

PUBLIC

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEE ON GREATER HOBART TRAFFIC CONGESTION MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON THURSDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2019.

Mr DON CHALLEN AM, Mr BOB ANNELLS AND Mr GREG RAY, NCK EVERS NETWORK, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Armstrong) - Thank you, gentlemen, and welcome to the public hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion.

The committee hearing is being broadcast today and if there is anything you need to bring before us in closed session, we can facilitate that for you. The evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but I remind you any comments made outside the hearing may not afford that privilege. A copy of the witness information is available there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on our website when it becomes available.

By way of introduction, I advise that the procedure we intend to follow today is we will give you the opportunity to speak to your submission and then the committee members will ask questions. We have allocated one hour for you today. We are seeking information especially regarding the terms of reference. If you would like to start by giving an overview of your submission.

Mr ANNELLS - Thank you, Chair and members.

My name is Bob Annells and I am the convenor of the NCK Evers Network. With me is Don Challen and Greg Ray. The other members of our network are Damian Bugg, Dan Norton, Tony Pedder and Mike Vertigan. These seven individuals have diverse expertise and we share a very common interest in applying our collective knowledge and experience in public policy towards the betterment of Tasmania and the Tasmanian community.

We call ourselves the Evers Network in memory of the late Nick Evers. Some of you would know he was a very well regarded senior minister who has now been dead for some time. We all worked with Nick and his personal qualities and the contribution he made to Tasmanian society, we all aspire to. It did not seem a big stretch for us to name ourselves in his memory.

The intention of the network is to apply an entirely independent apolitical approach in expressing the views, opinions and ideas of its members, where by doing so, we may contribute to the future social and economic advancement of Tasmania through enhanced public policy. That is our sole interest.

Today, our presentation will be provided through Don Challen, who has more information and detailed knowledge of this matter than the rest of us. We are happy, the three of us, when his presentation is complete, to answer collectively any questions you may have. With no further ado, I will pass over to Don.

PUBLIC

Mr CHALLEN - Thank you, Chair and members. Hobart is currently enjoying an extended period of growth and development. Among lots of positives, the negative is the city's rapidly worsening traffic congestion. For Hobart's growth to be sustainable, the traffic congestion problem must be solved, otherwise the city's growth will be choked off.

Hobart's traffic congestion is severe for a city of its size. It arises, as I am sure you know, from the geography, from colonial road design and from 50 years of infrastructure planning neglect. Its worst manifestation is the congestion of the Macquarie and Davey streets couplet, which now occurs for extended periods throughout the day.

Population settlement patterns, which has seen most of Hobart's growth in recent years in Kingborough, Clarence and Sorell, rapid growth in the proportion of women in the workforce and people's lifestyle choices have made the car essential to Hobart lifestyles. People want to combine activities like getting to and from work with shopping, taking children to child care, to school and to after-school activities. This is only possible with a car.

This lifestyle choice is not a passing trend; it is deeply entrenched and here to stay. That means cars are here to stay, too. The alternatives to the car do not meet people's lifestyle choices and are impractical for most.

Changes over time to transport mode choices - walking, cycling, using public transport and moving to higher density CBD housing - will not materially impact the use of private vehicles.

Hobart's traffic congestion is, in large part, due to the pressure of through-traffic. Through-traffic constitutes a significant component of the volumes on the Macquarie and Davey couplet. Recognition of the through-traffic problem on the couplet leads to the conclusion that sometime soon, infrastructure investment will be needed to deal with congestion. That will be in the form of a bypass that allows through-traffic to avoid the couplet and the CBD.

I am sure you are all aware of the current smorgasbord of proposals around to deal with Hobart's traffic congestion. Some undoubtedly have potential, but none is a long-term solution and, at best, they will marginally defer the point in time at which a major infrastructure option becomes essential.

Public transport has a role to play, especially as part of well-planned and -executed park and ride arrangements. Public transport accounts for only about 3.5 per cent of all trips in the Greater Hobart area; consequently, it is inconceivable public transport initiatives will make more than a minor dent in Hobart's traffic congestion.

A bypass for the Macquarie and Davey couplet and the CBD would significantly reduce congestion and create room for future growth. One bypass solution warrants close examination. It is the one used the world over - send the through-traffic underground.

Former Hydro Tasmania engineer Tony Denne, who gave evidence to your committee on Tuesday, has developed a design concept for a bypass tunnel complex. As you heard from him, one tunnel pair would link the Southern Outlet with the Brooker Highway near Campbell Street Primary School and a second tunnel would link the Brooker interchange near Campbell Primary School with the Tasman Bridge approaches near Government House.

PUBLIC

The entire project is estimated to cost about a billion dollars in today's prices and that cost is entirely justifiable for a critical infrastructure development.

Other infrastructure solutions also need to be examined. With the Tasman Bridge at capacity, linking the Tasman Highway at Mornington with the Bowen Bridge might significantly reduce volumes on the Tasman Bridge.

Other options need to be identified and explored. Usually, infrastructure development follows population growth. In Hobart, following decades of neglect, the urgent need is to unclog the city's main thoroughfares and this requires a bypass such as proposed by Tony Denne.

The Government has recently allocated funds to a feasibility study of the bypass along the lines of the Denne proposal. This is a crucial first step in evaluating the project. Given the time frame to bring a bypass to fruition, this feasibility study is urgent. In our view, the need for this type of visionary approach is unavoidable. Hobart's traffic congestion is already severe, ridiculously so for a city of its size, and the costs of this congestion are very large.

Hobart's traffic system is also very fragile. Without a bypass to allow through-traffic to avoid the CBD completely, these symptoms are going to get worse and rapidly so. The result will be a severe brake on the city's continued growth and development. If the traffic congestion problem is not resolved soon, development in Hobart will come to a standstill. Our decision-makers need to be looking forward 10 years and more to understand the stresses our road infrastructure will be under the future, not looking backward.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today. We've included in our written submission a set of recommendations which we hope very much will find their way into your final report. Thank you.

CHAIR - I'm really interested in Tony Denne's submission. You've touched on it. We had Tony in yesterday. It makes a lot of sense and I agree with what you're saying.

On your recommendation 6 -

Ms SIEJKA - The bypass.

CHAIR - Yes, and the private sector involvement. Are we talking about tollways to pay for that?

Mr CHALLEN -Yes, potentially. A project of this sort will be a very interesting one to private sector investors. Superannuation funds and managed funds and the like are always looking for infrastructure projects of this size and type, and there is dearth of them around the world. There is a dearth of them in Australia so they are very attractive. If there is a component of the revenue from use of the complex that comes from tolls that would make it a relatively easy project to at least part-finance with private sector investment. Whether you would do the whole project that way, I don't know. This is a matter that would be explored in a feasibility study, but I imagine a modest toll of a few dollars each way would produce enough revenue to allow there to be a private sector investor involved.

Ms SIEJKA - We've heard this week from a couple of different groups whose thinking is that we need a different strategic oversight or governance structure to progress a lot of the ideas

PUBLIC

we have on traffic congestion, public transport and all the work that's being done to coordinate and drive it.

Do you have any particular opinions on that given your experience in government? Metro, for example, and, I think, the Public Transport Authority but others talked in a much broader sense. Do you think that's something that would help to progress some of these ideas?

Mr ANNELLS - I think the answer is yes. Inevitably, when you put the various competing - and I use that word advisedly - interests in silos, with their own structures, their minister, their own legislation and legislative requirement often, inevitably, you have problems of communication and coordination and an enhanced difficulty in getting a sensible holistic approach. We think the situation is serious enough, particularly because of the very long lead time required to implement whatever you finally get around to deciding -

Ms SIEJKA - Let alone things like the Tasman Bridge.

Mr ANNELLS - Yes. We're talking about 20 years to do some of this.

We can't afford to waste another five years at the front end having territorial turf disputes between the various bodies with different agenda. I think there is an argument that we should quite probably, and this is my own experience based in Victoria, leave the actual delivery of on-ground services to individual agencies by all means, but you need to centralise the strategic planning work and the feasibility studies and all these things in one tightly held, well-managed, well-resourced body that is not captured by the philosophical views that often accompany things like public transport.

Ms SIEJKA - We've certainly seen in a number of the submissions that while there is a lot of overlap between the different groups that have presented, there are commonalities as well, particularly when they start to look at broader things like social and cultural aspects. It does seem that more than a public transport authority, a greater driving force might be required.

Mr ANNELLS - Certainly. You cannot separate the requirements and the thinking that needs to be done in relation to transport impacts from the broader land use determinations that need to clearly take place in and around Hobart. That raises a range of issues to do with master planning and other things, which we have grappled with for 40 to 50 years without a great deal of success. It brings up questions as controversial as the size of councils and the remit of various councils and how many councils you have. Do you have a regional council?

This needs leadership. We don't have a particular view on those things. We haven't turned our mind to it as much as we might. Certainly this is no time for us to creep up on finding a solution here. We need to go boldly. That requires a bold approach to structures.

Ms SIEJKA - The tunnels sound bold for someone who is not from an infrastructure background, but from Tony's work there seemed to be a number of sites he had identified that you could see would work quite effectively. Some have been talked about for a long time - the Mornington to the Bowen and things like that.

Mr ANNELLS - Don is more across this.

Mr CHALLEN - A billion-dollar tunnel sounds like a lot in Hobart.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Tunnels are everywhere now.

Mr CHALLEN - Yes, exactly. They have come relatively late to Australia. We have seen developments in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane in recent years. In Europe, if you go to the city of Lyon, for instance, which is a smaller city than Hobart but has some of its complex geography. It sits on a river, it has an island in the middle of the river on which the old town was built. The road network is a nightmare and yet the traffic whizzes around invisibly in a complex of tunnels under the place. It works like a dream.

Ms SIEJKA - Do we have the workforce within Australia? I know sometimes with particular infrastructure projects, we sometimes have to bring people in. Does that exist in Australia?

Mr ANNELLS - Absolutely. It's not that workforce-intense. It is capital-intense because you have to buy the tunnelling machines. The people with the skills to drive it are certainly in Australia. There has been a lot of tunnelling work done.

Mr VALENTINE - They used to manufacture tunnel boring machines in Kingston.

CHAIR - We did have the Hydro. They were tunnel experts.

Mr RAY - If you take Melbourne, for example, which has a very efficient rail system and a very efficient tram system and a pretty efficient road system, they are building tunnels to bypass and overcome congestion issues. The logic is there.

Ms SIEJKA - They've also got the benefit of multiple public transport streams.

Mr RAY - A pretty good bus service as well.

Ms SIEJKA - And it is coordinated, which is the other aspect.

Ms WEBB - It is economies of scale.

Ms SIEJKA - It is, isn't it?

Ms WEBB - It takes a lot of people to make those things viable.

Mr VALENTINE - You were saying, Bob, we've grappled with planning without a great deal of success.

When I was in local government, we put together the Southern Regional Land Use Strategy. That is a statutory document. I am wondering whether the problem is more that people don't follow these documents that have been robustly put together. That was the first for 30 years, for instance. I am not just saying that because I happened to chair the group. I certainly didn't do the work. That was done by somebody we will hear from this afternoon, Emma Riley. I hear what you're saying about an overarching planning body and that would seem to me to have some merit in it, keeping everybody on the same page and getting some focus and drive. Do you see the City Deal as providing that opportunity perhaps to bring the parties together?

PUBLIC

Mr ANNELLS - The City Deal provides one absolutely essential element and that is cash. Whether it is enough is probably debatable, but at least it's a good start. I hope that the City Deal has within it the kernel of cooperation that we badly need, but I suspect not. I suspect not on its own, anyway. I think we need an acceptance by all levels of state and local government that we need a regional approach here, and it can't be aspirational and it can't be advisory, it has to be regulatory-based, and strongly regulatory-based.

One reason, if I might be so bold, very good plans go nowhere and, in a sense are undermined left, right and centre - and I'm not for one moment suggesting the Southern Land Use Strategy falls into this category - is that although they are based on the best of intentions, on good science and intellectual rigour, at times they do not give sufficient import to human nature. That is, as the pressures build up for public housing, for more housing and for cheaper housing, the temptation to want to push further and further out into lower cost land is almost inevitable.

This is not a Tasmanian thing - this is a world thing. It has been going on ever since I started my town planning course 45 years ago. We, as a group, are very much of the view that we have to be brutally pragmatic about the realities that confront us; we have to be brutally pragmatic about the potential for public transport to solve this problem. Our very strong view is that it will not; actually, a lot of what Bob Cotgrove has to say, we strongly endorse. We might not like it; we don't have to like it to think it's probably right. I think there has been a great deal of pie-in-the-sky discussion about the potential of public transport to solve Hobart's issues - it's not. It's not to say it doesn't have a role and we shouldn't try to enhance that role, but it's not going to solve the problem - not even close.

Mr VALENTINE - I think it was Don Challen who made mention of the cost of congestion. We have had a submission from Andrew Holmes, who happens to have a Master of Planning and a Bachelor of Engineering with Philosophy, and he pulled out the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics 2019 figures which say that congestion Australia-wide is projected to cost \$27 billion to \$37 billion by 2030. That's what congestion is costing Australia. In Tasmania it's projected to increase from \$0.09 billion to \$0.12 billion and to \$0.16 billion by 2030.

Bearing that in mind, spending \$1.453 billion - I think that is Tony Denne estimate - seems to be a pretty big sledgehammer to crack what might be a nut. For example, during school holiday times there is no congestion issue. School is in and it's like an 8 or 10 per cent increase in traffic. It's that 8 or 10 per cent increase we're really dealing with immediately. I'm not suggesting that into the future it's not going to grow bigger if we don't address it. Do you see that doing something like you are suggesting with that bypass idea might be, at this time, a bit premature until we address some of the smaller issues that might be able to melt away that 8 to 10 per cent problem?

Ms SIEJKA - Is that likely to grow though, that 8 to 10 per cent?

Mr VALENTINE - I did mention that.

Mr CHALLEN - It's a question for a feasibility study and it's a question of when. I'm not saying we would build a billion-dollar tunnel or bypass tomorrow, what I am saying is that by the time we get it built, we are going to need it desperately, so we ought to start thinking about it harder right now.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - It's a 20- or 30-year plan.

Mr CHALLEN - I think we probably need it within 10 years, I don't think it's 20, but we probably don't need it right now, that's true.

This story about the school holiday traffic is a bit of a furphy. First of all, the claim that there is no congestion during the school holidays isn't right.

Ms SIEJKA - No, that's not right. Last school holidays it was -

Mr CHALLEN - It's not right because the moment there is any kind of incident on our road network on one of the major arterials, you get massive congestion. That's what I meant when I said it and we explore this further in the written submission.

Mr VALENTINE - So a lack of options for people to get around.

Mr CHALLEN - The system is fragile, it falls over at the drop of a hat. As we said in the submission, often you can sit in a traffic jam on the Southern Outlet for three-quarters of an hour, and when you finally get down to Macquarie Street, you wonder what the problem was. Well, the problem was an accident on the Tasman Bridge, and that's one of the problems - point one, if I may, Mr Valentine.

My second point is that the school holiday phenomenon is only going to keep you happy for as long as it takes that reduction in traffic associated with school holidays to be taken up with the growth of the traffic on the network overall. It's thought to be about 7 per cent less traffic on the network during school holiday times.

The volumes on the Southern Outlet alone are growing by over 3 per cent per annum, so in three years time, you are not going to see no congestion in school holidays as we see when things are running smoothly at the moment because the growth in the traffic volumes will have soaked it up. That's why we are saying we need to be thinking hard about this issue now and looking ahead to what the issues on the network are going to be like in 10 years time because if we sit here, comfort ourselves that things are fine during the school holidays, so if only we could get 7 per cent off the network everything will be fine, by the time the tenth anniversary of the meeting of your committee comes around, the system will be in such a mess that people will start thinking about whether Hobart is a good place to live anymore, and that's what we are worried about. We are worried about growth being choked off because the congestion problems become so severe it just becomes impractical getting around.

Mr ANNELLS - I'm not an expert in this return on investment thing at all, but I lived in Melbourne for nearly 20 years, during which many of the very major projects were sourced and funded and built and whatever. All of them went through a process involving Infrastructure Australia that did its own analysis about the economic benefit. There were many projects that actually got up and were accepted as worthy of being done with a one-to-one return - the actual cost versus the economic benefit.

Because of the sorts of questions that Don is alluding to, which are the non-quantifiable issues about quality of life for people and the attractiveness as a destination et cetera, and just frustration and whatever, as Don said, we're not saying we should be rushing out and buying a tunnelling machine tomorrow, we are saying this should be very much part of the analysis of the

PUBLIC

options. We understand that is happening as part of this study. Whether a million dollars is enough to actually get to the bottom of this, others will have to say. If this study does nothing else but address the very serious issue we raise in our submission, which is whether the analysis done by the public sector to this point about the amount of through-traffic versus the amount of CBD-centric traffic is accurate or not, we have some serious reservations that it is.

In fact we think there has been a tendency to talk down the amount of through-traffic as a reason to reject the need for a bypass. Don points this out in the submission he wrote for us; we all endorsed it. I think Bob Cotgrove has pointed this out also. We think this is something that should be laid to rest independently and exhaustively as soon as possible.

Mr VALENTINE - I think it is being done now, isn't it?

Mr ANNELLS - That is the theory, it is being done; I hope it is.

Mr VALENTINE - The cameras currently placed are in relation to that study going on. We would really need to see the results of that before forming any major conclusions about through-traffic. The last point, there is a school of thought that the more you build, the more cars will come to fill the space you build for it. You are simply creating a congestion problem for the years to come rather than trying to look at other ways of having people approach their habit of how they travel. Do you have a comment on this?

Glasgow as an example - did anyone see the SBS program the other night? I happened to be sitting down reading this stuff, here this program comes up with what happened in Glasgow. They have two of what they call 'ski jumps', where they were going to put a highway through the middle of the city. There was such a revolt, they just stopped developing it. The community was simply absolutely so against having flyovers and these sorts of things. Do you have an opinion on whether building it simply creates a greater problem for future years or whether changing the habit is the way to go?

Mr ANNELLS - You need both. The reality is there are any number of examples around the world where you build more capacity in the road system and it fills up over time, but that ignores the fact that this is building up because it is responding to people's wants and needs. If we try to artificially say you cannot have those wants and needs, that is fair enough. There is lots of public policy that does that.

But in relation to people's movement, their lifestyle and their dependency on the car, as much as all of us would like to see clean and green, public transport, blah, blah, blah, there are very few occasions - I cannot think of any but I am sure there are some - whereby people's fundamental habits have changed where they no longer are happy not to rely on their car for transport of kids, going to work and the multi-location journeys that are absolutely part of our current lifestyle.

In my view that horse has bolted, with an electorate that is not going to be told you cannot do this and you cannot do that. Now, there are societies where that apparently works. In some - Sweden and other countries - you can apparently take that view and get away with it, but I see no evidence to suggest that in Australia people will fundamentally change their habits. As a consequence, we need to be very wary of dealing with the real world, not the aspirational world. Please do not misunderstand me: I am not saying we should not be looking at public transport, I have some very strong views about some of the suggestions been made.

PUBLIC

We should be looking at public transport. We need to look at some of the improvements being made in public transport specifically to address the question of convenience happening around the world. A lot of the French companies - one I worked for many years - is looking at on-demand buses and a whole range of things. We should be looking at that too. As Don said, it is 3.5 per cent or something of journeys now. If we doubled it, it buys us only five or six years of grace from having to take a tough decision.

Mr CHALLEN - Public transport will work well in terms of those point-to-point journeys from home to work. If we can provide good park and ride type services -

Mr VALENTINE - For commuter traffic.

Mr CHALLEN - For commuter traffic, to take the morning and evening peak traffic off the main arterials; it is just designed to get from home to the city and that is about all. It ought to work from Margate, Kingston to the city, from the southern beaches, from Sorell to the city, and perhaps from the northern suburbs to the city - particularly the south-eastern out to Sorell and the southern down to Kingston, Margate. That ought to work.

The issue with park and ride is that to make it work well, you need a lot of capital and a lot of buses, because it is a very intense peak. If you are going to get people to use it, you have to provide a good quality service. Then the issue is, what do you do with your bus capital for the rest of the day?

Mr VALENTINE - It is not earning money?

Ms WEBB - No public transport system earns in the middle of the day. To be clear, they earn it during their peak. Nobody expects to use the capacity at the middle of the day of their public transport system.

Mr CHALLEN - No, that is true. But you do need a lot of buses.

