

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY 19 APRIL 2013.

FERRY MAIN ROAD

Mr ADRIAN PAINE, SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER, TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DIVISION; AND **Mr CRAIG TARBOTTON**, PROJECT MANAGER, PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND DESIGN DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY AND RESOURCES, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - Welcome, gentlemen. We will ask you to make a verbal submission to the committee, notwithstanding that we have the official witness submission. As you will recall from previous appearances, we will try to leave our questions until you have made your representation.

Mr PAINE - The Ferry Main Road project is an upgrade project, principally to address the queuing for the ferry at the end of the street. There have been a number of reports and strategic plans investigating into this area, the most recent one being the Ferry Road-Little Oyster Cove precinct plan. The issues that have been identified have been that the queue traffic interrupts the flow of traffic along Ferry Main Road, and also at peak times it has been known to extend out to the Channel Highway. It therefore interrupts the flow of traffic, creating safety hazards and generally interrupts the business of the street, residents' access and the like.

The project is centred around building a third lane along the northern side of the road, from just past the entrance to the Kettering Hotel down to the ferry terminal marshalling area. On the southern side of the road we are providing pedestrian facilities with a footpath that extends from the Channel Highway all the way down to the ferry terminal. We are providing a new roundabout just past the ferry terminal marshalling area to facilitate traffic turning around, because it is a one-way street. On the Channel Highway side we are building a new footpath that takes it from the intersection with Ferry Main Road across and along the Channel Highway up to the Kettering shopping centre so that there is extensive access there all the way through.

There are a number of residents and businesses along the road who are being consulted with quite extensively by DIER and our design engineers to try to address all their concerns. All those accesses have to be rebuilt because the road alignment changes in places and on the northern side where the new lane is built there are significant changes to the accesses there. There is going to be a need for retaining walls. As much as possible we have tried to reduce the number of accesses so there is more parking area in that queuing lane and less clearway area for the accesses. On the southern side, where most of the residents are, we have been working with residents to try to improve the amenity of the street in the process of upgrading the road. That is essentially the extent of the project.

PUBLIC

Mr BOOTH - I have a couple of questions about the process of creating a queuing lane, which is purely for access on the ferry. Is the ferry owned by DIER?

Mr PAINE - The terminal is owned by DIER, which is leased to the ferry owner who owns the ferry and operates it under contract with DIER.

Mr BOOTH - I know there are restrictions on where you can create a parking area but it does seem a bit odd to me that you would use public money to create a parking area for people waiting to get on to the ferry. You can call it a 'queuing lane' but it is also a parking area in a way.

Mr PAINE - DIER has a responsibility to maintain access to Bruny Island and that is why the contract for the ferry is with DIER. We oversee that side of it and maintain the road on either side. It is part of our responsibility to maintain that access and also to provide facilities for utilising the ferry and improving access to Bruny Island.

Mr BOOTH - Would that be the same philosophy if somebody's business grew beyond the size of their parking area? I know it's not a supermarket but I want it on the record why you would create a publicly-funded parking area that is a big, long car park. Clearly it has created traffic hazards and difficulties with access for other people, such as driveways and into private properties. Would it not have been more sensible to have created a bigger parking area?

Mr PAINE - DIER would not normally create parking areas for commercial operations.

Mr BOOTH - Just for clarity, that is exactly what I am saying. If it were a private operation, would you do the same thing?

Mr TARBOTTON - No, we would not. This queuing lane is not a parking area for the ferry operator. It might be perceived that way but that would be a misperception of what are trying to achieve. Under the current road alignment, there have been occasions where the traffic queuing up to go to Bruny Island and peak events has backed up to the Channel Highway causing very large disruptions to the local residents. What this project is attempting to do is to alleviate that pressure on the local residents. It is not to provide the ferry operator a parking lane.

Mr BOOTH - I think you could call it a parking area because people wait there for half an hour for a ferry to come in. I suppose they generally sit in their cars rather than leaving them and walking away. Is the queuing lane adequate to stop that problem of vehicles building right back up to the Channel Highway?

Mr TARBOTTON - No. The volume of traffic flowing down through there will increase over time. It may well during extreme events back-up to the Channel Highway again. However, the two remaining lanes are free to local traffic. We will simply move that blockage off the road -

Mr BOOTH - It will solve access apart from people trying to get through to the lane in driveways. If you are on the downhill side, the queuing lane would block you.

Mr TARBOTTON - No. They are not allowed to park there. Traffic management occurs.

PUBLIC

Mr BOOTH - No, you have the queuing lane going down to the ferry terminal. If somebody wanted to access one of those businesses, they'd drive down a driveway through that queuing lane, wouldn't they?

Mr TARBOTTON - Correct.

Mr BOOTH - How do you stop people on that queuing lane blocking those driveways?

Mr TARBOTTON - We have the ferry operator and they are licensed to conduct traffic management. Additionally, on peak events such as public holidays, DIER has, through its maintenance contract and arrangement with an authorised traffic management company to provide excess traffic management. To prevent those accesses being blocked off, that comes under the traffic management. There will be personnel, ferry operators and additional staff provided by this third-party contractor to be sure that does not happen.

Mr BOOTH - On a public road?

Mr TARBOTTON - On a queuing lane, yes.

Mr BROOKS - The photo that you have included on page 5 indicates traffic management in place and a lot of backed-up traffic and vehicles travelling on the wrong side of the road. Is that a rare occasion or does that happen quite often?

Mr PAINE - Yes, it is a rare occasion. It is six or eight times a year during those peak times when people go over at Easter, for example, or show day long weekend, or over the Christmas period.

Mr BROOKS - I understand that you have included it in here but under existing conditions. It makes out that it happens all the time.

Mr TARBOTTON - It is regular in a sense that we can anticipate it for each of the peak events at Christmas, Easter, show day, Australia Day - any time when there is large traffic movement across to Bruny Island. They are rare in the sense they only occur a number of times per year but they are regular because they occur yearly.

Mr PAINE - It is a growing area in terms of the marina and the like, so there is also a lot of pressure there to provide some parking for general visitors to the area who want to enjoy the foreshore, or come down to do some kayaking or whatever. That is addressed in this proposal as well. When we are in those off-peak times that queuing lane will be available for the public parking.

Mr BROOKS - Whilst we were walking along this morning, we saw that truck attempting to reverse into that unsealed section. What impact, either improvements or negative impacts, will this development have on the access as we saw it today?

Mr PAINE - The intention is to reconstruct accesses to the same standard they are now so in terms of that truck we saw today, it will not be any better for him to get down there because principally those accesses were established for normal vehicles - cars and stuff.

PUBLIC

We will be reinstating those accesses so that they have got the same level of access as now. We will be improving them to the extent we will provide some bitumen back down those driveways to increase the safety. When they go to leave those accesses they will have proper traction and will not just spin on the gravel at that point and they will be able to join the traffic.

Mr BROOKS - To follow on from what Mr Booth said because I think it was an interesting point. If you have got the traffic backed up to the main road, it said six to eight times a year, how are you going to manage access to those side roads - or side access, I should say?

Mr PAINE - They will all be designated clearways so they will not be allowed to park there. By reducing the number of accesses, bringing them together, we are reducing the number of those potential clearways. So we are providing a bit of extra parking capacity there than just the people parking at home and up whole extent of the road. As we say, there will be active traffic management through the day to make sure those clearways are kept clear.

Mr BOOTH - What are the forward projections then, if you say there is increasing demand on that road through extra use of the marinas? There has been quite an expansion of them. What is your projected data?

