



---

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

---

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

# **South Arm Highway Extension/Rokeby Main Road**

---

*Brought up by Mr Brooks and ordered by the House of Assembly to be printed.*

---

## **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Legislative Council

*Mr Farrell  
Mrs Taylor*

House of Assembly

*Mr Brooks (Chairman)  
Ms Ogilvie  
Mrs Rylah*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	3
2	BACKGROUND .....	3
3	PROJECT COSTS .....	3
4	EVIDENCE .....	4
5	DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE .....	24
6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....	25

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The Committee has the honour to report to the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914* on the -

### **South Arm Highway Extension/Rokeby Main Road**

## **2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 This reference recommended the Committee approve upgrade works on Rokeby Main Road between Oceana Drive to Buckingham Drive, including improvement to the road geometry and constructing four lanes with a median barrier. The planned works also involve construction of shared concrete cycle/pedestrian path from Oceana Drive to Buckingham Drive, connection of Tollard Drive to the signalised intersection at Pass Road and construction of a service road linking Tollard Drive to Buckingham Drive.

2.2 The objectives of the planned works are to:-

- Improve access to existing and future residential developments in the surrounding areas;
- Improve safety outcomes;
- Improve transport efficiency; and
- Provide a consistent traffic environment along the road corridor.

2.3 The planned works are Stage 2 in the upgrade of Rokeby Main Road to a dual carriageway from Oceana Drive to Diosma Street. The staged upgrade is designed to provide additional capacity to accommodate current and future growth in traffic volumes in the South Arm corridor, due to ongoing residential and urban development in the surrounding areas of Rokeby, Droughty Point, Clarendon Vale, Oakdowns, Lauderdale, Acton, Sandford, Cremorne and South Arm.

2.4 The full submission of the Department of State Growth in support of this reference can be found on website of the Committee at:-

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

## **3 PROJECT COSTS**

3.1 Pursuant to the Message from His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, the estimated cost of the work is \$15 million.

3.2 A Strategic Cost Estimate has been prepared for the project using the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development's Best Practice Cost Estimation

Standard for Publicly Funded Road and Rail Construction. The outputs of the Strategic Cost Estimate (including cost escalation of 5%) are:

- P50: \$ 13.1M
- P90: \$ 15.1M

## 4 EVIDENCE

4.1 The Committee commenced its inquiry on Monday, 27 October last with an inspection of the site of the proposed works. The Committee then returned to Parliament House whereupon the following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

- Shane Gregory (General Manager, Transport Infrastructure Services, Department of State Growth);
- Adrian Paine (Manager, Planning and Design, Transport Infrastructure Services, Department of State Growth);
- Wally Short; and
- Carolyn Thompson and Greg Belbin (Howrah Nursery).

### Background

4.2 Mr Gregory provided the following background to the proposed works:

*Instead of talking about the project in general overview it would perhaps pay to take a broader view initially. We have some plans that we are tabling into evidence. The first plan is giving an overview of the broader development of the Clarendon Vale Road, Rokeby-Howrah Road, Droughty Point area. We table this to highlight the importance of this corridor. The corridor essentially starts at the Tasman Highway and heads all the way to South Arm.*

*The plan we have here shows the key development areas that are coming in the future. We have a large development along Pass Road; we have a lot of development coming out of Droughty Point, there are 1 500 lots there on the eastern side and there are another 700 lots on the western side; and there is development going on out through the Pass Road area. This corridor feeds into a very significant area of urban development. There are currently some restrictions on that development, certainly in the Droughty Point area because of limitations with the road.*

*....The importance of this corridor has been recognised for quite some time, as far back as the 1960s. There is an area immediately on our project adjacent to the garden centre and to the west where back in 1962 widening strips were taken on properties and the owners were compensated for loss of future access to the highway. It has been evident for quite some time that this is a key corridor. It is an urban arterial and its function is to pick up traffic out of urban developments and commercial developments at key points, often urban collector roads, and carry that traffic through to the Tasman Highway. That is its key function.*

*It was recognised a long time ago. There have been progressive upgrades. In 1994 the importance of this particular section was recognised and there was a line of road proclaimed under the Roads and Jetties Act and that was annotated on various land titles at the time.*

Subsequent to that there was the Clarence Plains Outline Development Plan, which happened in the early 2000s and that looked at this broader picture, and this is where this diagram comes from, to identify key development areas and what is happening and how to best deal with that. That Outline Development Plan identified that the best way to deal with this was to upgrade on the existing corridor. It did look at a range of options, including a bypass of Rokeby, but it determined that this was the appropriate way to proceed.

That is a bit of scene-setting in the context of what this road is about. It is an urban arterial. Its job is to collect traffic and move it as efficiently and safely as possible. Urban arterials are characterised by a minimal number of accesses and the most efficient movement of traffic. That is what they are there to do. Coming off the urban arterials you have urban collectors and then off those you have local roads, and the standards change as you go through. You would expect a lot more accesses on local roads as they are picking up from individual houses and you would expect fewer accesses than that on urban collectors, and by the time you get to urban arterials you would expect contemporary design standards to have a minimal number of accesses.

....If we now talk about the concept of the project then that will open the position to questions. The plan we have currently tabled is the design but picking up those key urban development areas. On this plan, the areas in purple are the urban development areas immediately adjacent to the project and this plan shows stage 1 and stage 2. This is the complete project.

The work on this started in late 2009 or early 2010 and in the lead-up to that period the state had completed the stage from Shoreline Drive to Oceana Drive. The plan was always to continue on and continue this standard of development through. The completion of Shoreline Drive to Oceana Drive meant that essentially we had a high standard dual carriageway that had intersections at Mornington, then really no significant intersections until the Shoreline roundabout and then from the Shoreline roundabout, nothing significant until you get to Oceana Drive and Merindah Street. The intention of this design was to continue on in that manner so we would have a minimal number of intersections picking up at key points.

## Design

### 4.3 Mr Gregory then provided specific details on the design of the project:

The design was developed through 2010. What we are proposing to build now as stage 2 is in line with the original design from 2010 and, prior to putting that together, we looked at the whole section from Oceana Drive around the back of the Rokeby industrial/commercial area right through to Oakdowns. That was just to confirm that everything would fit in the bigger picture and we weren't building ourselves into a corner. Having done that, we then stepped back and looked at the section from Oceana Drive through to Diosma Street and because of funding constraints we had to cut that into two sections. The first section, stage 1, is nearing completion and will be finished in the next couple of months. It currently transitions into the old road and then we have stage 2.

