



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algonia Road Roundabout Upgrade

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

Legislative Council

Ms Rattray (Chair)
Mr Harriss

House of Assembly

Ms Butler (Deputy Chair)
Ms Burnet
Mr Wood

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	BACKGROUND.....	3
3	PROJECT COSTS	5
4	EVIDENCE	7
5	DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE	28
6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	29

1 INTRODUCTION

To Her Excellency the Honourable Barbara Baker AC, Governor in and over the State of Tasmania and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY

The Committee has investigated the following proposal:-

Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algona Road Roundabout Upgrade

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

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This reference recommended the Committee approve works to duplicate the existing Kingston Bypass and upgrade the Algona Road Roundabout. The project includes the Algona Road Roundabout intersection with the Channel Highway through to the Groningen Road overpass, including the intersections with Summerleas Road and the Huon Highway.
- 2.2 The Kingston Bypass opened in 2011 as a two-lane, two-way highway (i.e. one lane in each direction), extending from the Southern Outlet highway at the Kingston Interchange to a large-diameter five-legged roundabout at Algona Road. While planning work was undertaken for the first stage of the Kingston Bypass, investigation on the need for a second stage was undertaken, with traffic modelling indicating it would need to be upgraded by 2027. When the Kingston Bypass was constructed, provision was made in the design for its future duplication.
- 2.3 The Algona Road Roundabout currently suffers from congestion, with traffic queueing and delays, especially during peak hours and school start and finish times. Growth in the immediate area and south of the Algona Road Roundabout has contributed to this congestion, with significant queueing occurring on the Channel Highway approach and the Huntingfield approach. This is expected to continue, with growth in existing sub-divisions and additional new housing developments likely to increase congestion. The local community have also been expressing concerns over the operation of the Algona Roundabout for some years.
- 2.4 To guide the decision making and design process for a proposed solution, the Department of State Growth conducted two phases of public consultation. The first phase, conducted from late 2021 (and concluded in April 2022), sought feedback from the community to identify and prioritise potential future improvement solutions. Based on this feedback the Department undertook a multi-criteria option analysis, which found that a grade separated interchange with roundabouts was the optimum solution.

- 2.5 The second phase, conducted from mid-2022 (and concluded in June 2023), was used to gather feedback on the potential design solution. Feedback from public consultation indicated a strong preference for the grade separated solution for the Algonia Road Roundabout upgrade and duplication of the Kingston Bypass. Furthermore, a strong desire was expressed that any solution should also focus on providing connectivity for active transport and public transport users.
- 2.6 Based on stakeholder feedback and the multi-criteria assessment, design work was undertaken and has resulted in the following proposed works:
- Grade-separated interchange replacing the Algonia Road Roundabout in the north and southbound direction;
 - Full duplication of the Kingston Bypass, with two lanes in each direction between the Algonia Road Roundabout and the Southern Outlet (including a duplicated bridge over the Huon Highway);
 - Additional roundabout west of the existing Algonia Road roundabout that facilitates access between the northbound carriageways of the Channel Highway/Kingston Bypass and Algonia Road;
 - Shared use path connecting the Huntingfield park and ride to Maddocks Road and Hollyhock Drive, with provision for a future pedestrian overpass over the Channel Highway; and
 - Safety improvements to the Maddocks Road/Channel Highway intersection.
- 2.7 The proposed works aim to deliver the following outcomes:
- Improved road safety for all road users;
 - Increased capacity of the Kingston Bypass (Southern Outlet roadway), allowing for improved travel time reliability for through traffic and accommodating for future population and traffic growth south of Kingston;
 - Improved travel time reliability for local Kingston residents through improved intersection performance; and
 - Improved active travel connectivity to Huntingfield Park and Ride for all transport users.

3 PROJECT COSTS

- 3.1 Pursuant to the Message from Her Excellency the Governor-in-Council, the estimated cost of the work is \$76.42 million.

The following table details the current p50 and p90 cost estimates for the project:

Item	P50 estimate	P90 estimate	Notes
Base estimate	\$63,048,000	\$63,048,000	Works including investigations, design, community engagement, approvals, acquisition (including related compensation), project management and construction.
Contingency	\$7,723, 000	\$10,432,000	Contingency 12 % – 17 % of base estimate. Refer below for discussion
Escalation	\$2,630,000	\$2,840,000	Escalation 4 % – 5 % of base estimate. Refer below for discussion.
Total	\$73,401,000	\$76,320,000	

- 3.2 The Department's submission provided further explanation of the contingency and escalation allowances provided for in the project cost estimates:

Contingency

The contingency allowance provides for contingent events – that is events which may or may not occur. Typically for a cost estimate undertaken at the preliminary design stage, such as this one, a contingency of 10 – 30 % is expected. For this project, key contingent risk items include:

- *Delays in approval processes including:*
 - *environmental/heritage approvals.*
- *Variation in scope/design due to:*
 - *constructability issues.*
 - *complex traffic management.*
 - *environmental management.*
 - *service relocations.*
- *Geotechnical risks including:*
 - *foundation issues with abutments require additional substructure works.*
 - *softer subgrade than anticipated requiring additional treatment or importation of material.*
 - *rock in excavations increasing cost and time of construction.*
- *Market factors including:*
 - *contractor availability.*
 - *market conditions.*
 - *variations during construction period.*

Escalation:

The escalation allowance is a provision in costs for changes in economic and market conditions over time.

Estimates of escalation are not intended to be precise forecast of future prices; they are approximations intended to represent the average trends for a large group of projects in a broad region.

The escalation rate for projects which are part funded by the Australian Government is determined by the Australian Government and is included in the project cost estimates as part of funding submissions from the department to the Australian Government. The Australian Government commissions considerable economic investigation to provide state specific forecast escalation, and the department has not diverted resources into challenging these Australian Government requirements.¹

¹ *Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algonia Road Roundabout Upgrade: Public Works Committee Submission*, 28 October 2024, Department of State Growth, page 8.

4 EVIDENCE

- 4.1 The Committee commenced its inquiry on Wednesday, 13 November last with an inspection of the site of the proposed works. The Committee then returned to Committee Room 1, whereupon the following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

Proponent

- Luke Middleton, Acting Manager Transport Network Planning, State Roads, Department of State Growth;
- Cary Hicks, Project Management Team Leader, Programming & Delivery, State Roads, Department of State Growth; and
- Johan Jordaan, Project Manager, Programming & Delivery, State Roads, Department of State Growth.

Members of the Public and Interested Parties

- Mark Donnellon

The following Committee Members were present:

- Hon Tania Rattray MLC (Chair);
- Ms Jen Butler MP (Deputy Chair);
- Ms Helen Burnet MP;
- Hon Dean Harriss MLC; and
- Mr Simon Wood MP.

Overview

- 4.2 Mr Middleton and Mr Jordaan provided the background to and an overview of the proposed works:

Mr MIDDLETON - ... Today we are seeking consideration for the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algonia Road roundabout upgrade project. Here is a bit of background for you. Following the Kingston and Environs transport study in the mid-2000s, we started planning for the Kingston Bypass in the late 2000s, with the construction of the first stage of the bypass completed in 2011. This was a two-lane, two-way highway, one lane in each direction, extending from the Southern Outlet highway at the Kingston Interchange to a large-diameter five-legged roundabout at Algonia Road, which is the current roundabout.