Mr TARBOTTON - From a number of reports, we know for this area it is projected that 2.7 per cent per annum is the increase in the volume of traffic.

Mr BOOTH - At the moment there is not enough parking on that queuing lane six times a year to prevent traffic building up and spilling out onto the Channel Highway. Is that a fair statement?

Mr TARBOTTON - No.

Mr PAINE - The spilling out on the Channel Highway has only happened on very rare occasions. The blocking of that current lane is a regular event in terms of those happening virtually every time there are those peak periods at Easter and the like. But the traffic extending out to the Channel Highway I believe has only ever happened two or three times.

Mr BOOTH - There is no doubt it causes congestion - there were vehicles queuing up for the ferry but I am concerned about a couple of things. One is the use of a road as a car park and secondly, whether that was going to be adequate anyway in the long term. It might be geographically impossible to find a car park big enough for those vehicles to be there but it does seem a bit odd to use the street, particularly an area that has a lot of scenic beauty - there are a lot of people walking up and down there. The residential amenity is affected quite grossly by it, I would suggest. Have you got an overall long term strategic plan there to cater for growing traffic if it does get to the point that cars queue out onto the Channel Highway? Or don't you think that is going to be a problem?

Mr PAINE - I am not aware of any further studies that have been done or suggested recommendations in terms of dealing with the long-term future. We are just dealing with this project as it stands. There are a couple of issues around that in that. An alternative

PUBLIC

may be to put another ferry on. Then if you are running more regular services, you are not having such a huge delay. So that would be looked at too at some point when the queuing became unmanageable, I suggest. So, just providing a car park and making people queue longer is not necessarily a long term solution. However, there are no studies I am aware of that have looked at what we might do.

Mr BOOTH - You do not really know what the projected future load will be?

Mr PAINE - Only along those forecasts that Craig was talking about.

Mr BOOTH - The 2.5 per cent a year.

Mr TARBOTTON - From 1 to 2.7 per cent per annum. This design was not the first option; our design consultants were not the first to undertake this activity. There have been a number of design exercises in the past five years and within them, other alternatives have been considered. However, the restriction of publicly-owned land in that area is a constraint. The largest portion of land is privately-owned land at the moment. So for us this option which utilises crown land on the road reserve is the most cost-effective and efficient as far as the current demand goes.

Mr BOOTH - Are you aware if there is community support for a different alternative? Were there other alternatives that were more popular or more expensive in that they would require acquisition?

Mr TARBOTTON - The consultation process with the landowners extends back well over one-and-a-half years. During that period, to my knowledge, no adjacent property owner affected by this work - not the broader community - nobody from that segment has expressed a preference for an alternative.

Mr BOOTH - But they are adjoining landowners. If it were a fresh canvas and you had the choice of a range of different solutions for the traffic problems you have, is this the highest and best proposal in solving the problem or is it just because it is free land and it's the cheapest?

Mr PAINE - No, there was quite an extensive process we went through, which included the Kingborough Council and the community with the Ferry Main Road-Little Oyster Cove precinct study. That investigated a number of options, including acquiring some extra land next to the marshalling area to keep the queued traffic contained closer to the ferry and also investigating the potential to run additional ferries during those peak periods. That process happened over a number of years and this was the one that was put forward as being the most accepted and the best option.

Mr BOOTH - How many vehicles will that queuing area hold?

Mr PAINE - Approximately 70 vehicles.

Mr TARBOTTON - The queuing lane or the marshalling area?

Mr BOOTH - The queuing lane. How big would you need to make a car park that would hold 70 vehicles?

PUBLIC

Mr PAINE - It more than doubles the current marshalling area that is there.

Mr BOOTH - You're saying there's no suitable land that would be available to create a big enough car park so you didn't need to turn the street into a queuing area?

Mr PAINE - Without having to acquire a lot of land off existing businesses and effectively reduce the whole marina area.

Mr BOOTH - As to the traffic marshals, will the ferry operator be responsible for employing people to control traffic?

Mr TARBOTTON - There are two arrangements. The proprietor of the ferry is licensed to conduct traffic management within that current marshalling area - that is on a regular basis.

Mr BOOTH - The current marshalling area would be generally on their leasehold, would it?

Mr TARBOTTON - That's correct.

Mr BOOTH - I know it becomes a public street because it has access just like any other car park, but this is specifically the road we are talking about here and you're putting private traffic marshals there?

Mr PAINE - No, we will be using our maintenance contractors to put in place the traffic management when they are in the queuing lane.

Mr BOOTH - So they won't be the responsibility of the operator; they will be DIER employees on traffic management, will they?

Mr PAINE - That's right; that is currently what happens during those peak periods anyway. They have to be DIER employees to have the authority to control traffic on the road.

Mr BOOTH - They will be there with the lollypop stick?

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - I want to talk about some of the feedback we have had on this. One was again today about the application of a boardwalk. Something I find interesting is that you mentioned in your evidence a few minutes ago that you've had discussions and engagement with the council over this project. Did you have a discussion with the council about the inclusion of an improved boardwalk and pedestrian access?

Mr PAINE - Not as part of this project. It may have been part of initial discussions about what the solution was to this area, but I am not aware of those discussions. As part of this project DIER is responsible for the road, so our responsibility became dealing with the road environment. The foreshore would be a council responsibility and that would be something they would have to address.

PUBLIC

Mr BROOKS - But you have engaged with the council on this project because there are crossover issues?

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - Surely, it would be reasonable to at least discuss the project and see if there are some additional opportunities to increase pedestrian access along there? The thing I find interesting is the lack of open dialogue between government agencies, local and state, to get a better outcome for a whole project; I find it puzzling. Here we see a possibility of developing with this project better visitor access for potential growth in the tourism market for that region. But we are not considering what other opportunities we can add value with because 'that is not our problem' or 'that is not our department' - when you have already spoken to the council anyway.

Mr PAINE - We have no authority in that area. It is not something we could initiate or take any lead on. If council took some lead on it and there were areas that integrated with DIER's existing facilities or works, then I would imagine we would consider it and work with them on it. We have extensive discussion with them on this. There is a development application in the council at the moment for this project, so there is an opportunity for council to comment again there with a planning permit or whatever they like. Foreshore work is well outside any of DIER's responsibilities or authority. It is not something we could consider taking the initiative on.

Mr BROOKS - I want to talk about the new footpath. Is that your responsibility or is that the council's responsibility?

Mr PAINE - It will become council's responsibility when it is built. All the infrastructure outside of the pavement becomes council's responsibility to maintain, but we are building it.

Mr BROOKS - The state is building it?

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - Then it will get handed over to the council - but you did not have a discussion about whether that was the best option or not?

Mr PAINE - We did have a discussion with council about providing pedestrian access along Ferry Main Road. This was the only solution that DIER could offer that is within DIER's authority and responsibility. That is what we offered and the council accepted that it is what we should do. In terms of the foreshore work, that is just a foreshore walk. I think that is a separate issue. I agree that they might achieve the same end but in different ways.

Mr TARBOTTON - What Adrian is trying to say is the function of that footpath, whilst it may seem the same as a boardwalk - pedestrian access - is not the same. The footpath on the high side is for the residents. They still need to have access down that road corridor safely. A boardwalk which is isolated from the road corridor by tens of metres becomes more of an independent access - not for pedestrians so much, but more for tourists looking at the scenery. They are people who are simply there for a different function, not

PUBLIC

to get from point A to point B. From that point of view, DIER cannot involve itself in these activities or assets which are not directly associated with the safety of a road corridor.