This design will deliver a minimal number of intersections from Shoreline then Oceana Drive then Pass Road and Tollard Drive. Ultimately we would go down and the next major intersection would be Droughty Point Road and we would look at tidying up some access arrangements through Diosma Street and Burtonia Street in the next phase. We see that as being probably a longer-term proposition at the moment, the major developments coming out of these areas off Pass Road and Tollard Drive. We don't see that we would need to go into that next section down to Droughty Point any time in the near future

unless we get significant development further out. Based on the plans the key developments are going to be off Pass Road and Tollard Drive, and this project will cater for those.

### **Need for the Proposed Works**

#### **4.4 Mr Gregory was questioned by the Committee on what issues the proposed works were designed to address: Mr Gregory provided the following information:**

**CHAIR** - We might go into design, safety features and recommendations, and issues around the requirement, traffic flows and also why it has been designed the way it has.

**Mr GREGORY** - For the corridor in that zone of requiring duplication we would normally look at duplication in the range of 15 000 vehicles a day, and this is nearly 17 000. It is in those terms of capacity it needs to be looked at. There are also ongoing concerns around the access into the garden centre and also the Buckingham Drive access. They are not in particularly good locations and we had, tragically, a fatality of a customer coming out of the garden centre in the last few months. The alignment is quite poor as you come up past the church and head past the garden centre, you have a crest and it is difficult to see, so we needed to address those issues.

We are addressing the capacity issue and we are also addressing a growing safety issue, and the safety issue is compounded as you get more and more traffic and people find it more difficult to get out. As they are having to wait in side streets and commercial property accesses longer, people will start to do things that are risky and they will make poor judgements. When you don't have great sight distance, that is compounded and people will make a decision, thinking they are okay but they are not. There are not a lot of opportunities for gaps and when you are trying to look in two directions to get out of the commercial centre and you are dealing with very high numbers of cars, you will start to get problems. You have conflict points built in and people have to make those judgements. It is difficult to make those judgements in perfect conditions, but when you have less than perfect geometry, you have high traffic volumes and you have other things happening around you, that becomes very difficult.

This had to deliver a safety outcome as well as an efficiency outcome. That is reflected in the design. In terms of efficiency, we get two lanes in each direction. In terms of safety, we have controlled intersections at the key points, we have auxiliary lanes, where if you are turning you can get out of the flow of traffic. If you are turning right, you get out of the flow of traffic and if you are turning left, you get out of the flow of traffic. The two carriageways are separated by a median, there are wire rope safety barriers up the middle, there will be barriers on the edges and there will be barriers and fences to control pedestrian movements as well.

As part of the design, we are building in bus stops that allow the buses to fully get out of the traffic flow, whereas at the moment they cannot do that. We are going from what is a narrow road with poor geometry into one that is of a much higher standard, and we will get a consistent standard from here right through to Mornington. It varies slightly because they were built at different times, but essentially it is about separation and it is about controlling pedestrian movements and making sure there is adequate width for people and for vehicles to move.

.....Sorry, we didn't get to your question around bikes .....On the previous project from Oceana Drive to Shoreline there is a dual-use path. There is an old path that then runs from Oceana Drive through to Buckingham Drive and we are replacing that with a new shared path on this stage. Stage 1 has a new path and so there will be a connection all the way through from Shoreline, where it ducks off the highway before that. There will

be a new off-road, shared path all the way through to Grange Road.....The new path will be at road level where it is well-lit. Fundamentally we're providing a path to try to get bikes off the road. In this sort of environment of high volumes and higher speed, having bikes and cars mixing is a recipe for disaster.

### **Cost of the Proposed Works**

- 4.5 The Committee questioned Mr Gregory on the cost of the proposed works, specifically the contingency included in the cost estimate. Mr Gregory noted the Department was not expecting to experience any particularly unusual contingent risks during the proposed works:

**CHAIR** - Then the contingency on other projects. We know there is higher risk - I suppose the Macquarie Harbour Road would be the one that we would be concerned about or any contingency in that and the budget for that. You have now experienced that particular road so are there any concerns around the contingency?

**Mr GREGORY** - We do not think there is anything particularly unusual. When you are in urban areas services are always an issue. Despite what you might think, service authorities are not necessarily sure where their services are. Particularly the telcos are very bad at it. It is not unusual to find a fibre optic cable a few hundred millimetres below the ground right under where you need to put your guard fence when the owner of the service tells you it is 10 metres in the paddock and one and a half metres deep. That is quite common.

We used to do contingency just based on 'we will allow this much extra'. Now it is based on a mathematical model where we identify risks and we try to quantify the risks. As we step through the project those risks fall out and you start to rationalise your contingency fairly quickly.

There are two types. There are inherent risks and contingent risks. Contingent risks are the things we do not know about and might appear. They can be everything from finding a heritage site that is buried, or hitting asbestos, or any range of things that you could not reasonably have found and detailed. Inherent risks are risks around quantities and rates. You can never be 100 per cent sure about quantities. We are not building a house where you can work out the length of every bit of timber. When we start excavating that is when you find soft spots, areas that have to be replaced, and you need to make an allowance.

We would generally with our forecasting methodology, our monthly forecast, you would find that some of these risks would materialise or not fairly quickly in the process. One of the big risk items is around earthworks and fairly early in the project you get a feel for whether that is going to come to fruition or not.

### **Local Benefits Test**

- 4.6 The Committee questioned Mr Gregory on whether project procurement would meet the local benefits test, or whether the Department would seek an exemption for the project. Mr Gregory noted that no exemption would be sought and that a local firm would be contracted for the works:

**CHAIR** - I just wanted to quickly focus on cost and I am aware of the time. The requirement for a local benefits test on all government contracts. You know we are going to ask about this every time. Will you be applying for an exemption from that?

**Mr GREGORY** - No. When stage 1 was tendered, we tendered that in the open market and we included a preliminary set of schedules for stage 2 on the basis that subject to Parliamentary Standing Committee approval and all of the other necessary approvals, funding and so on, we could negotiate with the successful tenderer for stage 1 to continue on. We did that because that gives advantages. We were hopeful at one stage that we could continue on without building the transition and that would have saved us some money. It saves us some money saving us costs and also saves us some time in pushing on.

The local benefits test, the contractor for stage 1, who we will be negotiating with to continue on is a Tasmanian company based at Austins Ferry, Andrew Walker Constructions, a family business that employs a lot of local people. So we think that would very easily tick off the local benefits test.

### **Stakeholder Concerns**

- 4.7 The Committee received four submissions on this reference; one from a business affected by the proposed works and three from affected residents.
- 4.8 The respondents expressed a number of common concerns including:
- a) The perceived lack of consultation with affected residents and businesses, in particular on changes to the proposed works between 2010 and 2014 ;
  - b) The negative impacts on property values, associated with isolation from Howrah and connection to Rokeby;
  - c) The negative impact on businesses in the area;
  - d) The inconvenience and costs (time, petrol, taxis) of changed access arrangements for Buckingham Drive and Howrah Gardens residents and businesses;
  - e) The increase in traffic density and queuing at Tollard Drive; and
  - f) The loss of the eastbound bus stop opposite Howrah Gardens.