The planning work for the first stage of the bypass included consideration of the need for a second stage, with traffic modelling at the time indicating that duplication would be required sometime prior to 2027. The Channel Highway Algonia Road to Sandfly Road corridor study report, completed in September 2020, confirmed the need for upgrades to the existing highway. The project will provide two lanes in each direction between the Channel Highway and the Southern Outlet, improve consistency of travel times through the Algonia Road intersection by the provision of a grade separated interchange, and improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity between residential areas and park-and-ride sites.

The project is located in southern Tasmania in the Kingborough local government area and includes the suburbs of Huntingfield and Kingston. The Kingston Bypass is a component of the Southern Outlet, and is bounded by the Huon Highway at the Kingston Interchange to the Algona Road roundabout, where it becomes the Channel Highway south of the project area. The northern extent of the project area joins to the southern end of the Southern Outlet near the Groningen Road on-ramp, where we were today at the second site visit. The southern end of the project site joins the Channel Highway north of the Maddocks Road intersection, near where we were at the first stop.

The Southern Outlet is classified as a Category 1 trunk road under the current Tasmanian state road hierarchy, while the Channel Highway and Kingston Bypass are classified as Category 3 regional access roads.

In 2021, the Tasmanian government committed \$12 million to a \$60 million project to deliver a grade separated interchange at the Algona roundabout and to duplicate the Kingston Bypass. The Australian Government subsequently confirmed the commitment of \$48 million to these two important projects in its May 2021 Budget, with further funding in the May 2024 Australian Government Budget, bringing the total to \$76.42 million, which is \$61.12 million Australian Government and \$15.3 million state government.

Public consultation on the project took place over two consultation phases: April 2022 and June 2023. Feedback received during the public consultation and from engagement with residents, landowners and other key stakeholders was taken into consideration when finalising design. Summaries of the consultation and feedback were published on the Transport Tasmania website after public consultation was completed.

Three primary objectives of the project are to improve road safety for all road users, improve travel time reliability for road users, and provide greater modal choice for people travelling between south of Kingston and Hobart. The project is expected to deliver positive outcomes and benefits, including: improved road safety for all road users; increased capacity of the Kingston Bypass, Southern Outlet, allowing more consistent travel times for through traffic and accommodating for future population and traffic growth south of Kingston; improved consistency of travel times for local Kingston residents through improved intersection performance; and improved active travel connectivity to Huntingfield park-and-ride for all transport users.

Mr JORDAAN - ... The proposed works for the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algona Road roundabout project comprise the following:

- A grade separated interchange at Algona Road;
- An additional roundabout at the western side of the existing Algona Road roundabout that will facilitate access between the northbound carriageway of the Channel Highway and Algona Road;
- The duplication of the Kingston Bypass between Algona Road and Groningen Road;
- A shared-use path connecting the Huntingfield park-and-ride to Maddocks Road and Hollyhock Drive with the provision of a future pedestrian overpass over the Channel Highway; and
- safety improvements to the Maddocks Road and Channel Highway intersection.

During the scoping phase, a multi-criteria option analysis was completed. The different options were ranked against addressing the project objectives, the safety benefits and the estimated cost. The project is currently at the detailed design stage, which is planned to be completed by the end of this year. Construction is planned to start in mid-2025, subject to environmental approvals, and to be completed in mid-2027.

The estimated cost of the project is \$73.4 million, based on the P50 estimate, and \$76.3 million based on the P90 estimate. The cost estimate is considered to be reasonable for the scale and scope of the works proposed.

Once delivered, the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algona Road roundabout project will address the existing community need to reduce congestion and improve active transport links across the Channel Highway corridor.

Overall, we submit that the project is an important project that aligns with the department's response to best meet the needs of Kingston's and surrounding areas' growth in population. We recognise the significance of stakeholder contribution and engagement in the success of the project. We will continue to engage with cyclists to ensure key objectives of the project are met. We are seeking other legislative approvals, as required. The costs are appropriate.

Options Assessment Process

- 4.3 The Committee asked the Department's witnesses to outline the options that were considered prior to settling on the current proposed solution:

CHAIR - ... can we have some history around the options that were put forward? I don't need a detailed account of them, but just so we've got some understanding of why this option was deemed to be the most suitable to address the needs outlined in this proposal before us today.

Mr JORDAAN - ... we went through an option analysis in one of the previous stages of the project. That was actually during the scoping phase. We conducted a multi-criteria option analysis. We completed that by ranking all the options in terms of feasibility, cost benefit and what the community wanted at that stage. There were basically eight options. I can quickly summarise the options that we identified.

It was at-grade dual roundabout to maximise the use of existing infrastructure and for ease of future construction of grade-separated options.

The second one was at-grade dual signalised intersection for better control, and balance flows on existing road networks. That one is the one that included the traffic signals.

Then there was a grade-separated interchange with elevated dual-lane at Kingston Bypass and roundabout control terminals with a southern terminal to Algona Road roundabout.

Then there was a grade-separated interchange with elevated Kingston Bypass and signalised controlled terminals.

Then a grade-separated interchange with elevated Kingston bypass, northbound Kingston Bypass carriageway and signalised control terminals.

A grade-separated interchange with signalised controlled terminals on the left to right on-ramp merges and off-ramp diverges to Kingston Bypass.

The seventh option was a grade-separated interchange with an elevated southbound and at-grade northbound Kingston Bypass carriageway.

And then the last option, a grade-separated interchange with elevated southbound and northbound Kingston bypass carriageways.

Project Design Process

- 4.4 The Committee also asked the witnesses to outline how the project design was determined, including how community consultation had influenced the design process:

CHAIR - ... In one of our submissions we received from the Bicycle Network Tasmania, it talked about this particular proposal being rectified to address some matters that were raised for those who went through this stakeholder process. These matters that were raised and have been addressed, were they after those first eight options were put forward or did you have the proposal in place and then you made the changes to address, for instance, Bicycle Network Tasmania's concerns?

...

Mr JORDAAN - We'll have to confirm that against the two dates the public consultations were conducted and the time we did the option analysis.

...

Ms BURNET - Could you tell the committee when there was input from stakeholders, as far as you know, as part of the process?

Mr JORDAAN - ... the input from the stakeholders was at the two opportunities we had for public consultation.

Ms BURNET - When is that in relation to having significant input into the process?

Ms HICKS - I can probably add to that. We're talking about the concept phase, which was undertaken a couple of years ago now. The initial consultation was when we developed a number of options for consideration by the public and went out and invited feedback from the public: 'What are your issues? What do you need this interchange for?' We were just gathering data initially. That was the first round. From that we were able to finalise the top eight. There were probably more options than that initially. We isolated the top eight and then undertook our multi-criteria analysis ... Then there was a second round of public consultation where we went back out to the public with a restricted number of options....That's typically the process we go through for those early optioneering type exercises.

Ms BURNET - Input from stakeholders – Bicycle Network Tasmania and Cycling South have a lot of experience in providing advice on bike infrastructure and active transport. When is that information listened to or put into the design? Is it currently the best way of doing it? Is it optimal?