Mr BROOKS - The intention of it though, from my understanding, is to increase visitor access to the area and make it safer and easier for the future to facilitate residents of the area. It's also to enhance the opportunities for people to visit and to travel to Bruny Island and go on the ferry. I am not saying this is your fault. I tend to think it is a lack of leadership from the government for not thinking about this stuff before they put these projects together. They do not look at how to get economies of scale and the cost of projects more in line to get a better outcome across government agencies. We have seen examples numerous times on this committee since I have been on it for the three years where they have failed to engage properly across government levels to get a better outcome overall. This is another example where we are seeing the response that 'it is not our problem; it is not our jurisdiction; we are going to deal with this because we only look after our little blocks'.

This is not your fault; I understand that. But to me, we have lost an opportunity where we could have enhanced that for a lot less cost than if there is a boardwalk put in later on. We are going to have to bring the bulldozers back or bring back heavy equipment or contractors and fencing and all those things and do it again anyway.

[12.15 p.m.]

Mr BOOTH - Are there any other examples you can think of where a private development has had this amount of money spent on it to provide car parking?

Mr TARBOTTON - The Bruny Island ferry is a privately-owned business.

Mr BOOTH - Correct.

Mr TARBOTTON - However it is providing a public function. It is an isolated island and the state government has to provide vehicle access to that island.

Mr BOOTH - The supermarket provides food for people too, as they have to eat, do you know what I mean? The point is that it is a private development. I am interested in the concept of using public money to create a 800-metre-long parking area.

Mr TARBOTTON - The government has outsourced to a ferry operator in an area where we do not have that expertise. It is often carried out by some broad sectors of the government where we outsource. This is an example of outsourcing to the ferry operator who is going to provide that transport service. It is really not a car parking area; it is to alleviate traffic pressure on a public road and by doing that improve the safety and usage of that road corridor.

Mr BOOTH - If we had any other business in Tasmania whose business grew to the point that it was creating a traffic problem, would you not require them to put in adequate car parking to deal with it, or would you just make a car park?

PUBLIC

Mr PAINE - No, they would be required to deal with it but I do think this is a different circumstance than what you would consider a shopping centre or other sort of commercial operator business. It is a commercial operation but on behalf of the state. It is still the state government's responsibility to provide access to Bruny Island and they deliver it through a ferry and a contract with that ferry operator. This is part of that extension of our obligations to deliver proper functional access to Bruny Island.

Mr BOOTH - That is the point I am making. I am not sure whether it is being assessed in the same way that any other development would be because it is the crown. I am not sure that this is delivering the best project for Ferry Road. I am trying to understand whether that is the case. It seems to me there is an inconsistency in terms of the approach to the problem because as I have said in all other cases I can think of, where there is a problem you would fix it at the point of the problem - like have adequate car parking. You have not provided evidence that that is not possible. I am not saying that it is possible but you have not provided evidence that it isn't.

Mr TARBOTTON - We are getting into an area where it is perhaps outside the realms of project managers to provide a response. However, there are many solutions to this issue. Adrian mentioned before that additional ferries would resolve it and we would not need a marshalling area or queuing lanes. But the cost to the state government of providing larger ferry ramps, additional boats or the cost of actually subcontracting out to a private operator -

Mr BOOTH - Sorry to cut you off there but you are saying you would have to provide a second ferry mooring?

Mr TARBOTTON - We have not looked into that but it is possible you might be able to use the same ramping arrangement as it currently is. You might need to increase that width. You may not need a queuing lane but these sort of cost-benefit analyses are more at the strategic, if you like - a much higher level than what Adrian and I are currently involved in whereas DIER. We have an issue that has been addressed by many previous design studies that have indicated there is an issue of traffic that is bottlenecking and causing a hazard to the users of the local road. This was to try to get a solution to that issue.

Mr BOOTH - Setting aside the obvious need to do something about the road and making sure that the local amenity is not affected, are you saying that simply increasing the number of sailings would actually negate the need to have this queuing lane?

Mr PAINE - Yes, it would be one possible solution. You would only be doing it during those peak periods.

Mr BOOTH - Would that just be increasing the frequency of the same boat sailings, or putting in a second ferry?

Mr PAINE - It would depend on the boat. We have not looked at that in any detail, so it may be possible to get another boat that travels more quickly between destinations or it may require two boats. I wouldn't know; we haven't looked at that particular option. It was looked at in previous studies of what the best way was to deal with the peak demand that comes to the ferry terminal for people crossing to Bruny Island.

PUBLIC

Mr BOOTH - How many times a year would this queuing along Ferry Main Road be a problem for the residents? Is it every time the boat sails? Does the queuing out onto Ferry Main Road beyond the marshalling area or carparking area only occur eight times a year or is it every week or every day?

Mr TARBOTTON - No, it's only on the peak events when large public holidays occur.

Mr BOOTH - How many times would that be?

Mr PAINE - Christmas, Easter, the lead-up to school holidays.

Mr BOOTH - So if it was possible to get the boat to do an extra journey rather than the advertised times -

Mr PAINE - They do extra journeys during those peak periods to clear the traffic, but it's more managing the traffic when it gets to the ferry. You get rushes and then quiet periods, so they run extra trips backwards and forwards during those peak times to clear the traffic. They have been known to run until 10 o'clock at night, but that then becomes a management issue with their staffing - getting new shift workers on the next day, et cetera.

Mr TARBOTTON - As an example of that, during the highest peak period - perhaps Christmas - the ferry doesn't abide by a schedule. It simply goes backwards and forwards, and the constraint is the distance it travels and the speed it is allowed to travel at. At Christmas there was three hours of backing up on the Bruny side and the ferry was going back constantly. It wasn't a matter of getting the ferry to do more trips in that instance, it was an issue of needing an additional ferry to take the volume of traffic.

Mr BOOTH - So this isn't going to assist that at all in that sense; it will just mean that people will be sitting on the side of the road in parked cars rather than in the car park?

Mr PAINE - It will help assist traffic flow more quickly to and from the ferry coming from Bruny down the Channel. At the moment we have a blockage; so if they have blocked up the left-hand lane and someone is overtaking a local resident and there is traffic coming from Bruny then we have issue. It will alleviate that.

Mr TARBOTTON - It also provides a parking opportunity for those off-peak periods for people who are going down there for recreational reasons. It addresses two issues, where putting an extra ferry on would only address one.

Mr BOOTH - You're suggesting the queuing lane would become a permanent parking area when it wasn't a peak time?

Mr PAINE - Correct.

Mr BOOTH - How would you detail that? Do you know when the peak times are?

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - Will they be signed 'Parking any other time but' or whatever?

PUBLIC

Mr PAINE - No, there will be fold-over signs. When it is to be a clearway for queued traffic only, those signs will be opened up to make that a no-parking area, except for queued traffic.

Mr BOOTH - What about if somebody has parked there and gone off on their boat for a couple of hours and you come along and unfold the sign?

Mr PAINE - That will have to be carefully managed and during those peak times we will have to make sure traffic management staff get down there early in the morning to make sure they have identified that as a queuing lane before we have people down there filling up the queued lane - before daybreak, say.

Mr BOOTH - What about people who might go overnight on a boat, would they be able to park their car there and go off on a boat?

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - So they get on the boat one afternoon; there's no unfolded sign; they go down the Channel and the next morning you unfold the sign.