Each of these matters is addressed directly below.

#### **a) Consultation on and History of the Changes to the Proposed Works between 2010-2014**

- 4.9 Each of the respondents noted that they felt there had been a lack of consultation from the Department of State Growth. In particular, concern was expressed that no consultation had been undertaken on the changes that were apparent in the proposal that was before the Committee to the proposed works that stakeholders had previously been advised of in 2013.

- 4.10 Mr Alcock noted in his submission that:

*The previous Labour Government had reassured residents of Howrah Gardens that Buckingham Drive would NOT be bypassed. However since the change to the Liberal Government, they have reversed the Labour Governments decision without consultation of residents.*

- 4.11 Mr Short expressed similar sentiments in his submission:



*Last year residents received an undated plan of the proposed stage 2 road works of upgrading Rokeby road to south Arm Highway. This was the first notification I was made aware of, concerning this section of the upgrade of Rokeby Road. This design had a controlled intersection on the western end of Buckingham Drive. This plan was acceptable to my self and family as we maintained our local identity.*

*3 months ago we received another undated plan, and proposal for the road works. This new plan bypasses the Buckingham Drive intersection, which totally isolates the Howrah Gardens Community to the rest of Howrah.*

*From the time we received the first plan in 2013, until we received the modified plan in July this year, there was no contact from the Department of State Growth. How can a project that will affect the community to such a large scale be developed without consultation with all stake-holders within the community.*

4.12 Mr Matthews noted in his submission that:

*After four years examining the proposal by the Department of Infrastructure, including consultation with stakeholders, a decision was reached to provide traffic lights about adjacent to the Howrah Garden Centre. This gave relief to all residents using the Buckingham Drive access from Rokeby Road (South Arm Highway). Recently the decision was changed and deleted the planned traffic lights.*

*.....I have e-mailed The Hon. Rene Hidding and copies of his response and my reply to that are attached. It can be seen from the response that Mr. Hidding was told that consultation between the Department and the business owners had occurred when it did not. Consultation was carried out with the landowners only. There was no consultation with the residents for THIS change. The Department had considered that previous consultation was satisfactory and further consultation was unnecessary.*

4.13 Mr Belbin noted at the hearing that while consultation may have been undertaken with the owners of the property that the local businesses occupy, no direct consultation had been undertaken with him as a leaseholder:

*But as a business owner, or as a leasehold owner, we have had pretty much zero consultation whatsoever. Other than things that we have done ourselves off our own bat with our own solicitor, which has cost us money, we have had no input into what was happening, or where the road was going to go, or anything like that, it has all happened with our landlord. Unfortunately, our landlord has done zero to us and has not kept us informed whatsoever.*

4.14 The Committee noted that Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson's landlord had not been keeping them apprised of their discussions with Departmental representatives on the proposed works. The following exchange took place:

**Mr BELBIN** – We are in the unenviable position that we are leaseholders, so we basically have no say whatsoever.

**Mr FARRELL** - Your current landlord has not informed you of the dealings he's had with the department?

**Mr BELBIN** - Not at all. We had one meeting on site with the previous government when David O'Byrne was the minister - about 2010. The boys came and grabbed me and said,

*'Quick, we have to go to a meeting, David O'Byrne is going to be there'. I had no prior knowledge whatsoever - it was a two-minute job. That was the only time they have shown any interest in including us whatsoever.*

**Ms THOMPSON** - *We've asked. We have made it known to their solicitor that we know nothing, that we need to know, through the people we pay rent to and their agent, yet it is never forthcoming.*

- 4.15 The Committee questioned the Department of State Growth representatives extensively on the consultation undertaken for the project. In particular, the Committee questioned Mr Gregory on the consultation undertaken regarding the various changes to the scope of the proposed works over the period 2010-2014. Mr Gregory provided the following information under questioning from the Committee:

**CHAIR** - *You have mentioned previously that this was the original plan and there were several amendments. Part of the representations to the committee is consultation and community engagement. Could you give some firmer time frames or date ranges around when this was first proposed, when amendments were then proposed, what consultation went through the community and where that led to?*

**Mr GREGORY** - *We have compiled a consultation report which we will table, and if you are happy with it I will refer to that as we go through.*

*The project kicked off in 2010 with the commitment from the then government as part of the election to fund the next section. We started working on what it looked like. We always had the intention to have a single section with no intersections between Oceana Drive and Pass Road. During that period we had a number of public consultation exercises.*

**CHAIR** - *To clarify, was that stage 1 and stage 2?*

**Mr GREGORY** - *We looked at both of them together and we have always shown them on plans as being together and all our public displays have indicated that this is the project but this is the bit we would be building. We had some articles in the Eastern Shore Sun and we did some letterboxing. We ran a couple of information sessions by invitation to come and discuss with various groups, and we had two open days on 4 May and 6 May 2011. They were at the Rokeby Hall and the Rokeby Community Centre and that during the scoping phase of the project. They were advertised and they were an open invitation; you did not need a specific invitation to come along. We invited people to come and give us feedback.*

*On the scale of this consultative process, you can do everything from informing people to what you are doing through about five different steps, to actually having people involved in the decision-making. Typically, informing people is what you do towards the end of a process when you have sought submissions. The far end of the scale of involving people is something you might do, say, for Macquarie Point, where you are open to ideas about how you might proceed. Transport infrastructure projects generally sit in the middle in what we call the consultative phase. The process is: you go out and inform; you put on the table what you are thinking of doing; you ask people for their input, do they have issues, are there things you need to consider as a design team and you take those on board.*

*A clear distinction between that part of the process and the full-blown value management process is that the team takes that information away and balances it and makes decisions,*

taking into account all the facts, what is the appropriate way of doing things. That is the process we are in and we are asking people for their thoughts on how this would proceed, what were the issues we needed to factor in as a team in planning and designing the project.

Prior to that very public process, we had had some discussions with the owners of the property where the garden centre and what is now the bottle shop and the other businesses were sited. We started discussions with them a little bit earlier because they put a development application in to the Clarence City Council and they were proposing the bottle shop development and other developments at that stage. We met with the owners and advised them that we thought it was probably premature to proceed with that development on the basis that the access to their property would be changing. That was late 2009, early 2010. As part of their development application they had to submit a traffic impact assessment to us. We made some comments on some issues with the projected traffic and the impact it would have, and at that time we advised their representatives that we thought they should hold and rethink their proposal, particularly given there were some access restrictions and background issues related to the property.

