

Submission to the Parliamentary Works Committee on the construction of the Southern Outlet commuter lane and associated works from Mervin C Reed FAICD FCHFP AAFA

This submission is focused on the noise abatement aspects of the proposed construction of an additional lane on the Southern outlet roadway in Hobart.

This roadway is the section running from Olinda Grove to Davey Street.

It is apparent from the lack of consultation with the Dynnyrne and Tolmans Hill communities that any consideration of noise abatement measures has been fleeting to say the least.

In fact, the lack of public knowledge about the program is it seems, a deliberate ploy to slow down criticism of the project.

Modern roadways carrying large volumes of traffic put out significant noise pollution, and most road design authorities take this into consideration when building freeways and roads, such as the Southern Outlet.

The key issues are the provision of noise abatement updates to housing adjacent to the motorway, with the agreed addition of double glazing, sound insulation and of course sound abatement fencing specifically designed for the roadway.

There is another measure that will be needed and this is the use of low noise asphalt for the road surface.

All of these measures appear readily understandable by Infrastructure Tasmania and the Department of State Growth.

Such measures as the sound barrier walls on the edge of the roadway have been installed at Kingston in Southern Tasmania to ameliorate the impact of that motorway on residential housing.

I see no such planning in the outlines available to me as a citizen in regard to this project.

I mentioned earlier, there has been no consultation with the impacted residents apart from it seems fairly dumbly written notices to Treat under the Lands Acquisition Act that caused significant human grief.

This lack of consideration for people is an issue the committee needs to take account of, as people have a right to be heard. They also have a right to be consulted.

The recent reversal of road designs “set in stone” by the Minister on the Bass Highway illustrates the point.

There has been no consultation with the impacted communities on Dynnyrne or Tolmans Hill.

Clearly this project should now be refused by the Parliamentary Works Committee in its present form.

The reasons for this refusal under section 16.5 of the Act is for a range of very simple yet fundamental reasons.

1. The Public have not been informed of the design issues and options with this project and have not been thus able to make representations. There has been in real terms no communication with the impacted suburbs at all.

2. The project does not address pollution abatement in an area that is highly built up with residential homes.
3. The project has had design flaws consistent with poor planning and road construction strategies, and it was only recently that the acquisition of property was changed to a lower number. This means that the designs put to the committee for approval are flawed and now need adjustment.
4. No noise abatement planning and detailed design has been included with this project, with the intent of the project to increase noise by 25%.
This should be mandatory that noise abatement is a central part of the project, to protect the lives of the citizens who will be impacted and whom this committee represents.

The Committee could take the view that the project is a worthwhile one in its intent, and I have no argument with that theory.

It is the execution of the engineering designs, that are the issue.

It would be in the public interest for the hearing to determine that the project should be set aside for the period of time it takes the Department of State Growth to remediate the defective design.

If this is not possible then the project should be refused under section 16.5 as not being in the public interest.

They can fix the planning and bring it back to the Committee as a new project.

I am happy to attend the hearing and amplify my submission.