Mr ANNELLS - But you aim for the economics of your public transport system. You want as much out-of-hours activity as you can possibly get.

Inner-city sporting facilities are one thing that really helps. In Melbourne the MCG is a fantastic generator of people. Mind you, from experience very few of them pay to use the system, nevertheless, having run the system for some years.

You need stuff because you can never have enough infrastructure just for one-and-a-half-hours morning and night. Don't underestimate the cost of park and ride. The cost to establish it is significant. The cost to monitor it in security terms is also significant - people getting off the buses and into their cars, people not having their cars broken into during the day et cetera. It is, unfortunately, not as easy a system to administer as you would like.

Mr RAY - Mr Valentine, just picking up on your point about reports sitting in a bottom drawer. There are a lot of them. As I said to Don the other day, you could start your own library with them.

Back in the 1970s, when I was working for Mr Reece, who was premier at the time, there was a company called [inaudible/PackPoors?] -

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - That's exactly right. Tony Wilson.

Mr RAY - that looked at the whole western bypass thing nearly 50 years ago.

At the time, Michael Barnard was the minister. Now it was considered to be a visionary project. In my view, that is no longer visionary, it is an essential issue. Unfortunately, I imagine all the corridors and so on mapped out at the time have long since gone with urban expansion into the foothills of Mount Wellington, which may cost us more than we realise at the end of the day.

The tunnel system allows the bypass to be created with, dare I say, less disruption than the surface bypass.

Ms WEBB - We have covered a lot of ground already; what I would like to do is to come back and pick up on bits in more detail or clarify for myself.

First of all, to come back to what Bob was saying a moment ago about park and ride and the potential expense of establishing, then maintaining as an option.

Do you know if that has been modelled here? Around the proposals for putting in place?

Mr ANNELLS - Not that I am aware of. Some work has been done on ferries. I am not sure how current that is. It would certainly need to be revisited, given what has happened at Bellerive with the development that seems to be going ahead.

Ms SIEJKA - Kangaroo Bay.

Mr ANNELLS - I am not entering into that debate.

When park and ride was first thought about, I am sure most of that area was sorted out for being park, as in car parking.

If that has been taken away now, and it appears it has, I am not sure whether park and ride goes for the ferries. I am a very keen rider up and down the bike path out through Glenorchy, and at the pace I go, I get a lot of time to look around. There are not many spare chunks of land out there either for park and ride.

All I am saying is that it is a very expensive proposition wherever you do it. Less expensive in Tasmania, no doubt.

Ms WEBB - Is that something you would also suggest should be looked at for a feasibility [study] or perhaps a business case or a cost benefit analysis around proposals that may be in play at the moment?

Mr ANNELLS - Absolutely. We need to put some of this stuff to rest. There are too many options on the table with too many people out there saying that this is feasible, that's not feasible, including me. We need, for example, to look at this question of light rail using the heavy rail network. A large part of the feasibility for that suggestion depends upon the park and ride solution. If ever you've seen a route that does not demonstrate the essential prerequisites for most

PUBLIC

successful public transport that is high density residential along the corridor, there is no high density residential along that corridor.

Ms WEBB - I think the suggestion there is that putting the corridor in could drive the changes along the corridor in future. That's my understanding of the suggestion.

Mr ANNELLS - It is the suggestion. I think that needs to be tested. As an old, defrocked valuer, I can tell you that won't happen in my lifetime. I suggest it probably won't happen in yours either. These are all things that can be looked at, there's no doubt about that. I'm not convinced they have been looked at in anywhere near enough detail; certainly, the park and ride component. We will come to back to that.

Ms WEBB - Can I connect that back to the idea of a coordinating mechanism? Is that something you would see as being a responsibility of that mechanism to look at the suite of possible options and do that comparative analysis around cost-benefit and feasibility in order to help inform the allocation of priority and funding?

Mr ANNELLS - Yes is the short answer.

Ms WEBB - What might that mechanism look like? Where would it sit? Who would it be responsible to or articulated with in terms of bureaucracy and government?

Mr ANNELLS - Dan, you're the arch bureaucrat - ex.

Mr CHALLEN - I will take that as a compliment. I'm not sure if it was intended that way.

In terms of governance, the authority obviously needs to be established by an act of parliament. It needs to be responsible to a state government minister. As Bob was saying earlier, it needs to bring together the responsibilities that are currently with a number state and local government agencies. I think if you're going to have an overarching authority, it's got to have authority. For practical purposes, it has to be a creature of the Tasmanian Parliament; it has to be responsible to a Tasmanian minister who can be accountable to the parliament and be scrutinised in the usual way.

Ms WEBB - It's likely to touch into a range of portfolios, isn't it?

Mr CHALLEN - Yes, but I think that's the point about an overarching authority - it absorbs responsibility from a number of places.

Ms WEBB - So there would be responsibility to one minister, acknowledging that it touches the portfolio areas of other ministers also?

Mr CHALLEN - I think that's the point about authority, Ms Webb. These overarching entities only work if they can trump the authority of individual ministers and so on. You can't expect an authority of this sort to work if it has to endlessly negotiate with a raft of other people who have their own responsibilities. That won't work. What you need is an overarching authority that just trumps the individual authorities and gets on with the job. That's what it's about.

Mr VALENTINE - And hopefully consults and manages the stakeholder interests and does all that stuff.

PUBLIC

Mr CHALLEN - Absolutely, but at the end of the day, there's no point in having it if it hasn't got decision-making power.

Ms WEBB - Can I move on to another area?

You've discussed in your submission, and it's come up today, that we have flawed data at the moment about through-traffic with the CBD and there is a need to gather accurate data in that space.

Do you have another data source or another source of evidence that you are relying on to make the assertion that what we currently have is flawed?

Mr CHALLEN - I have the evidence of my eyes, which is pretty important, I think. If you speak to people who use the major arterials regularly, as I do, you get the same story all the time. They are just incredulous that the through-traffic component of the traffic on the three major arterials could be as low as the data that the Department of State Growth says. That's one issue - the evidence of our eyes.

The other thing is that some features of the way the data is being collected and constructed ring alarm bells. For instance, the definition of the CBD is very large. It is not what you and I think of the CBD - a few blocks around the intersection of, say, Collins and Elizabeth streets. It is very, very wide. It goes way out to Augusta Road, Lenah Valley. That is one feature that makes me very suspicious of the data. The other thing is that - this has been confirmed when we quizzed the people at State Growth about this - the way they define a trip that has a destination in the CBD.

If you are a mum starting off in Kingston -

Ms WEBB - Or a parent even.

Mr CHALLEN - Indeed, I just took a mum for the sake of illustration, but it could be a dad. A mum will do. If you drop a daughter, as it would have to be, I think, at Collegiate, then go on to your work in a call centre in Derwent Park, the data counts that as a CBD destination, even though all you did was drop the child off in Macquarie Street and kiss her goodbye, tell her to have a nice day, then go on to your job well out of the CBD. The data is flawed. It needs to be defined better. We need better quality data than we have to rely on.

The suggestion that through traffic constitutes - the numbers vary but up to 25 per cent is the biggest number I have heard. Sometimes they claim it is as low as 13 per cent. I regularly come over the Tasman Bridge and up the Brooker in the late afternoon. I have business in the north of the state and I regularly come that way. Every time I do, I look at the cars around me. It is amazing the number of those cars that are still sitting next to me as I am going down the Southern Outlet on my way home to Blackmans Bay. These numbers 13 and 25 are just not credible; I do not believe them.

I admit readily these are just assertions. The point is that there is enough of a question mark over the data that it needs to be properly put to bed. We need good quality data that everybody is happy with.

PUBLIC

Mr RAY - There is another dimension to that too. Putting statistics aside, there is an expectation in the community that something needs to be done. There is from, dare I say, a politician's point of view that it is inescapable. I am sure you have had enough discussions to know that people are fed up with it.

Ms WEBB - Absolutely.

Mr CHALLEN - If I may, Ms Webb, I think some of the attitude to these issues can be explained by human nature. There has been so little money around in government for so long that I think the people in the Department of State Growth and its various predecessors over time, DIER and those sorts of departments, have held a view that there is no point in recommending infrastructure solutions because they will never happen, there is no money for them. To make their life easy and to make their minister's life easy, they have steered away by one means or another from infrastructure solutions. That is one of the things that we describe as 50 years of neglect of infrastructure.

Ms WEBB - Kicking it down the road, so to speak.

Mr CHALLEN - We are all paying the consequence of that now. I think, as a community, we have to face up to this and come up with some real and workable solutions.

Ms WEBB - This infrastructure solution you are proposing is in fact late coming, because we have known about the potential for it to help our situation for some time. For what period of time do you see that providing us with a solution? At what stage would we need to think about the next significant infrastructure solution? Given that we feel like we are behind the eight ball with addressing this issue, we know things are moving quickly with growth and development in the state, how far does this get us before we then have the next thing to contemplate?

Mr CHALLEN - It is hard to say; it depends how fast Hobart grows. Of course, as Mr Valentine was saying earlier, these sorts of infrastructure solutions do tend to enhance the rate of growth. In a way they bring forth the next solution. I don't know. That's the point about my closing comment - planners need to be looking forward at least 10 years all the time and maybe longer. We have some big issues around Hobart. The Tasman Bridge is at capacity. What are we going to do about river crossings in the future? That's a huge issue.

Mr VALENTINE - You certainly can't go under it.

Mr CHALLEN - Maybe you can, actually.

Mr VALENTINE - It's pretty deep.

Mr CHALLEN - There is technology about hanging tunnels.

Ms SIEJKA - Submarine rather than tunnel.

Mr VALENTINE - Submarine? That's cool.

Mr CHALLEN - I don't know the answer to that question, but the important point is that we need people in the responsible government department, in a responsible overarching authority,

PUBLIC

who are actually thinking about these things and thinking a long way ahead. Solutions will emerge that we probably can't imagine now.

Ms WEBB - I'm also wondering about the extent to which you have contemplated looking ahead were we to go down this path of implementing a significant infrastructure solution with tunnels and how that will articulate with the developing technologies. Given that developing technologies are moving fast - and in the transport space we have been invited to contemplate a range of them in this inquiry already; certainly you can cast about and see them quite readily, whether they are electric or autonomous vehicles and things like that - have you spent some time thinking about the intersection of where we are going with technology and this solution? Whether it supports it or whether it doesn't matter what happens technology-wise, is this still the right direction? Or is there something about this proposal that needs to be considered in light of emerging technologies?

Mr CHALLEN - They are good questions. We have given that some thought. I think you have to come back to the fact that the settlement pattern in Hobart is pretty well established. Lots of people live at Sorrell and the southern beaches, lots of people live at Kingston and Blackmans Bay and Margate.

Mr VALENTINE - And the Huon.

MR CHALLEN - And the Huon and further out. People do this because they want the lifestyle associated with living in those areas. Their needs to get around, to get to work and to get in and out of the CBD are going to be there for a long time. The question is: how can you satisfy that need? We can't see any technology that's currently known that's will make much difference to the congestion problem. Yes, petrol-powered cars may disappear over the next 20 years and be replaced by electric vehicles -

Mr VALENTINE - They are still cars, though.

Mr CHALLEN - Autonomous vehicles might come; I don't think we'll see them in the lifetimes of -

Mr VALENTINE - Some of us.

Mr CHALLEN - anybody around the room. There was a lot of hype about autonomous vehicles a few years ago, but if you read the considered comments now, autonomous vehicles are developing and there is no doubt that they are coming but -

Mr VALENTINE - It's all about risk.

Mr CHALLEN - the time frame is very long precisely because of the risk.

Ms WEBB - I'd suggest that all indications are that autonomous vehicles would add vehicles to the road because people who aren't currently able to drive will have access to travelling in a vehicle.

There is a second part to that, and it's not just about changing technology. You've talked in your submission, and mentioned briefly today, about changing cultural patterns, work and family and lifestyle patterns. Have you turned your mind to the prospective changes on that level as well

PUBLIC

and what that means for the way we travel? For example, I am thinking about how work patterns have changed a lot in the past 50 years. Who does paid work and where they work has changed and it's likely to change quite significantly in the next, not 50 years, probably the next 20 years given the way AI technology is coming in, the sorts of changes that are being made and the focus of the kind of industries and work we do. Have you given thought to the way that likely more rapid change in how and where we work might influence congestion patterns and the need to travel and where travel happens?

Mr CHALLEN - We have a bit, though Bob Cotgrove is the expert on this, and we tend to defer to him on these sorts of issues.

Ms WEBB - That's interesting because I observed Bob to be looking backwards on this issue about what has changed, but he didn't articulate for us yesterday a forward-looking view in terms of likely change.

Mr CHALLEN - I think the trends occurring at the moment where the work pattern is becoming more flexible and more variable will certainly have an impact on traffic volumes; in particular, it will tend to spread the peaks through the day and to the extent that occurs, it will tend to defer the point at which major infrastructure investment is needed. Those trends tend to be fairly slow and I can't see it deferring the need for a major infrastructure development beyond the sort of 10-year time frame that we now think is critical.

A lot more work is being done from home now than was done, say, 20 years ago. Quite a range of jobs in the workforce allow people to work from their home some of the time. Obviously that has an impact on traffic volumes because there is less peak hour travel.

Fundamentally, work is a social experience and there is a limit to how much work can be done without face-to-face interaction with other people. I think that will mean these trends are actually fairly limited in their impact on traffic volumes.

Mr RAY - Effective collaboration and a work environment are really important. That's a challenge when people are working from home.

The issue about the impact of traffic on employment is already there. Two of my staff who live on the Eastern Shore - our office is in Battery Point - come to work between 7.45 and 8 a.m. and they go home sometime around 4 p.m., simply because they are fed up with the traffic. It's not a requirement on my part. I'm relaxed about it. It's also essential that they are in the office at a certain time because collaborative effort of all the staff is vital to the way we operate.

There are a couple of other things, just going back to some of the other points you made about the development of transport technology in particular. The reality is that Hobart is a ribbon development. It straddles the river in either direction.

Mr VALENTINE - Strip city.

Mr RAY - Yes, it is. That's not unusual, but it's unusual in the Australian context. In Melbourne, you have a very flat environment and you can have wonderful transport systems all over the place, but it's more complex here.

PUBLIC

Even with improvement in vehicles and so on, I think that will create a greater demand for cars, particularly with autonomous vehicles. The fact is that cars now, and the RACT will bear witness to this, just don't break down, which is why the RACT is busily diversifying into tourism and lots of other areas. For its fundamental service there is really negligible demand. I have spoken to the RACT about this, and it is quite clear on it. We all are.

Apart from that, you can walk into a showroom now, buy a car and walk away with almost no percentage interest on it. The opportunity to acquire a new car is also a complication in all of this. There is no sign that is necessarily going to change in the immediate future.

There is a whole complexity of issues. The way we see it, it's clear that ultimately people, for the foreseeable future - we aren't blessed with a crystal ball, unfortunately - are still going to rely heavily on their cars and that may be made even more convenient into the future.

Mr ANNELLS - I will make just one point. We are not advocating for the tunnels. We are advocating that government look at the tunnel as a serious option because it wasn't being looked at from where we sat. To the extent that now a study is being done, they are looking at this issue, we've done what we set out to do, which was to get that option on the table.

We're not saying it's viable. What we are saying is: as you look at the tunnel, you need to look at some of the issues that you quite properly raise about what is the future in 20 years. It's very difficult to calculate, there is no doubt about that. But someone needs to be given that charter, and you don't give that responsibility to a roads authority. You give it to a planning authority, independent, with government oversight. In terms of the structure, I have no doubt that what we're saying about needing a separate body is correct. You clearly have to have your own minister responsible for it, but you need a government or Cabinet subcommittee that is sitting there demanding responses from that minister and the authority, because this problem is serious enough that it can't be left to percolate through the public sector.

CHAIR - The Wilbur Smith proposal went back many years with a flyover coming into Burnett Street with some land acquired and everything.

Mr VALENTINE - Was it the Cook Plan? Are you aware of that one?

Mr ANNELLS - Vaguely, I was here then.

Mr VALENTINE - It was in the 1960s.

Mr ANNELLS - In the 1960s. Could I say there are lots of cities around the world busily pulling down flyovers because of their impact on local neighbourhoods. I have just come back from Boston and they have spent a zillion dollars in pulling out all the flyovers and putting them in tunnels. That may sound as though I have just dismissed it - I have not. I am saying it is something we need to look at because if a corridor has been reserved, that is a start and maybe that flyover could as easily be a short tunnel using that particular corridor - who knows?

There is all this stuff sitting around, as Don says, most of it accrued by Treasury. He speaks glibly about - well, of course everyone was told there was no money, well, who did the telling, I ask?

Mr CHALLEN - This is uncalled for.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - I will give you an opportunity, Don, to respond in a minute.

CHAIR - It was interesting - I think it was your comment earlier on - people in Hobart do not realise if you have a breakdown on the Eastern Shore, it impacts on traffic in Davey and Macquarie streets, whichever way.

I quite often hear - there is a breakdown on the Eastern Shore, we are going through Hobart, and it will not affect us. Well, it does, doesn't it?

Mr VALENTINE - All of this means money in the future. Are you suggesting we have an untied grant from the feds that's not going to cover our GST payments? Don, is this the only we are going to get this money?

Mr CHALLEN - I think the Denne complex could be financed through a combination of state and government capital contributions in the hundreds of millions of dollars, nothing like the billion-plus, together with private investors and a toll. That is the way I would do it.

Mr VALENTINE - And a toll?

Mr CHALLEN - Yes, a toll.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you think our population would handle a toll?

Mr CHALLEN - They will. Everybody everywhere else does. They will get used to it in five minutes. It will be a few dollars each trip.

Ms SIEJKA - It is all about options, isn't it? If you have an alternative -

Ms WEBB - As long as there is an alternative way people can go.

Mr CHALLEN - I watched a bit of the webcast yesterday and you were talking about the EasyPark parking app - I think this is the greatest thing sliced bread. I use it actively - and not too long ago I used to put huge effort into avoiding paying for parking. I would walk kilometres to go to a meeting because I hated paying for parking. Now I have this EasyPark app I am getting \$5-\$6-\$9 littered through my credit card statement with EasyPark parking because it is so easy and painless.

Mr VALENTINE - And you only pay for what you use.

Mr CHALLEN - Yes, and the convenience is fantastic. Tolls are exactly the same.

My dear brother-in-law in Melbourne spent years refusing to have one of those electronic gadgets - eTag. He used to go mile and miles out of his way and he finally gave in and got one. Now he is the greatest proponent of them. Hobart will be absolutely fine with tolls.

Ms WEBB - We have different demographics to Melbourne. To put on the record that a toll does have, even if it is a couple of dollars either way - which for you and me would be nothing - but given a third of our population is reliant on government income support payments as their main source of funding and people are on Newstart payments of \$40 a day, that actually becomes

PUBLIC

a significant amount. Even avoiding the toll by having to travel further out of your way puts a cost impost on those people living on a very low income.

It is a consideration for our state that may be different to other jurisdictions.

Mr CHALLEN - What you say is correct. There are ways of dealing with that. We face those problems with all sorts of essential services - local government rates, for instance. We have ways of dealing with that.

Mr VALENTINE - An untied grant would be good, wouldn't it?

Mr ANNELLS - Commonwealth money is the best money.

Mr VALENTINE - As long as it doesn't cost us in the long run. I have one more question, but if I ask it, it is going to take me to 11 o'clock to answer it. It is about light rail and the configuration of the nodes, the cost of setting it up. Bob, you have been in rail for a long time. Heavy freight into Hobart?

Mr ANNELLS - No, it is not going to be needed. With the establishment of the Brighton Transport Hub, the bridge as I understand it, does not have a rail component. Even if it did, the days of heavy rail into Hobart are long gone.

Mr VALENTINE - Even with the increasing number of trucks?

Mr ANNELLS - The economics of bringing freight rail in on that alignment with the number of level crossings. There is no terminal left any more, Macquarie Point - the answer is an emphatic no, there is no possibility. There is a range of issues around light rail using that corridor that I am concerned have not been properly assessed by the proponents. I will give you just a couple: the lack of urban density along the rail corridor, most of it now is industrial zoning. Yes, over time that could change, but it is a real issue.

Mr VALENTINE - The advocates are saying that needs to change.

Mr ANNELLS - There are examples around the world. What is not going to change is for a third of its course, it runs around the base of the Domain. There is no way there is going to be urban development around the Domain - one-third. You can forget about that all through the Regatta Grounds et cetera. You have a third of its course where there is no potential for urban development whatsoever.