**CHAIR** - That was the landowners?

**Mr GREGORY** - Yes. At the time, the landowners operated most of the facilities on the site with the exception of the nursery, but they were certainly operating the fruit and vegetable market at the time.

**CHAIR** - Was that in 2009?

**Mr GREGORY** - Early 2010, before we had a funding commitment to the project and before we had started the real scoping. It was really prompted by their submission to the Clarence City Council for a development application and we were advising them at the time to hold before they would proceed.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Did you advise them of that in writing?

**Mr GREGORY** - Yes, to their traffic engineer. We also met on site and told them we thought they should hold off. We advised them at the time that anything they would need to do to manage the traffic getting into their property would be wasted. We felt it was probably about a million-dollar investment to manage the traffic problem, and that would be basically wasted when we proceeded with the project.

**Mrs RYLAH** - Did they accept that?

**Mr GREGORY** - No, they were not particularly happy with that but the reality is they have purchased parcels of land that had annotations on the title that indicated to them they had restricted access. One of the properties, the large property that is a residential property with a house on it, was one of the properties that was compensated for loss of access in 1962. All this is noted on titles so the information was available to them. You would expect purchasing a property, if you undertook due diligence and had proper conveyancing, you would be aware of those issues. They are not difficult to find on a title.

That is the process we went through. We received a number of submissions. The project received strong support from the Clarence City Council and a number of developers who saw this as opening up development opportunities.

The key objections to the project came from the garden centre and the residents of Howrah Gardens. The issues were subtly different for the garden centre and the residents. The garden centre was concerned about impact on business and their investment. It was for that reason that at this time we would advise them to proceed

carefully with their investment because this is going to change. The investment happened after all this was in the public domain.

**CHAIR** - It is important the committee understands the time frames we are discussing. That discussion was had when?

**Mr GREGORY** - It would have been around about February 2010. We have had ongoing discussions with the Lambrakis family who owned the property since that time. That culminated in September 2011 with what we understood was an agreement about an alternative compromise position.

- 4.16 Mr Gregory noted that full consultation had not been undertaken on the changes to the proposed works in 2011 or the change back to the original proposed works in 2014, as it was not considered necessary given the initial consultation process that had been undertaken:

*.....We didn't do a full consultation on the change in September 2011 or the change back. We informed people that this is what we are doing. To be honest, if we went back and ran a display and a consultation and said, 'Here's what we are doing. What do you think?', we believe we would have got the same response as we got in early 2011 - the same issues would have come up.*

*In the context of consultation in that spectrum, we don't believe it is appropriate to give people the impression they can have whatever they want; we need to make decisions. Going back and running another set of consultations may merely raise the expectation that we might change our minds again.*

#### **b) Negative Impacts on Property Values**

- 4.17 A key concern expressed by respondents was that the proposed works would have a negative impact on property values in the Howrah Gardens area. Respondents indicated that this would occur for two main reasons; the inconvenience of the new access arrangements to Howrah Gardens and the belief that Howrah Gardens will eventually become, or be perceived to be, part of Rokeby.

- 4.18 Mr Short made both these points in his submission:

*I find it unacceptable to drive past the turn off to my home, drive into Rokeby, then drive back to Howrah. This will cause the area to lose its identity as Howrah and the area will eventually be called Rokeby. It has already been identified that Rokeby is a low socioeconomic suburb and is well known for its anti-social and criminal behavior. My wife and I are intending to retire in the next few years*

*..... We would not have brought in this area if we were told about the road work situation.*

*... .. I do not feel at all comfortable with a direct link ONLY to such a suburb, which will in effect leave me some \$50 to \$100K deprived when I sell my home.*

- 4.19 Mr Short expanded on these comments under questioning from the Committee at the public hearing:

**CHAIR** - ... ....There are some concerns around changing Howrah Gardens from what you would deem as a Howrah suburb to Rokeby. How valid is that, in your opinion?

**Mr SHORT** - The correspondence I have had with various departmental officials said there is no plan at this stage to change it. People going to Rokeby are going to have to drive past Howrah, go into Rokeby and come back to Howrah. It is not going to be appealing for people to purchase their houses because it is going to lower the value. I foresee in future that we will become part of Rokeby. The skillion road that comes off Buckingham Drive is in the districts of Howrah and Rokeby and once this new subdivision goes through it will only be a matter of time before we will be classed as Rokeby.

**CHAIR** - Have you seen anything in a plan that creates that from a government point of view?

**Mr SHORT** - Only the one from Malwood. I am not sure I have the plan from the Planning Commission -

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Are they calling it a Rokeby development, or a Howrah development?

**Mr SHORT** - Both - 473 Rokeby Road and 606 Oceana Drive. They want to go through Droughty Point - there is a plan to link up -

**CHAIR** - But Rokeby Road isn't changing its name.

**Mr SHORT** - ... ....I was concerned about the value of the land if you do sell it. Even if it is still classed as Howrah, when they drive in through Rokeby they are going to look at the surroundings and that is going to put a whole damper on the whole Howrah Gardens area suburbs.

**CHAIR** - But won't that be a new subdivision there?

**Mrs TAYLOR** - They might be lovely houses.

**Mr SHORT** - They would have to get there first. I know when we have been looking at properties, and we go into an area, when we start to see the first few houses and say, 'This isn't looking too good, no, we won't bother about this' and we do not always get to our destination.

- 4.20 The Committee questioned Mr Gregory on residents' concerns regarding the potential impacts of the proposed works on the property values in Howrah Gardens. Mr Gregory recognised there would be some inconvenience to residents of Howrah gardens. However, Mr Gregory also noted that a principle of the proposed works was to provide similar access arrangements for Howrah Gardens residents to those which currently exist for Glebe Hill Estate residents, and that property values were unlikely to be affected by the new access arrangements:

*There is no argument that it will take longer to access Howrah Gardens for the residents coming in and out. We have estimated it is less than one minute. It is an inconvenience, yes.*

*... ....A small number have indicated they are concerned about being connected to Rokeby and believe changed access arrangements will devalue their properties, that they will see a reduction in the value of their properties. We have looked at the property value*

issue. The access arrangements we currently have here for Howrah Gardens are mirrored by the access arrangements to Glebe Hill. We did a comparison of median property values and sale process. We also looked at the same sort of issue, the median sale prices, in the areas off Oceana Drive and Merindah Street. We discovered there is nothing to suggest those change access arrangements would affect property values. In fact, the median value in both those other areas is higher than it is in Howrah Gardens at the moment. So there are other factors that influence what people are prepared to pay for properties.

- 4.21 The Committee questioned Mr Gregory further on the potential impact on property values. The following exchange took place:

**CHAIR** - Part of the further evidence provided from the community was the impact on land values. You mentioned previously that you have done some work on that to consider that aspect. Is it possible for this committee to receive a copy of that? I understand there may be some in-confidence information in that so I would suggest the committee receive it but not table it.