Mr TARBOTTON - That's a valid question and we would need to talk to our designers about that issue. The folding signs are only effective when there is a traffic marshal there. You are right about how to prevent the innocent pedestrian parking their car there.

Mr BOOTH - The innocent person could not possibly know when there's going to be a problem and when they need to restrict the queuing lane to only vehicles that are queuing.

Mr TARBOTTON - We could put permanent signs up saying that vehicles with trailers are not allowed - that is often used to prevent that occurring. We will address that.

CHAIR - While we're on the matter of parking, can I suggest we park this for a moment and have Mr Hay come to the table because he has been here longer than he anticipated given our delayed start because of our time spent at the site. Mr Hay, if you would not mind coming and taking a seat and we will swear you in and then we will hear your evidence.

PUBLIC

Mr PICTON HAY, CHAIR, KETTERING COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC., WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Mr Hay, we have your submission with the sketch attached and we have familiarised ourselves with that. We would invite you to speak to that and then, if you have the time, to remain; it may raise questions which we want to put to the department. You are welcome to stay and listen to those questions and answers. For the moment, if you would like to speak to your submission; we would appreciate that.

Mr HAY - Thank you, Mr Chairman. The items mentioned there, are the embankment, the drainage and also power poles. Probably the most important thing relates to the drainage and embankment. You people were down there this morning. If you walk down there, the result of the works that are planned will be exactly as they are now after a couple of years. Unless the embankments are properly protected and prepared and particularly made less steep, they will just become a wilderness. All the residents are getting very concerned about that.

It has been 50 years since that road was changed. The only change in the last 50 years is that there has been a white line painted down the middle. This is a one-off opportunity to improve that and particularly with the numbers of people who are there now, I think it is essential. It is one of the busiest tourist hubs in Tasmania. If 157 000 cars go over during the year, then they have to come back. That relates to about 400 000 people travelling backwards and forwards. You double those figures to give an idea of the amount of traffic there.

Doing this roadworks now provides a perfect opportunity to do it properly rather than just a single road-minded thing. There should be a proper drainage there. The sewerage problem will go on for years because it will be years before Kettering gets any proper sewerage. All the sewerage on the high land comes through, no matter what the system is. Unless there is proper drainage on the southern side of the road, it will remain as it is, no matter what.

The other point about the electricity is that Aurora are not all that happy about trying to go underground with it. But I think that is something that should happen because the roads are being dug up. At least the provision to put the power underground should occur at this stage. The cost of moving the poles themselves would be quite excessive and taking that off the cost of undergrounding it would be a much better proposition. It would do a complete and proper job on that road.

Also on the north side of the road, there is no provision for people alighting out of cars that are parked there. It is a very steep bank. The verge, from what I see on the plan, is too narrow for somebody to safely alight from their motor car without the danger of going down the bank. I think DIER should address that problem and put at least an area where it is safe to alight from your motor car.

There was a lot of question previously concerning the parking. Mr Booth, I think it should work the way it is. The actual queuing of cars on that side is quite constant. It does not always go to the highway but it is constantly blocked on the left-hand side, halfway up or more. Of a morning, afternoon, or any time it can be blocked well up,

PUBLIC

which means resident or anybody or anybody else who wanted to go down has to drive on the wrong side of the road. As far as having a parking lane, for most streets that you are in, you can park a car. At the moment, you cannot park your car safely on the sides of the road. That third lane will have great benefit to everybody, particularly to the ferry queues and residents will now have two-way traffic. The community is quite happy about the way the road is being done, but we want it to be a finished job and not a job where the road signs aren't finished and it remains the way it is now.

Mr BROOKS - We walked along that road and there were some vehicle movements while we were there and we ended up in the gutter. I understand this project puts some management around that with a footpath on the high side. I am interested in your concerns around erosion over a period back into that drainage system with potential blockage, and also the failure to provide a some sort of more permanent retaining structure to stop that. Can you go through what you meant by that and what you think should happen?

Mr HAY - What I think should happen is a proper concrete drain on that side.

Mr BROOKS - We're talking about the high side.

Mr HAY - Yes, a retaining wall along there with agricultural drains to take the seepage into a pipe drain so all the effluent and everything else that comes down there can be removed in one go.

Mr BOOTH - You don't want that spoon drain, in other words.

Mr HAY - No, it will be just like it is now and everything will lie in it; the weeds will grow in it. DIER might plant some beautiful stuff there but it will end up a mess, as it is now.

Mr BROOKS - On the opposite side, you mentioned there is a limit for people parking -

Mr HAY - From what I can see from the plan it is very limited.

Mr BROOKS - One area is the lack of access. It can be quite dangerous getting out of vehicles, especially if you're living with some sort of disability or have limited mobility access. When we go back to questioning the DIER experts, it would be interesting to see what their take is on that and where they go from there. You consider it to be a risk and an issue?

Mr HAY - It would be a risk, as I see it, unless there is provision for adequate level space where people can get out of their cars because people will be staying there and getting out of their cars.

Mr BOOTH - On the issue of people safely being able to use that area to get in and out of their car, it seems there are conflict views. DIER evidence is that it is a queuing lane, which is obviously not a parking area. We have now had evidence there could be a problem with people parking there. Once someone is parking there, it cannot be used as a queuing lane any more. People who are further up the street won't know - they're sitting there for half an hour because somebody has blocked the lane. There is a real issue with the what the purpose of that lane is. If the purpose is for parking, it is not

PUBLIC

going to work as a queuing lane. If its purpose is for a queuing lane, it's not going to work as a parking area. I am interested in your view as to whether, given the evidence we now have that it won't work as a car park, you could still have the lanes. I understand you need to fix the road, but is it appropriate to use the road as a queuing lane, which means you can't use it as a car park? Would it be better to have a bigger car park at the ferry terminal and is that possible, in your view?

Mr HAY - I probably should have used 'people queuing' rather than 'people parking'. Not all that much parking would occur along there in normal times, but people queuing for the ferry often wait for an hour. They don't sit in their car, they wander about the road. It is like trying to drive through a mob of sheep getting down there. The situation is of people queuing rather than just parking there normally. The other thing of making more space at the ferry terminal - that would be most unlikely.

Mr BOOTH - I do not live there and I only got a casual view of it so I am really interested. If you say from your association's point of view, which represents the community, that there is no other practical alternative, then that is what I am interested in if that is the case.

Mr HAY - Yes, you would have to fill in great areas and it would just ruin the whole area anyway. I live just above the ferry terminal so I have got a pretty good idea of what goes on down there.

Mr BROOKS - Whilst we are on the road design and the zones off-road. In the absence of our resident cyclist, Mr Hall, are there many cyclists that go down there and go on the ferry or is it more that they will drive and take their bikes with them. I did see a car come off with a couple of bikes on it.

Mr HAY - Yes, mostly it is bikes on cars or they get carried over. Very few people ride down and go on the ferry.

Mr BROOKS - I wanted to go into the electrical power but we are changing the subject, chair. Is that all right?

CHAIR - That is fine if there are no more questions on that line.

Mr BROOKS - Not at this moment. One of the things you have represented in your submission is either making the power supply an underground supply or at least putting in provision for the power supply to be underground. That was raised by our site visit and was discussed out there. I will put it on the record that there was nothing trying to be hidden. The response I was given when asked, 'Why don't they just do that?' was, 'the cost or the expense'. My understanding is that Aurora has indicated it would be over a million dollars. I am not saying the people who told me that were inaccurate or not but I would be surprised. It seems a lot of money for 800 metres. How strong is the community behind getting that other -

Mr HAY - Very strongly. It could be offset against the cost of moving the poles, anyway.