Second, people forget the second rail track was pulled up 20 years ago. There is a single rail track on that corridor. You cannot run an efficient scheduled urban service on a single track with passing loops; it just does not work. You simply cannot coordinate over that distance with 12 level crossings, all of which will need very expensive gating systems, lights et cetera, and will create even more havoc with the traffic as a consequence.

A couple of issues have been just blithely overlooked about particularly this question of there is only a single track left. I am not sitting here attesting that track actually could be used for a modern light rail. The rail track is probably 70 years old. These are issues we need to look at very carefully. The economics of running a passenger service anywhere in the world, with about two exceptions, both of them in Asia, are such you are looking at a heavily subsidised

PUBLIC

arrangement. The Melbourne rail system, which carries 1 million passengers a day, receives a government subsidy in the order of \$600 million to \$700 million a year.

Mr VALENTINE - They are looking at something in the order of 16 800 passengers a day.

Ms WEBB - In summary, a feasibility study would be required.

Mr ANNELLS - Yes, but could I plead it not be handed out to one of the big four accounting firms who will tell you they know all about public transport. You need to go to a specialist transport-related firm, preferably with a consultant who has actually run public transport companies. Those people do exist in Australia. Running these sorts of businesses are horrifically expensive. It does not matter how big you are, the safety regime you have to operate under is exactly the same, different scale, but exactly the same.

CHAIR - Yes, we have been through that on north-east rail.

Mr ANNELLS - We have been through it on TasRail. I know only too well what was involved in setting this up to meet the various regulatory requirements. I am not saying it can never work, but I would say before you get carried away, you need to look seriously at the economics of it. It is not just the establishment, it is the ongoing running costs. I am very confident this is a pretty brave decision if you want to go down that path.

Mr VALENTINE - What would you see that corridor being used for?

Mr ANNELLS - I think half of the corridor is being used very adequately for the bike track. For rest, I would put in a decent walking track to get the pedestrians off the bike path. It is getting more and more dangerous, as somebody who uses it almost every day. There are lots of people pushing prams and stuff up and down it, which is fine; you want to see that, but mixing them with training cyclists doing 40 kilometres per hour is just a recipe for disaster.

Mr RAY - Bob talked about the multimillion dollars of subsidy for the rail system in Melbourne. On top of that is the indirect subsidy, if that is what you call it, in trying to get rid of all level crossings. The Victorian government has spent millions and millions and millions of dollars on that and there are 12 level crossings.

CHAIR - How do they get rid of level crossings?

Ms SIEJKA - It is very popular over there, though.

CHAIR - It was very informative. I think it was worth the extra 10 minutes of your time. We really appreciate your submission. It was very good reading. Thank you for making the time available today to come before the committee. We are sorry for taking you a bit over time, but I think the questions and answers were clearly worthwhile.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr PHIL HOYSTED, PRESIDENT, **Mr KEVIN WILSON** AND **Mr DAVID HALSE ROGERS**, HON. SECRETARY, SOUTH HOBART PROGRESS ASSOCIATION, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - I welcome you to the public hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken has parliamentary privilege when inside the building but if you step outside, you are not afforded such privilege. A copy of the witness information is there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded by Hansard and its version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available.

By way of introduction we will give you an opportunity to give an overview of your submission, and then committee members will ask questions. We have gone over time a little, but you have 30 minutes to present your submission and have questions. If there is anything you want to say in camera, we can facilitate that for you, if the need arises.

Mr HOYSTED - First of all, thank you very much for allowing us to come along. Thank you also for setting up the inquiry. It is hard to imagine a more pertinent issue to address.

I am not a traffic engineer. I don't think Kevin is, and I don't think David is either. We don't have particular expertise, but we do have some expertise about what annoys South Hobart residents.

We had our AGM last night, and I said that if I had realised I spent so much of my time dealing with traffic congestion and parking issues, commuter parking et cetera, I might not have put my hand up to be president. As Rob would attest, when you come to one of our monthly meetings, honestly, at least 60 to 70 per cent of the issues debated are around traffic and parking issues.

We are not the only suburb, presumably, that experiences that. It is a huge issue out there. From South Hobart's point of view, the two main ones are commuters, of course. Hundreds of commuters come into our suburb every morning and park in streets like Adelaide Street, Anglesea Street, Denison Street. Whole sections of the suburb are taken up by commuter parking. That really affects the amenity for local residents.

Anecdotally, when we were driving here, trying to cross the intersection of Anglesea and Adelaide streets, we had to inch the car into the middle of the intersection before we could see whether we should cross or not, because cars are parked illegally, either over yellow lines or too close to the intersection. You can't actually see where you are going.

I get regular complaints from people not being able to have on-street parking when friends visit and things like that. It is a real issue.

Traffic congestion is a bit of an issue. When I was gainfully employed a few years ago, it used to take me four minutes to get into work in the CBD. If it went to five minutes, I was in a rage. But nowadays, during peak periods, we can have congestion that goes from where the Southern Outlet comes into Macquarie Street. It will go from there right up to St Johns. It is about a kilometre at least. It is shorter at some periods. It is rarely longer. During peak periods in the morning, that is what people have to experience. That has happened only in the last few years, in my experience.

PUBLIC

The thing to remember is that South Hobart has two major feeder roads. It has Davey Street. It has Macquarie Street. As I glibly put in our submission, they were originally designed for horse and wagons. They weren't designed for cars. There are places, particularly in Macquarie Street, but also in Davey Street where it is way too narrow - around Jane Franklin Hall, around the Salad Bowl, around the badminton centre. It is quite dangerous now. The Council has done a range of things to try to ameliorate it, but nonetheless it is still dangerous because they weren't designed to be major feeder roads.

The local road network in place has its problems. The traffic impact assessment for the cable car proposal pointed out that Apsley and Degraeves streets are of poor geometric standard. It is not just the feeder roads that have problems, it is also parts of the local road system have issues, and this all leads to the congestion and other issues that arise.

In terms of why it happens, I suspect you have probably heard this a thousand times - there are more cars and people. Perhaps more so for us because the South Hobart population has gone up by about 6 or 7 per cent between the last two Census periods. We have lots of people who come into the suburb to do school drop-offs and a disproportionate number of people leaving those suburbs. Pressures are created with about 2000 vehicles that leave the suburb each morning and about 800 coming in.

Commuter parking - people come in for commuter parking and obviously that leads to pressures also.

In terms of solutions - good luck. One thing we have to do is somehow deal with cultural change and we have to stop worshipping at the altar of the car. It seems every time we look for solutions to the number of cars on the road, we create infrastructure that encourages more cars to go on the road. With the increasing population, and we have quite a large percentage of younger people living in the suburb, building more monuments to cars and having more cars on the road will not lead to less congestion.

We think we need to encourage public transport, to create incentives and disincentives. At the moment it is very cheap to park in the CBD. Maybe it should cost a little bit more. We have tried to address it with the council and have called on the council to have a parking strategy for the whole suburb. It is slowly moving in that direction. A letter went out a couple of weeks ago to most residents of South Hobart saying, 'Do you want residential car parking out the front, timed or residential zone parking?' Once that goes back to the council, it will then look at upgrading those streets. If that happens and soon, there will not be a major commuter issue in South Hobart, but it could take years, who knows, but at least it is underway.

We need more bike lanes. We need to encourage pedestrians to walk into the city. The only way we are going to get more people on buses is to make them more frequent, reliable, cheaper, maybe even free with bus lanes if we possibly can. And let us make life as miserable as possible to people who commute. Let us try to have more people who carpool. Less than 1 per cent of the cars arriving into South Hobart are carpoled. Something like 70 per cent of cars have a single driver.

CHAIR - What is the distance from the main area of South Hobart, say, from the brewery to the centre of the CBD?

PUBLIC

Mr HOYSTED - It would be roughly 2 kilometres.

In terms of commuter parking, there is apparently a tipping point where they will not do it anymore and although the council says it does not want to put in residential parking because it just moves the problem somewhere else, that is not necessarily the case. If we push cars out beyond, say, Huon Road, it is just not worth doing commuter parking and might force them onto buses or to carpooling. It is a bit NIMBY-like - we do not want commuter parking and other suburbs are the same. It is a problem that might be moved somewhere else, but it is still a problem.

Mr HALSE ROGERS - The two points, which were not in our submission, we identified with congestion as our main problem are peak periods and school periods. We have a problem in South Hobart with two schools in Anglesea Street, where a lot of students are dropped off by mothers and fathers, whoever, at the schools. This causes a lot of congestion, particularly on school mornings. We do not know exactly where those people come from, but I am sure they use Macquarie and Davey streets, which adds even more to the traffic in those major streets.

CHAIR - I quite often get caught at Collegiate when they are dropping children off when I am coming in of a morning.

Mr HALSE ROGERS - We also have a lot of tourist traffic in South Hobart visiting the brewery and the Female Factory, using those big, red - and I emphasise - slow buses, which cause a terrible amount of congestion at times. Obviously that peaks when there is a tourist ship in. The buses get used heavily.

Mr VALENTINE - During peak hour traffic or not?

Mr HALSE ROGERS - It is probably mainly outside peak hour traffic, but it still causes congestion. They do move very slowly. To my mind, they are not very friendly towards fellow motorists. They do not seem to pull over and let the following vehicles pass, which is a bit ingenuous of them. It would probably help the general congestion if they were to make areas where the buses can pull over and let other traffic pass.

Mr WILSON - I just wanted to reiterate some of the things said. One of the issues with the parents dropping off children, is that if the government provided free or very low fee bus services for schoolchildren - as they do in other states - that would cut out a lot of the congestion. We know in school holidays there is not a problem on our roads. There is 13 per cent less traffic on the roads. That is enough of a drop to make it convenient and pleasant to drive in the city and around the suburbs. Buses really are part of the key. As Phil says, reliable, more frequent and freer preferably. You get a lot of free buses for \$55 million for the cost of the Southern Outlet extra lane, for instance. They have to make it more difficult for people to drive into the city without being in pooled cars.

The other thing necessary with buses are park and ride stations in the suburbs, at Kingston, Mount Nelson, out the Eastern Shore and so on.

Mr VALENTINE - You mentioned 2000 cars leave the suburb each morning and 800 come in. Where are the 800 coming from? Are they coming from the Huon direction, down Strickland Avenue? Do you have any understanding?

PUBLIC

Mr HOYSTED - I do not really, Rob. I know a lot of them are food deliveries and probably parents delivering kids.

Mr VALENTINE - To the kindergarten, Anglesea Street?

Mr HOYSTED - Also the Macquarie Street kindergarten.

Mr WILSON - Also the primary school. I think it is parents coming in.

Ms SIEJKA - The day care centre also.

Mr WILSON - They have a couple of hundred a day.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you see any solution with regard to the traffic lights on the corner of Macquarie and the Southern Outlet, where it comes in? Do you see any solution there, with a dedicated lane possibly coming out of South Hobart to allow continual traffic, or not?

Mr HOYSTED - Are you talking about the bus lane coming down the Southern Outlet?

Mr VALENTINE - The bus lane they are going to put into Macquarie Street. Do you see any opportunity or any way that might be used at certain times for bleeding the cars out of South Hobart?

Mr HOYSTED - When it was originally proposed, we opposed it adamantly. Basically, it was redirecting traffic up Davey Street, down Elboden Street and back into the one-way street in Macquarie Street. That is basically untenable because you are putting another 5000 cars through the suburb each day at least. Once you had a one-way street from, say, the Salad Bowl down to the Southern Outlet, that would adversely affect all the traders there. No one from South Hobart would go to one of those shops because then you'd have to drive right up to Antill Street and do a huge block to come back into the street. I certainly understand at the departmental level that the whole idea has been abandoned. I do not know if I am going to answer your question, but they have not abandoned the idea of having the bus lane. I suspect it would involve the demolition of some important buildings if you were to put it in.

Mr VALENTINE - Or no parking.

Mr HOYSTED - I am talking about that little bit from Davey Street down to Macquarie Street. If you are going to put another lane there, you would have to knock down heritage buildings.

Mr VALENTINE - Whether that would work, I don't know. One of the submissions suggested that the right-hand lane that turns left onto the Southern Outlet be a through lane to further Davey Street above the outlet. So, instead of all lanes turning left onto the Southern Outlet, during peak times that right-hand lane that would normally turn left into the Southern Outlet coming up Davey goes through and continues up Davey rather than going around to the Southern Outlet. Have you heard that?

Mr HOYSTED - No, I have not heard that.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - You come up Davey street. You currently have one lane that turns right towards South Hobart.

Mr WILSON - There's already a dedicated road going straight up Davey street.

Mr VALENTINE - Does that do a left at the same time?

Mr Wilson - No.

Mr VALENTINE - No, you look at it, it is submission number - I can't remember.

Ms SIEJKA - I have driven up there recently. That is why I know.

Mr VALENTINE - We are obviously at cross-purposes. I think I haven't described it properly.

Mr HOYSTED - What I would say about that intersection is, it is so dangerous, particularly because cars coming down Davey Street that want to turn down do not give way to cars coming down the slip road. I guarantee maybe 20 or 30 per cent of the time I go there, cars drive out there and would create an accident. So many drivers doing that turn do not recognise they have to give way to their right.

Mr VALENTINE - That will do. I will look this up while someone else is asking a question.

Ms WEBB - Where did you get those figures of 2000 vehicles a day leaving the suburb and 800 coming into park?

Mr HOYSTED - Good question. I have been sitting on a community resilience program. We have looked at issues around transport in and out of the suburb. Information was by a guy called Ian Patterson. He got it from the census data. I can send it to you, if you like.

Ms WEBB - I am imaging that the commute-to-work figure gave you the 2000 vehicles leaving the suburb because that was collected in the census. I wonder what would have provided the 800 cars coming into park in the suburb from the census.

Mr HOYSTED - I really don't know.

Ms WEBB - Because that is the key one in a way, isn't it?

Mr HOYSTED - I might have it in my briefcase.

Ms WEBB - I am in no way doubting the issue of commuter parking in that suburb. I am well aware of it; I know people who do it. It would be interesting to understand how it has been quantified so far and to test that figure. Do you feel that park and ride facilities in more outer suburbs would alleviate some of the commuter parking? People would be leaving their cars, for example, in Kingston at a park and ride facility and catching a bus. What they are doing now is basically parking and riding in your suburb as the most convenient place they do not have to pay for parking and then either walking, riding or scooting even down the road into the CBD for work.

PUBLIC

My HOYSTED - Park and ride is an excellent idea, but you have to have the additional incentive to get on the bus. If the bus gets stuck in traffic, it costs too much. Then people are not going to get on it and they will not use park and ride.

Ms WEBB - It is not just the physical infrastructure, it is all the arrangements that are facilitated around that.

Mr HOYSTED - There's not one solution to this traffic congestion problem. There is a whole range of them. Park and ride is one. Allowing the buses the privilege of unmitigated access, I suppose it is, and cheap, frequent -

Ms WEBB - Do you have any sense of the impact on your suburb of the move of UTAS into the CBD? Have you contemplated that? Has there been any discussion around quantifying that?

Mr HOYSTED - The answer is no. Hadn't really thought about it. I can't see how it would affect us all that greatly.

Ms WEBB - Apparently, there would be 3000 staff be working in the CBD who are currently working in Sandy Bay. We had hearings from university yesterday. They are doing some excellent initiatives to try to shift their staff away from the use of the car. But even given their likely success with those measures, there'll still be fairly sizeable cohort of people who would be working in the CBD, not working where they are now.

Mr HOYSTED - There may be fewer students going through our suburb. Part of the reason they moved to the city is because of much improved public transport to the city. It would be a complicated cost-benefit analysis to work out whether it would.

Ms WEBB - I wondered if it had been a topic.

Mr HOYSTED - We have quite a few students. In fact, I think we also happen to have a disproportionate number of scientists in our suburb, presumably academic.

Ms WEBB - You've almost priced the students out, haven't you?

Mr HOYSTED - Not quite, there's a few. It is reasonably close to the university. I suspect the pressure won't go away because it will be even closer in the CBD.

Ms WEBB - I'm thinking more that it is a convenient spot to park to get to CBD.

CHAIR - I am interested in the cycle part of it. You are 2 kilometres from the city centre, and now with ebikes going back up hill - is the Hobart Rivulet encroached on by buildings all the way in to Hobart, or is it just an open rivulet all the way in?

Mr WILSON - It's a clear run from the Female Factory.

Mr HOYSTED - It's a pretty clear run. There is one building on the western side, just over the rivulet. In the main, it is a clear run. For a fair bit of it, there are two tracks. There is a sealed one, and there is a dirt one. Anecdotally, it is getting used more and more.

Ms WEBB - It is very well used.

PUBLIC

Mr HOYSTED - By ebikes, ordinary bikes, mountain bikes, people walking. It is a great asset.

CHAIR - Is there any way it could be used as a safe cycleway for people into the city for commuting?

Ms WEBB - It is now.

Mr WILSON - It is.

CHAIR - Apparently people are not using it as much as -

Mr WILSON - It is overused, according to residents. Unfortunately, the problem is that cyclists are not disciplined. They are supposed to ring their bells if they are approaching someone. Often there will be a couple with a stroller or a dog, and the bikes come up so quickly behind them. In some places it is very narrow. Where there is a separate bike park track, that's no problem, because the pedestrians are on the other one, but when there is a shared bike track there is a problem.

CHAIR - I think you were saying that you need a cycle lane into the city.

Mr HOYSTED - You can't have a dedicated one.

Mr WILSON - It is not wide enough.

Mr HOYSTED - There are sections where it is way too narrow.

CHAIR - This is on the Hobart Rivulet. I was wondering why it hasn't been further developed.

Ms SIEJKA - The South Hobart side is quite well serviced, isn't it? It is the bit where you get close to the city.

Mr HOYSTED - Yes, that's right.

Ms SIEJKA - The lower Macquarie Street end. I suppose people don't feel safe.

Mr HOYSTED - It goes up to Gore Street.

Ms WEBB - I think that is what the bicycle groups are suggesting to us. If there were a network of separated cycleways in the city that people felt were safer to use, you would get more use of the South Hobart cycleway down the rivulet, because they would feel confident to get through the city and where they needed to go on separated cycleways. While it is well used now, you might see an increase in use.

Mr HOYSTED - I think it would be fine if there was an increase in use. I don't think it has reached saturation point. Far from it. It's just this issue that David raised that you can't hear the bikes coming, they frighten people.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - I think that tends to be a common thing with those tracks.

Mr HOYSTED - It's an education thing, I think.

Mr VALENTINE - I found the submission. It's about clearways, it's not about extra lanes going in anywhere. They are saying -

The clearway times on Macquarie Street have been increased, but this has had no effect on moving the traffic through more quickly.

I don't know whether that's your experience or not -

The clearway, likewise, needs to be increased in length back to Antill Street. Also, the short clearway on the northern side of Davey Street, just before the Southern Outlet turnoff, should be lengthened to commence at least at the Radiology Tasmania entrance so that traffic in that right-hand lane turning into South Hobart does not block the next lane for traffic heading to Fern Tree.

Mr WILSON - That makes sense.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that something that you would support or do you see a detriment?

Mr WILSON - During the clearway period, yes.

Mr HOYSTED - Cars do pull out there and block the Southern Outlet. The slip road helps.

Mr VALENTINE - It's the Fern Tree road that it blocks too - that's what this submission is saying, that without the clearway, traffic wanting to turn right into South Hobart, coming up Davey Street and turning right into South Hobart, queues back and blocks the Fern Tree road.

Mr WILSON - Up Davey Street, yes, that's right, definitely.

Mr VALENTINE - If there were a clearway, that would mean more cars being able to exit in a shorter space of time.

Mr WILSON - It's extremely dangerous. A lot of people also - maybe tourists are at fault here - there are four lanes there. There are two that go down on the left into the Southern Outlet. The right-hand one of those goes to the Southern Outlet. People will suddenly, even without indicating, swing into the right lane, which is the Davey Street lane. That often causes problems too. I don't know that there have been accidents, but there could be accidents potentially.

One of the other problems is that quite a few years ago the council built that slip lane through into Macquarie Street. It had extra property taken out from Mr Bock's, on the corner of the Southern Outlet and Davey and Macquarie streets. Theoretically, it was to create a better flow of traffic, but in fact it doesn't do that because people queue across the intersection so it makes no difference. Nearly \$2 million was spent on that, which was from Commonwealth funds and was supposed to have gone through a community approval process, which it never went through. It has been a waste of money. It has not had the desired effect. It may also be that if you added a clearway further down Davey Street to Radiology Tasmania, that won't make much difference either because they are still queuing across the Southern Outlet.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Taking that option out is not viable either. Then you would block up Elboden Street.

