *inter alia*, stated as follows:-

DIER commissioned a report by agricultural consultants Macquarie-Franklin to assess the land capability of the property to be acquired for the project and attached is a map showing the land capability and below the reports' conclusions:

"No areas of prime agricultural land were identified within the survey area (land Class 3 or better). The northern end contains the only soils suitable for cropping (Class 4e) however the suitability for cropping is severely limited due to erosion risk and drainage constraints. This land is also highly constrained due to its limited extent (< 2 ha).

The remaining area is primarily restricted to grazing activities only. The Class 4s and 5s land is most suitable for this activity, but the restricted extent (approx 5 ha) and often dissected distribution limits extensive use. While the heavy clay soils (Class 5w and 6w) have the most cohesive and abundant distribution, they are only suitable for

grazing when soil conditions are dry. The impeded drainage of these soils results in only a limited period when soil conditions will be favourable to permit grazing.”

The Committee asked Mr Iles what confidence he had that the works would not approach the P90 estimate, to which he responded:-

With the construction industry the way it is, we would envisage getting some very competitive prices on this. The idea of the P50 is that you are 50 per cent confident, and there is a fair bit of contingency as well within that price. This has only come in within the last 12 months. We have been working towards these P50 and P90 estimates based on what the Australian Government requires for national projects. We are now doing it for all state projects. We are pretty confident that, with the current construction industry, we can bring it on this price.

The Committee questioned the witnesses first as to whether the works would be let as one contract and second as to how many businesses would be able to tender for works exceeding \$5 million and how many were expected to submit a tender. Mr Paine responded:-

One whole contract.

...You have to be pre-qualified ... I think it is close to 90 per cent (of DIER approved contractors) for pre-qualified, probably even higher, who would be able to tackle a project between \$5 million and \$10 million.

...It is always hard to know. There are a few contractors that have traditionally worked up north but that are starting to tender more in the south because of the scarcity of work. We would expect four to six. It depends on the workloads and commitments at the time.

The Committee sought a breakdown of the budget allocation for professional fees and DIER internal overheads and fees. Mr Paine responded:-

Traditionally, professional costs are between 10-15 per cent of the project, so they fit approximately within that.

... they have to provide us with a fee proposal, which we review. They have to break it down in costs they are applying for - noise assessments, drainage calculations et cetera. We review them for being reasonable. Each project is different; some have more lighting and some would have street landscaping. We get fee proposals from the consultants and we review them.

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to why external consultants were necessary for works such as those proposed. Mr Iles responded:-

DIER doesn't have any design expertise anymore; that was outsourced years ago. We are building that part up at the moment with smaller jobs. I work in planning and design and we're gradually building up our design section. We're also building up our planning sector in being able to do some of our environmental and heritage work, and also planning, which was all outsourced originally.

... In the last 12-18 months DIER has been building up those resources where we can do a fair bit of work in-house. We won't go down the line of having a botanist or

anything like that. That will still go out to consultancies, as will engineering design. We are always looking at what the costs are to undertake planning and design for our projects. We are always looking to reduce those costs.

...By having our in-house resources, we at least then can do all the desktop assessments on heritage and environmental issues, so we know what the scope is. By knowing that scope you can save hundreds of thousands of dollars potentially, depending on the size of the job - tens of thousands of dollars on a small job. With planning applications, where we have to go through the local government planning approval process, we will doing those in-house in the future. That can be anywhere between \$2 000-\$3 000 to \$30 000-\$40 000, depending on the scope of the project and how much is involved. There are potential cost savings in all those areas in future. We are building up those resources right now.

The Committee sought an explanation of the 'additional items figure of \$1.13 million. Mr Paine responded:-

I haven't seen the detail. It may include the access road, for example, that we have to provide for the property acquisition, or upgrades to other roads, so we would need to review exactly what is in there.

Mr Iles added:-

Some of it is in relation to services and some is related to upgrades of the road, like the reserve road we need to upgrade to provide additional access points.

...There are four properties involved for access points. For Andrew Jones' property where we sever his title, we are providing a new access road of nearly 480 metres. It will come out on Colebrook Main Road just north of the football oval, currently the access to Houston's farm. It is actually owned by Andrew Jones but leased to Houston's.

... and fencing on both sides of that access road (will be included in that \$1.13 million).

...As part of Andrew's negotiation with the Valuer-General, for future compensation there is the long-term maintenance. That will be taken into account in his compensation. We are acquiring land off him, but as part of that we will fully fence the property in relation to the boundary with the link road. We will fully fence the new access road as well. We don't normally do that. We negotiated with him because of stock issues. It will potentially be a housing site for his daughter, so we have agreed to fence both sides of the new access road. Compensation includes his long-term maintenance of that access road.