Mr JORDAAN - To get back to the previous part of the question, the two rounds were conducted between 1 December to 21 December 2021 and the second round was 27 June to 17 July 2022. Those were through public consultation. The public had the opportunity to comment on Social Pinpoint. That information was collected and then the two summary reports ...were then compiled. Our designer worked with that information into the next phase of the of the design. It was not that the public consultation was done after the design was completed, it was part of the process.

CHAIR - There was some criticism in one of the submissions that you would expect the department, given they have an obligation or their policies, that all major projects include safe access for people walking and riding. Their input delivered the outcomes that have been presented here today, but it appears it wasn't the initial part of the project put forward. Is that a fair criticism or not exactly the way it unfolded?

Ms HICKS - I'm not sure I agree with that summary of it.

CHAIR - That's my summary, their words are possibly a little bit different.

Ms HICKS - The approach is open; it's an equal playing field. We go out to the public and also have some targeted consultation with individual stakeholders, which could be the cycling community groups, could be council or TasNetworks. We invite feedback from anybody, but we do have to consider all of the different aspects for the project and traffic modelling is certainly a part of it.

Cost effectiveness, long-term planning, all of those are criteria we have to assess and weigh up. And, yes, we're just trying to get the best fit.

CHAIR - Would it be fair to say... that there's a focus on vehicle traffic. In that particular area, walking and riding is not something - you'd have to be brave from what I could see today to be cycling around that particular area. Is that somewhat part of why there's a more particular focus on vehicles?

Ms HICKS - No, I don't think there's more of a focus on vehicles, but it is a grade separated interchange and that is the nature of the project. There's a massive amount of traffic volume running through that intersection every day.

... we are aware of the active transport users and have made provision to improve safety where we can for that and provide additional access where we can also.

Mr MIDDLETON - The department does operate under the positive provision policy for cycling infrastructure, which means we have to take it into account when we do major transport projects like this and that is what we've done. We may not be able to deliver everything that particular stakeholders want, but we take it into account and that's what the design is certainly doing.

Project Cost Estimate, Contingency and Escalation

4.5 The Committee sought some clarity on the estimated project costs, and the contingency and escalation allowances for the project:

CHAIR -... Obviously, we've been presented with the estimates and it's clear that these are only estimates.

... the escalation allowance, is a provisioning costs for changes in economic and market conditions over time. Estimates of escalation are not intended to be precise forecasts for future prices.

Does the department feel confident that the P50 estimate, the P90 estimate and those escalations that are not set in stone are going to be achieved? Because I can see \$3 million that we could possibly start on that overpass if we went P50, which we go P50 - take P50 road - can I have some assurance around that?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes, just to get back to your statement about the estimates, these estimates were derived just before we went into the detailed design. We did that with the preliminary design, which is, at that stage, you have fairly accurate quantities and those estimates were derived from that bill of quantities. We have the base estimate and then above that we had to work on a contingency allowance for both P50 and P90. We also allowed for the escalation over the two years of construction, but also the additional year heading up to its approval of the project. Yes, we are confident that we've looked in detail into these numbers and they are similar to what we do with other projects.

... If we look at the contingency that we've published in the tables of the report, the P50 was at 12 per cent and the P90 was at 17 per cent.

...

CHAIR - If something happens with a geotechnical risk it could blow the budget out of the water.

Ms HICKS - There are contingency items for things like geotechnical and other delays, but yes, we might use some of that contingency, but there's another contingency that might not get realised.

Ms BUTLER - It is quite significant though. If you add together the contingency and the escalation on P50, that's 14 per cent of the total cost. If you add together the P90, the contingency and the escalation, it's almost 13.5 per cent of the total cost. It's a lot. Why is that? It's unusual for us to see contingency and escalation actually divided as such. Usually, when we get these submissions they're not. Why is there a different approach, because that's a lot?

Mr JORDAAN - The contingency is based on confidence about the base case items identified. It's not just a one liner at the bottom of the of the cost estimate, it's a column on the side. Those contingencies the percentages differ from for all the line items so that the average

combined contingency for the P50 was 12 and for the P90 was 17. Escalation is about the future price that you will pay for something you buy.

... it's not uncertainty about the numbers.

Ms HICKS - The base estimate is on today's rates. The contingency is on the base estimate, which is also today's rates.

Ms BUTLER - We usually don't see them separated as such...

Ms HICKS - In all estimates, they will always be separated and sometimes the way they're presented might not show that separation, but escalation is always applied to both the base estimate and the contingency because it is a separate item and it can apply to both.

...

Mr HARRISS - You touched on it just before. The base estimate's done on current market. Is it taken into account when the project's going to start, or is it purely done on 2024?

Ms HICKS - It's on today's rates. That's all we can do - is start off with a base case. Then we work out what contingent risk there is, or risks, applied to all of those items, and some mathematical wizardry and probabilistic analysis gets applied to all of those items, which generates the contingency amounts. That's where the P50 and P90 comes in. Those have different weightings in that probabilistic analysis. That's all on today's rates. Both of those sides of the estimate can then increase based on whether or not we construct in one year's time, two years, three years.

Matters raised in Public submissions

4.6 The Committee received three submissions in response to its call for public submissions, from:

- Bicycle Network Tasmania;
- Cycling South; and
- Mr Mark Donnelon.

4.7 Each of these submissions had a similar focus, raising matters related to improving access and safety for active transport. These included:

- Support for the Channel Highway pedestrian overpass;
- Improving crossing arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists on Algona Road; and
- Improved connections to access the Huntingfield Park and Ride, from both Algona Road and Huntingfield Avenue.

4.8 In its submission, Cycling South indicated its support for the Channel Highway overpass:

Pedestrian overpass across the Channel Hwy – It is excellent to see this improvement from the original design which had no grade-separated crossing on the Channel Hwy. The pedestrian overpass needs to be 3.5m in width which leaves a shared path operating space of 3.0m with 25cm clearance on either side from railings (which can catch handlebars). The overpass should

have DDA compliant grades of 1:14. Corners on the path should be rounded curves rather than sharp angles.²

4.9 Mr Donnellon made a similar comment:

...To effectively support active transport, the pedestrian overpass should be designed to comfortably accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. Ensuring sufficient width is essential for safe and seamless movement. The overpass must also feature a gradient that complies with accessibility standards, making it usable for individuals of all abilities. This consideration is vital to ensure inclusivity and promote regular use by the community. Additionally, pathways leading to and from the overpass should be direct and well-aligned. Avoiding sharp or impractical turns will enhance usability and encourage more people to integrate active transport into their daily routines. By incorporating these design elements, the overpass can be made safe, accessible, and inviting, fostering a shift toward more sustainable and active modes of transport.³

4.10 The Bicycle Network highlighted its concerns with both the current and proposed Algona Road crossing options:

... we reiterate our concerns about the crossing of Algona Road, which could still be improved. The current crossing and proposed crossing are at grade and so very difficult for people to use safely during peak periods because of the volume and speed of cars and having to cross two lots of two lanes of traffic.⁴

4.11 Mr Donnellon also provided similar commentary, and suggested a designated crossing space marked on the road may be a safe and effective solution:

On the south side of the Algona Road crossing, a keep-clear zone or zebra crossing would be a cheap and effective way to make this part of the Algona Road crossing significantly easier for users of the path. I currently experience two lanes of traffic backed up here when crossing and find that vehicles are regularly stopped directly between the two sides of the path. This leads to a difficult to navigate, zig-zagging, crossing between momentarily stopped vehicles. Often, the drivers that can see me in the closest lane will wait for me to cross in front of them, but drivers in the next lane will not see and stop.