Mr HOYSTED - What did cars do before the slip road went in? How did they get in?

Mr WILSON - They went around just normally, it made no difference, absolutely no difference.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do you have any closing comments you want to make?

Mr HOYSTED - We wish you all the best.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission and for making your time available today to be here. We really appreciate it.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Ms KATHY LAZANAS, GENERAL MANAGER, VICTORIA AND TASMANIA, AND Mr TIM LECKY, CONSULTANT, MRCAGNEY, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED, AND Mr GERARD REARDON, DIRECTOR, MRCAGNEY, WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED VIA TELECONFERENCE.

CHAIR - Good morning and welcome. The committee hearing is being broadcast today, so for your information, if you have any problems and if there is anything you want to tell us in camera, we can facilitate that for you.

Welcome to the public hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but I remind you that outside parliament you may not be afforded such a privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is available there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded by the Hansard and will be available on the website later on. By way of introduction I will ask you to speak to your submission and then committee members will ask questions relative to the terms of reference.

Ms LAZANAS - Good morning and thank you for having us there today. We would like to open by providing an overview of our submission to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion.

The Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics estimates that traffic congestion will cost the Australian economy approximately \$27.7 billion to \$37.3 billion by 2030. In Hobart, car travel has been the predominant mode of transport allowing easy and convenient movement connecting people to and from jobs and services across the metropolitan area. Despite some efforts to stem traffic congestion in the city, 83 per cent of all journeys to work are made by car which is a higher proportion than other Australian capital cities.

Until recently, Hobart's' road-based transport system has had the available capacity to adequately carry the level of demand. However, population growth and the continuation of traffic congestion has recently emerged as a new challenge. Planning for future growth while maintaining Hobart's liveability will require well-considered integrated and sustainable transport solutions. Transport is one of the most important considerations for a growing city like Hobart and is critical to the city's long-term prosperity and liveability.

Within this context the need for this inquiry is understandable, and we commend the committee for this. However, we strongly caution against a short-sighted approach of only providing more road capacity in order to reduce congestion. Transport is a derived demand and congestion should be viewed as a travel demand measure that needs to be managed. In our view, seeking to address congestion by simply building more road capacity is like the old saying of loosening a belt to address obesity. Essentially, we cannot build our way out of congestion. Traffic surveys undertaken in 2016 reveal the origins of traffic movements through inner Hobart and found that during the morning peak time more than three-quarters of the journeys that start in the east, north or south of Hobart end in the city. Similarly, in the afternoon peak more than two-thirds of the journeys that end in the east, north or south of Hobart began in the city. This shows that predominantly commuters from all regions in greater Hobart are travelling to and from inner Hobart.

PUBLIC

The City of Hobart Draft Transport Strategy 2018-2020 recognises a problem that peak hour weekday traffic congestion affects the city's liveability and economy, and it has put forward a suite of initiatives to address traffic congestion through a series of land use, transit planning, active travel and car management measures, while acknowledging the essential coordination required between all tiers of government to deliver these important transport projects. We are very much in line with what is provided in that report to manage congestion into the future.

Our submission goes into detail as to the causes of congestion, including the physical and topographical barriers. These are summarised in the five key areas of traffic pattern management and circulation that lead to congestion; car parking management, which drives congestion; insufficient public transport network; an insufficient cycling network; and the need to improve land use planning policies.

Our submission then goes into further detail and provides an overview of elements that could be implemented against those five initiatives, which I am happy to talk to or answer your questions about, depending which way you would like to go through.

CHAIR - If it does not come up in questions, in summary.

Ms LAZANAS - I can address it that way. Sure, that's great.

Ms SIEJKA - Your submission highlights the challenges that come particularly with our ageing population. We need to think about that a bit more broadly because we also have a really high rate of people living with disabilities, but mobility issues in general. This particular generation and other cohorts will need to be provided with new transport options. I was hoping you could expand on how these might look or what they might be. I presume they are already mentioned here but if you could highlight for me what aspects those are and what you think of those consideration.

Ms LAZANAS - We felt quite strongly about addressing that because it will be something - particularly for Hobart - that will be a growing concern in the future, more so than other cities. What we are finding is that by making more liveable cities, and we talk about the different things that could be implemented - cities that are more walkable, easier to access, having things like infrastructure around the place - does not necessarily have to be transport-related. A lot of work is being done in cities around the world that talks about having rest places available in the public realm for people to be able to stop, pause and reflect.

Ms SIEJKA - There is broader planning?

Ms LAZANAS - That is right. It goes beyond transport.

To come back to your original question on what the transport-related issues are: public transport and providing means and ways, whether through smaller on-demand services - we are seeing a lot of those particularly to service that generation to get to medical/hospital [facilities], but very much focusing on public transport - buses, light rail.

Ms SIEJKA - We have heard a lot about those broader planning issues, which is good because it is obviously not just an infrastructure issue. I presume they would be things like making sure there is safety at bus stops for all our cohorts - that's a concern - but also accessibility.

PUBLIC

One of the other things we heard was new developments. While we do not have this here, in other jurisdictions there are requirements you should be within a certain distance of public transport.

Ms LAZANAS - There is a lot, as I am sure you have heard and there is literature on, about what the walkable distance is. It is 400 metres, 800 metres, 1.2 kilometres - these are the standards we talk about within the industry. That standard probably needs to be relooked at, particularly when you are talking about people over the age of 65. We have done work on walkability, particularly around the time it takes to cross intersections, which is very interesting because that does change as people get older but it is also general mobility issues. As you said, it is not necessarily accessibility - whether it is people with prams or elderly people, it is both.

Ms SIEJKA - Is there anything you could mention about the walkability study because that would be quite good?

Mr LECKY - We did a walkability paper for the City of Melbourne as it was preparing its new transport strategy, which was mainly focused around pedestrian delay experienced in the CBD and the economic costs of that. Why would you allow cars to take up all the space in a city when the predominant mode of transport is pedestrians?

Ms SIEJKA - In the very centre?

Mr LECKY - Yes. Hobart is not quite there at the moment, but you are heading that way. You are increasing in population and there is more demand for services and entertainment in the CBD. The walkability piece is all on how the CBD is structured for the pedestrians and how the traffic engineering works in the favour of that as well.

Ms SIEJKA - All those small frustrations build up to people not really seeing much point in walking if they can travel further. I have seen on documentaries and things where they have demonstrated that a lot of those crossings don't allow enough time for older people and people living with disabilities.

Ms LAZANAS - Correct.

Ms SIEJKA - That's another reason to stay at home.

Mr LECKY - It just requires some finetuning with the traffic lights.

Ms SIEJKA - It also sounds like quite a simple thing to address.

Mr REARDON - To answer the question, the comment about walkability, particularly with cities, is very important in the context of this inquiry because congestion and provision for pedestrians actually is counterintuitive in terms of its juxtaposition. I have been on the lord mayor of Brisbane City Council's external reference group on the development of its transport plan. It's what's happening in cities around the world, in Melbourne and Auckland. It will need to occur in Hobart. Our view is that the priority for your city is all about giving the pedestrian the priority so the delay goes to the vehicle. If you take that at a strategic level, you then start to say, 'How do we position it and what do we see congestion as?'

PUBLIC

As Kathy alluded to in the opening statement, our message is quite simple: we often hear 'We're going to reduce it, we are going to bust congestion.'. You can't build your way out of congestion. At a national level, when we are advising Infrastructure Australia, we need to rethink how we plan our networks. We need to stop thinking about congestion, that we must reduce congestion. You just can't keep adding and adding roads. We really need to look at congestion being a demand management tool. Walkability - you redesign your cities based on giving pedestrians the priority. That really then says that traffic movement and delay takes a lower order priority.

My recommendation to the committee is that if you have that vision at the start, that then sets the scene and the tone for how you can plan the rest of your city and how you design your street networks.

Ms SIEJKA - Drawing on the fact that you do work in other jurisdictions as well as here, we have heard, across the last couple of days, how in other jurisdictions there is an authority or an overarching body that draws together the varying strategies, whether it's public transport or planning, infrastructure and all those sorts of things, so that there is a coordinated approach to addressing issues like these and traffic. I wonder what your thoughts were. We currently don't have that; we have a department. I wonder whether that leadership does bring that drive and coordinated approach. Do you have any particular thoughts on whether that might be needed, or how that might work in other areas?

Ms LAZANAS - Absolutely. I'm really pleased you asked that question because it's definitely something we would see the need for, with the work we do down here. You are right, you do have a department of transport. If you look at the interface of how people engage with the department of transport here, it is very much around the vehicle. It's everything around licensing; it's very much focused on those elements.

Yes, Infrastructure Tasmania looks at those planning and broader infrastructure projects. What we see lacking is exactly what you have highlighted. In other jurisdictions, there is the likes of Public Transport Victoria, which is now Department of Transport.

Ms SIEJKA - Is that an independent body?

Ms LAZANAS - It was an independent body, a department; there is also Transport New South Wales. In terms of how this could be explored - and we would really encourage the committee to explore this and we have given it some thought - the way you are structured here is that you have the department, but you also have Metro Tasmania. They just do buses. Interestingly, from where we sit, they also interface with the public and commuters. If you are talking about increasing public transport usage, you already have an entity that understands that base. Even if there is discussion about increasing other modes of transport and introducing those into the future, there is an opportunity there with people who understand the fundamentals of running a public transport service.

Whether that could look like a department or a subset of the department, there are definitely people in that organisation. It wouldn't require necessarily a full department. Perhaps the infrastructure isn't there just yet, but if you want to look at how to think differently and focus on public transport and active transport, the road element needs to shift a little bit. I think that needs to be done at the departmental level.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - It seems to have emerged partly as an issue because you have people or organisations, as in every industry where different groups are representing different aspects, and there is overlap and not always collaboration and coordination.

Ms LAZANAS - Correct. Right now in Victoria, for example, the new Department of Transport - Roads, which was VicRoads, an independent body - as from 1 July, legislation changed and they will fall under the Department of Transport, which is road and public transport under one department.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to that aspect, are you saying that what might be missing in the traditional planning arenas of the past are urban geographers? Those sorts of people who bring a more holistic, helicopter view to the problem? From a cultural viewpoint?

Ms LAZANAS - There is the land use side of things, absolutely, but there is also a very strong transport planning side as well - transport planning meaning not road planning but public transport planning.

Mr VALENTINE - We're dealing with people's habits here, aren't we? I heard your comment that we can't build our way out of congestion. Do you want to expand on that a little? We've had a couple of submissions that have highlighted this and yours is one of them. Why might that be expanding the problem into the future? Can you explain that so we can get a good understanding of where you are coming from?

Ms LAZANAS - I guess when we talk about building our way out of congestion, traditionally we can map that over decades of work where we've built roads and everyone has a car, and then you think the solution is that because we've got more cars, therefore we just need to build more road space. What we're realising and have realised, collectively and globally, in the space of transport planning is that it's not sustainable. It just doesn't work.

When we talk about an integrated transport network, cars are part of that. We are not saying that cars are outside that, but it's how we use those vehicles and how we manage that.

The starting point is understanding the right land use that's required; creating an integrated network, which looks at hierarchies of use - what is it we actually want our cities to look like, what do we want the main form to be?

The other thing we also see in jurisdictions is that behavioural science units are part of departments as well. The reason for that is that they are the ones which are looked at to then think about shifting people from being in vehicles into public transport, which is ultimately the aim.

Mr VALENTINE - What about the future aspect of that with technology, which was brought up this morning in talking with previous witnesses? Sometimes it's not always easy to predict exactly how that's going to pan out. Planning for the future has its problems and issues. Do you want to comment on that side of it?

Ms LAZANAS - I think it does and it always has had a problem because no-one, let's be honest, has a crystal ball to be able to say how things will pan out.

However, what we are seeing, and I think it's fair to say, is that transport is one of the industries that is being disrupted, and I use this word in the positive sense.

PUBLIC

If an independent body were to be established to oversee the development of the City of Hobart in the form of a department, it would definitely be looking at mobility as a service.

I'm assuming you have had other reports and submissions that talk about mobility as a service. I will use that as the catch-all because while we talk about elements - whether it's real-time information panels or whether it's parking management and pricing, or whether it's moving people and changing habits, mobility as a service is really the catch-all for that. So what is it we want to do? The essential part of that is using technology to move people from A to B in the most efficient and effective way possible.

While we don't have the exact solution yet for every model of every city around the world, there is definitely a lot being done in different levels. It might be a small solution which looks at integrating bus, for example, with walking or it might be parking. It's all based on apps and technology. We would encourage the committee to really think about what is being done in other jurisdictions that is readily available and is being shared. I think that's the important part about using data. This isn't reinventing the wheel; this is collectively learning about how we can improve our cities. We find that there is a lot being shared.

Mr REARDON - Kathy has spoken across a lot of these issues very well. For the committee, to put it into context, the challenge before you is one of investment. A road investment absorbs a significant component of limited public funding.

Economists always tell me that we work on an average a 300-day year; in other words, when we account for public holidays and weekends and so forth.

With transport, historically, over the past 30 years we always like to look at the peak at a peak. Whenever we design infrastructure, we extrapolate the current mode of operation and look at the peak. Assuming you have two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon, given the fact that 83 per cent of people coming into Hobart come in by car and leave by car, and as we said in our submission, it is a significant component of your demand on your transport network. When you look at that over a 24-hour day over 300 days, you are really only talking about 16 to 17 per cent of the actual total hours. The question I have in my mind is: isn't that a hell of a lot of money to be investing in only a fifth of the actual time that it's used?

It seems to us technology is an enabler and it's opening up opportunities. The shared economy is allowing younger people to make choices about how they live and when they move. Kathy alluded to the EasyPark app as a mobility of a service. It's perhaps best explained by someone who told me, 'I'm over 50. Our generation is told don't drink and drive. We decided we have to give up drinking'. We've told our nephews and nieces, 'Don't text and drive'. We made the assumption that they would give up texting. They are giving up the car.

Mr VALENTINE - Big assumption.

Ms SIEJKA - That is very interesting when you think of it like that.

Mr REARDON - Yes. It's a very powerful statement. That's what's happening so we need to respond to it. We need to respond to the pandemic of physical inactivity. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation is telling us that on current trends by 2040 a significant proportion of the federal health budget will have to fund diseases attributed to obesity.

PUBLIC

Active transport and the infrastructure that encourages active transport - walking and bikes - works to address that issue. So that comes to that planning context.

The other silent issue is fuel. Whilst we won't necessarily run out of fuel until the near future, it's certainly not going to continue to be the cost it is. When you look at the levels of apportioned discretionary funding and the proportion of people who are paying for fuel, it adds another burden to people to have to rely on cars as their only choice. As Kathy has alluded to, it is a land use based proposition. We are world-class at urban sprawl in this country. We are world-class in sending road tunnels bankrupt in the shortest possible time; we are very good at that.

We need to start thinking about how we are going. There's no right or wrong. We need to look at where we are putting our investment. As Len said, technology will be able to give you that flexibility.

The other underlying issue for state and local government is parking. We are socialising our cost of parking. We provide parking and people have an expectation that there will be a car park available. That distorts the whole origin-to-destination trip cost and it distorts people's perception. We are doing a lot of work in bringing back that expectation that you will have free and unlimited parking availability. It is a limited resource and it needs to be managed. That is where you start to introduce behavioural changes as Kathy alluded to; the idea of more information and data on behavioural sciences.

Ms WEBB - I am interested. Other folk have made assertions that it is unrealistic to expect people to change behaviour. Somehow the way we have arrived at our current use of cars and patterns of behaviour in transporting ourselves means it is not possible to shift to the extent that would be required to achieve meaningful outcomes for congestion. Could you talk a little about what your evidence says about the ability to shift behaviour and make those changes? It seems to be people think that it has to be an either/or - that people completely give up their cars and go to these other things. Maybe you could talk about what level of shift needs to happen in behaviour, the change, rather than that either/or outcome.

Ms LAZANAS - That is a great question. I am happy to answer here and we would probably be even happy to come back and give you some further information on specific case studies. I think that - respectfully to those people - that is not the case; you definitely can shift behaviour. We have seen that in cities around the world and in Australia. I think the interesting thing is that we are playing catch up largely in response to the demand for use of public transport services.

Without even being planned, some really good data and information is available, which we will circle back with if you would like it, that talks to 10 + 10 + 10 per cent increases year on year in usage of public transport. That is simply because of the challenges in moving around and congestion. People do get fed up. How bad does something have to get before you then shift to a mode?

There are other factors as well. Petrol prices come into it and parking, as Gerard said. Parking management is a big part. If you really want to change behaviour, it is an excellent stick to change that behaviour.

Mr LECKY - If your car parking supply is so abundant, there is always going to be that expectation that you are going to secure a free park at the end of your journey.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Right outside where you want to go.

Mr LECKY - Exactly. Other cities around the world and around Australia have shifted that over time. If you have been to Melbourne, Southbank, along the Yarra River, in the 1980s that was car parking. Over time that has been redeveloped, now it is a lot more valuable than car parking, it is Crown Casino and all sorts of other things. It is just a step change; over time it will change with car parking management, congestion and car parking levies or other things that you can do. There is a range of things that do the heavy lifting behind the scenes that are quite valuable.

Mr REARDON - Thank you, Chair, I think it is a very good question. I would answer it this way, recognising, as Kathy said, that we will come back with further information to the committee. You want to be able to give people choice, otherwise they will be making a change because it will be forced upon them. What will people do when fuel is \$3 or \$4 a litre? We know we have a health problem. Electric vehicles are a good example. We are doing a lot of work in the electric bus area. It is not a case of whether governments convert to electric buses. You will not be able to buy a diesel bus in the future, because the manufacturers have made that decision. External forces can actually drive that. We have seen people make behavioural change in adversity. The recent restrictions in water drought 10 years ago saw consumption of water drop dramatically across the major cities.

Presented with the data, the community is very well educated and can make decisions. But to date, we have allowed people to have that flexibility and choice, with unlimited parking. When you have the political language coming from all levels of government about how 'We're going to bust congestion, we're going to reduce congestion', there is a sort of presumption that the community will continue to have the levels of travel demand and travel speed and so forth that they currently have. We need to start to re-educate people and say that is unsustainable and it's unaffordable, and we're only going to be looking at that. You don't need much change to get huge effect. I will give you an example: in school holidays, I'm sure the congestion levels drop about 15 to 20 per cent. Car occupancy at the moment around the capital cities is only about 1.08. It used to be about 2.4 to 3.5 in the 1970s. On back-of-envelope calculations, if you hit car occupancy and double that alone, you can actually halve your congestion problem.

My point being that infrastructure is not the only way to address congestion. I think you can get that - people just need to be informed about it and provided the choices.

Ms LAZANAS - To come back to the other part of your question, which I think is really well noted, it's not either one or the other. One of the things that's really obvious to us working down here is that there is a lot of high usage of vehicles and road use, but the other thing that you have and are very lucky to have is one of the highest active travel statistics in the country. That doesn't happen by chance, that happens by people having the ability to make a choice. There is certainly room for improvement in connecting those bike paths and making the city friendlier for walking - wider footpaths, some of those infrastructure elements we were talking about before - however, I think, from memory, your active travel is 7.8 per cent, and that is higher than most other states'.

Ms SIEJKA - We haven't heard that yet.

Mr LECKY - As a proportion of population.

PUBLIC

Ms LAZANAS - As a proportion of population, yes. If you look at that, you have lots of car use, but you have a very high active transport use. The missing piece of the puzzle is public transport. When you are talking about how do you get people to move, it's in incremental changes. It is small and it's setting targets. Again, that's what other cities do in other jurisdictions: they set small targets years on year - 2 per cent, 1 per cent.

Ms SIEJKA - And supported by good planning.

Ms WEBB - It is interesting, we heard from our Metro organisation yesterday that it has actually had double-digit growth figures over a number of years without adding to its fleet. It has done that through changing the routes, the timetabling and the service, which is quite fascinating. Comments have been made that if we increase our public transport fleet, we then end up using it in peak time but then it's dormant during the day.

Something that has just occurred to me is, surely there would be a similar phenomenon with a large piece of infrastructure, say, a tunnel, which would be full at peak times and probably dribbling with traffic in the middle of the day. But we haven't heard the same concern raised about that, funnily enough.

Do you see that we should make every effort on those other measures before an infrastructure solution, or is there a place in an integrated approach to be making efforts around public transport and active transport, and using those tweaks to parking availability, and contemplating an infrastructure solution? Or how do you see the balance of that?