The Committee subsequently sought a written response from the Department as to the details of the 'Additional Items \$1.1 million' shown in the cost estimate. Mr Paine provided a response by letter dated 17 April last which, *inter alia*, stated as follows:-

This amount is the total (all inclusive) cost of acquiring the property including but not limited to:

- *Land valuation and associated severance, disturbance and injurious affection.*

- Relocation costs associated with demolition of residence at 3 Middle Tea Tree Road.
- Compensation for injurious affection (including change in amenity, property access etc) to “other land” impacted or affected by the project.
- Ancillary costs, being reasonable legal, valuation and other professional costs.

For privacy and “commercial-in-confidence” reasons further detail as to the negotiations and final agreed settlement for the purchase of the properties is not provided.

Tendering process

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to why the proposed date for advertising tenders was relatively delayed. Mr Paine responded:-

We didn't go to tender in February because we needed to conduct a final survey of the green and gold frog. There haven't been any green and gold frogs discovered in the area, so that's clear. We moved the program back a bit to accommodate those works. We would be looking to go to tender by the end of this month. When we go to tender and when construction starts, they can be two different things. We would like them to follow on but in this case, because we could possibly go to tender as early as the end of this month, there may be a delay before construction commences, because of the winter period. It may be too wet for us to start construction.

Green and Gold Frog

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to whether the construction of culverts was a deliberate strategy to enhance the survival of the Green and Gold frog. Mr Iles responded:-

It is a natural wetland area at the moment, which has been created from the agricultural pattern. It is low-lying and a natural wetland area and that is where the Aboriginal heritage issues come into it. Before we tried to work out an alignment we did the initial environmental surveys to acknowledge our constraints. Because of the wetland areas the green and gold frog was one of the things picked up initially as being there. We did a separate survey for the green and gold frog in 2010 and no frog was found. It is a potential habitat for the green and gold frog and green and gold frogs are in the area. This is how it all gets back to that tender date of February. Our environmental report was two years old. For most environmental reports, even though there is nothing in legislation - it is like a general protocol - after two years you should reinvestigate. We went back to DPIWWE and did some consultation with them. They had done some of their own work in that time and the green and gold frog has been found within 500 metres of the site. That is why we did that extra survey to double check. It wasn't found but the culverts were always part of the project. We did a hydrological survey as well to work out the drainage lines so you don't increase the flooding behind; it goes back on Andrew Jones' property. There is also an issue with a stormwater drain down near the bottom, east of the existing turn-off to Middle Tea Tree Road, which has potential flood problems with the Clarence Council. We have been working with them in relation to our hydrological report so that you do not cause potential flooding

The Committee asked Mr Iles whether or not statutory approval for any disturbance of the Green and Gold frog habitat was necessary, he responded:-

It is not required (at this point). Frogs move about, so it is a risk management. If the green and gold frog happens to move into the area during construction, a referral is required under commonwealth legislation.

Construction standard

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to whether the road will be built to potentially triple the axle loading. Mr Paine responded in the affirmative and Mr Iles added:-

It is not an HPV route and we would not envisage it being so. At the moment the HPV route is Tea Tree Road. They have the old log truck route, which is Midland Highway, Tea Tree Road and Fingerpost Rd. That was basically when Triabunna was open. It has always been DIER policy not to have Mud Walls Road as a major route from the Midland Highway.

... Richmond Road is not a B-double route at this point in time and I do not envisage it being so.

Clarence City Council

The Mayor of Clarence, Ald. Doug Chipman made the following submission:-

Clarence Council is very supportive of this road being built. There has been concern for some time about the damage heavy vehicles have the potential to cause to the heritage parts of Richmond. We've also been concerned about the mix of traffic - the tourism traffic as well as the transport traffic - going through the fairly tight area in Richmond. It is a potential safety risk of well. There are also a lot of pedestrians walking through the village when the tourist season is at its height. It is going to be excellent to see all that deconflict take place. Unloading the risk to heritage buildings and improved safety are important to us. Now that Mud Walls Road has been improved markedly in recent times, the amount of traffic going through Richmond has increased considerably. If you now pick up the GPS navigator in your car, the preferred route that comes up mostly, particularly from the eastern shore, is up through Mud Walls Road to Launceston. There are all sorts of reasons but the road is top class now and attracting a lot more traffic.