Designating space on the road for path users to cross may be a simple way to make this much safer and easier for path users.

4.12 Bicycle Network Tasmania, Cycling South and Mr Donnellon also highlighted the inadequacy of the connections from Algona Road to Huntingfield Avenue and the Park and Ride, with each offering possible solutions:

... The safer alternative is to travel east on the footpath to an underpass under Algona Road, which exits onto Coffee Court. There is no footpath on this street, which sees regular heavy vehicle movements in and out of Mitre Ten and other industrial businesses in the area. People walking and riding then have to circle up and around to get back to the new pedestrian crossing to be able to safely cross Huntingfield Avenue to the Park and Ride.

² Submission from Cycling South, page 1.

³ Submission from Mr Mark Donnellon, page 2.

⁴ Submission from Bicycle Network Tasmania, page 1.

The project should include the building of a path to take people from the underpass back up to the shared path on Channel Highway. There is plenty of room in the road reservation to do this and it will make the journey for people riding and walking quicker and more direct.

This is especially important as the Huntingfield housing development proceeds and more people move to the area.⁵

..The section of Huntingfield Ave by the Park and Ride is extremely hostile to people trying to cross the road to travel to the Park and Ride by foot, bicycle or scooter, particularly during peak periods. It is good to see a pedestrian refuge included as it was omitted from the original Park and Ride plans, despite requests from multiple submissions. It needs to be wide and deep enough to accommodate the length of a bicycle and more than one person in the refuge at a time.

The pathways connecting to the Park and Ride are extremely poorly aligned and need to be remedied as part of this project. It's one of the worse examples of poor design I have ever seen for a pathway project intended to make it easier for people to access public transport. The paths are indirect and have convoluted alignments and multiple unnecessary driveway crossings (red dotted line on diagram). A direct wombat crossing that gives priority to path users should be constructed across the driveway entrance to Mitre 10. Ideally the exit from the carpark by the pedestrian refuge should be closed and cars are directed through the Mitre 10 carpark to the exit further south on Huntingfield Ave. This would make this messy intersection more straightforward and improve amenity and safety for people walking and riding.⁶

The northern side of Algona Road has a shared path and a gravel path leading down to an underpass. However, the other side of the underpass is completely disconnected from good quality, safe cycling infrastructure and is a significant detour when the destination is the Huntingfield Park and Ride. A path connecting the underpass to the existing shared path on the south side at Mitre 10 would provide a very usable, safe path option for residents to the west of Algona Road, around Redwood Road, as well as provide a safe, although long, crossing option between Huntingfield Avenue and Channel Highway.⁷

- 4.13 Mr Donnellon took the opportunity to give further evidence to the Committee at the public hearing. Mr Donnellon relayed his first-hand knowledge of negotiating the Algona Road crossing and accessing the Huntingfield Park and Ride, the barriers he saw to the increased uptake of active transport alternatives, and measures he felt would provide a safer and more effective active travel experience:

Mr DONNELLON - *The crossing at Algona Road, as has been mentioned. It's two lanes in each direction for people to cross. It's a high-traffic road at particular times of the day, like school mornings and, yes, easily considered a frightening road to cross.*

... However, the alternative to crossing there is if you're going from the Channel Highway to the park and ride, it's a 250-metre detour to go through the industrial estate, of which is not really high-grade footpaths.

⁵ Submission from the Bicycle Network, pages 1-2.

⁶ Submission from Cycling South, page 2.

⁷ Submission from Mr Mark Donnellon, pages 3-4.

CHAIR - It's not ideal.

Mr DONNELLON - No.

Ms BUTLER - Is it well marked? If you were local, would you know it was there?

Mr DONNELLON - No. If you're local and you've tried a few times, you'll eventually figure it out.

Ms BUTLER - But if you're someone not local who is going to, say, Clennett's to do some shopping, you wouldn't know it was there, would you?

Mr DONNELLON - That's right. Especially if you're approaching from the Huntingfield side, you have to go through some side streets to actually find it.

Ms BUTLER - So it's local knowledge.

Mr DONNELLON - That's right. And if your goal is to get people to take up active transport, then what's currently there is a barrier to using that, a discoverability barrier and practicality barriers as well. This project doesn't include any changes to that underpass, or changes to access to that underpass. One of my recommendations is to link up the other side of Algona Road where the underpass is.

Ms BURNET - That's the northern side?

Mr DONNELLON - So, a link on the south side of that tunnel up to the Algona Road roundabout, in the road reserve between Algona Road and what is currently Mitre 10.

CHAIR - How do you mean link up? What do you envision there, as a person who is using that area?

Mr DONNELLON - It would mirror what's alongside the Antarctic Division going down from the roundabout to the tunnel.

CHAIR - Is this where you've suggested that a keep-clear zone or zebra crossing would be a cost-effective way to make this part of the Algona Road crossing significantly easier for users of the park and ride?

Mr DONNELLON - It's a different suggestion. If you want to make the level crossing perceived safer and easier to use, you could do so by designating some space for cyclists, pedestrians to cross there. Currently, cars will back up at the intersection when entering the roundabout.

CHAIR - Right. So, you'd need a keep-clear type, which is pretty simple.

Mr DONNELLON - Simple bit of paint.

CHAIR - Very simple. That's only some paint on the road.

Mr DONNELLON - Yes. It may also involve some realignment of the path because it's quite close to the entrance to the roundabout, but that's specifics.

CHAIR - Right. And your suggestion around the northern side of Algona Road has a shared path and gravel path leading down to the underpass.

Mr DONNELLON - Yes, the gravel path leads to Redwood Road. That is a residential area that's not pictured on the plans you have. But it's a very walkable distance for the residents there to access the park and ride.

CHAIR - So, again, a fairly cost-effective solution to achieve a reasonable outcome, in your view?

Mr DONNELLON - A cheap solution to make a small improvement, yes.

...

Mr DONNELLON - Things that I think are important to focus on is improving the access to the park and ride without a car.

...One of the ways I believe we can improve uptake of the bus services from the park and ride is to create options that make it viable for people not to own one of their cars...

...

Ms BUTLER - But if you were a person that was living nearby or riding a bike, there are a lot of residential dwellings around there. So, instead of those people having to drive from their residential dwelling, cut across, go park up near a bus stop, for them to have an access way to be able to just walk across to catch a bus would be a lot easier, I imagine.

Mr DONNELLON - That's right. I might point out that there are houses 200 metres away on the western side of this project and for people to walk currently without the unfunded overpass, they have to walk 1.7 kilometres, or 24 minutes.

... The overpass would cut that reasonably significantly, although it isn't entirely the most direct route yet.

...

Ms BURNET - Can you just describe, as a bike user, the difficulties or ease of getting around if you're crossing the Channel Highway or you just try to get from point A to point B effectively? And also your experience using that roundabout as a bike user?