Ms LAZANAS - I think there is a lot of opportunity; if I look at Main Road, for example, and the buses that go down there - they are stuck behind cars.

CHAIR - This is Elizabeth Street?

Ms LAZANAS - Yes and going up into those northern suburbs. From what I understand, that's one of Metro's busiest routes. You have a busload of people who are stuck, as Gerard said, among one-person vehicles. That's not great. If you have a timetabled service, because public transport is all about efficiency, if you can increase your efficiency and have more services, that's great, but you need to be able to make those buses run into the CBD freely. There is definitely tweaking that can be done by looking at what you have already without having to jump to that big piece.

We have been looking at the network, and cycling is a really important one. There are a lot of great cycle paths but they don't all connect. How can you increase that? It's the same with footpaths and walking.

Mr LECKY - On the note of infrastructure, typically public transport systems in places around the world stimulate that level of demand around the corridor. In the absence of heavy rail in Hobart, your road system has typically stimulated the other kind of built-form typology, which is sprawl. Cars require more space, they require bigger roads, and therefore the houses around highways are bigger and more dispersed. Whereas in Melbourne, for example, with the rail corridor, which was put down a long time ago, development was always built up around that corridor. The planning strategies over the last 15 to 20 years in Melbourne have been about building even more around those train corridors to enable the walkability and improve the catchment.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Transport-oriented development.

Mr LAZANAS - Correct, densification.

Mr LECKY - Because there is no foundation of that in Hobart, it's natural that things have been quite dispersed and sprawling.

Mr VALENTINE - We're a strip city.

I was just interested in Tim talking about parking availability and car-parking levies. One of the issues we have in Hobart is that commuter parking is provided by private enterprise, largely, not councils. Councils provide short-term shopper parking, in the main. The long-term parks are mostly private enterprise.

I am interested in the levy situation. Are you talking about private car-parking entities having these levies as well? Can you explain how it works?

Mr LECKY - Parking levies are used to essentially place a tax on parking providers. The City of Melbourne has that. It's not for private operators, from my understanding, it's for employers. If employers provide off-street parking for their employees, they are subject to a levy.

I'm not entirely sure how that would work for private operators because I think what would happen is, if you started to tax private operators they would do their balance sheet and it would end up being uneconomical to operate as a -

Mr VALENTINE - This is why I mention the issue, because it is an issue. They have entered into these agreements over time, knowing that they can project what their income is going to be and all the rest of it. That's why I asked that very important question in terms of management. How do you work with private enterprise to achieve that outcome? Are you aware of any other places that have that same problem?

Mr REARDON - I preface that by saying that in my previous life I used to be responsible for managing all the on- and off-street car parking systems in Brisbane City, and those under a service agreement.

To make a point on what Tim was saying, as a state government you have many tools at your disposal that you can use. First of all, you can look at trialling legislation which encourages a differential pricing structure being required by the private operators whereby, if you are going to park there all day, you are going to pay a higher margin than if you are parking there for a short term.

The other issue with parking is not so much that it's there, it's its utilisation. You want to discourage or put a deterrent on all-day parking, but allow short-term, half-hour, one-hour [inaudible] to encourage [inaudible] infrastructure, which points back to the other lady's comment about utilisation of the infrastructure. It's not just a fee.

You have the [inaudible] ability of [inaudible] legislation in place for differential charging. You also have [inaudible] in Sydney.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - You are breaking up.

Mr REARDON - To recap, you can use legislation to introduce the differential parking pricing scheme.

I don't really mind that, because at the end of the day they have the ability to charge long-term commuters more for their parking. It's an actual win in some respects, from their point of view. And you get the pricing structure that points to the outcomes you want in terms of travel behaviour.

The other opportunity you have is to require a levy. We don't use the word 'tax', because it sends chills up your spine, and I appreciate that. The important thing is that it is a hypothecated and publicly transparent funding mechanism, whereby if there were a levy charged over car parks, it would be a hypothecated -

CHAIR - You are breaking up again, Gerard.

Mr REARDON - I might dial back in again.

Ms LAZANAS - I will make a quick comment on the reference he made to council car parking and availability. There is significant information available around the rates people now charge. I note it is quite cheap in Hobart, in comparison to other cities and probably something for the committee to also explore.

Mr REARDON - Is that any better?

CHAIR - That is a lot better.

Mr REARDON - Kathy, are you going to finish off?

Ms LAZANAS - No, I just made a comment.

Mr VALENTINE - I would like to comment on something you said with respect to private car park operators charging more and [what] would be good for their bottom-line. The difficulty is in Tasmania a significant number of people are welfare-dependent or in some way have federal government assistance and creates a problem for them in terms of being able to effectively travel to work or whatever.

Mr REARDON - You put their challenge there and an interesting point, getting support. More money would be [inaudible] for long-term parking. In other words, we would go to long-term parking to discourage, or incentivise car occupancy. You have a raft of tools where if there is car sharing, you can park them in the car park. You can play around with your pricing structure. You just use the legislation to help incentivise the private operators, to introduce those sort of pricing structures.

I haven't not seen the data on people who are actually getting welfare support and are also working. With the public transport pricing structure, do they have access to public transport and SSR?

Mr VALENTINE - They have access to concessions.

PUBLIC

Ms LAZANAS - Which would be the answer to the same thing. So, you could use the existing mechanism to use for private parking.

CHAIR - You wanted to summarise some points you said we might not touch on, because we have gone over time.

Ms LAZANAS - No, I think we have touched on most of them and our submission covers the areas. Traffic circulation is probably something to really consider. When we talk about whether we need to go to the large infrastructure project or what are the low-bearing fruit we could look at, traffic circulation is one that really does need to be considered. We would encourage the committee to conduct a review on one-way traffic circulation in central Hobart. It is not the most efficient or effective. We know that people are very keen on it.

CHAIR - That has been raised.

Ms LAZANAS - Good. Obviously two-way travel would encourage that and look to design a street manual which is what we are seeing in a lot of jurisdictions and having those hierarchy of streets - what do you want specific streets to do, what would you like their functions to be and then design.

Mr LECKY - Streets, not roads, so adjacent land use. What you want your streets to look like.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for your submission and for making your time available today. Thank you, Gerard.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Dr SHANE BROAD MP WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome, Shane. Do you want to give an overview of your submission?

Dr BROAD - I would like to make an opening statement.

First of all, thank you for having me in today to give evidence and I thank the committee for establishing the committee in the first place.

We know the issue of traffic congestion in the Greater Hobart area and the problems it creates for commuters, industry and tourist traffic alike is one of the key issues confronting southern Tasmania, hence this is a very important issue and you should be commended for establishing the committee.

The main message from Labor's submission is we really need to take an integrated approach, a multi-pronged approach, because there is no single solution that will solve traffic issues in southern Tasmania.

We need to also talk about long-term investments rather than election cycles. We need to properly plan public transport systems - whether ferries, buses or light rail, or any other option, for that matter - not only to consider moving people, but also to work with planning schemes to facilitate development of the things that need to go around those public transport systems - things like parking, retail, education, services and medium-density residential buildings in and around transport hubs and stations. This is what I mean by needing to take an integrated approach and to think through the consequences of what we are actually planning.

Specifically to public transport, ideally you want a system where you can do everything you want to do in and around the station or the hub, whether that be a train station or a park and ride facility or anything like that. You want to be able to do everything you want to do in and around that hub and then you only catch the public transport into your workplace and then back. For example, you can drop the kids off at child care or school, catch a light rail or a bus to work, and then the bus or the light rail or whatever it is back to the hub after work, where you can see the doctor, buy groceries, pay bills, pick up the kids, and only then do you get in your car to go back home. That is the sort of integrated -

Ms SIEJKA - More than just a parking facility.

Dr BROAD - We have to think around all the consequences, rather than that just a single approach such as an extra lane will solve your problem or one particular infrastructure project is the magic solution that will solve all these problems.

Mr VALENTINE - A transport-oriented development?

Dr BROAD - Yes, but we also need to address the lack of coordination and planning between the three levels of government in order to make those sorts of integrated hubs and stations work.

There is no doubt the federal government has a big role in helping fund large infrastructure projects, but local government has a very important role when it comes to planning. For example, if we want to have a train or a bus station, we need to be able to work with the planning scheme so

PUBLIC

we can facilitate retail, education, parking et cetera around that hub or station. It is very important we work together with local government in a structured way to think through all the problems and also plan for the solutions.

Labor does have a good history of thinking things through. The example I will give is that in the last term of a Labor government, Labor delivered the Brighton Transport Hub. This has made freight movements around the state more efficient by speeding up the time it takes to get a container from the Burnie Port into Hobart, allowing that train not to have to go through the 21 level crossings all the way through Hobart to Macquarie Point to unload all of those containers for them to then be distributed throughout southern Tasmania.

Basically, having the transport hub in Brighton meant that all of those truck movements and all the people movements - I'm not sure of the exact figure but it was something like 200 000 a year - were taken out of Hobart by putting the Brighton hub in place.

Ms SIEJKA - How many did you say?

Dr BROAD - I think it was 200 000, but I haven't seen the exact details.

Ms SIEJKA - Trips?

Dr BROAD - Yes.

Not only did taking the train out of going all the way into Macquarie Point mean that there weren't 21 level crossings to be crossed, slowing traffic down all the way; that and the truck movements were taken out. Every truck would have to come into the Hobart CBD to Macquarie Point to have the container loaded for it then to go to its end point.

CHAIR - They were coming into Hobart and then the containers were put on a truck and dragged back to Claremont.

Dr BROAD - With the Brighton hub, the trains get to the north and south far more efficiently so the train system itself was more efficient, which again we see with the freight volumes that are now going on rail increasing at record levels. We've taken trucks off the Midland Highway, we've taken trucks out of the Hobart CBD. It required an integrated approach. There was a whole bunch of developments, including the Brighton bypass. The Brighton bypass meant that the township of Brighton stopped having all the traffic from the Midland Highway go through it. The Brighton Industrial Estate went around it as well. The development of the Brighton Transport Hub meant there would be more traffic going through Tea Tree Road, for example, to take freight through to the west coast and the other side of the city. Therefore, Tea Tree Road had to be fixed.

This is the sort of integrated approach we need to take rather than pretending that there is a single solution. Public transport, bikes, park and ride and also infrastructure upgrades are all part of the solution. Everything needs to be integrated and properly planned and stretched out over the long term or funded beyond electoral cycles and implemented.

Ms WEBB - Thanks for that, Shane. That was a useful opening statement.

I wanted to pick up on a couple of things. We've heard from a lot of people about the need for integration and the need for coordination between tiers of government and probably also

PUBLIC

across different areas of government as well, say, at a state level or beyond. You talk about that in your submission.

It has been suggested to us that a separate statutory authority of some sort could draw all those threads together and having the coordinating body would be a potential way to do that. Has the Labor Party given some thought as to how that coordination mechanism might look and work?

Dr BROAD - I would be really interested in your findings on this. I think there is a risk of duplication. At the moment we have Infrastructure Tasmania. I thought part of its role was to help this integration. We have people in State Growth whose role is to help that coordination and so on. There's also a role for local government. For example, on the north-west coast, the Cradle Coast Authority, over a number of years, has been working with stakeholders and developed a plan for shared pathways to stretch from Latrobe all the way through to Wynyard. That plan was put in place a number of years ago and it has been rolled out. It depends. That instance was a specific project. The project was designed, agreed upon and over various electoral cycles they've received funding to do bits of it. Preferably, it would be great to do the whole lot in one hit but that's quite difficult. It doesn't necessarily need to be a statutory body to achieve really good outcomes when it comes to moving people and doing projects like Shared Pathways. Again, I would be very interested in your recommendations but we have to be very cautious not to duplicate what already exists.

Ms WEBB - Absolutely. I think the thought was not so much around duplicating but bringing together those bits that exist but don't necessarily have a mechanism to integrate with each other well - Infrastructure Tasmania and infrastructure something around public transport, something around land use, planning, and how those things connect.

Dr BROAD - It is also a role for government too. I have made public statements about the 30-year infrastructure plan and how disappointed I was that it did not have any actions, projects or plans. It talked about things that may occur in the future.

Mr VALENTINE - Was it a framework more than a strategy?

Dr BROAD - It was really a grab bag of ideas rather than a structured way of thinking things through. For example, it talked about electric cars, but it did not talk about how would you implement those.

Ms WEBB - Not commitments to actions.

Dr BROAD - Yes and there were no measurables along the way. We would need to have charging stations. This would be the number of vehicles we would start bringing into the state government fleet and that way those electric vehicles will trickle out into the rest of the market when they get turned over second-hand and so on. If we want to talk about specifically traffic in Hobart, we need to develop a long-term plan that has, rather than talk about one thing - such as we need ferries or another thing, we need light rail - we need to bring all that together and plot it out and plan it over a long term, so this is what we will have in place. One of the issues is we do have short-, medium- and long-term issues. There are some short-term things we could do right now. Some of those examples are decisions the Government could make right now that would improve traffic flow through the CBD.

Ms HOWLETT - Can I ask what they might be, Shane?

PUBLIC

Dr BROAD - Yes, things like we know a large part of the issue of traffic in Hobart is people coming into work. We only have a minor reduction in the amount of traffic coming into town in the school holidays and then all of a sudden the roads have good flow. It was about 8 per cent reduction in traffic flow results.

Ms WEBB - I think it's about that; it might have been a little higher.

Ms HOWLETT - I heard it was 11 and 10 -

Ms SIEJKA - Maybe there was not a definitive [figure], but there was a certain amount we had to shift anyway to make a big difference.

Dr BROAD - The point is you do not have to make a very big change to make a big impact. Things like the Government could spread start and finish times for public servants. For example, start at 7 a.m. and finish earlier, and then other people may wish to start later and finish later. That way you are spreading out the commuting time frames from everybody coming in at 8.30 to 9.00 a.m. to people coming in much earlier. For some people, it works well in their life.

CHAIR - Don't they now work with flex time? Isn't it available with flex time?

Dr BROAD - It is. It is not necessarily mandated, but could be encouraged. Obviously, in departments you need an overlap of time so you can coordinate meetings and so on but that would spread out the commuter load potentially and some people may want to start later. They might want to drop kids off at school and get into work a bit later or they may want to finish earlier so they could pick up children and take them to after school sport or maybe take their parents to appointments and so on.

Ms HOWLETT - That is not removing vehicles off the road, is it?

Dr BROAD - No, but it is spreading out the commuting time.

Ms HOWLETT - You still have to get your kids to school at a specific time, pick them up at a specific time and then take them to their after-school activities, so it is still not reducing vehicle congestion.

Dr BROAD - It would. Instead of having all the cars on the road at the same time, they are spread out over a greater window, or the buses or the public transport. Once again, this is not going to be a magic bullet solution, but it is part of the solution and other things like encouraging people to work from home. People do have the ability to work from home. Maybe those sorts of things we could encourage more. In the medium term, maybe thinking about things like decentralising departments around the city. Victoria has decentralised government departments all over their state. That way instead of having all the traffic for public servants coming into the CBD, they are spread out. There already are public servants spread around the city. This is not about my sitting here today necessarily making exact recommendations on which department should go where, but these are the things -

Ms HOWLETT - You must have thought about it; you must have some kind of vision.

PUBLIC

Dr BROAD - Well, these are the things we need to consider in a coordinated way. For example, if we want to have a light rail system or bus hub and spoke models, then around some of those hubs we should also be thinking about building facilities for office work and so on. These are the sorts of coordinated approaches we need to be taking.

Ms HOWLETT - What are your thoughts on light rail?

Dr BROAD - If I could finish my point - and also things like -

CHAIR - Just let Shane finish instead of interrupting.

Dr BROAD - Also, there are things the Government could do right now, like greater encouragement of things like cycling by the provision of showers, lockers, bike storage facilities and so on. Some government departments do have this.

Ms HOWLETT - They have done that well here in this building, you have to admit.

Dr BROAD - No, I am saying it's good, but these are the sorts of things we need to be encouraging, and the same with schools - greater ability for kids to ride to school and therefore parents don't have to drop them off, and parents would be much happier with kids riding to school if it was safer.

Once again, I will go back to the example on the north-west coast. The bike path between Turners Beach and Ulverstone has meant that kids are now getting on their bikes at Turners Beach and riding to East Ulverstone Primary School. Every time that happens there's a parent who doesn't have to drive that child to school - although there are really good bus services from Turners Beach to Ulverstone Primary.

These are the things to consider that may help, and other things like organising group discounts or subsidies on ebikes. They are a much more comfortable way to travel in to work. You don't need to be as physically fit and it can deal with hills a lot better.

CHAIR - The university is looking at it.

Dr BROAD - Again, the university is looking at that. These are the sorts of small approaches that may be part of the bigger solution. Those are some of the things the Government could be doing right now.

Ms HOWLETT - Shane, do you support the replacement of the Bridgewater Bridge?

Dr BROAD - Yes. There is no doubt that the Bridgewater Bridge needs to be replaced.

Ms HOWLETT - What's your vision for that, what would it include?

Dr BROAD - The Bridgewater Bridge is a key piece of infrastructure. It is a key piece of the corridor and we know from many reports that, for example, if there is a one-in-200 year earthquake, the bridge could fail. We have seen before when the bridge got stuck, the impact that had. We need a new Bridgewater bridge.

PUBLIC

Labor had a design and basically that was canned by the incoming Government with another proposal.

Ms HOWLETT - What did that include?

Dr BROAD - That included rail and pedestrian use and they were some of the things that were criticised in the Government's -

Ms HOWLETT - How high was your proposal?

Dr BROAD - I can't recall exactly.

Ms HOWLETT - Did it allow river access?

Dr BROAD - Yes, it did. The criticisms from Infrastructure Australia of the plan that has basically been dumped were that there was no consideration of rail and of pedestrians, and that the underlying geotechnical issues were not dealt with. What we see now is the Government going back to square one and putting out consultancies for geotechnical work and then, following that, a design phase, so we will have to wait for that as well. Obviously it's prudent especially to see the geotechnical information. It's a great big mudflat there and it's unstable.

We know there are heritage issues with the causeway and that wasn't dealt with in the previous business case and design so there's a lot to go through.

The Bridgewater Bridge needs to be replaced; however, that is not the magic solution to southern Tasmania's transport because we know that when you build bridges and highways, it can sometimes push the congestion further into the network. That's why we have to have these integrated approaches.

CHAIR - It has been said that Metro ought to have more buses on at peak hour, morning and night. Metro disputes that, saying it's full now. Metro disputes that because they've then got all that downtime and the cost would be exorbitant. What's your position?

Dr BROAD - There are big issues when delivering a service like Metro's.

Ms SIEJKA - You should probably be aware that they also said they had had a lot of growth, double-digit, so it's getting to capacity at those times.

Dr BROAD - In a bus with 40-odd passengers, that's whole bunch of cars or even bicycles or pedestrians put onto a bus. There was an interesting picture that somebody put online of 40 cyclists, 40 cars and 40 people on a bus, which really illustrates the movement power of buses. It's not just about the design of the scheduling; there are always issues with design and scheduling, it benefits some and disadvantages others. Again, we need to take a coordinated approach. What are the behavioural issues stopping people from getting on a bus? Is it because they can't do everything they want to do? They need to drive into town because after work they want to drive somewhere else to do an activity, go to the chemist, whatever it is, so there are behavioural things we need to address. I think maybe that coordinated approach of the hub and having various hubs throughout the city, and doing it in a coordinated way, may alleviate some of these problems.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Not increase any more peak hour and then have a lot of buses stood down with the cost -

Dr BROAD - Metro is really well placed to have those conversations. I don't have a department behind me to be able to give you a specific answer to that. Indeed, the route planning of buses is very complicated. The worst thing is when you have buses on a route and nobody uses them. If those buses are full, there should be more scheduled, there should be more services.

The public transport systems I have seen in other places in the world that work really well are ones where you turn up and within a few minutes there is a service, rather than having to think, 'It is now 11.43, I have two minutes to get there.' Again, Metro is really well placed to do this, but I think the -

Mr VALENTINE - It's a population issue though, isn't it?

Dr BROAD - It's a population issue when it comes to being able to fund large public transport infrastructure, but we don't have the population of Melbourne or a big city to be able to do it, and we have geographic constraints as well. Hobart isn't flat; it has hills, it has the river, and that is why we need to have integrated public transport. Ferries - where has that gone to? I don't know, it sort of dropped off the radar.