The General Manager, Mr Paul added:-

In the late 1990s, but particularly in 2000, the council commissioned a study into the impact of heavy vehicle movements through the Richmond township, particularly in relation to aspects of heavy vehicle vibration and the impact it was having on heritage buildings. That study indicated to us that heavy vehicles travelling through the heart of the Richmond township were potentially having an impact on some of our major heritage buildings along the vehicle route and were in fact causing, or had the potential to cause, cracking in buildings. At that point council took the decision to support seeking a bypass around the Richmond township and actively pursued that by placing a reservation within our planning scheme to provide for transport movements around the town, to take heavy vehicle movements out of the centre of Richmond. Whilst I understand the proposed design is now slightly outside the reserved corridor, nonetheless the fact that council did reserve the corridor within its planning scheme back in the early 2000s is indicative that we are keen to the project proceed.

I reaffirm the mayor's comments on tourism amenity and long-term protection of some of the most important heritage buildings in the state. It is important that we

take heavy vehicle movements out of the main street of Richmond. In support of particularly the traders and the tourism components of Richmond, it is important that if the project does proceed there is adequate planning for a significant gateway to Richmond and for adequate signage such that the township does not become bypassed but that there is a front door or front gate to the Richmond township, promoted through this project.

Andrew Jones

Mr Jones made the following submission in relation to the proposed works:-

My submission is based more on having to have that gravel access road. My great grandfather bought the place in 1895. My father was told in the early 1960s not to plant trees up our present farm driveway because the bypass that was coming in. It was going to come out opposite Kelly Field back in those days. Where it is placed at the moment, if you have to have a bypass, is probably the best option. I was a little bit disappointed when it was moved further out of that aforementioned corridor, but ... I thought it was quite a good compromise.

... I am losing quite a bit with the bypass - or link road because apparently some people do not want a bypass, but it is a bypass even though you give way at one end. Six years ago I leased land to Easton's. Previously I had a centre pivot there with four circles. It does leave the fourth set of wheels free to go around, but centre pivots have an overhang, so I am definitely losing quite a bit more, having that gravel access, which is accentuated by the Aboriginal heritage findings there. I have to have a bulge.

... I do not believe we will be compensated enough to maintain 480 metres of gravel road in perpetuity. I have a farm driveway about that length or a little bit shorter at the moment and it is a constant drain of manpower and finance to keep it in reasonable order.

All the other land-holders affected by having access compromised by this road have alternative access to their titles up, what we used to believe, was our farm driveway, which is deemed to be the old road to Jerusalem, now Colebrook. We do not have a problem with that. They have alternative access. This 30-acre separate title does not have any other access. It is part of my farm succession plan, which most of you realise is quite a tricky thing to do. I will leave that 30 acres to my daughter. My son, who is already living in the old farm homestead, is going to take over the rest. I presently live down at Acton. So it is not setting a precedent by giving it direct access because everyone else has alternative access already. I think it is fairly extravagant to build a 480-metre gravel road when you can have perfectly safe access off a road which has the same speed limit as Acton Road. Now that I live down at Acton, I have not seen many accidents down there. I think it is a complete waste of money, and is taking up more of my agricultural land.

In correspondence so far from DIER, it seems they are expecting to just put a right-of-way over that land I lease to Houston's, which is owned by Limekiln Farms, of which I am sole owner. They just expected to put an easement on it, a gravel road, fence it and attach it to the title of A F Jones. If it has to go ahead they should have to buy that strip of land, fence it and attach it to that 30-acre title.

... The 30-acre title is in my own name. My father left that to me about eight years ago when he passed away. The other one is the same entity that owns the rest of the farm. Because you are taking the access away, it should be attached to that 30-acre title.

... They are proposing an easement. In the letter I have they are taking an easement, but it's taking it out of production and taking it away because it's going to have a gravel road on it. It's more than an easement, in my view.

I can live with a bypass; it is as good a placement as you could wish for but I am very much against having that burden placed on that block of land. It will considerably devalue it. No figures have been mentioned as to how much they will compensate us for it. The amount of money to invest to provide enough interest every year to maintain 480 metres of gravel road would be considerable, but no-one has mentioned a figure.

The Committee questioned Mr Jones as to whether the land acquisition price had been calculated. The following exchange ensued:-

Mr JONES - No, we haven't got that far yet. I find it very strange that this committee is sitting to determine whether it goes ahead, yet I have come under a lot of pressure to sign the acquisition papers. I have given them to my solicitor and told him to go slow. We've had this bypass threatened for many years and I am waiting to see if it goes ahead, although they have shifted the power poles.

CHAIR - Would you care to elaborate on your comment that you've been placed under a lot of pressure to sign the acquisition.