Mr DONNELLON - Sure. From deep into Huntingfield, towards where the schools are, down Huntingfield Avenue, is where I normally come from. And down that way there is a great, I think it's about 2 metre, footpath that's hardly intersected by roads and driveways, which makes travelling out of Huntingfield pretty great up until we get to the industrial estate. It might be Patriarch Drive; and the very narrow road sections and footpaths immediately on the approach to the park and ride. So, we have some great separated paths on Huntingfield Avenue already, but they end a few hundred metres from the park and ride. So that will put myself, being a keen bike rider, onto the road with the traffic on the left-hand side going up to the park and ride. If I'm catching the bus, I'll pull in there. Otherwise, continue on until I can turn into the Mitre 10 intersection.

...It is pretty busy there. Anyway, you can turn off there and then go on to the newish path that leads to the Algona Road crossing. At that point, depending on the time of day, there'll be two lines of cars banked up across the crossing waiting to enter the roundabout, which I will navigate with my kid in my child seat on the back of my bike, and often try to acknowledge the drivers.

...

...Yes, it's tricky to navigate. Definitely need to pay attention to whether the drivers are paying attention and get across there. And then the second crossing is much more difficult to do in high traffic, as you have a lot of cars coming round the roundabout at speed. If they've come from the Kingston Bypass, it's pretty much a straight shot across the roundabout...

... Then you also have traffic that may or may not be turning around the roundabout and you have to, essentially, give way to them whether or not they're going to take the exit or not, because drivers can't reliably indicate.

... There's a lot of traffic to give way to crossing that second side of Algona Road.

CHAIR - Your recommendation for paths, and you've made what I consider is a fairly reasonable recommendation here, where you talk about:

The re-alignment of the north side will increase the distance where path users and road users can see each other, a welcome change. This could be further improved with the removal of vegetation that blocks the sightline between path users and road users turning left from Channel Hwy to Algona Road.

Is that something that could just be done as a matter of course? It doesn't need this reference to do that.

Mr DONNELLON - Absolutely not. No.

CHAIR - Right. I thought that sounded so practical that surely that's not part of this. Is that something that you've progressed with anyone: the council or Department of State Growth or anyone?

Mr DONNELLON - I don't know who to contact in Department of State Growth.

CHAIR - ... I'll probably throw it up to the other end of the table. I think that's a really practical solution for providing some better sight distance, so thank you for that. Anything else that you'd like to add, Mark?

Mr DONNELLON - I'd like to add that this project area is smack bang in the middle of some large residential areas, large places of employment, schools, a new shopping centre, hopefully.

... And it's in an area that should have lots of trips taken without cars. We're not talking about large distances here. We're talking about walkable, bikeable distances. This project area is right in the middle, and I believe non-car transport should be highly considered as part of the project.

Channel Highway Pedestrian Overpass

4.14 The Committee noted the support in the public submissions for a pedestrian overpass across the Channel Highway. The Committee was of the view that this was a critical element to meet the objective of improving active transport connectivity, however, noted with concern that it was not part of the project presented to the Committee for approval. The Committee sought to explore this matter further with the Department's witnesses. The Department's witnesses indicated their view was that it was a key component, however current project funding precluded its inclusion in the proposed works, and additional funding from the State Government would be necessary for construction of the overpass to be undertaken:

Ms BUTLER - ... I also wanted to talk about the pedestrian bridge and how that is discussed in this submission. However, this submission is not providing for that bridge; it's touted as a future possibility. Why was it included at all in this submission if it's not part of these costs at all, and why is it on the maps?

Mr JORDAAN - Part of the objectives of the project was to cater for pedestrian access; to make sure we cater for that need, so during the initial -

Ms BUTLER - Sorry to cut you off, but it doesn't cater to that need in this project, so I'm just curious why it's actually in this proposal because it's not being built under this proposal.

Mr JORDAAN - When we received the submission for the concept design, there was some allowance for footpaths as part of the Algona Road dual carriageway. It made provision for pedestrians passing at the underpass. After a few reviews, we've realised that is not a proper solution. Going through a detailed design, we looked at better options, and that overpass was identified as an option that is more suitable for the public need. Therefore we progressed to that as part of the design. The other thing is we just need to, because at that stage the funding would not allow within the budget, for an overpass. It was just part of pedestrian walkways at the underpass. It is additional cost, which is outside the cost estimate for this project or the budget. Therefore, we still have to look for additional funding for that.

Ms BUTLER - I thought it's important on the record that there was an announcement by the federal government of \$100 million, the Active Transport Fund, that will come into term, I suppose, as of 1 July 2025. Has there been any engagement made on that level from the department to potentially tap into that \$100 million fund to complement this? That is about active transport. Could you provide any information about whether that has been considered?

It seems like it could be a reasonable way to ensure this project can actually not be three-quarters.

...Has that been considered at all?

Mr MIDDLETON - I might have to take that on notice and check back with our urban mobility planner.

Ms BURNET - Just on those pertinent points that Ms Butler raises, is it just seen as a 'nice to have', or is this pedestrian active transport bridge an important component of this application before us?

Mr MIDDLETON - From my perspective, it's an important component. What Johan was trying to say before about the design was that the initial concept was for a separate pedestrian underpass at the Algona end. The problem was that as the design progressed that proved to be impractical. Basically, it couldn't be drained. It wouldn't be safe, from the antisocial perspective.

... It would, and it would be very long and very deep, and you'd basically have to have a pump going 24/7 to keep the water out of it. By the time we'd got to that point, the design had moved on some time, and I'm sure you'd appreciate these are very complex designs that you have to go through to come up with a final.

... So, yes, by the time we got to the point in the concept development and realised that the underpass was just not practical, we started to look for an alternative, but we'd moved a long way down the track. Essentially the design for the overpass was just a bit late to get a start, which is probably the primary reason why it's a bit delayed.

...

... To be honest, we didn't get beyond the concept really. There was some design work done, but it wasn't much more than the concept because it was realised by the project team that it wasn't the optimum option to serve the community.

Mr HARRISS - ... the shared-use path connecting the Huntingfield park-and-ride and Maddocks Road and Hollyhock Drive: will all that work be done or is it costed in this one, and at the moment the only works not included is the pedestrian overpass? ... The work on each side of the highway - will that work be done, and just not the orange highlighted part at the moment is costed, is that right?

Mr JORDAAN - That is correct, yes. It is allowed for in the budget.

Mr HARRISS - So you've got all the footpaths, the shared -

Mr JORDAAN - Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR - It's just that small component that's really important that we need the \$4 million for.

Mr JORDAAN - That's correct, yes.

...

Ms BUTLER - I think it's really important as well, Chair, as a committee that we're looking to see if there's value for money in a project which provides shared pathways. There's a park-and-ride on one side, which is all about having people not use cars. We've got the Antarctic Division, we've got a new potential shopping precinct going into the area, we've got Clennett's Mitre 10, then we've also got another hardware store, but there's no safe avenue for people to gain access across that highway. There are no traffic lights or a crossing or a bridge or an underpass. I think that's really the deficient part of the project for us. I think it's important that that's noted on the record, that we're investing in, but there's nothing to get over the road for people on bikes or walking. It just seems like a large component of the project is missing.