**Mr GREGORY** - It's not the specifics of individual sales; it is a summary of sales. It doesn't name this house or that house, it says 'in this area'.

**CHAIR** - I accept that is public information anyway.

**Mr GREGORY** - You can do what we did and go through the Land Titles Office and get the information, but we will table it.

**CHAIR** - You have had a look at the impact of that?

**Mr GREGORY** - We were looking at the principle that a longer connection will devalue the property. On the other side of the road is Glebe Hill, which has the same access arrangements we are proposing - probably a little bit more tortuous because while we are here talking a short distance connecting into that area, to access Glebe Hill you have to come way down to get into the properties. We are saying there should be similarities between these two and what we wanted to confirm was that these weren't of a lower value because of different access arrangements. We were looking at whether changing the access arrangements devalue the properties and the evidence we have suggests that is not the case.

- 4.22 Subsequent to the public hearing, Mr Gregory provided the Committee with a desktop study of housing sales in the area undertaken by the Department of State Growth. This summary showed that in Glebe Hill Estate, which has never had direct access to the highway, property values were, on average, higher than Howrah Gardens. The study noted that:

*This suggests that direct access to a Highway may not be a significant factor in the valuation of properties in the area.*

- 4.23 Mr Gregory also confirmed that there is no plan to alter suburb boundaries such that Howrah Gardens would become part of Rokeby:

*We haven't looked at the Rokeby issue. We have no intention of changing any suburb names. That requires a formal process through the Nomenclature Board anyway, with public submissions. I am not sure why anyone would proceed down that path anyway.*

### **c) Negative Impact on Local Businesses**

- 4.24 The Committee received evidence from respondents that the proposed works would have a negative impact on Howrah Gardens businesses, both during and post construction. Mr Alcock noted in his submission the:

*....Effect on the three businesses in the area.*

Mr Short also noted in his submission:

*If direct access is not maintained, the shopping complex will suffer. History shows that people will not divert too far from their route of travel. They will shop elsewhere.... Removing direct access will cause the shops to close.*

- 4.25 The leaseholders of the Howrah Nursery, Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson, provided evidence of the impact the proposed works would have on their business, in part based on their past experience with the Stage 1 works. In their submission, Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson highlighted the recent impact of road works on their business:

*How do we know roadworks will be catastrophic to our business. For 2 days back in September the road was under the influence of workers stopping starting traffic to allow trucks in and out for most of the day except peak hour when trees from Church of Christ, Rokeby Road, Howrah were cut down. On this day we did not turn over enough money to pay wages for 1 staff member for the day let alone 3 or enough to help pay the rent, electricity, water, rates, etc! The reality is Monday to Friday every day there will be workers standing with paddlepop signs stopping 1 lane of traffic at a time to get road built. If it is too hard or too longer wait for our customers they will forget about us and drive to our competitors, we will not survive the 2 years.*

- 4.26 The Committee questioned Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson on the potential impacts on their business during the construction phase:

**Ms THOMPSON** - .... The access is the main issue, but the construction over the two-year period could kill us off. We had one or two days where they were cutting trees down.

**Mr BELBIN** - They were cutting trees down on the southern side. They were removing the trees where the road is extending out in front of the church that is down there, and there was a day where they had paddle-pop people stopping traffic to let their trucks in and out, and we did around \$90 for the day.

**Ms THOMPSON** - It wouldn't cover three staff.

**Mr BELBIN** - From \$2 000 a day to \$90.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Are you aware the department has said most of the road construction will happen off the road and it will not interfere with the road until the last section where they would need to do the connector?

**Mr BELBIN** - It does, but there are still trucks going in and off -

**Ms THOMPSON** - When the initial part was done from the Shoreline to Oceana Drive, we experienced disruption with that because even though they are off the road they still have paddle pop people stopping the traffic so those big trucks can access that part of the highway and that is happening all day. Really, it is not that different. You only have one lane traffic that may be operational. You still need to get the trucks in, dump, fill, and get them back out again.

- 4.27 Under questioning from the Committee, Mr Belbin also noted how the inconvenience imposed on road users might impact on the business once the road works were completed:

**Mr BELBIN** - Our biggest concern is our entrance is, instead of being zero metres, it is now probably around 1 300 metres to get back into us. So it is 500 up and it is about 200 down and about another 500 or 600 metres back. You are looking at 1.3-1.4 kilometres to get back into it. I don't know how you find people, but people like convenience and that is not convenient. They will go elsewhere where you can drive straight to the front door. There are other places around that do what we do which are a lot easier to get into than what we are. I am going to lose probably 15-20 per cent of people who will come to us because we are conveniently located at the moment. That is probably our biggest concern.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What sort of hit would that be to your bottom line?

**Mr BELBIN** - Probably close to half of our profit and not getting our return on what we have already spent. We have three other employees at the moment, two of whom have relocated from other states to come and work for us, so they have made a big commitment to come to us. I cannot guarantee jobs. I would like to, but I cannot. If we start going down the gurgler, my wife and I have to be the ones standing there trying to keep the place afloat and I cannot afford to pay people to be there. It is hard enough as it is for small businesses.

- 4.28 Mr Belbin conceded there was a need for works in the area to improve road safety, but agreed there were other options, such as a left-in left-out access, that would minimise the impact on his business while at the same time providing a safer road environment:

**Mrs TAYLOR** - So you think the road is necessary then?

**Mr BELBIN** - ... .. Something has to be done, absolutely; it has to be fixed.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - ... .. The State Growth representatives told us they offered a little slip lane, a left-off, left-on lane, outside the garden centre and it was rejected by the owners... .. Would a left-in, left-out lane help you?

**Mr BELBIN** - I think an out-lane is almost a must. I don't want people coming across the road because that is dangerous. An out-lane is definitely a must. It's a hard one. I definitely don't want to see another person die out there.

- 4.29 The Committee noted the importance of ensuring business continuity during construction to minimise the impacts of the proposed works on affected businesses. Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson noted in their submission that they were concerned about the impact of disruptions to their business during construction and had put forward an advertising proposal to help minimise the impact:



As a result of my letter to Craig Tarbottom dated 11 July 2014 we had a meeting with Graeme Nibbs, Shane Gregory and Ben Moloney from State Growth on 8 August 2014 expressing our concerns and the ways in which we could be assisted to help our business sustain itself to overcome the enormous disruption that will occur as a result of the building process. It was agreed by both parties to consider during construction phase paid advertising, proper signage, sealing carpark due to enormous amounts of dust floating over our business.

... ..On 2 September, 2014 I emailed an advertising quote based on 12 months coverage from a television station to Graeme Nibbs. We are receiving the run around and are already feeling the effects of the road being built as we are now a month into construction, we require financial assistance to survive the next 2 years.