Mr JONES - Phone calls from the office of DIER, from Teresa Ferraro-Quin, asking why I have not signed. There was one little corner that will be divided where the road goes through that 30-acre block. It will leave a very small triangle on the eastern side, which will be no good to me so they may as well attach it to Justin Nichol's block. She wanted to know why I had not signed it. I said nothing was finalised yet. I said, 'If it goes ahead I will sign it but I am not signing it until everything is a bit more concrete'.

The Committee asked Mr Jones whether his preferred option was to have access to the link road. Mr Jones responded:-

Yes. Where the present Victoria Street extends; that is its present access.

... I have a farm gate there and the farm gate has always been there. There used to be a rifle range there pre-war. In my grandfather's day he allowed a horse racing track to be there. I put a lock on the gate in 1972. When Simplot bring their pea harvesters, they always brought them in there because, although it is down a bit and covered in soil, there is rock underneath so it was an all-weather access to the farm. Our gateway on Middle Tea Tree Road goes off at quite a severe angle so it is very hard to get a large truck in from the Richmond end. So when we have big machines, they come in through that gate. Since Houston's leased it, I have an arrangement whereby I can come up through the gravel road they put in for access. Traditionally it was access for heavy machinery to the farm.

The Committee asked Mr Jones whether he acknowledged that accesses may compromise the safety character of the proposed heavy vehicle link road. Mr Jones responded:-

I would not think it would be compromised with one. There are lots of heavy vehicles going down Acton Road and there are gateways everywhere. I presume that building a pull-off area would be cheaper than to build and maintain 480 metres of gravel road. I am not an engineer; that is my opinion.

... There are lots of higher speed roads that have a widened bit and people have access to and from them. Because it would be the only one and because of particular circumstances, I would prefer that and that is why I am here. I would have thought an 80 kph road could be widened out a bit in a similar fashion to what Acton Road is...

Community support

The Committee questioned the witnesses as to whether the Richmond community supported the proposed works. Mr Chapman responded:-

There has been, for a number of years, a very small number, so far as we can ascertain, who were fearful of it. They thought all the traffic would drive by and they saw an early highway-type situation as occurred with Ross. Our group went up to Deloraine and spoke to the chamber at Deloraine and to business people at Ross. The response from Deloraine was fantastic. They said it was the best thing that's ever happened to the town. The people at Ross said, 'In the early days we didn't do it right but now we love it because people come in and we can give them this true historical village'. If you go to Evandale, which was naturally bypassed, they are able to present something quite different than Richmond can currently present. There's no doubt this could be the making of Richmond.

Mr Paul added:-

My advice from the Richmond Advisory Committee is that they are supportive of the project, although there are one or two voices within the business group who are concerned about it becoming a ghost town. Overall, the advisory committee is supportive of it. The advisory committee contains representatives from the many groups that exist within a small town like Richmond.

DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE

The following documents were taken into evidence and considered by the Committee:

- Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources - Richmond Heavy Vehicle Link Road, Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, March 2013;
- Clarence City Council (John Stevens, Group Manager Asset Management), Submission dated 20 February 2013;
- Chris Adams, Submission dated 17 February 2013;
- Andrew Jones, Submission dated 19 February 2013;
- Richmond Community Association (Barry Chapman, President), Submission dated 19 February 2013;
- Dr. Dianne Snowden, Submission undated; and Peter Dalkin, Submission dated 18 February 2013; and
- Correspondence dated 17 April 2013 from Adrian Paine, Senior Project Manager, Transport Infrastructure Services Division, Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources to the Secretary.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The need for the proposed works was established. Once complete the works will provide an alternative to heavy and oversized traffic travelling through Richmond which will result in the following benefits:-

- Removal of heavy and oversized vehicle through traffic from the Richmond township;
- Removal of a large amount of heavy vehicular traffic in the Richmond township;
- Reduction of vibration by heavy traffic damaging heritage buildings in the township;
- Reduction of issues regarding turning movements at the junction of Colebrook Main Road and Bridge Street;
- Increased safety of pedestrians;
- Increased pedestrian amenity for the local community and tourists; and
- Lessening of the ongoing issues with oversized vehicles coming into contact with overhead power lines at the entrance of the township directly after the existing Middle Tea Tree Road junction.

The Committee noted Mr Jones' concern that the strip of land, which he will effectively lose the use of, should be acquired, fenced and attached to the 30 acre title rather than the creation of an easement or 'right of way'.

The Committee recommends the project, in accordance with the documentation submitted.

**Parliament House
Hobart
14 May 2013**

**Hon. A. P. Harriss M.L.C.
Chairman**