Algona Road Crossing

- 4.15 The Committee also recognised the safety issues in crossing Algona Road raised in the public submissions and described from first-hand experience by Mr Donnellon at the hearing. The Committee explored this issue with the Department's witnesses including seeking their views of the solutions proposed in the public submissions to improve the safety of this crossing:

CHAIR - ... I'm taking myself back to the submission by Bicycle Network Tasmania where it talks about how the current crossing and proposed crossings are at a grade and very difficult for people to use safely during peak periods because of the volume and speed of the cars, having to cross two lots of two lanes of traffic. Is that something that you could comment on?

Mr MIDDLETON - It sounds like it's talking about Algona Road.

CHAIR - Yes, it is.

Mr MIDDLETON - One of the things being looked at which perhaps Johan can talk to is some changes at the Algona Road crossing coming from the AAD [Australian Antarctic Division] side.

Mr JORDAAN - The one at Algona Road at that roundabout - that crossing coming from the Antarctic Division; currently you're not crossing the road perpendicular; it's at an angle. We've improved that crossing to be more perpendicular to the existing road. Also, the radius of the path the vehicles need to follow going outside of the roundabout was also adjusted to slow the traffic down slightly. The benefit is the better crossing; it is moved slightly away from the roundabout, so there's better visibility, and then the advantage of traffic being slowed.

CHAIR - Does that address the grade to some extent?

Mr JORDAAN - That is a level crossing. It is not at an angle at all.

Ms BURNET - Is that a zebra crossing?

Mr JORDAAN - No, it's not a zebra crossing.

...

Ms BURNET - Does it have a refuge?

Mr MIDDLETON - Yes.

Ms BURNET - Is that proposed or is there one there?

Mr MIDDLETON - There is one there.

Mr JORDAAN - Correct.

...

CHAIR - Can I have some thoughts around the suggestion of having the keep-clear zone or the zebra crossing, which I indicated at the time seemed like a very easy solution to be able to gain some sort of access without fear of being knocked off your bike, particularly with a little person on the back. Is that something that's not an expensive item that could be progressed?

Ms HICKS - I'm happy to talk about that one. I'm not sure if we acknowledged it in the report; part of our final detailed design activities are making some adjustments ...

... We are looking at that crossing of Algona Road. Johan mentioned previously we were realigning and moving the crossing a little bit farther away from the roundabout.

...

CHAIR - It's in? It's a definite in?

Ms HICKS - We're doing improvements to that crossing. I don't know specifically whether we have line marking to preclude vehicles parking over that on the approach to the Algona roundabout from Blackmans Bay. I actually do agree that that is a good suggestion. Because we're still finalising that design, if we haven't considered that, I'm happy to add that to the list of things we're looking at. I agree with that approach.

In terms of a pedestrian crossing, it's not practical to have a pedestrian crossing that close to the proximity of approaches to a roundabout because of the impact of backing up traffic through the roundabout. That causes other substantial safety issues for motorists and everybody.

I do agree the line marking is a good opportunity.

CHAIR - Like a keep-clear zone.

Ms HICKS - Yes, a keep-clear zone type line marking. We will look into that if we are not already.

Another point on that matter, with pedestrians and cyclists crossing Algona Road, we acknowledge the issues with crossing it at the moment with the current level of traffic that uses the roundabout. The new design will have a greatly reduced amount of traffic using the roundabout.

CHAIR - Spread the traffic across two roundabouts.

Ms HICKS - That's right. That will also have a positive impact on the safety of that crossing.

Traffic Disruption During Construction

- 4.18 The Committee recognises that roadworks can cause significant, but unavoidable, disruption to the travelling public. The Committee asked the Department's witnesses what arrangements would be in place with the contractor to minimise traffic disruption during construction:

CHAIR - Moving on to the potential impacts and opportunities. I did ask on site before, as an overarching question, about the interruption by the works, should this proposal see favour, to the travelling community, the community in general, to anyone who uses this road. Can we have some indication of what discussions will be had with any chosen contractor should the proposal proceed around general impact on the community? Like, whether you're going to have night works or whether it'll be purely day work or how that might be undertaken? If you could just give the committee some of your thoughts around that?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes. The first thing after we place an order on a contractor, the contractor needs to submit a stakeholder engagement and communication plan. Within that plan, the way we communicate with the community will be defined and it's also reviewed by the department. If it's going to be night works or day works and noise and those type of things, lighting to be used, traffic management, everything will go into that, what we call a SCEP. There's also additional traffic management that also needs to be approved by the department.

CHAIR - Luke also said that there is a process where the department might identify that there needs to be at least this much of the highway available and must be able to travel at x amount of speed through the works as well. That's something that is also put into the mix on behalf of the department, representing the community. Is that correct?

Ms HICKS - That's typical of all of our construction projects, where we do provide a specification that's specific to the project and the specific traffic needs of that project. Yes, that will be developed, and then the contractor will need to comply with those requirements in their traffic management.

CHAIR - For instance, we won't have traffic banked up for more than 10 minutes on a red light for any time during the construction stage.

Ms HICKS - Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR - Is that the going time, 10 minutes?

Ms HICKS - No, we are typically have less than that, particularly on these high traffic volume roads.

Potential Noise Impacts

- 4.16 The Committee noted that an increase in highway capacity may lead to an increase in noise levels, which may impact upon nearby properties. The Committee asked the witnesses about anticipated noise levels and whether mitigation measures would be required:

Mr WOOD - You're doubling the capacity of the highway, therefore, would it be fair to assume noise will increase a little bit too? There are different types of asphalt or whatever the product's called that can reduce the sound ramifications. Is that factored into this at all or is there any need for soundproofing walls along this area due to the extra noise possibly generated?

Mr JORDAAN - ... We went through a process of conducting noise assessments. Taking into account the model of additional traffic in the next few years as well as the fact we are not going to increase the speed limit on the bypass. It will still be 80 kilometres per hour. From the noise assessment, it has been determined it is not needed to do additional noise mitigation over and above what we have already done there.

Ms BURNET - ... But I don't know if that goes to the heart of your question in relation to the noise with the surface of the road, is that what you're doing?

Mr JORDAAN - We will use the same type of surface we currently have. We did investigate other options. As you mentioned, there are options available to reduce noise even further. However, that comes at additional cost. During the assessment, it was determined that the specific additional measurement will not be required.

Mr WOOD - Wasn't warranted.

Mr JORDAAN - Yes.

CHAIR - Would that in any way elevate the road from a P50 to a P90 by having that extra sound proofing in the resource that's used for the bitumen. Does that elevate that?

Ms HICKS - We don't have that level of detail for the specific additional cost and how that will relate to the P90. But typically, we have a design guideline for noise mitigation and that gives us our constraints as to how far we have to model in the future and what the thresholds are before we have to spend money on mitigation. We went through that process - including the location of the new lanes, which are closer to some traffic - and we found that everything was within those thresholds. We don't have justification to spend more money on asphalt types. However, the asphalt surfacing and all of the spray seal surfacing on the project have a design life of about 15 years. Then we resurface just the same as any other road on our network. At that time in the future, that assessment can be done again if there are issues and we can then resurface with the different asphalt at that time.