- 4.30 The Committee questioned Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson further at the hearing on what arrangements they considered necessary to ensure business continuity:

**CHAIR** - Did you have a suggestion around that or specific concern?

**Ms THOMPSON** - We put a quote forward to State Roads.

**Mr BELBIN** - We had a quote from one of our companies that we use, what it would cost for a 12-month campaign and it was more or less an awareness campaign. We would have the new ad made saying, 'Sorry for the inconvenience, the road is being built, but this is for your safety and it will be easier and safer'. Something along those lines. 'But we are still open, so please come and visit, business as usual'. It was not to say, it is Howrah Nursery, we have the best plants in Hobart, nothing like that. It was not just to get advertising; it was to say, we are open while this road is being built.

- 4.31 Mr Gregory was questioned by the Committee on what could be done to ensure business continuity for affected businesses. Mr Gregory noted that the issue of business continuity was not something the Department encounters often due to the nature of the projects they undertake, but were open to discussing ways to ensure business continuity for affected businesses:

**Ms OGILVIE** - ... .. This would not be a new issue for you regarding maintaining business continuity when you are doing works?

**Mr GREGORY** - It is not something we see a lot. We don't do a lot of urban projects. This is probably a little bit unusual in that we are building right outside some businesses. For that reason we are happy to have some discussions around maintaining business continuity while the building is underway.

- 4.32 Under questioning from the Committee, Mr Gregory noted the discussions the Department was now having with Mr Belbin and Ms Thompson on this matter:

**Mrs RYLAH** - If you aren't able to get an adequate conversation going with the landlord and yourselves, what process can take place to ensure that businesses are able to continue to operate at least at some version of reasonable level so that they can at least stay viable?

**Mr GREGORY** - Now that Mr Belbin said he will approach us directly and sit down with us then we are happy to work with him to ensure that he gets business continuity. We have

looked at a range of options. We are considering the option of funding an advertising campaign. We have raised and put on the table the idea of we will need to do some landscaping so to have him as an on load supplier of the plants. We are just at a point where I think he has indicated that that does not work commercially for him, but we are happy to continue discussions because certainly we want to see that he is as prosperous as he can be. It is unfortunate that there wasn't the level of discussion that perhaps there should have been.

- 4.33 Mr Gregory also commented on arrangements to ensure traffic flow during construction, noting that the Department was open to additional provisions to facilitate traffic flow in and out of the nursery:

**Mrs RYLAH** - What consideration does the contractor have to give in regard to his stop-go men in considering businesses having continuity of business? I know their primary function is to get trucks on and off the road safely, but clearly this is an issue for their continuity of business. What consideration is there?

**Mr GREGORY** - There is a limited amount that really can be done. We can talk to the contractors. I am aware we are happy to pay a little bit extra to perhaps have stop-go people at the entrance and let people in and out of the nursery. Generally, their stop-go people will be performing a safety function and that is essentially what they are about. In that sense they do not have to give any consideration, but we require that they keep traffic moving as freely as they can. So there are requirements in the contract that they do not just jam traffic up to get the job built. They have to keep the traffic moving and that is what I will be considering.

#### **d) Inconvenience and Cost of Changed Access Arrangements**

- 4.34 Mr Alcock noted in his submission that the proposed works would result in:

... ..extra travel, every time residents access the South Arm Highway to head towards the city,.....extra fuel costs,.....inconvenience for families/friends and visitors to the area,.....increased cost of taxi's for residents in the area due to increased travel time.

- 4.35 Mr Short noted in his submission that:

Having to pay additional taxi fares to get to our home when we are on a pension, will cause substantial financial hardship.

- 4.36 Mr Short reinforced this concern at the hearing:

For those elderly people and pensioners who will have to start using taxis, to get into Rokeby and back again, it is going to be an added cost.

- 4.37 Mr Gregory agreed there would be some inconvenience, including minor increases in travel time, and additional costs borne by residents of Howrah Gardens. However, Mr Gregory indicated these were relatively minor in comparison to the overall and ongoing benefits of the proposed works, especially in comparison to the option of including traffic lights at Buckingham Drive:

There is no argument that it will take longer to access Howrah Gardens for the residents coming in and out. We have estimated it is less than one minute. It is an inconvenience, yes. Taxi fares might be slightly more expensive, yes, and over a period of time there will be a cumulative increase in the use of petrol. But, this is a very broad issue in serving a very large community and we need to look at the best way to deal with that.

... We did come up with an option that would put a set of traffic signals effectively at the city end or the western end of Buckingham Drive and a set of signals there coming out and that would also provide an access into Glebe Hill as well, into the commercial area that is going to be developed in Glebe Hill... In terms of cost it was much of a muchness between what we are now proposing and that concept, but the key issue was for gaining a small benefit to a smaller number of people we imposed a dis-benefit on 17 000 vehicles a day. That is what we didn't think was worth doing. We felt that was a compromise. Recognising that the plan as we have it now does have an impact on the residents of Howrah Gardens. In a transport plan you need to take into account the big picture and you need to look at the maximum benefit for the maximum number of people.

#### **e) Traffic Density and Queuing at Tollard Drive**

- 4.38 Respondents noted concerns that the proposed works would result in a major increase in traffic density and queuing at Tollard Drive and the Tollard Drive/Rokeby Road/Pass Road signalised intersection, especially once the planned residential sub-divisions adjacent to Howrah Gardens and at Droughty Point were developed.

- 4.39 Mr Alcock noted in his submission:

*...the potential for a significant bottleneck for residents leaving Howrah Gardens via Tollard Drive due to merging with traffic from Rokeby.*

- 4.40 Mr Short noted in his submission that:

*There has been approved a 173 lot development for Skillion Hill. This development will put high density traffic onto Tollard drive in addition to the current traffic Howrah Gardens residents create using the same road. This volume of traffic will put further delays on the lights at the Pass Road intersection.*

- 4.41 In his submission, Mr Matthews also made similar comments about the Tollard Drive intersection:

*This road will also be uncontrolled at the intersection (no traffic lights) and therefore becomes a safety issue, particularly in the future as traffic accessing Droughty Point increases.*

#### **f) Loss of the Eastbound Bus Stop opposite Howrah Gardens**

- 4.42 Mr Short noted that the proposed works includes the removal of the eastbound bus stop opposite the Howrah Gardens subdivision. Mr Short noted that that removal of this bus stop would inconvenience residents of Howrah Gardens, who would have a much longer walk from the nearest bus stop, which would be located further east, just past the traffic lights at the intersection with Pass Road.