Mr BROOKS - Have you got any response from Aurora on that?

PUBLIC

Mr HAY - No.

Mr BROOKS - Have you made representations to Aurora about it?

Mr HAY - Yes, mostly through council - Kingsborough Council.

Mr BROOKS - But Aurora has not responded to you directly?

Mr HAY - Not directly, no.

Mr BROOKS - Obviously you fed this into DIER as part of their community consultation around this project?

Mr HAY - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - What was their response?

Mr HAY - Not interested - not their business.

Mr BROOKS - Again this is not directed at the individuals at the table but to me it is part of an ongoing problem with these projects - we do not look at a holistic cross-department or cross-group solution when we could fix some of this for a lot less cost than coming back in 10 years time and doing it anyway.

Mr BOOTH - Can I ask about the footpath issue that you were concerned about? It has been mentioned with regard to the boardwalk. It is apparently the council's responsibility. Is it your view, representing your community group, that the design as it is with a footpath on the high side is the best solution if you cannot have a footpath on both sides? Or would it be better in your view to not have the footpath on the high side, if you could only have one, and have the boardwalk instead as a footpath and get foot traffic right off the road? Do you have a view on that?

Mr HAY - Yes, I have quite a strong view. There should be a footpath on the road. The optimistic view would be to have a boardwalk as well. There are some there that would prefer the boardwalk but the vast majority want a footpath on the road, along that side of the road.

Mr BOOTH - On the high side.

Mr HAY - Yes because that is where most of the driveways are. That is where most people come out. They do not want to have to cross the road to get to a footpath on the northern side; they want it to be on the southern side.

Mr BOOTH - Without it being a perfect world, you think that that is actually the best siting for the footpath.

Mr HAY - The majority certainly believe that and DIER provided it.

Mr BOOTH - Yes. The consultation has been quite extensive; it is just that you do not have everything you want.

PUBLIC

Mr HAY - About 15 years.

Mr BROOKS - We did see one car go past with a sticker on it which said, 'Fix Ferry Road'. You're generally in support of the project; it is just that there are some flaws in either their approach or the design, or you think there could be certain improvements in the outcome without a huge added cost.

Mr HAY - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - In regard to the leaking septic tanks flooding into that drain, is there any project that you are aware of to put sewerage into Kettering?

Mr HAY - DIER did put sewerage in for the ferry terminal and the hotel. That is now, I am pleased to say, working. It did not work for the first year but it is now working. It has the capacity to service more than the number of homes in Ferry Road.

Mr BOOTH - Where is that sewerage system?

Mr HAY - The sewerage system is in the valley behind the hotel.

Mr BOOTH - Was the old one that was the hotel's?

Mr HAY - No. There is a brand new system there. That is servicing the hotel and the inquiry centre at the marina down there only.

Mr BROOKS - Is that the one we saw near the highway in the gully?

Mr TARBOTTON - Correct.

Mr BROOKS - That is working now, you were saying?

Mr HAY - Yes. But to make it work we had to reduce the size or the capacity. Perhaps DIER might answer that. It was way out of capacity and it did not work. It has now been reduced. You blokes can tell us how that was done but it was reduced.

Mr BROOKS - Is that like an enviro-tank?

Mr - Yes.

Mr HAY - I am sure that has the capacity to service the whole of Ferry Road if it was hooked onto it.

CHAIR - Mr Hay, I go to the matter of the flattened bank that your sketch indicates with the hydromulch and the planted swale and we will come to the DIER representatives in a moment. I did a quick grab of what they are proposing for the embankment down into what I will call a table drain, which they are proposing. The steep part of that, if they do their batters as indicated, will only be about 30 degrees. That is a reasonably flat slope that they are proposing as the inlet side to their table drain. You have suggested on your sketch a 1.2 metre wide strip with new shrubs and flax planting to stabilise the bank and

PUBLIC

form there, coming down into the hydromulch with some grasses. Do you know what slope your sketch suggests?

Mr HAY - I presume it will vary depending on the height of the bank down the road. That is just one section. It is not my sketch; it was one from the department and that would vary because some parts will be much higher than that and some parts will as low or may be lower. It varies as it goes down.

CHAIR - Yes, it depends how far back it is taken as to how flat it is.

Mr HAY - Yes, that is right. But the main reason for trying to get it more level is so that it can be maintained in a reasonable manner. If it is level enough, residents will look after it.

CHAIR - I am familiar with what the council was proposing many years ago. It seems to have not gone any further than the excitement the council generated in the community at the time with a fair commitment by the council to do something. I will make my own inquiries as to why that hasn't progressed. I suspect it has a fair bit to do with cost. From your community association's point of view, are you aware why the council has not progressed that?

Mr HAY - Presumably it is cost, but it has ebbed and flowed over a number of years. In conjunction with the roadway, the majority of people think of it as being on the wish list. After the roadway is done, there will probably be a bigger push to get the full plan.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Mr Hay. You're welcome to say, if you wish.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr ADRIAN PAINE AND Mr CRAIG TARBOTTON WERE RECALLED.

Mr PAINE - Chair, can I make a comment about clarification of the information Picton has provided? This is an early landscaping plan developed by DIER, which we shared with council. We have subsequently done some more extensive landscape plans in consultation with council. That is a very broad outline of some of the ideas we were anticipating at the time, but it's not the final landscape plan. The final landscape plans are with council and are out on show with the development application. Picton could have a look at those if he wants to.

Mr BOOTH - Where does this piece of road fit in the hierarchy of your scaling the road up to a higher priority, based on traffic flows?

Mr PAINE - This is a relatively minor rural road in our category. It has quite high traffic volumes but only during those peak periods.

Mr BOOTH - Can you explain that criterion? You have spoken about that before at hearings, where there is a traffic count put down to determine numbers. If no-one travels on a road, you're not going to make it a superhighway, but there is a traffic volume criterion that you use, isn't there?

Mr PAINE - There is, and it varies. It's not just in terms of the traffic numbers; it depends on the freight load of the vehicles, et cetera. We have a hierarchy of categories of roads up to the main freight routes such as the Midland Highway. This one would be basically at the lower end of that. It's a fairly small, minor road. There would be other similar roads that would carry less volumes that we still maintain. What we are addressing in this project is not influenced by the traffic volumes so much as it is with the other issues we want to address here, such as queuing traffic congestion and pedestrians and the like. In considering how we deal with this road, there hasn't been any particular criterion built into this project - that is, in relation to its category.

Mr BOOTH - So there are a lot of vehicles and you have issues with congestion, but there's nothing that triggers some automatic assessment?

Mr PAINE - No, because likewise it is a very low speed range, 40 kph road.

Mr BROOKS - Previously in evidence you said you weren't aware of any strategic plan for the future. Mr Hay indicated around 157 000 vehicles travel there annually, so do you think that will increase significantly or grow over the short to medium time? Have you done any modelling at all on that?

Mr TARBOTTON - The studies show and not just by this design consultant but they are basing their information on previous studies that indicate that between one to two per cent per annum over the last ten years; over the last ten years the traffic volume has increased between those two percentages. Based on that, it is going to continue to increase - yes.

Mr BROOKS - Do you think with this improvement that projection will increase even further or not?