Mr VALENTINE - There has been talk through various submissions, even today, about the implementation of tunnels, with costs around \$1.4 billion, and softer options. How do you see this progressing? Do you see the softer options being tried first and then consideration of more expensive infrastructure? How do you see that side of life as far as working out the solutions to what we have in front of us as a problem?

Dr BROAD - We need to do it all. We need those short-term, quick things as I have highlighted already with changes to the workplace and so on. We need long-term infrastructure planning, for example, the Tasman Bridge, when that comes to the end of its life, which isn't that far away, we need to start planning for it now. When it comes to tunnels -

Mr VALENTINE - When you say 'the end of its life', do you mean the end of its carrying capacity or the end of its physical, structural -

Dr BROAD - Yes, its structural life is going to come to an end at some stage and what is it going to look like?

Ms SIEJKA - Don Challen or Bob Cotgrove mentioned that.

Dr BROAD - It is a number of years down the track, but these are the things we need to plan. The Sydney Harbour Bridge wasn't built for a couple of lanes.

Getting back to tunnels, I don't have any objection to tunnels, provided they can actually help.

There is a bit of an issue sometimes where, when you add a new road to a congested network, it can actually have the opposite effect. It's quite complicated, and there is this phenomenon called Braess' Paradox, where a German mathematician found that in some examples when you add another road to a network, paradoxically it creates more issues. The alternative to that -

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Congestion further down the track.

Dr BROAD - It is a mathematical thing. If you are more interested, look up Braess' Paradox. Paradoxically, there was a massive freeway through the middle of Seoul, South Korea. When it was closed for repairs, it actually improved traffic.

These are about the behavioural issues of drivers themselves; the way that drivers tackle the road network can have a paradoxical effect.

When it comes to tunnels, I spent a number of years in a place called the Faroe Islands. They have a population of around 50 000 people. They have 20 tunnels in the Faroes. They started in 1963 and are still creating new tunnels to the present. They have something like 43 kilometres of tunnels. Around 50 000 people have paid for this. Their shortest tunnel is about 220 metres, and there is actually an 11-kilometre tunnel under construction at the moment, which is underneath the North Sea.

Mr VALENTINE - What is the substrate?

Dr BROAD - It is volcanic rock, but it is under the sea. They have to deal with leeching and they have to have pumping systems. There is actually going to be a roundabout in this tunnel underneath the North Atlantic. I highlight this because for €222 million they are building an 11 kilometre-long tunnel, including a roundabout the North Atlantic. That works out to be around \$460 million. So, when people talk about a tunnel in Hobart being \$1 billion, I think it may be possible to do it cheaper than that, although it does depend on the substrate. Also, they have bored a lot of tunnels and they are not going to have to import machinery or expertise.

In this instance, the tunnel changes the travel time from 60 minutes down to 15 minutes. It is obviously worthwhile. They are talking about a tunnel to the southernmost island that will be 26 kilometres long. In other places in the world, tunnels are a viable option and it might be the case in Hobart.

I don't know if people have talked about a tunnel underneath the Domain and joining that up with the bridge. We would need to do some pretty good investigations. Without power of a whole department behind us, it is very hard for us to calculate the numbers. A lot of work would need to happen. I think tunnels could be part of the solution but, again, we have to make sure that it doesn't actually have a negative impact on the network.

Ms WEBB - Shane, I was interested that you talked about - and I think most people would agree with you, especially in the community - the need for long-term solutions that will fall beyond election cycles. That requires a particular sort of approach that will endure potential changes of government.

How would you see us arriving at those sorts of robust solutions that can be carried forward, regardless of the government of the day?

Dr BROAD - That is why we should have a 30-year strategy that actually maps it all out.

Ms WEBB - That cannot be just thrown out the window by the next government that comes in?

PUBLIC

Dr BROAD - A 30-year strategy that everybody has bought into is very considered. It takes into account things like where population growth is going to be, where we actually want to encourage population growth. It has to be a whole-of-government, all levels of government.

It has to be federal, state and local government. Each level of government has a role. The federal government has a role in helping support major infrastructure projects. The state government has a role in major infrastructure projects and local government has a role in the planning it needs.

Where should we be encouraging medium-density housing, for example? They are going this whole process in Melbourne. They are encouraging medium-density development around the train stations. Instead of an ever-increasing urban sprawl, which adds more and more congestion to an already congested network, you have people wanting to live closer to where they work.

However, this is a lifestyle issue as well. Not everyone wants to live in massive high rises. Some people want backyards. This is why we cannot say no more funding for highways. That is not practical - people still want to have a backyard. There will always be growth outwards. If we want Tasmania to grow, which we do, higher population means better services and more opportunities for our young people. But where are these people going to live? If we think it through and coordinate it with properly planned public transport, for example, we can have these hubs and spoke models around a designated transport hub. We also have medium-density housing, supermarkets, doctors, schools and so on.

Ms WEBB - The RACT has produced a 30-year strategy as an independent non-political process. It had a very robust, it would appear, consultation and engagement process to do that. Is that something the Labor Party has examined, and would it support what is laid out in that long-term vision?

Dr BROAD - There is no doubt the RACT has some really good ideas, but we need to take it to the next step - we need not only to talk to the RACT, but also to businesses, transport, the users of the network and local government.

Ms WEBB - The RACT did that in that process. Are you familiar with its process? You might not be, but I direct you to have a little look if you have not looked at it. It actually embarked on a very robust and thorough consultation with all stakeholder groups who might have something to say about that, including the general populace, to put together that vision. It might be one you would find good to look at.

Dr BROAD - We need to actually have the planning that goes with it, the steps along the way, the local government planning changes that need to happen and so on and so forth.

Ms WEBB - That could fit well with that. They have mapped out each five-year bracket and even some costings and activities.

Dr BROAD - Things will no doubt change over time too. We have seen massive growth in Hobart, more so than the rest of the state.

CHAIR - It also has an impact on the economic productivity of our area, with all this growth coming in; the liveability, of course, you touched on. The economic productivity, as mentioned in your submission, when you have traffic issues, it is affecting all that, isn't it?

PUBLIC

Dr BROAD - Part of the reason we would hope Hobart is a very attractive place to live is because you are not stuck in traffic for an hour. If we start getting stuck in traffic for an hour every time people commute to work, some of the benefits for moving to Tasmania go away. That is why we need to get ahead. Traffic is a problem now, but if we do not have proper planning and investment it is going to get and worse. That will impact liveability. It will also impact on productivity if it takes a lot longer to move goods and services around Greater Hobart, or indeed, southern Tasmania and that then impacts the economy, there is no doubt about it at all.

CHAIR - We see that in my area, Shane's area too, with the salmon industry.

Ms HOWLETT - Rosebery, yes, regional centres

CHAIR - Regional areas, with productivity getting it to market, getting it through the cities.

Ms HOWLETT - There is a certain time frame to make it profitable with any freight.

CHAIR - Especially with the salmon industry, they have to get it to the markets.

Dr BROAD - Berries, all sorts of stuff.

Mr VALENTINE - The issue you point out about long-term strategic framework can apply across a whole heap of things, such as health and education. The various parties, as they come into power, might concentrate on a certain aspect of that framework, but not go outside it.

Dr BROAD - As I have talked about, if we are going to have placement of schools, the placement of transport hubs, or park and ride facilities also has to consider education. If we are going to build a new school with a greater populace and if we have a big increase in population, then which schools - do we build new schools? How do we coordinate movement of people around existing schools if the demand for education services goes up?

Mr VALENTINE - The whole thing has to be holistic.

Ms HOWLETT - We heard a bit about it.

Dr BROAD - The same with the university moving into the Hobart CBD; that will have a big impact on it. When I was at university, I lived in Sandy Bay, Battery Point, Dynnyrne areas because I really liked being close to the university. If the university is in the CBD, that changes the dynamic because people now, if they want to live outside of those areas right next to the city, it spreads out. Now it would be easy to live in Goodwood, Claremont, the Eastern Shore or Sorell and instead of having to get all the way through town, through all that congestion to get to Sandy Bay to go to university, it's into the CBD but that has pros and cons as well. You have more cars coming into the CBD. With that extra volume of students, it may make public transport more accessible from, for example, the Huon or Sorell because there are more people on buses wanting to come into town, so it may be part of the solution as well.

CHAIR - Thanks, Shane. We have taken you a bit over time. I am not sure if the other witnesses are there yet.

Ms SIEJKA - I think they might be.

PUBLIC

Dr BROAD - I think the main message is it needs to be a coordinated traffic solution. Hobart's traffic solution is one that is going to be integrated and not one thing in particular and we need to plan it out and fund it over a long period of time.

CHAIR - Thanks very much, Shane.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr KELLY SPAULDING, MAYOR, AND **Mrs KIM HOSSACK**, GENERAL MANAGER, TASMAN COUNCIL, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - The committee hearing is being broadcast today and if there is anything you want to bring to us in camera in your submission, we can facilitate that for you. Welcome to the public hearing of the Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All the evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but outside of the parliament may not be afforded such a privilege.

A copy of the witness information is there for you. The evidence is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be available when it becomes available. We will give you the time to speak to your submission and then we will take questions. We have allowed 30 minutes.

Mr SPAULDING - Thank you very much for the opportunity to present today. With the Arthur Highway in constant deterioration and the increased visitor numbers to the region making the trip to Hobart longer most days and even more constant roadworks to improve the traffic flow, I believe it is a great opportunity to further investigate the option of a ferry service to Hobart and surrounds.

It would be a valuable opportunity to insure the state gets the best out of a ferry service across the Derwent to help congestion and if it is also utilised to move visitors around, for example from Nubeena to Tasmania and also Bruny Island options. With the opportunity to cut travel time from Hobart to Nubeena from an hour and a half to as little as 40 minutes and further reduce car flows in and out of the Hobart district -

CHAIR - A Nubeena to Hobart ferry service.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, 40 minutes.

Ms HOWLETT - Thank you, Mayor, and thank you, Kim, for coming today.

In relation to the ferry service, what take-up do you think there would be from residents in the area? There would be a tourist take-up as well, I imagine. I know you have run some polls and had quite a bit of feedback. What has the feedback been?

Mr SPAULDING - I don't think I have had one negative comment from anyone in the community, and certainly many of the older community are extremely excited about any sort of concept of it happening.

Ms SIEJKA - As you get older, it would be quite a way to drive.

Ms HOWLETT - What would the cost be to implement it?

Mr SPAULDING - I've got no idea as far as that goes.

Ms HOWLETT - Would the council contribute?

Mr SPAULDING - I think council would have to look at helping with some sort of infrastructure. The opportunity for council to put in infrastructure such as a marina as part of that

PUBLIC

development would open up an income stream opportunity for council as well to help fund the Tasman in the future.

Ms HOWLETT - I'd be interested to know the number of tourists it would attract.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, there are a lot of figures around from Port Arthur, especially, being World Heritage and the number is in the thousands who are going down there. It would be very interesting to see, out of those thousands, how many actually leave Hobart in the morning, travel to Port Arthur and in the afternoon go straight back. They just do the day trip. To get that traffic off the road, I believe, would be a great if they left from Constitution Dock and come to Hobart. They can't come into Port Arthur because it's too difficult with weather conditions and everything.

Ms SIEJKA - In that peak summer period, there are a lot of tourists on that one patch of road.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, it's a lot. It's not only the tourist traffic, it's local residents. A lot of people travel to Sorell and beyond, even daily, for work.

CHAIR - Any idea of how many people travel out of the municipality?

Mrs HOSSACK - No, I haven't got the exact statistics but I know a lot do. A lot come the other way because they work for forestry or Tassal, and they travel. You have schoolchildren too. There are a lot of students who travel daily.

Ms SIEJKA - Is it a growing population down there?

Mrs HOSSACK - We are not growing hugely at the moment, no.

Mr SPAULDING - We are just seeing a bit of change in that with the younger families coming down, and the interest from Tassal, as far as its employees go.

Ms WEBB - I imagine a 40-minute trip to Hobart would help attract people - they could commute in more easily.

Mrs HOSSACK - Exactly, of course.

Mr VALENTINE - It's 80 minutes otherwise, isn't it,?

Mr SPAULDING - At least an hour-and-a-half, and that depends on road works.

Mr VALENTINE - An hour-and-a-half you are saying. I know it is 45 -

Mrs HOSSACK - Slow-moving traffic.

Mr SPAULDING - Depending on what happens with the World Heritage Area there, if the Historic Sites Management Authority develops the Coal Mines Historic Site further, it would fit in with the through-traffic around the municipality. As part of the ferry service there would have to be buses or a small car rental car or something set up as part of that process. It would then work with the flow of the visitors around the municipality as well.

PUBLIC

Mrs HOSSACK - That creates another business for the area - local employment and business.

Ms WEBB - That covers what I was about to ask. You'd naturally need a transport service on the peninsula to take people from the ferry terminal in Nubeena to, say, the Port Arthur site and others. You particularly talked about daytrippers and tourists doing it in a day - 40 minutes each way makes a much more accessible day for, for example, cruise ship visitors from the city. You would envisage that it would add other businesses to help with the further movement from the peninsula.

Mr SPAULDING - The only other public transport we have the Tassielink service which is generally mostly full with schoolkids going backwards and forwards, morning and night.

Ms SIEJKA - I suppose when you look at Bruny - it is interesting you flagged that - Rob Pennicott and others, while they don't have the local bus services, have built in other aspects to add to doing tours.

Mr VALENTINE - I hear the arguments; in fact we talked about this when we were down there. What I'm a bit concerned about is that if it were tourists, there are a number of tourist operations between you and, say, Dunalley that might basically be starved of customers. Have you thought about that side of it?

Mr SPAULDING - I think, with the through-flow of traffic throughout the east coast there is still going to be a certain amount of driving customers. It would be just that daytrippers to Hobart who is travelling backwards and forwards.

Mr VALENTINE - You are saying the commuter traffic might be enough to make it viable?

Mr SPAULDING - I think you are still going to get the growth in the tourism and the normal areas that they travel. This would just help that flow backwards and forwards of those people. Certainly for the elderly residents going to the Royal and specialists' appointments in Hobart.

Mrs HOSSACK - I think it would be a combination. I don't think you can rely on one particular group to keep it viable.

Mr VALENTINE - So it's an option.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, it will be a combination. You will have your peaks and troughs, but I suppose you need what is going to be consistent right throughout the year.

Mr VALENTINE - I was just thinking of places like the Bangor Oyster Shed and other cafes in Dunalley, on the way through; even the Blowhole and Eaglehawk Neck, those sorts of places that really rely on traffic.

Mrs HOSSACK - I suppose we are trying not to take away from that. There are still a lot who travel down, but then they continue on up the east coast, they circumnavigate Tassie.

Mr VALENTINE - They are in hire cars.

PUBLIC

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, I believe it's probably trying to spread the ease right around the state. You know that they are going to come, but it's just another option for them to get there quicker. I know nowadays people are looking for things that are quick, something to gain quickly, to see something in a day.

Ms SIEJKA - Even going to the heritage site now - before, we usually just pulled up or we walked round - but now you have to put a lot more planning into where you park. Even though the facility is really good, there are all those things that add to your time frame, that if you had the option of a ferry -

Mr VALENTINE - You would have a lot of motorhomes, wouldn't you, that go to Port Arthur? I think 360 000 now go to Port Arthur, and I don't know whether you have any figures on how many motorhomes there would be in that lot.

Mr SPAULDING - Hundreds a day, if you look at the car park at Port Arthur, especially at this time of the year.

Mr VALENTINE - They are not going to catch a ferry, are they?

Mr SPAULDING - No.

CHAIR - What's your population?

Mr SPAULDING - It's about 2500 permanent residents. Then, during the summer it swells.

CHAIR - In the summer time, with the shackies, it goes to -

Mr SPAULDING - Ten thousand.

Mrs HOSSACK - Quadruples.

Mr VALENTINE - It's 2500 from basically Bangor, down? Okay.

Mr SPAULDING - It also adds some options as far as safety is concerned. Quite a lot of the newer residents moving in are quite aware of what happened in the Dunalley bushfires, that it's quite easy to get trapped down there. Some people are concerned about that if they move into the area. That adds a bit of security if such a service was operating. It would just alleviate that for people, about ways in and ways out of the municipality.

Mrs HOSSACK - Also, recently we have just had a new jetty installed at Murdunna and it will be declared open in January. It's actually a deepwater jetty. It came out of the bushfires, saying that they needed somewhere where larger ships could get in to the peninsula.

Ms SIEJKA - There were a lot of people relying on boats in and out at that time, weren't they?

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, the smaller boats, but they couldn't actually bring in the larger boats because it was too shallow. Now, there will be a deepwater jetty at Murdunna and you can pull directly up to it. It will provide different varieties of services as well as emergency services. Even ambulances can pull directly up to the jetty and take patients off.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - That's already built, is it?

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, it's just about finalised.

CHAIR - Is that through MAST, or is that -

Mrs HOSSACK - It is through the local Murdunna Jetty Association. It's a community group that has put this all together. It has funding from three different groups: federal, state, the Tasmanian Community Fund and MAST.

CHAIR - That wouldn't be an option for a ferry to pull up at though. You're talking about a ferry from Nubeena.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, it could be. I know that will be used very much recreationally, but there is a second option there. That particular asset will become council's asset. It will become our asset when it gets fully signed off on completion. That will be roughly in January. There is one sitting there.

CHAIR - More asset renewals.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes.

Mr SPAULDING - Yes.

Mrs HOSSACK - It is another option. Remember Murdunna is on the Forestier Peninsular. It is north of Eaglehawk Neck. Nubeena is down on the true Tasman Peninsula. We really could have two options; plus, from a safety point of view we should have two options.

Mr SPAULDING - The reason I included the option of Bruny Island in that statement was from talking to visitors in the area about where they are heading to next, whether they are going up the East Coast, back to Hobart or planning to go to Bruny Island the next day.

CHAIR - That would be another business opportunity on Bruny Island then, for a bus to pick them up.

Ms SIEJKA - I think they already have a bit of that.

Mr VALENTINE - Either that, or have a few cars on this ferry.

Ms SIEJKA - I was thinking that, but then that changes the whole ferry dynamics, and the weather ...

Mr SPAULDING - Originally when I started talking about it -

Ms SIEJKA - It would be good, but that is a whole other story.

Mrs HOSSACK - If you did have it that way, you would be dealing with traffic congestion from three directions - southern and northern and eastern.

PUBLIC

Mr SPAULDING - Ideally it would be nice to have a ferry that would take at least five vehicles.

Mr VALENTINE - In relation to the Bruny thing you were talking about. Are you suggesting there might be a commuter aspect to that as well as a tourism aspect?

Mr SPAULDING - I am not sure how many jobs.

Mr VALENTINE - They'd go from Nubeena to Bruny to Hobart. Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr SPAULDING - Yes. I think once a day. It certainly would work with the visitors travelling around in the area. They could go that way, or back the other way, taking them straight out of Hobart to Bruny. There would be a different type of traveller wanting that service.

CHAIR - What sort of ferry would you need? The weather can cut up pretty bad there.

Mr SPAULDING - That is why I have said I am not sure exactly what ferries have been looked at.

Ms WEBB - We're pretty good at building them in this state, aren't we?

Mr VALENTINE - We are good at building ferries, and there are two or three operators.

Mr SPAULDING - That is why I suggested a larger one that would service the Derwent in the peak times, and then offer an off-service to the Tasman and to Bruny.

CHAIR - It should work, because your peak times here on the Derwent would be after you come back from Nubeena, and before you go back to Nubeena, wouldn't they?

Mr VALENTINE - But if you got the right vessel.

Mrs HOSSACK - It is not as rough as Bass Strait.

Mr VALENTINE - You are not going the bottom of Tasman Island, are you?

Mr SPAULDING - It's not called Storm Bay for nothing. The roads are getting pretty rough anyway. It is a good option. It is really interesting. Our community, at times, can be quite negative to new ideas. As I said, I haven't had one negative person at this stage.

Mrs HOSSACK - Neither have I. Everybody is very positive about it.

Ms SIEJKA - I think as we have an ageing population in most regional and rural areas, there would be more and more people paying for some form of passive transport.

Mr VALENTINE - I guess the ultimate thing is the cost.

Mr SPAULDING - From our perspective, at least if there was a ferry service, you could actually work while you are travelling. If you are backwards and forwards, it can save a lot of time.

PUBLIC

As far as the elderly community goes, if they are using the bus services, it is a whole day round trip to go in and out for doctors' appointments in Hobart. There are some really good positive things about it.

CHAIR - It is reasonably expensive to travel up and back from down there if you are using your own vehicle.