He also noted that this created safety issues related to the socio-economic status of the area and the shared cycle/pedestrian pathway:

4.43 In his submission Mr Short stated:

*I do not wish to walk to a distant bus stop some 20 minutes' walk to our front door in the cold, dark night during winter. The shared walkway/cycle way is not a safe situation for the elderly as the bike riders claim they have right of way. Although not legal, it is a fact as to what is happening now. Rokeby is a lower socio-economic area, with significant crime, and even in the last few years have had issues involving weapons. The lives of patrons waling a long distance to the bus stop will put their lives at risk.*

4.44 Mr Short reiterated these concerns at the public hearing under questioning from the Committee:

**Mr SHORT** - We knew there was going to be roadworks, which we totally agree with, it is the best state of affairs. Then when the work started and we saw the bus stop going on Pass Road I contacted Metro about bus stops. They said they were in consultation with the department, but it was not public, and could not release anything. At that stage they had already put a pathway to the bus stop heading into Hobart, which is on the current plan, and I thought that is all right that is only another two or three minutes. Then I found out that there was going to be no bus stop heading east from Hobart and I had to use the one for Pass Road. I got off at Pass Road and it took me 18 minutes to get home, whereas normally it is only four minutes.

**CHAIR** - Sorry, I want to clarify we are talking about the same.

**Mr SHORT** - There is Pass Road and Howrah Gardens there. At the moment there is a bus stop right here.

**CHAIR** - On the other side of the highway?

**Mr SHORT** - There is one on both sides. That is coming away totally. I have to get off at this one here and come down there. That is an 18-minute walk in the winter in the rain, also for school children. Once Tollard Drive comes through I think there is a safety issue. I hate to say but part of Rokeby is a low socioeconomic group and there has been crime and violence there and that is going to be a threat to the children in particular.

**CHAIR** - Those who are travelling from the city will have to get off -

**Mr SHORT** - They have to go all the way up here and come back down through here.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - What would you propose, Mr Short?

**Mr SHORT** - At the moment there is a lot of filling going in. I can't see why an underpass couldn't have been put through; either that or an overpass. When I looked at the contour of the road I thought an underpass would have been ideal.

4.45 Mr Gregory was questioned by the Committee on new bus stop arrangements. Mr Gregory detailed the reasoning behind the placement of the bus stops, and highlighted how unsafe it was to cross Rokeby Road between the bus stops opposite Howrah Gardens. Mr Gregory also noted that Metro Tasmania was in

discussions with the owners of the commercial land in Glebe Hill Estate about the inclusion of a bus bay in the proposed commercial centre:

**Mr GREGORY** - We are building in bus bays on the exit side of the signals at Pass Road and Tollard Drive. If you are heading out you will go through the lights and the bus will pull off to the left. The reason we put them on the exit side is that buses can use the red light to their advantage to get away. If you put them before you will always be caught up in the traffic. If the bus bay is on the exit side there will always be a period where the lights go red and the traffic coming through stops and they can get out. They are on the exit side of both approaches. The reason we put them there is to get that advantage, but also when you look at where the development areas are going to be this is a key focal point of those development areas. It also provides the opportunity for connector buses to come in and various things that Metro want to do in the future.

**CHAIR** – Aren't there already two bus stops on what would be the southern side of the end? Are there going to be two, or is there only going to be one?

**Mr GREGORY** - There is an existing bus stop outside the garden centre and we are retaining that. That will be a higher standard bus stop than currently exists.

**CHAIR** - That will be kept there?

**Mr GREGORY** - We will be keeping that, yes. At the moment we have a situation where residents are coming out of Glebe Hill and walking across this commercial land, which is currently vacant, and then as we saw on the site -

**CHAIR** - We saw that and that is why I know there is a bus stop there.

**Mr GREGORY** - That is very problematic. To see it done in the middle of the day is one thing, but to see it done in peak hour traffic would be something quite interesting. We certainly do not want to promote that. We have looked at underpasses, overpasses and various things, but again we come back to where the key development areas are going to be and an underpass or an overpass is just not actually quite in the right place to connect people through. The commercial development will cut off the movement that we saw on site today, people crossing that vacant land. You will not be able to do that. People coming out of Glebe Hill will have to go to Pass Road to cross anyway and that is why we have centred the bus stops around there.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - It is a fair way to walk, isn't it, for those people if coming out of town your bus stop is on the exit side?

**Mr GREGORY** - ..... We are aware that the developer is in preliminary discussions with Metro to look at whether they are interested in having bus drop-offs within that facility. If you go to other states that is quite common for shopping centres to have bus malls attached to them. We are aware that they are in some level of discussion there.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - So it could just come off the slip-off lane?

**Mr GREGORY** - Yes. Obviously, as these developments occur, Metro will be considering whether to have feeder buses or run buses down at Tollard Drive to pick up Droughty Point patrons as well.

## **Other Roadwork Options**

- 4.46 The Committee noted that there were other options that had already been considered, or put forward by respondents, as alternatives to the current proposed works. Specifically, the options considered were the provision of traffic lights at the western end of Buckingham Drive, a slip-lane off Buckingham Drive providing westbound access onto Rokeby Road, and a left in, left out access to the local business centre from Rokeby Road.
- 4.47 The Committee noted that the option including traffic lights was the proposal the Department had settled on in 2011. The Committee questioned Mr Gregory on the decision to proceed with the traffic lights option and the subsequent change back to the original proposal, which is the proposal currently before the Committee:

**Mr Gregory** - ... The design we are planning to build, and have tabled here, is the design as it was put on public display in 2011. During the course of 2010 and the middle to latter part of 2011 we were asked by the then minister to look at alternative ways of providing access, particularly to the garden centre, and what other alternatives could be provided to provide that access. We looked at things such as seagull treatments, slip lanes, left in left out, and a number of those were rejected by the owners of the centre. They wanted full movement access at their current location. It could not be achieved at Buckingham Drive or at the entrance to the garden centre simply because that was too close to Tollard Drive-Pass Road to be efficient in terms of transport.

We did come up with an option that would put a set of traffic signals effectively at the city end or the western end of Buckingham Drive and a set of signals there coming out and that would also provide an access into Glebe Hill as well, into the commercial area that is going to be developed in Glebe Hill. Interestingly, the proponent at Glebe Hill said that he did not think it was necessary. Lynmore felt that they did not think it was necessary and did not think it was a key part of their development. If they were able to have access that was good, but it wasn't something that they were asking for. They actually suggested that they felt in the bigger picture it was not the right outcome, even though it did benefit them.

In September 2011, we understood we had an agreement with Mr Lambrakis that that is what we were going to do even though it was never our preferred option to go down that path as we felt it compromised transport efficiency. We notified Mr Lambrakis and we notified the residents of Howrah Gardens, and we notified the council and a couple of other adjoining developers. It was a concept that never went beyond that in terms of consultation. It never went to open days. It was never advertised. It was simply 'here is what we are thinking about doing'. As I say, as a department we did not favour it. We felt it was certainly a compromise and a compromise that we did not really want to make on this corridor, given the level of traffic it is going to take.