PUBLIC

Mr TARBOTTON - No I do not think this improvement is going to increase the flow. It might have a spin-off effect if it becomes easier. I know queuing for three hours does deter certain people so if people hear that the queuing is no longer an issue, if that restriction is no longer there, then perhaps yes other people will travel to Bruny Island. But just the inclusion of a queuing lane is not going to drastically increase the flow.

Mr BROOKS - I understand that. Obviously though, the more accessible and the easier access it is to the island, the more publicity there is around that. You would think that would be an attribute rather than a negative so it should theoretically help the development or the increase in access and visitor numbers.

Mr TARBOTTON - As to whether that additional traffic volume -

Mr BROOKS - We are not talking about huge amounts though, I assume.

Mr TARBOTTON - We have not studied that.

Mr BROOKS - But you do not think it would.

Mr TARBOTTON - No, I cannot say that. What I can say is that I believe there may be a spin-off effect, if you like, a minor effect where accessibility improves -

Mr PAINE - As a general rule, you would expect there to be some development. You know traffic volumes increase because there is somewhere for someone to go if it is a new attraction, or if there is an extensive residential development but there is nothing that has been indicated to us that is about to happen on Bruny Island to increase people's attraction.

Mr BOOTH - Queuing lanes have not been a great economic driver; they have created traffic problems.

Laughter.

Mr TARBOTTON - It might just be that.

Mr PAINE - We have not got extensive experience in queuing lanes, so we have to reserve our judgement.

Mr BROOKS - Obviously, you would have projections on what you think the numbers will do and the question was really around whether you have taken that into account in the design of this.

Mr PAINE - It is based upon our historical records.

Mr BROOKS - I would like to ask about the road design. Based again on the evidence given by Mr Hay around the access of people getting out of their vehicles, what is your response to that evidence?

PUBLIC

Mr TARBOTTON - We do not have page numbers but inside your report you will find a sketch.

Mr BROOKS - The first picture.

Mr TARBOTTON - It shows three cross-sections of the road. Mr Hay probably did not have access to this because these are design drawings. If you look at that, you can see that the high side on the right hand side of the drawings we have this V-shaped drain or table drain. That is the high side, the residential side. On the left hand side of those cross-sections, we have three scenarios. It is unfortunate that Mr Hay is not here but we have a shoulder or a verge that is unsealed. It is not sealed, it will be gravel.

Mr BOOTH - There is a kerb there as well?

Mr TARBOTTON - There is a kerb and gutter to catch the stormwater.

Mr BROOKS - On some aspects?

Mr TARBOTTON - You are right.

Mr BROOKS - On the bottom picture - it does not indicate any kerb and gutter on that one.

Mr PAINE - That is down the bottom end near the roundabout where those eight trees are. There is no kerb and gutter down there because we are not doing any works near that spot.

Mr TARBOTTON - For alighting from a vehicle safely, we have, where possible - and these are typical cross-sections, not -

Mr BOOTH - Every -

Mr TARBOTTON - No, correct. Where we can, because we are constrained by property leases and property boundaries, we have provided a verge, if you like. It is not a shoulder; it is not trafficable by vehicles; it is raised above the gutter line so it is a verge where people can walk and can alight from vehicles. That is on the inland side, the passenger side of the vehicle.

Mr PAINE - You will also note in that middle one that there is guard rail shown where we have got it to protect people falling over the -

Mr BROOKS - I was going to ask about the top section where you have got what looks like a 1 by 1.5 gradient.

Mr TARBOTTON - Correct.

Mr BROOKS - Is that within the standard of slopes that does not require a guard rail or some sort of railing or support?

Mr TARBOTTON - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - Do you know what the standard is?

PUBLIC

Mr TARBOTTON - Wherever there is a slope, it is based on vertical fall. So for pedestrian safety, it is vertical fall. If it was more than a metre of vertical fall, we would be required to put a balustrade but a batter is not a vertical fall. The theory behind a batter is that if you do slip, it is a single fall event.

So a one in five may not easily be traversable - you are not going to go and play football on it - but it is not a hazard to pedestrians.

Mr BROOKS - There is a one metre gap between the gutter and then the down slope.

Mr TARBOTTON - It varies but, yes, correct.

Mr BROOKS - Would it get less than a metre in some areas?

Mr TARBOTTON - I imagine it would. It would not get much less than a metre but, yes, it would. It also increases beyond a metre.

Mr BROOKS - Yes. Mr Hay did raise a valid point about people who do not have the mobility that others have. If you are hopping out of your vehicle, you have probably 300 to 400 millimetres to the gutter, then you have the gutter. If it is less than a metre before the slope down, it is not a huge amount of room with the risk of tripping and sliding down that slope.

I think a metre would be close to what you would expect to be a reasonable amount of space but less than that could certainly increase the risk to people in that position. I suppose, in the design phase, surely it would be easy to at least look at what space we have and what gap we have.

Mr PAINE - We will do that. The reason for showing these typical diagrams is that that is what we will be trying to achieve.

Mr BOOTH - But to make it clear, that is intended to be a footpath or a walkway along the side; so it is really for just trying to get out of the car.

Mr PAINE - It is room to open your car and get out comfortably and save space.

Mr BOOTH - It is unsealed; I understand that.

Mr BOOTH - Looking at those drawings, I want to ask you about the open stormwater drain which the footpath is constructed over - it appears that that is the case from the drawings - does that mean that there will be a spoon drain further out?

Mr PAINE - Yes, what the footpath is over the top of, that line underneath is the existing profile of the ground - that is why it is a dotted line. That is the existing spoon drain but that would obviously be filled in with the subsurface drain going in and the footpath on top and the new table drain - spoon drain - is built beside the footpath there.

Mr BOOTH - So the information on page 4 about where it states:

PUBLIC

to keep the concept of the project, construct a footpath along Ferry Road at road level over the open stormwater drain.

Mr PAINE - That is right; it is going over the existing stormwater drain but the existing stormwater drain will be filled in for the footpath to go on top and a new stormwater drain built.

Mr BOOTH - So there will not be a drain underneath.

Mr PAINE - Correct, except that subsurface drain we are showing there.

Mr BOOTH - So that new spoon drain that is shown is shifted back to the new stormwater drain.

Mr TARBOTTON - Correct.

Mr BOOTH - Is that constructed in a way that there is no danger, if there was a torrential flooding or anything like that, for kids to get sucked along or anything like that? Is that a danger or is that not an issue?

Mr TARBOTTON - There is no danger in these open drains which are grass-lined. There is no danger to the flow of water through that. It is not sufficient to drag a child or any other thing.

Mr BOOTH - I have certain interest in that because it appeared from the information that it was constructed over the footpath sitting on top of some sort of open drain.

Mr TARBOTTON - Unfortunately, that was a typing error.

Mr BROOKS - On that, Mr Hay indicated that he thinks it is more dangerous, or is not the best option. His contribution suggested that there should be a gutter-type installation. What are your thoughts on that suggestion?

Mr PAINE - As I said earlier, once we build the footpath, that drain becomes council's responsibility. So we have been consulting with council as to what they would like there and what is achievable. We have also been consulting with the individual landowners to make sure we create a frontage that is acceptable for them, too. With both those criteria, that's what we have tried to address, so there are different solutions at each point along the road.

Mr BROOKS - I suppose Mr Hay, on behalf of the Kettering Community Association, spoke for most of the residents and they have indicated they don't think it is the best option. I would question whether that consultation had been as effective as you'd like. Would they have taken that out based purely on cost or because it is easier and stuff the residents that want it?