Mrs HOSSACK - You have your fuel, and if you are coming into the city, you've got parking. There are other things - time and traffic.

Mr SPAULDING - The upgrades happening on the highway add time to the trip, as the new infrastructure goes in at the airport. It all slows the trip down. It makes it longer, and makes it harder. We thought we would be running late today, and there are not many roadworks.

Mr VALENTINE - Would the council undertake a cost-benefit analysis on this? Or is that something you would want somebody else to do?

Mrs HOSSACK - I think that now Tasman is staying Tasman, we need to start collecting the data around our local community and our local tourists.

Ms SIEJKA - Size of vehicles would be interesting.

Mrs HOSSACK - For example, postcodes, or 'How did you travel here?' I think it is up to us, as the community, to collect the local data. I don't think you can obtain it through the ABS or rely on Port Arthur to provide it. They are busy with busloads. We need to start to have a network of trying to collect that information.

Ms SIEJKA - One of things we had about that sort of data, if you do go ahead and collect it, was the multi trip-type data. Sometimes it gets counted as a trip to the CBD, in this instance, when actually the person was travelling on. That is something to be cautious of.

Mrs HOSSACK - Exactly - like, where is your destination? Maybe that could be something that could be brought up with our local business association. The business and tourism associations have just merged, as Jane would know. For them to be able to collect that information and have some sort of survey would be great.

CHAIR - How many people travel out from work every day?

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes.

Ms HOWLETT - Or, as you said, medical appointments. It would be interesting to know why they are going into the city as opposed to going into Sorell for services.

Mr SPAULDING - And certainly as businesses are growing on the peninsula in the municipality, a lot of people are travelling in for work now because there's not the work available

Ms SIEJKA - But also, as I said, the other way.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Station someone at the Dunalley Bridge and stop everyone that comes up.

Mr SPAULDING - The bridge at Dunalley causes delays as well. If the new marina goes ahead, there is a lot of concern from residents about how much delay that will cause more regularly, as the bridge would be open more.

Ms SIEJKA - The historic site would already collect some of that data. It would be just adding to it.

Mrs HOSSACK - Yes, they do. We need to tweak it and get everybody on board collectively.

CHAIR - How long does it take from when they close the bridge and to when they reopen it?

Mr SPAULDING - Depending on what the tides are doing, it is about 20 minutes.

CHAIR - That's a maximum?

Mr SPAULDING - It does get stuck every now and then.

Mr VALENTINE - It didn't in my day; we used to help crank it open.

Mr SPAULDING - Only last January it got stuck during peak time. It only took about five minutes for the phone to start ringing.

CHAIR - What is the time frame if it does get stuck?

Mr SPAULDING - I'm not sure whether it was stuck for 40 minutes or what the failure was. Luckily it wasn't too long, but it was in the middle of January.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for your submission.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Ms EMMA RILEY, BOARD DIRECTOR, TASMANIA, PLANNING INSTITUTE OF AUSTRALIA, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED

CHAIR - Welcome to the hearing of the Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you any comments made outside the hearing may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the witness information is there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded. The *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available. By way of introduction, we let you speak to your submission first, then we will ask questions. I think we have allocated 30 minutes, but we are ahead of schedule, so if we need a little bit longer, we have that time up our sleeve.

Ms RILEY - I am here today representing the Planning Institute of Australia. I am one of the national board directors of the institute. You will have had the opportunity to read our submission, so I will not go through it in any great degree of detail. I highlight that overall our submission is that the Greater Hobart traffic congestion issues and the potential resolution of those need to be considered in a much broader context than just as an infrastructure solution, it needs to be considered as part of a broader integrated land use planning and transport solution. Ultimately, the transport task for Greater Hobart arises because of the relationship between where people live, and work and wish to go for entertainment and recreation.

We know the majority of employment opportunities within the area, in central Hobart and yet we haven't in recent years done any policy or strategic work in the planning area on the growth of Greater Hobart.

While there are some potential small-scale solutions, we do not think the overall resolution to the problem will be able to be resolved unless it is seen through that lens.

Ms WEBB - One of the things we have heard about a number of times is the need for coordination across effort, because this issue does have multiple elements. Land use planning has public transport elements, infrastructure elements et cetera.

A coordinating mechanism for those things - does the Planning Institute have thoughts on the need for something to be put in place that is a coordinating mechanism, to draw it all together and to stop the siloed approach?

Ms RILEY - We agree there is definitely a need for something to coordinate among the councils, as well as across the different tiers of government and also across government agencies, because there are siloed effects within government agencies. You only need to look in the context of the relationship between Planning and Infrastructure.

We have a fairly small planning policy unit that in actual fact is focused on regulatory policy, not strategic planning policy, in the Department of Justice. A lot of these other decisions are made within the Department of State Growth. We would see a lot of that systems-level planning strategy as actually a strategic growth question.

Ms WEBB - In that sense, what do you think has been stopping even some coordination between similar areas? I notice in your submission, on page 3, you talk about the number of existing strategies there to guide decisions, like the inner Greater Hobart area, the Southern

PUBLIC

Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy, the Southern Integrated Transport Plan, the City of Hobart Transport Strategy and the state Government's Transport and Access Strategy.

They are all there already. Can you comment on what has been the barrier and the coordinated approach, even in those, that are all in similar areas?

Ms RILEY - The major factor is it requires a strong leadership role. We even have, at a state level, some of the factors spread across a couple of different ministerial portfolios.

There needs to be very strong leadership. Also, there have been concerns about creating another level of governance and potentially regulation in a state where we already have quite a lot.

We would say that it does not need to be regulation. In fact, good land use and infrastructure planning is actually a non-regulatory thing, but holding people back is seen as another kind of governance mechanism.

Ms SIEJKA - In the same vein of oversight: one of the things that has come up is not such much the strategic stuff, but that there is a lot of work on infrastructure and perhaps we need to focus much more broadly.

Are there particular aspects of how we could consider some of those broader influences - cultural, social, demographics and those sorts of things we should really be looking at when we consider congestion.

Ms RILEY - The question it comes down to is: how do we as a greater city want to grow, and factor in all those things? That is at the heart of every good planning question and approach. It's only through a consistent - what as planners we would describe a systems level. It's not a kind of a one-off project where you say this is what you are doing; you are constantly evaluating how the city is growing, where people are working, where new jobs are going, where new houses are going and looking at the infrastructure needs of those and doing it at a systems level rather than a one-off.

Ms SIEJKA - On that, we heard some evidence to do with what happens in some other jurisdictions. I understand that some of it is holistic and some of it is planning in dedicated kinds of ways. One thing mentioned was that in, I think, Victoria, where, when there is a new development, they make sure there is public transport within a certain distance and things like that. Are there gaps you can see, from that broader holistic sense, in Tasmania's planning rules and regulations which perhaps we could address to improve those sorts of things?

Ms RILEY - Everything here is done on quite a small scale compared to, say, in Melbourne. In Melbourne you would be dealing with very large land release areas or very large brownfield redevelopments. Most other jurisdictions have some form of land development authority that does it through a public-private partnership type of way that ensures that infrastructure is delivered early, the right public transport goes in and supports that from an early part in the project.

The challenge we have in Greater Hobart is everything is on a much smaller scale.

Ms SIEJKA - And probably quite spread out.

PUBLIC

Ms RILEY - Yes. It's usually a cumulative impact arising from multiple smaller developments in a place like Hobart, rather than one big one, in terms of things like, for example, public transport. I think it comes down to that coordination question. There isn't anyone coordinating that link between local government when they get to the point of assessing a new development somewhere and the public transport providers.

CHAIR - I was just reading with respect to infrastructure here, that you have 'review car parking requirements within the State Planning Provisions of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme'. That has been raised with us in one of the other witnesses' submissions. Would you like to elaborate on that?

Ms RILEY - The car parking provisions in the scheme - I will say the ones in the interim planning schemes at the moment are even a little bit more conservative than those in the State Planning Provisions - probably don't fully recognise the desire to have fewer cars in some inner urban areas. For example, if you are trying to do even a relatively small-scale infill residential development around the city fringe or some of the inner suburbs around Hobart, you still generally need two on-site car parks per dwelling. Most then come in with car parking discretions. There does seem to be a bit of a mismatch between what the planning schemes are requiring in terms of provision of car parking and what the desire is in terms of getting more people to use alternative forms of transport.

CHAIR - That was quite interesting. I can't remember who else raised it, but it was raised.

Mr VALENTINE - Looking back nine or 10 years ago when we worked on that famous Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy, at the same time the government was working on its transport strategy, I think.

Ms RILEY - Yes, it was.

Mr VALENTINE - It has been pointed out there needs to be an integration there. If you had your time again, what would you change in how the Regional Land Use Strategy was approached? We actually looked at growth corridors, didn't we, at that time.

Ms RILEY - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you think that was effective, looking back on that time? Has that been effective? Would you say there is now another way of doing it, after having that experience, how you would tackle it?

Ms RILEY - In hindsight, the regional strategy has, to a very large degree, stood the test of time. There are concepts in that which have continued to flow through a wide range of strategic projects and initiatives. For example, the identification of that infill corridor between Hobart to the northern suburbs that now underpins a lot of different projects, including potentially that northern transit corridor that the Department of State Growth is looking at doing further work on. So, I think it has.

What we highlighted at the time - and that has come true - is that it is difficult to achieve some of those infill outcomes that the regional strategy was aspiring to without some active level of facilitation and intervention outside of the regulatory system.

PUBLIC

The problem we have, and I was saying this 15 years ago when I was state president of the Planning Institute of Australia, is that we see the planning system as a regulatory system. All the efforts are always focused on the regulatory side of things, doing planning schemes. However, actually delivering real outcomes and change requires planning strategies to be implemented. Infrastructure provisions are a key way because infrastructure provision can be a generator of private investment into an area through active economic incentives or even, indeed, disincentives. That was highlighted in the implementation report to the regional strategy at the time and I think it has come largely to fruition.

We have been lucky that incidentally, because of broader factors, there has been a desire for all forms of infill development around Hobart probably. When we wrote the strategy, I was not envisaging the extent of the pace of change and growth that has happened in the intervening 10 years.

Mr VALENTINE - You mentioned that it's time for review.

Ms RILEY - The institute's view is that it is well overdue for review. We haven't been doing any monitoring against the key statistics. That is problematic in terms of decision-making, even outside the normal planning approval processes around planning scheme amendments and the like. It is the fact that we aren't as a holistic city looking at how many dwellings have gone where; what type of dwellings; none of that. If you look at the background report, the regional - the profile that underpinned the whole strategy was 2006 census data and we haven't been monitoring against it at all.

Mr VALENTINE - If the Government does that review, and bearing in mind the problems and issues we have with congestion and people flow and all those sorts of things, you were asked the question before, who would you be putting on this overarching body to bring all together for something useful going on into the future? Clearly it is not just transport planners.

Ms RILEY - Yes. I definitely think there is a need to increase the capacity at a state level within the public service of more traditional experienced planners who deal with metropolitan-based issues. There is always a need to continue with the regulatory planning policy but you need to have a separate area that focuses on that systems-level strategy. Ideally, they'd be in an area that has a very close day-to-day functional relationship with the infrastructure side of government. You can have an overarching governance mechanism that relies upon a resource within, say, something like the Department of State Growth and what resources you have in government. If you have a coordinating person on a day-to-day level, I think you can do it in a way that has a minimal governance burden.

In the institute we certainly have a discussion and a view - a little challenged now - that the structure around the city deal has been created -

Mr VALENTINE - That was going to my next question.

Ms RILEY - That is only four councils within the Greater Hobart Area. So, spatially, the Greater Hobart Area is six municipal areas and while you would say, in terms of pure numbers, Clarence has had the highest number of new dwellings, in terms of proportional growth, Sorell and Brighton are actually proportionally growing faster than those other ones. We have had that discussion now that that structure has been created - you don't want to do another one because then we start to -

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - It has an act behind it.

Ms RILEY - Yes. The challenge is about how you would link it in with that.

Mr VALENTINE - It is the capacity to ask other people in to the table.

Ms RILEY - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - I was interested to know how you would see the planning aspect, the holistic nature of planning that is needed, and what sort of bodies might be involved.

Ms RILEY - If you look at what happened with the Regional Planning Project, the governance had all the councils, as well as the minister for Planning at the time, and the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority. If you had a coordinating kind of unit that sat within government with good day-to-day relationships at an officer level with councils, you could generally rely upon the kind of normal sign-off mechanisms that you have already within local and state government.

Mr VALENTINE - Thanks for that.

CHAIR - Do you want to make a closing statement?

Ms RILEY - No, just to thank you for the opportunity to come along. Certainly, the Planning Institute is a very strong advocate for integrating land use and infrastructure considerations.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr JOHN PAULEY WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic. We are being broadcast, and if there is anything you would like to have *in camera*, we can facilitate that for you. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but outside of the parliament, you are not afforded that privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is there for you, if you need it. The evidence you present is recorded on Hansard, and the version will be on our website when it becomes available.

By way of introduction, we usually let you speak to your submission first, and then we have questions. We have allocated about half an hour, but we can go a bit longer if you need to.

Mr PAULEY - I start by saying thanks very much for the opportunity to present.

I really want to start with a quote from John Maynard Keynes, which is quite relevant to Greater Hobart traffic, and that is: 'The difficulty lies not so much in developing new ideas of which there are hundreds, but in escaping from the old ones.' In the case of Hobart traffic, we have to somehow escape from the old ones. That is the problem we really face in Hobart.

As I have read in the papers during the week, and heard on radio news as recently as this morning, you are not short of new ideas. Nor are many of those ideas an extension from the Wilbur Smith report in the 1960s. I hear this morning the new tunnels were proposed. The tunnels are just a modern way, but Wilbur Smith said in the 1960s that we need to address Hobart traffic. Similarly, in the recent election, there was a debate around electric cars. Some clung to the old ways of internal combustion. Others want the new.

But how many people realise that Volkswagen, which is just one of the major motor manufacturers, will be releasing 70 fully electric models by 2028? They are investing \$30 billion in e-mobility. They are expecting sales of 22 million vehicles by 2028. If Volkswagen is doing it, Mercedes Benz is doing it, and all the major motor manufacturers are doing it, then it is no longer an if. It is about when. The issues for government are not so much about encouraging electric cars. It is how they are going to replace the fuel excise associated with petrol-engine cars - and in 1998 I did a report on that very issue for Ozroads. Another issue is also ensuring our electricity system can cope with extra demand. I am not sure you realise that an electric car will increase the domestic household consumption of electricity by about five times for an average house.

There are issues bigger than the electric car that we have to deal with.

Before we can move forward, we have to escape the anchor of the past. When I look at Greater Hobart traffic, we are really anchored in the past.

I appear before you not in a professional or paid capacity. I appear as an interested Hobart resident. But as some of you know, I have a past.

I am perhaps the only former or current bureaucrat in Tasmania who has had direct responsibility for the delivery of the hard, physical infrastructure used for a variety of transport services. I was manager of Wayne Transports' planning in the late 1990s, and they are still building my projects. One of the last of my projects was the Perth bypass.

PUBLIC

I also finished my career in the public service as General Manager for Passenger Transport, and had responsibility for the bus network in that role. I think that gives me a unique perspective on the issues we face.

On top of that I am a keen motorist. I have a sportscar and I enjoy driving it. I am an enthusiastic motorcyclist. I have just done a 7000 motorcycle trip through the outback. I am a long-time bicyclist; for most of my working life I commuted by bicycle. I am a user of public transport services - not so much in Hobart because I live so close, but certainly interstate I preferred transit services. I am also a frequent pedestrian commuter in Hobart and most recently, including today, I am a convert to the wonder of the electric bicycle.

I tend to use the mode I take based on the trip purpose I am undertaking, and I am lucky I have access to all those. What this tells me is there is no silver bullet to Hobart's traffic issues. There is no one-size-fits-all solution.

Returning to Keynes, is it really traffic we are concerned with? That is the old idea; we have traffic engineers. Or is it about moving people, and the best way to move people in Hobart? That's the new idea I want to put to you today. Is it about gaining the most efficient use of our very expensive transport infrastructure?

Transport infrastructure, particularly in urban environments, is excessively expensive. I believe this morning you were presented with the tunnels, which is a billion dollars-worth of investment.

Mr VALENTINE - It is \$1.453 billion.

Mr PAULEY - I can tell you after planning road systems for four or five years, whatever estimate you get is always wrong. Whatever time estimate you get is always too short. At least take that to two.

My objective in taking the time to make this submission was to seek to get this point discussed, and move the conversation beyond a discussion of competing infrastructure projects, which is where we are in Hobart at the moment. I am not going to repeat my submission, because you have that before you, and you have most probably read it.

I want to make a few additional points. We need to take a step back. We need to accept the constraints of Hobart's topography and our current settlement patterns. We can't change them.

We need to rethink the urban layout of Hobart and begin to seek opportunities for developments that minimise continued dependence upon the private car, and there are plenty of these around Hobart. Some densification on the eastern shore would create the passenger demand that is needed for a ferry. Densification up Elizabeth Street would take a lot of people. I do not know how many of you walk up Elizabeth Street, but on one side of the road you have the new residential complex of the university. On the other side of the road, what you experience as a user of the road, as a pedestrian, is the traditional street frontage. But set back behind that street frontage is about a five-storey building.

PUBLIC

So there are plenty of opportunities to undertake that sort of development in Hobart. You could do that in the Murray Street corridor, or Elizabeth and Argyle streets corridor, very easily. It just needs somebody to start the ball rolling and people to think a bit differently.

There are huge opportunities in Hobart to improve the situation. Some are reasonably easy decisions, and a lot of things I am going to suggest you can do with a can of paint and a bit of electronics. You don't need to get the bulldozers out. Others are much harder, and my experience as a public servant is that politicians can usually choose between the hard decision and the easy decision. The only difference is if you take the easy decision, you still have to make the hard decision, and they both give you about the same amount of grief.

As a one-time bureaucrat whose job was to get rid of the grief, I am much happier when a politician makes the hard decision, because I know I am not going to have to face that decision over and over again.

We need to think about what I call Hobart's transport infrastructure topology: how the network fits together. Rather than beginning with the private car, as we do at the moment, and we put at the top of the pyramid, we need to reprioritise the network, and this starts with our future transit network: its frequency and priority, and most importantly, the information available to passengers and the mix of fare products they have access to.

I spent 10 years looking at transit issues, and when we did a survey of what stops people using buses, it wasn't the fare. It was other attributes, such as, people didn't know when the bus came, or there weren't enough buses, or whatever.

If you are thinking of spending a billion dollars, you can most likely spend between \$80 million and \$100 million every year forever on transit. If you give me \$100 million in Hobart forever you will have a world-class transit system that will be the envy of anywhere.

A key aspect of this planning is what I call a 'rubber-tyred transit network', that mixes trackless trams and a redefined bus infrastructure. A trackless tram is very similar to 'steel wheels on steel rail' in terms of the user experience, and that is what we are after. But it can go wherever it wants to on the network. It can accommodate greater gradients. For example, you would be lucky -

Ms SIEJKA - What does 'steel on steel' mean in terms of environment and fuel?

Mr PAULEY - 'Steel on steel' is a steel wheel on a steel rail.

Ms SIEJKA - But in terms of comparing it to the environmental impact, is that better?

Mr PAULEY - Exactly the same. The motive technology is identical. I know you have heard from some of the northern suburbs light rail people. If you put a rubber-tyred trackless tram into the rail corridor in the way they want it done, with rapid recharging at the stations, the users would not know it had rubber tyres. But at the end of the journey it could go onto the road and work in a defined corridor. You would not need to rip up huge parts of Hobart's road network and put tracks down.

So let's jump to the future, rather than languish in the past. Trackless trams provide, as I said, the key ingredients of light rail: a more attractive vehicle design, rapid in-service charging of

PUBLIC

electric vehicles. But more importantly, they offer a city-wide option. We have wide needs for transit in Hobart. One thing people hate doing is transferring from vehicle to vehicle to vehicle. With a trackless tram, you could do an end-to-end journey, but to do this we need to have the right strategic planning structures for Greater Hobart.

At the moment we have five or six councils, a Department of State Growth that has a very strong infrastructure planning expertise - they are all engineers - but they have a lesser focus on the strategic transport transit needs in Hobart.

I will raise the question: do we need a city-wide people-moving authority that reports to ministers and lord mayors, that starts to set the strategic direction for the city as a whole, rather than having the fragmented approach? I hope that challenges your thinking a little.