**CHAIR** - Was that the main reason that you did not favour it, or was there other aspects?

**Mr GREGORY** – Essentially, to put it in and to make it all work, we would have to take some property away from Lynmore. It basically wiped out what is currently the residential property owned by the Lambrakis family with a house on it to fit in the geometry. Effectively that whole lot disappears. So we did not think that was a necessary thing to do. In terms of cost it was much of a muchness between what we are now proposing and that concept, but the key issue was for gaining a small benefit to a smaller number of people we imposed a dis-benefit on 17 000 vehicles a day. That is what we didn't think was worth doing. We felt that was a compromise. Recognising that the plan as we have it now does have an impact on the residents of Howrah Gardens. In a

transport plan you need to take into account the big picture and you need to look at the maximum benefit for the maximum number of people.

... ..Our view was it is an urban arterial and we need to make it as efficient as we possibly can and that will have the greater benefit in the long run. That was our view. The residents, the business owners and the adjacent developers, and the council were advised here it is and yes, we will do this.

We subsequently went back to touch base with the owners of the garden centre, the Lambrakis family. There had been a passing of the baton from the father to the sons and they withdrew support for the compromise concept that we had. On that basis we said if we do not have support for that - and they wanted to keep moving it down and tried a whole range of different things, and we spent quite a deal of money looking at alternatives - we got to the point where we said if they no longer support it let us go back to the original plan, which provides the greater transport efficiency. We advised the minister, Mr Hidding, to that effect that we felt that was the best approach. We then advised the owners of the commercial property and the owners of the residences and council by the same means that we did in 2011 when we had the compromise. We went back and said, 'We are actually not going to do this, we are now going to do this'.

- 4.48 Two other options were put forward by respondents; the inclusion in the proposed works of a left-in left-out access on to Rokeby Road from the commercial centre and a slip-lane from Buckingham Drive to permit westbound traffic to access Rokeby Road.
- 4.49 The Committee questioned Mr Gregory on the potential inclusion of a slip lane off Buckingham Drive or a left-in left out access onto the highway from the business centre. Mr Gregory noted the difficulties and negative aspects of a slip lane; however he did indicate the Department was open to considering the provision of a left-in left-out access onto the highway from the commercial centre:

**CHAIR** - Another option offered to the committee was allowing a slip road or access from the Howrah Gardens on to the highway travelling into the city. Was that considered and why wasn't that included or considered appropriate?

**Mr GREGORY** - We have considered slip lanes, and we have considered left in and left out. The complications are how you cater for Buckingham Drive and the commercial centre because they are very close together. If we talk about a left in and left out, you can put that at Buckingham Drive. You would have a slip lane coming here, left in left out, and what you would end up then with is you either block this off and you do not allow people to go this way into the garden centre, or you end up with what is effectively a four-way intersection starting to mirror Baronia Street, Diosma Street. On site we talked about the problems there with these things being too close together. Down the track it is nearly impossible to control that because it is just too close.

Alternatively, we could put a slip lane, a left in left out, into the garden centre but then you would block this section off and you would not allow Buckingham Drive to do that. Having a slip lane out under this configuration it will end up being a rat run and it will be drawing people from all over to here and when they are coming along and see a bit of a queue at Tollard Drive lights they will duck down here and out and you will start drawing people from other areas. We looked at all of that and we did not want to also start drawing people from the new subdivision back in through Buckingham Drive through that way.

*We think those things do not work. We would still be open to a left in left out into the commercial centre, but it would be on the basis that it is only into the commercial centre. It could not achieve both. They are just far too close together to achieve both.*

**Mrs TAYLOR** - *You did say that you had considered that and proposed it and that the owners of the property had said no. What was the reason for that?*

**Mr GREGORY** - *They wanted all movements or none, basically. They may have been taking a very unwise bargaining position perhaps. They said no. We did offer that very early and we said, 'How about we do this.'*

**Mrs TAYLOR** - *Would it cost them money?*

**Mr GREGORY** - *To build?*

**Mrs TAYLOR** - *Yes, or would they lose land? What would the implications for that property be?*

**Mr GREGORY** - *No, a left in left out would have not had any impact on them at all.*

## **5 DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE**

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

- Department of State Growth:
  - South Arm Highway Extension/Rokeby Main Road - Department of State Growth – Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, August 2014;
  - Public Consultation Report – Extension of the South Arm Highway/Rokeby Main Road Upgrade;
  - 2 maps highlighting the currently developed and future developable land in the surrounding Clarendon Vale, Rokeby and Droughty Point areas;
  - Aerial view map showing Stage 1 (under construction) and Stage 2 (proposed) of the South Arm Highway Upgrade;
  - 4 computer-generated images from various view-points showing what the completed project will look like;
  - 3 maps highlighting properties specifically affected, including where compensation has been granted and those that have covenants and access restrictions on property titles;
  - The summary of property sales in surrounding areas compiled by the Department;
  - Rokeby Main Road, Oceana Drive to Diosma Street, Local Road Connections Traffic Assessment; and
  - Rokeby Main Road Junction Upgrading Concept Report;
- Submission from Mr James Alcock, dated 15 October 2014;
- Submission from Mr Wally Short, dated 10 October 2014;



- Submission from Mr Greg Belbin and Ms Carolyn Thompson, Howrah Nursery, dated 21 October 2014;
- Submission from Mr Dennis Matthews, dated 27 October 2014.

## **6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 The Committee does have concerns with the significant impact the proposed works may have on businesses in the Howrah Gardens area, both during and after construction. In light of these concerns, the Committee strongly urges the Department of State Growth to:
- engage in further consultation with affected businesses to ensure appropriate arrangements are established to facilitate business continuity during construction; and
  - reconsider providing a left-in left-out access for the affected businesses, to allow traffic to enter from, and back on to, Rokeby Road.
- 6.2 However, the Committee is satisfied that the need for the proposed works has been established. Once complete, the works will provide the following benefits:
- improved road safety outcomes, through the provision of a dual carriageway with a median barrier, the elimination of intersections and uncontrolled accesses, and improvements to the road alignment and sight distance;
  - enhanced transport efficiency by providing a consistent traffic environment along the road corridor;
  - additional capacity to meet existing and future demand;
  - improved access to existing residential areas and future residential subdivisions; and
  - a shared cycle/pedestrian facility.
- 6.3 Accordingly, the Committee recommends the project, in accordance with the documentation submitted.

**Parliament House  
Hobart  
25 November 2014**

**Hon Craig Farrell MLC  
Deputy Chairman**