Mr TARBOTTON - I believe the consultation process has been effective. Most of what Mr Hay said is valid. A formalised concrete drain may well be better. It's not about DIER saying, 'It's too difficult' - we don't do that - but we have budget constraints, which aren't set by ourselves, and we have to work within those parameters. An open spoon

PUBLIC

drain or an open table drain is far more cost-effective and far cheaper to build than a formalised spoon drain, most certainly. Any formalised concrete-lined drain has to be covered; they become a hazard because they are a trip or fall event, whereas this is not.

Mr BROOKS - Is that because they have a gradient rather than a drop-down?

Mr TARBOTTON - No, mainly because they are formalised. They are a hard, 90° angle shape often. They are often quite deep, depending on how the lay of the land is.

Mr BOOTH - In fairness to Mr Hay, I think what they were talking about a completely piped drain cover, so you'd have to have grilles over them, et cetera.

Mr TARBOTTON - These open drains are the most cost-effective. We work within those parameters and design these batters so they don't fail.

Mr BOOTH - Specifically then, Mr Hay commented it will end up just like it is now. But what you're saying is the battering you will do and the treatment you will provide will not end up allowing that to happen. Is that fair to say?

Mr TARBOTTON - No, I will get onto that. The design - that slope is 1.5:1 - 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical - is a design slope gradient so these batters will not slump or fail - so they won't move down. There is a risk management here, so we determine what the likelihood is of this failure, if it is going to occur in a reasonable amount of time or an extended period of time, we consider that acceptable. These slopes won't fail weekly or monthly; they may fail every 10 years, depending on the storm event, but we have to accept that and design within those risk parameters.

The overgrowth, which is what Mr Hay referred to - and we all saw that when we walked down there - is a maintenance issue; it is not a design issue. If we design this in a perfect world, we assume council will maintain their property as a council property. We can't avoid that. We can put signs up, 'Please maintain', but that is a separate issue. Do I believe it will occur? It probably will, but how DIER can prevent that, I can't provide an answer. We have contracts in place; council has its obligations, funding and tasks.

Mr BOOTH - It's like septic tanks - it's not really your department?

Mr PAINE - It isn't, but we have consulted with council and at that stage we addressed their ongoing maintenance issues. By tidying this up and putting a proper gradient batter in there, it will make it easier for them to do their maintenance work.

Mr BROOKS - What would be the cost if you wanted to do that?

Mr TARBOTTON - Stormwater drains?

Mr PAINE - I don't know, we'd have to take that on notice and do some calculations. It would depend on the size; we'd have to review the drainage.

Mr BROOKS - You don't have a rough ballpark figure?

Mr TARBOTTON - No, it's a kilometre of road.

PUBLIC

Mr BROOKS - I won't hold you to this number; it's more an indication.

Mr TARBOTTON - I would suggest it would be in the hundreds of thousands. It is not \$10 000; it's not \$50 000; it would be \$100 000 to \$200 000. That is just a very focused view of the issue.

Mr BROOKS - I understand that. I'm not saying that's what you should do, all I am asking is: if that were an option, how much would it cost? What are the risks or impacts of an option like that? I appreciate Mr Hay's concerns and suggestions. We also have faith that engineers look at this and consider it on the best advice, given the budget constraints you have.

Mr PAINE - The other issue there as we have talked about is maintenance and being comfortable that Kingborough Council are comfortable with the solution we are providing and to take on the ongoing maintenance.

Mr BROOKS - You are absolutely confident that this solution that is listed within the proposal will adequately cover the requirements of that issue that has been raised.

Mr TARBOTTON - I cannot guarantee that. We had a stormwater event just recently down on the peninsula that was not expected. It washed out all of our table drains. That might have been a one-in-a-hundred-year event; it might not have been. We try to design all of our stormwater carriageways to a certain time interval - typically 100 years, depending on the category of a road and how many people use it. We cannot categorically state that we guarantee it is going to perform.

Mr BROOKS - No, and I certainly would not ask you to guarantee this will never crack or anything like that. What I am asking is, in your opinion, based on your experience and the expertise your department has, do you feel it is the best outcome for the budgetary requirements that we have.

Mr TARBOTTON - Yes, all assumptions considered and assuming that the council will maintain it in its present or designed state.

Mr BROOKS - We are not going to bring back the stockade if something happens in three years and we had an unexpected downpour. Obviously Mr Hay has raised a legitimate concern and I wanted to seek your thoughts on it as the experts in this submission.

Mr TARBOTTON - Mr Hay's comments are valid. I do not personally disagree with them but we have to work within our constraints. I will not actually raise the question, I will leave it for you to answer.

Mr BROOKS - If we are moving onto the budget now I did have some questions on that. I think we have done the power pole stuff, haven't we? Effectively, your information is that it is too expensive.

Mr PAINE - We met on site with Aurora and council representatives to discuss the issue and Aurora's view was that it was going to be a million dollars but they were just guessing. There are numerous issues with underground power; it is not just digging holes and

PUBLIC

putting conduits through. There is also finding locations to put ground-mounted transformers rather than up in the air. They may be considered too unsightly to be placed down on the road and you would have to acquire property to do that; so that is another issue that would need to be considered. In comparison to the relocation of the poles we discussed this morning, we are talking maybe \$80 000 to \$100 000, so it is a lot less cost and it does not go anywhere near contributing -

Mr BROOKS - Around 10 per cent of the estimate you were given, or the indicative figure.

Mr PAINE - Exactly, yes.

Mr BROOKS - One thing he did raise though was that you could consider putting in a provision for the future underground power option. I presume an example like that is - let us put a conduit in there.

Mr PAINE - We looked at some of those options in discussions with council. My suggestion is that Murphy's law would apply there. Without doing a comprehensive design, if you are going to do the underground power, you would put a conduit in now and find it is in the wrong place. I know most people think it is silly to build a road and then be digging it up to put conduits underneath but in the real world it is not that difficult. It is a saw-cut section of bitumen out, dig a trench and lay a conduit afterwards. It is not a significant overcost compared to doing it while you are there. Given the response from Aurora it is a significant cost and in their view there would be a number of other locations they would be looking at when considering underground power before they started on Ferry Road. Yes, it just does not seem an appropriate thing to be dealing with at this time.

Mr BOOTH - Can we move onto the budget now, chair?

CHAIR - Before you do, on the physical construction layout matters and then we will conclude with the budget. I want to go to the roundabout at the end of the road. Just so that we are clear for the record, the submission talks about a turning circle. We talked about it as a roundabout at the site. Can you describe to us the construction of it? My understand is that it will basically be a flat, designated thing that looks like a roundabout with some markings on the road but heavy vehicles coming off the ferry will be able to breach straight across the roundabout without any difficulty. It is not a true roundabout as we would understand in the normal circumstance.

Mr PAINE - It is a true roundabout. It will look like a roundabout and the centre will be formed as well but it will not have shrubbery in it or will not have a steep curve. There will be a gradual entrance such that large traffic could go over that centre section without causing any damage to all the vehicles that traverse it. It will be roundabout with a virtually flat centre but it will be slightly raised from the normal paved area.

CHAIR - What is the practical benefit of doing that? If I look at the plan and I am familiar with the site as to various accesses coming into it, why do you need a specifically designated and marked and slightly raised roundabout rather than just an extra manoeuvrability on the pavement?