I am a keen cyclist. We need to think again about the bicycle/e-bike network. As a long-term cyclist, I don't really think Hobart is a cycling city. I ride to Richmond every Sunday morning. Its topography precludes all but the keenest from accessing most parts of the city. Ms Webb, I see you occasionally at Hill Street Grocer. I can tell you, to get from here to Hill Street Grocer on a bicycle is not easy.

Ms WEBB - No, indeed. To get from Hill Street Grocer to my house -

Mr VALENTINE - That is why you don't see her on a bicycle.

Ms WEBB - That is right, because I would have to go back up the hill with it.

Mr PAULEY - Personally, I have found riding a bicycle in Hobart over the past 30 years has become increasingly dangerous, and I will frequently choose walking to cycling. An e-bike, on the other hand, opens up a new world. Hobart hills disappear. I say to people, 'My e-bike makes Hobart like Saskatchewan' - and Saskatchewan is a little flatter than this table.

On an e-bike your speed is also uniform relative to the traffic. You ride an e-bike up Elizabeth Street and your ride up at 25 kilometres an hour not 12 kilometres an hour. In the peak hour the traffic does not go much more than that. Yesterday the university said they were going to encourage people to get e-bikes -

Ms SIEJKA - A lease arrangement.

Mr PAULEY - Great idea. E-bikes are to me the urban vehicle of the future. We need to separate bikes from high-use traffic links. We also need to give far more consideration to the gradient of bike routes. I notice in Hobart the bike route goes up Argyle Street. There is a big hill at the bottom of Argyle Street up past the police and when you get to the top of Argyle Street and you want to go, say into Elizabeth Street you have a very difficult right-hand turn. You have to get across a busy road, and you have to make a very difficult right-hand turn. Elizabeth Street is far better: better gradient, gets you right up into West Hobart easily.

Cycling needs to be made safe and easy. It needs to be made consistent. If you have ever used the cycleway you will notice there is a difference in how Hobart and Glenorchy manage the crossings. These are just small things but they are things that put people off.

Ms SIEJKA - What is the difference?

PUBLIC

Mr PAULEY - For a long time at Glenorchy you had to go through a chicane whereas Hobart they only had one. They got rid of half the chicane for a while.

Just last week, I found that TasRail has refused to permit the missing bit of the bike track to go through the cutting between where the Macquarie Point track - which is fantastic - meets the intercity track. There is a railway cutting there. It is a beautiful gradient. TasRail does not need two tracks. Instead what are they going to do? They are going to put it up through the edge of the Cenotaph car park and cut down a few trees. It does not make any sense. To me, and I will say this and it is all being recorded, it is just crazy 'patch protection' on somebody's behalf and it does not consider the greater good.

There are ways we could register cyclists and create an income stream to help provide cycling infrastructure but I know that the bicycle lobby would vehemently oppose that because I have spoken to them about it and they hated it. They will hate it as much as motorists who will oppose any change in the way we currently levy MAIB charges based on the vehicle rather than the user of the vehicle. Again, there are opportunities.

We need to escape all these old ideas which hold our transport system back. We need to think in terms of journeys not the mode used. For some journeys, the car will be best. For others it is a bus, some are bicycles, some walking. We often want to get 20 per cent of the population on to trams, trains or buses or whatever. But say we could encourage everybody to catch the bus once a week, it has the same net effect but it requires a different strategy around how you do it.

Perhaps we could gain traction in all this by giving our senior executives in the public sector a cash allowance instead of a fully-funded motor vehicle. I know I stopped riding my bike to work when I got a fully-funded motor vehicle. It is just natural. Let them choose the best mode for their needs on a journey-by-journey basis. Perhaps we could allow others to salary sacrifice the cost of their bus travel or the purchase of an e-bike.

I always found it quite strange that I got a fully-funded motor vehicle that I could drive anywhere in Tasmania and the people who worked for me could not even get a salary sacrifice on their bus fare. It just seems a bit strange. These are just ideas but they escape the thinking of the past.

I am also a motorcyclist and I often use my motorcycle in the city, less so now that I have an e-bike. They offer huge but misunderstood opportunities, particularly for people who need to travel a further distance from the outer lying suburbs. I raised this with the RACT but they were dismissed because people think motorcyclists are dangerous. If you look at the statistics, motorcyclists are not being killed or injured undertaking urban journeys. They die and hurt themselves on rural roads, often on a Sunday afternoon on the way back from their recreational rides. Often excessive speeds are involved or perhaps some over-enthusiasm or unfamiliarity.

We saw that just recently when, unfortunately, a tourist who had just got off the boat that morning was in an accident overtaking a car. Not only was she killed but the three people she was travelling with were travelling too close together on Hobart roads and they all ran into each other.

Mr VALENTINE - It was on the north-west.

PUBLIC

Mr PAULEY - Yes it was, outside Wynyard. Yes, motorcycles are dangerous but not in the urban environment. On a motorcycle you travel at the same speed as a car, you are much safer. Hobart should encourage motorcycles. If you set aside one car park on each side street in every block for motorcycle parking you can fit four or five motorcycles in a carpark. In addition to expanding some of the existing motorcycle parking locations, suddenly you would get lots of people who have motorcycles using them for commuting. Yes, Hobart City Council would lose some parking revenue but it would encourage more motorcycle use and that would have a huge impact on congestion.

I have outlined in my submission some infrastructure projects if that is what you are after. They are not the mega projects others seek, rather they are small, targeted projects addressing specific issues. More important than new infrastructure, I think, is better use of existing infrastructure by creating a clear strategic network and no longer seeking to have every road seek to meet the needs of all transport modes. I live in Newdegate Street in West Hobart. A bus route goes up there and there are no bus stops there. It is being dug up at the moment and the Metro seem to have coped pretty well.

I will leave things there and leave the committee with one final thought. When I was doing transport planning a piece of research I came across related to the provision of transport infrastructure. It was from the United Kingdom but I see no evidence suggesting that it does not apply here. That was, when you created a piece of infrastructure not only was it more expensive and took longer to build than people thought, its capacity was used up much quicker. There was what they call an induced demand event.

Let us say we spent \$1.3 billion on tunnels, thinking that is going to be the solution and people thought that they were going to last for 15 years but it would probably be four and five. That is not so much the issue. The other thing that this research found is that when you build stuff you simply move the problem down the road. We got rid of two roundabouts in Kingston and where is the problem now? The bottom of the Southern Outlet.

The more interesting bit of this research was when you took infrastructure away, you actually reduced traffic by more than the amount of infrastructure you took away, so people actively looked for alternatives when there was a loss of capacity.

Hobart has opportunities but they require us to escape the old ideas. The top of my list would be putting the 1968 Wilbur Smith report - and I had a copy of that on my desk and a photocopy of the master plan on my wall for many years - and those ideas on developing the Hobart transport network into the archives where they belong.

We want to start looking towards the future. We want to start looking to new technology. That is all I wanted to say. I am happy to answer any questions you may have based on my experience, what I have said today and what I provided in my submission.

I also want add into my submission another article on trackless trams where Peter Newman says, 'It is not a contest, both can improve our cities'. But when you read it, he is saying that as population density increases, tram becomes a better option than a trackless tram but in low population densities like Hobart something like a trackless tram is, perhaps, more appropriate. Personally, I would like the idea of Hobart being the first city in Australia to have trackless trams as the basis of their transit system. I would rather us be the first people to have a trackless tram than the last people to have a light rail.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Can I ask about the trackless trams? It is just a clarification question. If it is rubber instead of steel does that mean - I am just thinking of the recycling and the disposal of those sorts of items. These are all things we need to consider as we go into the future. Are there any issues with trackless trams in that?

Mr PAULEY - No more than with a bus. Steel wheel will - train wheels wear out.

CHAIR - They have to be re-machined.

Mr PAULEY - Yes, they have to be re-machined. In the scheme of things, there is not that much difference between a tram in terms of the operating costs and a trackless tram but there is a huge difference in terms of the infrastructure costs. You can run them down the existing road network; you could run them with cars, you could do what they are doing in Melbourne now.

If you go to Melbourne now with their tram network, increasingly the tram network is being given its own corridor on the road. They are keeping the cars out of the way so the trams do not get caught up with the cars. What a trackless tram means is you could hop on a trackless tram out at Brighton, you could come across the new Bridgewater bridge which has no facility for a light rail network, given its current design. You could come all the way to the city into the rail yards and then you could move onto the Hobart road network without having - and I do not know if you have asked this question of people. How are people getting from the rail yards -?

Ms SIEJKA - That has come up.

Mr PAULEY - into the city?

CHAIR - Where do trackless trams operate now?

Mr PAULEY - They are very much a new initiative and I think Peter Newman identified a few places that they are operating. I am not going to say that -

CHAIR - Not in Australia.

Mr PAULEY - Not in Australia, but certainly trackless. If you look at a spectrum you have heavy rail, you have light rail, you have what this new technology called a trackless tram. You have an existing technology which is called bus rapid transit, which is basically a three carriage bus. A trackless tram and a bus rapid transit are very, very close. Then you get into your articulated bus and your normal bus. They are all part of a spectrum. The thing about a trackless tram is it gives the passengers the experience of a tram, which you know is a much better travel experience than you get on a bus.

Ms HOWLETT - You were talking about motorcycles. Is anyone actually doing an electric motorbike?

Mr PAULEY - Yes. A lot of people do electric motorbikes. Harley Davidson has just released an electric motorbike. BMW is looking at electric motorbikes. There are a lot of brands of Chinese electric motorbikes which are much less powerful.

CHAIR - One manufactured here.

PUBLIC

Mr PAULEY - And there is one in Australia. So again, you can call it a powered two-wheel vehicle; it starts with an electric bicycle and it goes up to a high powered motorcycle.

Ms HOWLETT - Like an e-bike.

Mr PAULEY - Yes. An electric motorcycle. The Harley Davidson one gives you all the Harley Davidson experience if you are into that.

Ms SIEJKA - Different sound.

Mr VALENTINE - Minus the sound.

Mr PAULEY - Minus the sound. Certainly, everybody who manufactures vehicles, whether they be motorcycles, or whatever, that are based on the internal combustion engine, are looking very seriously at electric power.

Ms HOWLETT - Can you state what countries are actually using trackless trams?

Mr PAULEY - I would have to go back to Newman's article. He identifies a couple of spots where they are in. I should point out, for a long time Peter Newman has probably been the strongest advocate in Australia for light rail and heavy rail. It is interesting that he has seen this new technology and he sees opportunity. I do not claim to be an expert.

Ms WEBB - It was a good article. I printed it out myself.

CHAIR - I was interested in your comments with cyclists with paying fees - registering cycles - and the money would go back into infrastructure specifically for cyclists. You said you have talked to cyclists and they are not interested in it. I imagine it would be for a senior cyclist; it would not be including children?

Mr PAULEY - Say when you reach 18.

CHAIR - It has been raised with me, not specifically in this forum, but over the years. I know cyclists have said they would be happy to pay a fee if it helped put safe infrastructure in for them.

Mr PAULEY - My proposal, which I have worked up a bit, is that, say you charged \$50 a year. The way you could charge that \$50 a year is as an extension of your car driver's licence, or an extension of your identity card, which people who do not have a driver's licence usually have if they are over 18, so they can get into clubs and pubs and the like.

On my current driver's licence, it says I can ride a motorcycle and drive a heavy rigid vehicle. Somebody who wants to ride a bicycle could simply go into Service Tasmania, do a test to show they understand the road laws that pertain to bicycles, and pay a small fee, say \$1 a week, and that would give them the legal authority to ride a bicycle on the road network.

As a cyclist, one thing I get all the time is, 'Get off the road, you don't pay for it.' It would be nice to be able to scream back, 'Yes, I bloody well do!' If cyclists knew the money was going into cycle facilities and cycling advocacy, I think there would be less opposition. Cyclists I have

PUBLIC

spoken to say, 'No, I already pay for the roads,' because most of them have a car - or if they do not have a car, they own a house and they pay rates or, if they do not own a house they rent, and rates are part of the rent. Their argument is, 'Well, I am already paying, so why should I pay again?'

If, as cyclists, we want better facilities, I do not see any problem with paying for them.

CHAIR - Your argument is that your registration is for the roads. If you are going to put in separate cycle facilities - and maybe you will not be able to answer this - it would be interesting to know how many cyclists there are in Tasmania, and how much revenue would be raised each year, if a \$50 fee was put on cyclists?

Mr PAULEY - I propose putting the fee on the person, not on the bicycle. There is a self-interest in that. I own 11 bicycles, and I would hate to pay 50 times 11, and I cannot ride more than one at a time.

Most households would have a bicycle. It might discourage it, but again, if there are bicycle facilities - you only need to look at the inner-city cycleway that is getting more and more bicycles on it all the time. People complain about Hobart's weather, but Hobart is the second-driest capital in Australia. It has far better weather than places like Copenhagen and Oslo. A few years ago, Oslo banned all on-street car parking, and it has changed the whole nature of Oslo: the whole centre is now much more pedestrian friendly, with a much stronger focus on active transport - and that is in a place like Oslo. We don't have bad weather here. The Norwegians say there is no such thing as bad weather; there is just bad clothing.

Mr VALENTINE - I am interested in exploring the trackless tram idea. I want to look at how that might operate. It's my understanding that trackless trams have multiple carriages and a single driver, so that's an economic advantage, just as it is with a light rail or tram - light rail more particularly, because they have multiple carriages, trams generally only have one. You would still have the crossing issues, wouldn't you? How would you see that operating?

Mr PAULEY - My view on whether it's a trackless tram or a bus, well we'll start with the old rail line. My understanding is if you want to put a tram down there, you would have to rebuild the railway at any rate, and there's not much difference.

Mr VALENTINE - You can run them, but -

Mr PAULEY - You are not going to run a tram down the current alignment, on the current tracks, at 60 to 70 kilometres an hour.

Mr VALENTINE - I agree with that.

Mr PAULEY - You are going to be running them at 20 to 30 kilometres an hour. I have ridden on the bikeway with a train alongside me, and keeping up with the train.

Mr VALENTINE - Not going fast.

Mr PAULEY - They do not go fast.

Mr VALENTINE - It doesn't mean to say that they cannot be graded to -

PUBLIC

Mr PAULEY - There is a lot of infrastructure expense.

CHAIR - You would need to have crossings and everything, the same as a train.

Mr PAULEY - You have to reinstate the crossings.

Mr VALENTINE - I am just asking the question about trackless trams. They would have to use the same crossing, wouldn't they?

Mr PAULEY - Yes, but because it is a rubber-tyred vehicle, it can stop faster than a train, or a light rail.

In many ways, on that corridor, the actual experience of motorists using the cross-streets, and people using the trackless tram, would be identical. The difference between it and a bus is that it gives you greater capacity in each vehicle - most probably up to 150 people - and it gives a dedicated corridor.

The advantage of trackless trams really comes when you get to the end of the corridor, and you can keep going without undertaking really expensive infrastructure investment.

Mr VALENTINE - That is the aspect I am thinking of, so if it has multiple carriages going into a normal traffic environment, whether or not it would tend to clog up that normal traffic environment with its length, and logistically getting around?

Mr PAULEY - Not necessarily. I do not see a trackless tram going everywhere in Hobart that a bus does. I see a trackless tram, which is a high-capacity vehicle, would have to be restricted. You most probably would take it no further than lower Sandy Bay, and no further than the brewery. On the eastern shore, you might take it along Clarence Street between the Bellerive quay and the Howrah shops, or going the other way you might take it along the East Derwent Highway to the end of Geilston Bay.

It would be a much more defined network than you have with buses, which basically go everywhere in Hobart, but you would also be thinking about how to reconfigure the bus network in Hobart to work in with the trackless tram.

Mr VALENTINE - This is one of the questions. When considering light rail, one of the ideas being put forward in this forum has been the nodes - so you have buses running to the nodes, and you have services to those nodes. You have your childcare, the dentist, doctors and shopping, and all of those things, and then light rail would take people on that journey and through other nodes, possibly, and then at the end they get off and then have to be transferred elsewhere. I am wondering how the configuration of a light rail might work, given that sort of scenario.

Mr PAULEY - The difference is, you are never going to extend light rail up into South Hobart, because it is economically infeasible.

CHAIR - Nor to the eastern shore.

PUBLIC

Mr PAULEY - Nor to the eastern shore. Nor to the new Bridgewater bridge, down Sandy Bay or the Southern Outlet. Light rail services one corridor in Hobart, only one, and that is not the corridor that has the most congestion.

Mr VALENTINE - No, I suppose people argue that the corridor is there, so why not use the corridor?

Mr PAULEY - I would agree with you, the corridor is there.

Mr VALENTINE - So you do not have to acquire the land.

Mr PAULEY - You do not have to acquire the land, but as I stated before, the difficulty is not so much the new ideas, it is dispensing with the old. Just because there are currently sleepers and rail tracks in that corridor, it doesn't mean that corridor has to be a 'steel-on-steel' vehicle style.

I don't know whether anybody has told you about the O-Bahn bus in Adelaide, to Paradise. It has been operating in Adelaide since the 1970s. It can travel around the streets of Adelaide as a bus but it has a dedicated carriageway which it follows into the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide.

One of the most valuable things we have in Hobart is that rail corridor. It is a very valuable corridor but that does not mean it should not be looked at as a transit corridor that can be used - at the moment we use that corridor for bicycles and we use that corridor for pedestrians. If we moved down and we say it is going to be light rail, it means that every bus that comes in from the northern suburbs cannot use that corridor. If we were to, say, use that corridor as a trackless tram, it is suddenly available for buses; it is suddenly available as we get autonomous vehicles.

Mr VALENTINE - How would you handle passing and things like that? You have buses or trackless trams coming from the south and trackless trams coming from the north, you have very limited -.

Mr PAULEY - We already have that problem with that corridor. I would handle it with electronics in the same way. There would be passing areas. With modern technology you could make it so they could pass without stopping. There are locations in that corridor where you can put passing loops without disrupting the existing cycleway.

Mr VALENTINE - I have probably taken up too much time.

CHAIR - Does anybody else have any more questions?

Mr VALENTINE - On page 3 of your submission, you have up the top there, 'there is a need to improve traffic flow around the city at this end. We already have the Brooker Highway', et cetera, and you go through a couple of points there. In the next paragraph, would you suggest that there should be a pedestrian priority but cars not banned in the city?

Mr PAULEY - Unfortunately, because of Hobart's topography, it is going to be very difficult to ban cars in the city. We need to think about some roads in the city where you discourage cars. We are all familiar with Melbourne. Swanston Street, in what used to be one of the main arterial streets in Melbourne, it has been pedestrianised. We could do the same things with Elizabeth

PUBLIC

Street. You wouldn't necessarily ban cars but to me that is an ideal active transport corridor. It is an ideal corridor for bicycles and bicycles and transit can coexist, it happens elsewhere.

Mr VALENTINE - The new buses aren't being built with capacity to hold bikes.

Mr PAULEY - I mean operating alongside one another. It would mean we would have to make a decision that we are not going to use Elizabeth Street and particularly through the North Hobart strip as a major car arterial. If a car is coming in from the north they would be in Argyle Street and Campbell Street; if a car is coming from West Hobart they would be in Murray or Harrington streets. It would not take long to actually encourage people to change the way they travel. I used to live in Sandy Bay and I used to always do the rat run through Sandy Bay down near the Rivulet and up through Battery Point.

I am not sure if you were Lord Mayor at the time but you changed the direction and made it one-way of one street.

Mr VALENTINE - Yes we did, to stop people like you.

Mr PAULEY - It changed the whole amenity of that whole area overnight. So, we have done it in the past. I now live in West Hobart, there is a rat run in Andrew Street and Newdegate Street and that is traffic that is going into the north of the city. They are trying to avoid the Burnett Street-Elizabeth Street lights. These are easy things to do. They do not require a lot of money and we could make huge improvements in the city.

I could go on forever. I thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR - Thank you, John. I thank you for your submission and your time.

Mr PAULEY - I will leave you with that, which is an update. He has written another article which is that one. I can send you the link. I hope it has been worthwhile for you. It is pleasing to be able to make a submission as someone who has not got a vested interest in all of this, other than the fact that I think Hobart is a great place to live and I am finding that it is becoming more and more congested.

I should point out, I was responsible for the 460-something metres of bus lane on the Southern Outlet. After I finished work somebody told me that that 460 saves 35 buses between two and five minutes per day. I had a lot of trouble convincing people in the department at the time that we had a traffic issue in Hobart. They were all against that development.

CHAIR - Are you sending that link through to that, John?

Mr PAULEY - I will forward that link for that conversation. Good luck. I look forward to reading your report and all the solutions.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.