Ms BUTLER - On that, the new roundabout is a lot closer to residential than what was there previously. Was there consultation done on that and additional noise mitigation because that is a lot closer to residential dwellings than has been previously. Could you provide the committee with a bit of information about the consultation or that potential noise monitoring undertaken, because that is significantly closer to residential properties than previously.

Mr JORDAAN - Yes. A part of the noise assessment was actually to temporarily install noise measuring equipment over the project area, which includes private properties. As per those

assessments and the results we received from that, it was not required to do additional noise mitigation and therefore no additional public consultations.

If we found there were properties affected and where you have added or higher thresholds, then you go to the next step and actually do that.

CHAIR - You put up a barrier, rather than change the product you use in your seal.

Mr JORDAAN - Yes, correct.

Ms HICKS - We would consider all of those options for mitigation.

CHAIR - It would be too late after the seal's done. You'd have to put up a barrier. A sound barrier like a wall, because you've already sealed the roads, so it's too late for that.

Mr JORDAAN - It all goes into part of the design. We know what type of seal will produce specific noise levels. It's not needed to measure afterwards. You can predict that within your design model.

...

Ms HICKS - Certainly the noise modelling does account for the posted speed limit; the expected speeds of vehicles. They'll be braking as vehicles are coming on the ramp and approaching the roundabout; accelerating as they leave. All of that is taken into consideration in the model.

Aboriginal Heritage

4.19 The Committee understood there were a number of Aboriginal heritage sites within the works area. The Committee sought further information from the Department's witnesses on how potential disturbance of these sites would be managed:

Ms BUTLER - ...Could you, for the record, provide us with some information around the potential to disturb several sites of varying significance of Aboriginal heritage, and what work is underway to try to lessen that impact at the moment?

Mr JORDAAN - We have done assessments on Aboriginal heritage sites. We've identified certain areas where we found some specific sites that will be affected within the project footprint. We've been in contact with Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and Aboriginal Heritage Council to basically communicate the strategy on how to deal with those sites. Subsequently to obtain permits for removal of those to relocate to identified approved alternative sites. We are currently busy with that process.

Ms BUTLER - How significant is that removal work and is there any other alternative than removing Aboriginal heritage from those sites?

Mr JORDAAN - As I said, it was all negotiated with the council and that was their preference.

Ms BUTLER - The Aboriginal Council or the Kingborough Council?

Mr JORDAAN - The Aboriginal Heritage Council. Their requirement is that we do relocate those artefacts and we went through a process of identifying a relocation site which we presented to them. They then indicated what would be their preference and we are currently going through that process of getting everything relocated.

We also had to contact the Australian government because of the EPBC referral that could have affected the site, but we've got permission from them to continue this process independently.

Assessment under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

4.17 The Committee understood the project was expected to impact upon flora and fauna that triggered assessment under the Environment Protection and

Biodiversity Conservation Act. The Committee questioned the witnesses on this process and the mitigation measures that may be implemented:

Ms BURNET - We talked about the significant natural landscape and maintaining that. Can you talk us through the EPBC referral process and how that might work?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes, certainly. During the design we had to do everything related to the environmental compliance, and guidance and acts around that. We've submitted the referral to the Australian Government under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, the EPBC act. Based on that, the feedback that we've got as part of the inquiry was that we had to look at a referral area for a specific site, meaning that we are currently in a process of investigating alternative sites that can be used as an offset. More specifically, as mentioned during the site visit this morning, that area at the Algona Road roundabout, we've got Eucalyptus ovata forest. There is about 0.7 hectares that fall within the project footprint. That is the specific environmental triggers that we need to cater for.

Ms BURNET - Okay, so That's 0.7 hectares. By offset, do you mean planting new trees? How do you offset removal of that?

Mr JORDAAN - Offsetting is we investigate other sites, other possibilities where you have current vegetation of that specific species. And then, depending on the quality of that site, there's specific calculations that are done to calculate what will be there at the new site for offset. It's normally much bigger than the current footprint, but it will all depend on the quality of vegetation in that offset area. So it could be; the areas that we've looked at are typically 10 times that size.

Ms BURNET - Where do you find that?

Mr JORDAAN - With difficulty. We've looked at a few options around Kingston, so there was a site alongside the Southern Outlet. We've looked at a site close to Hobart College. At this stage, the feedback that we've received is that they were not adequately vegetated, specifically with Eucalyptus ovata. So, there is an ongoing process for identifying other locations.

Ms BURNET - Right. That's an interesting process. That will all be considered through the federal - you will have to get permission through that referral process?

Mr JORDAAN - That is correct.

Ms BURNET - When do you expect that?

Mr JORDAAN - They've asked us to submit a strategy for the offset. They call it the offset strategy, and there are guidelines on what needs to be included through that process.

... Yes, we are working closely with the Australian Government. It is unfortunately difficult to predict a specific date, because this process is outside of our control. At the moment, we've got the offset and we've got the offset strategy documented. We will submit again and then we will then be in contact with them and hopefully, as soon as possible, get a response.

Ms BURNET - Are there any mitigating things you can do as part of this project rather than take that part of that wooded area?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes. We did look at that. The first option was not to affect that specific area, but we did a lot of work around the design to see how we can avoid having to go through that area. The consultant had to look at various options in the location of the roundabout. The proposed option we've got at the stage is basically the best option we've got.

CHAIR - Ticked as many boxes as you could.

Mr JORDAAN - Yes, that's correct, and then the other avoidance could be to revegetate an existing site in State Growth property, but once again, that could be 10 or 15 hectares of new vegetation to be planted. There needs to be a proper program to manage that and it's not just the specific species, it's also the species that grows below that. It's quite a complex process.

The easiest way or the recommended way is to find an adequate piece of land and then work around that. If not, then we have to revert back to revegetation.

Additional Information Sought From the Department of State Growth

4.18 Subsequent to the public hearing the Committee sought further information from the Department of State Growth on several matters. The following information was received in response to the Committee's request:

... The Traffic Modelling conducted for the Kingston Bypass project was based on the 'Kingston Bypass Model Development Report', produced by the consultant for this project. This Model Development Report developed the predicted Travel Demand by utilising the Greater Hobart Urban Travel Demand Model (GHUTDM), developed by the Department of State Growth as a travel demand base, before revising the travel demand to accommodate known development in the Kingston region. The travel demand associated with these known developments – including Spring Farm, Huntingfield and Whitewater Park – was sourced from the Kingborough Land Use Strategy or from the respective Transport Impact Assessment for each new development.

Included below is a summary table of the Kingston Traffic Model, which shows the average road network performance for the current year, as well as 20 years into the future. This has been modelled for both the existing/base case, and the design case, which includes the Kingston Bypass and Altona Roundabout Upgrade works.

A few key takeaways from this summary include:

- As a result of the project, the average speed of car traffic in the project area in the morning peak immediately after construction is estimated to increase from 46.7km/h to 61.8km/h (an increase of approx. 15km/h)
- Including future development, without the Kingston Bypass project, the average speeds in the Kingston area in 2044 are estimated at 33km/h in the morning peak and 40km/h in the afternoon peak. With the construction of the Kingston Bypass project, the model predicts the average speeds in 2044 to be 60km/h in the morning peak and 55km/h in the afternoon peak, an improvement of 27km/h and 15km/h, respectively.
- The model predicts that, with the inclusion of the Kingston Bypass project and the future development in the Kingston area, the overall average traffic speeds in the morning and afternoon peaks will decrease by approx. 2-3km/h over the next 20 years. However, without the Kingston Bypass project constructed those average speeds are predicted to decrease by approximately 14km/h.
- With the Kingston Bypass project built, the model shows a reduction in the Vehicle Hours Travelled (VHT), despite an increase in the Vehicle Kilometres Travel (VKT). This means that despite vehicles covering more distance, drivers in total spend less time in their cars.

Table 3-11: Network statistic comparison

Year	Scenario	AM Peak [06:30 to 09:30]			PM Peak [15:00 to 18:00]		
		VKT	VHT	Average Network Speed km/h]	VKT	VHT	Average Network Speed km/h]
2023	Existing	96,604	2,070	46.7	111,011	2,057	54.0
	Design	95,406	1,544	61.8	110,562	1,906	58.0
2044	Existing	102,207	3,102	32.9	120,787	3,018	40.0
	Design	106,347	1,783	59.6	122,695	2,230	55.0

Notes for the Table

Existing = Current Kingston area road network without the Kingston Bypass Duplication and roundabout/interchange upgrade

Design = Kingston area road layout with the completed Kingston Bypass Duplication and interchange upgrade works.

VKT = Vehicle Kilometres Travelled, or the total distance covered by vehicles within the modelled peak hours

VHT = Vehicle Hours Travelled, or the total time of vehicle trips within the modelled peak hours.

...

... State Growth is aware the Active Transport Fund program is open for applications from 31 October 2024 to 13 January 2025.

The program requires a 50/50 contribution for all applications made by States and Territories.

While no State-led projects have been confirmed for submission, State Growth is considering whether applications could be submitted for existing transport projects that are specifically for walking, wheeling and riding infrastructure or as part of a larger road project, such as the Channel Highway pedestrian and cyclist overpass which is part of the larger Kingston Bypass Project. As yet State Growth has not had confirmation whether projects that are already partly funded by the Australian Government, such as the Channel Highway pedestrian and cyclist overpass, are eligible for the program.

...

... The posted speed limit on the Kingston Bypass is 80km/h. There are no speed signs proposed along the entry/exit ramps to the freeway; these will function as acceleration/deceleration zones, with drivers speeding up/slowing down as they enter/exit the highway, respectively. This is common for Tasmanian highway ramps. No speed signs are proposed within the roundabout; drivers' speeds will be limited by the geometric design of the roundabout. This is as per the relevant Austroads design standards.

The road link between the two roundabouts does not have a posted speed limit and will therefore default to the 50km/h urban limit in place throughout Tasmania. This piece of road

is only 130m in length, and therefore, drivers are unlikely to accelerate past the default 50km/h limit.

...

... The Kingston Bypass is principally a road upgrade project. The traffic model produced for the Kingston Bypass project included buses as part of the overall vehicle mix within the wider traffic model, including the recent Huntingfield Park and Ride. However, bus patronage is not considered within the traffic model and therefore, the model does not provide any indication of bus patronage before/after the construction of the Kingston Bypass project.

...

... The 50% crash reduction estimation is derived from AusRAP (Australian Road Assessment Program), where research found that for every improvement in a star rating, the estimated fatal and serious injury crash risk reduces by approximately 50%.

The assumed one star increase in road safety is based on past project examples, whereby similar interventions such as grade separation, separated carriageways, roundabouts, and centre median barriers resulted in an increase in AusRAP rating of at least one star.

...

The road link between the existing Algona Road roundabout and the new ramp terminal roundabout has sealed asphalt shoulders available for cyclists. These shoulders are marked with a 1m width to the lip of kerb. Furthermore, the ramp terminal roundabout has a 1m marked shoulder available for cyclists. This is above the requirements of the relevant road design guidelines.

The project is not significantly changing the arrangements at the Algona Road roundabout, and the existing bike lane/shoulder encircling the roundabout will remain available.⁸

Does the Project Meet the Requirements of the Public Works Committee Act?

4.19 In assessing any proposed public work, the Committee seeks an assurance that each project meets the criteria detailed in Clause 15(2) of the Public Works Committee Act 1914. Broadly, and in simple terms, these relate to the purpose of the works, the need for and advisability of undertaking the works, and whether the works are a good use of public funds and provide value for money to the community. The Committee questioned the witnesses who provided the following confirmation:

CHAIR - ... Does the proposed works meet an identified need or needs or solve a recognised problem?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget with a couple of amendments that we've already heard and we look forward to?

Mr JORDAAN - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

⁸ Department of State Growth response to matters taken on notice at PWC hearing 131124, pages 1-3

Mr JORDAAN - Yes.

CHAIR - *Do the proposed works provide value for money and are the proposed works a good use of public funds?*

Mr JORDAAN - Yes.

5 DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE


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

- *Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algona Road Roundabout Upgrade: Public Works Committee Submission*, 28 October 2024, Department of State Growth;
- Submission from Cycling South;
- Submission from the Bicycle Network;
- Submission from Mr Mark Donnellon; and
- Department of State Growth response to matters taken on notice at PWC hearing 131124.

6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Committee recognises the importance of this project to road users in Kingston and communities further south. However, the Committee is concerned a key component necessary to maximise the benefits of this significant investment, the pedestrian overpass over the Channel Highway linking the shared use pathway, is not part of the project referred to the Committee for inquiry.
- 6.2 The Committee understands planning and design work is being undertaken by the Department of State Growth on this overpass, however, the funding required to include this in the current project, estimated at \$4 million, has not been delivered by the Tasmanian Government. The Committee is concerned that without this element, the potential benefits of increased active transport and use of public transport will not be realised. The Committee therefore strongly recommends the Tasmanian Government commit the additional funding required, so the Channel Highway pedestrian overpass can be constructed as part of the Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algona Road Roundabout Upgrade, as a matter of urgency.
- 6.3 The Committee also recognises the safety concerns regarding the crossing of Algona Road raised in the public submissions. The Committee recommends the Department take heed of these concerns and engage with these submitters to include measures that address their safety concerns. As an initial measure, the Committee suggests the Department liaise with the Kingborough Council to arrange for the clearing of vegetation currently blocking sightlines at the Channel Highway approach to the Algona Road roundabout.
- 6.4 Notwithstanding these matters, the Committee is satisfied the need for the proposed works has been established. Once completed, the proposed works will provide additional capacity on the Kingston Bypass to accommodate current and future demand, and a grade separated interchange with two roundabouts to reduce the congestion and queueing currently experienced by road users at the Algona Road Roundabout.
- 6.5 The proposed works are expected to lead to improved safety and travel time reliability. The Committee recognises the proposed works are also likely to provide some improvements to encourage growth in active transport.
- 6.6 Accordingly, the Committee recommends the Kingston Bypass Duplication and Algona Road Roundabout Upgrade, at an estimated cost of \$76.42 million, in accordance with the documentation submitted.

**Parliament House
Hobart
10 December 2024**



**Hon Tania Rattray MLC
Chair**