Mr TARBOTTON - Roundabouts are also a traffic flow or a traffic management device. What we anticipate is that this is a multidirectional road. We have local residents' traffic

PUBLIC

who might want to turn back to get back on the Channel Highway. We have traffic exiting from a ferry. Having a roundabout as opposed to a simple T-intersection or a 45 degree intersection is that this is self-managing of traffic. For local residents or small vehicles wanting to turn and go back to the Channel Highway, once you have entered into that roundabout, the normal traffic prevail. It allows heavy vehicles to exit these back on to the Ferry Main Road as well as allowing local residents who wish to turn about easily, to do so. At the moment there is no turning circle for local residents who wish to around. They have travel to the end of Ferry Main Road or utilise some of the boat ramp.

Mr PAINE - By forming it into a proper roundabout, you better control the traffic and reduce the possibility of accidents of the light traffic trying to cut across the middle while somebody else is cutting across the other way. They enter a roundabout as they would in a normal roundabout and other traffic will enter it in the same way.

Mr TARBOTTON - That is not a large expanse of flat surface. The centre dark hatching is slightly raised, perhaps 100 millimetres above the concrete. But is mountable, so it has a mountable kerb - one of those inclined edges. It is not an issue to mount that by either truck or vehicle but it does still formalise that outer ring into a lane. It still restricts and controls the flow of the traffic where they can travel. You cannot, as a vehicle, cross over that centre. There will also be some signs in there directing traffic, so you cannot cut straight across it. It is not just a large open public square.

Mr PAINE - That square entrance will be directing traffic. The buses will use that roundabout as well because the buses come down here to drop pedestrian traffic onto the ferry. There is also a school bus that comes down and turns around, so they will be using that roundabout as well.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr BOOTH - Looking at the aerial photograph with the overlay that Mr Harriss has just pointed out with regard to the roundabout picture on there, I want to ask a couple of questions. I go back to the question I was asking about whether this long parking area, as I will call it, is the best way to deal with the traffic management issues. How many cars does the current queuing area provide - parking and queuing area - specifically for the ferry?

Mr TARBOTTON - I cannot answer that off the top of my head.

Mr PAINE - I think it is about 50.

Mr BOOTH - I am just looking from that aerial photograph there

[1.15 p.m.]

Mr BOOTH - I'm not trying to make a point out of this. If you have figures, I suppose we should use them rather than guessing, but it does look as though there would be considerably more than 50.

PUBLIC

Mr TARBOTTON - The only figures we have, and we may be able to gauge a response, is if you look at our aerial photograph you will notice that to the top of queuing area there are some other vehicles parked there, their fronts facing in. That area is for 35 vehicles.

Mr BOOTH - So that area on the water side of the marshalling area, that is parking plus manoeuvring is it?

Mr TARBOTTON - Yes. To give you an idea of scale -

Mr BOOTH - Mr Hay indicated they were happy with this proposal and he was thinking there wasn't adequate area anywhere for an alternative parking area there; but it's a \$6.5 million project or thereabouts. Given, in my view, the inappropriateness of having effectively a car parking area where people can sit for hours, in a perfect world it still looks to me that negotiation with landowners or acquisition could have created a much more compact parking area. Probably it would be a better solution by building something that was custom-made there rather than trying to retro-fit the side of the road into a parking area.

Mr PAINE - That investigation was part of the previous study which included the council in consultation.

Mr BOOTH - So you're satisfied in that sense that there wasn't any other real alternative than the one you propose?

Mr PAINE - That's right, that was agreed out of that consultation with the council. Whether the acquisition of additional land to provide more car parking is a more cost-effective solution to that problem, I don't know. I would have to go back and review that report. This proposal also addresses some other concerns of the community, such as pedestrian access and other issues, and that is why, I would suggest to you, it ended up being the best choice from those previous studies - to build the extended third lane rather than trying to solve queuing for the ferry.

Mr BOOTH - It's a double whammy. It achieves some other good results for them.

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - In the budget it shows 'miscellaneous' and you go down the next line to 'precast units'. Is that what that \$224 000 is? There isn't a miscellaneous of \$224 000 and then precast units with the price missing - should that be one line?

Mr PAINE - I don't know, but we can give you some more information on that. I'm not sure whether precast units is part of that or whether it includes some other items.

Mr BOOTH - I am confused and obviously you're not able to tell us what it means, but if it is not miscellaneous precast units - which is what it could be read down to be - if it's miscellaneous and then precast units are another line item and there is no figure next to precast units - it means the budget may be wrong.

Mr PAINE - We can clarify that for you.

PUBLIC

Mr BOOTH - It probably is supposed to be on one think, you'd think.

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BROOKS - You'd think so, that precast units didn't cost any money. Not that I have added it up, the \$2.9 million.

Mr TARBOTTON - We are using precast panels.

CHAIR - The numbers add up.

Mr PAINE - I do not believe there is anything -

Mr TARBOTTON - I think it is a question of whether the budget has been underestimated but I do not believe it has.

Mr PAINE - I have seen the more comprehensive budget figures that go into more detail and they match with what is on this page from my recollection. I do not believe there is anything missing off that budget that you have got in front of you.

Mr BOOTH - I will leave it to you to figure out if there is obviously a problem there and then you will get back to the committee, I guess.

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - You would quite often have 'contingency' or 'miscellaneous' in a figure itself, wouldn't you?

Mr TARBOTTON - Yes.

Mr BOOTH - If you read that to include the pre-cast units then there is no miscellaneous figure so maybe if you check that.

Mr PAINE - Yes.

Mr TARBOTTON - There is a wording issue; I do agree.

CHAIR - Anything else on that, Kim?

Mr BOOTH - No, I think I am done, thank you.

Mr BROOKS - Just my usual - local contracts. How are you going to promote or ensure that you get as much representation locally as you can without obviously breaching any act or law?

Mr TARBOTTON - Actually, no we cannot. Obviously we will go to public tender. We will be using pre-qualified contractors again to ensure there is reliability there but interstate contractors are also pretty qualified under the national scheme. I think what will aid local contractors is the knowledge that this is not simply a construction project. In fact, one of the greatest focuses we have on this project is traffic management - this

PUBLIC

whole banking up of traffic is a concern to us. We feel internally that we have resolved it so a local contractor will also have familiar knowledge of that, whereas an interstate contractor may come down and he may understand the dollar view of putting the bitumen down, but not necessarily how to manage those issues. I believe that will work in their favour.

Mr BOOTH - Dealing with Tasmanians is different to dealing with Victorians in that regard.

Mr PAINE - There is nothing specific within this project that deals with that issue beyond DIER's general approach.

Mr BROOKS - I understand that. You are probably used to me going on about this at every single public works committee hearing we have. I am passionate about it and I think it is important that we reinforce that. I believe we need to make it as open as possible to anyone who wants to tender but Tasmanian businesses tell me they feel let down from lack of opportunities. It will go to tender as a \$5 million plus contract, will it?

Mr PAINE - The construction cost estimate is about \$3.1 million, isn't it?

Mr BROOKS - Is that what would be tendered?

Mr PAINE - That is approximately the tender price, yes, a bit over \$3.1 million. The other amounts are contingencies.

Mr BROOKS - That would include pre-qualified tenders. I presume it would go from probably \$2 million to \$5 million.

Mr PAINE - That is right. We have recently given the committee some information in terms of what the -

Mr BROOKS - That was a few weeks ago?

Mr PAINE - Yes, it was.

Mr BROOKS - But that one was over \$5 million. I think you said there was 80 per cent -

Mr PAINE - No, that was for the under \$5 million. I think it is 94 per cent or something.

CHAIR - Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr TARBOTTON - Thank you.

Mr PAINE - Thank you.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW