



20 July 2020

Michael Stretton  
General Manager  
City of Launceston Council  
P.O. Box 396  
LAUNCESTON TAS 7250

By email to: [contactus@Launceston.tas.gov.au](mailto:contactus@Launceston.tas.gov.au)

Dear Sir,

**Re: DA 0047/2020 Bulky Goods Sales – 65-67 Gleadow Street INVERMAY.  
Construction of a showroom; installation of signage, subdivide one lot into five  
and associated works within Goderich Street road reserve.**

In making this representation we refer to the advertisement in the Examiner Newspaper on July 4, 2020, which deceptively identifies the subject land as 65-67 Gleadow Street, not by any observer of The Examiner newspaper, alerting to Goderich Street being the principle entrance with a new road formation.

We submit that this application may not have gained the attention of the public due to its identification as Gleadow Street, not Goderich Street, and accordingly there has been a lack of appropriate transparency regarding important planning and traffic management issues.

When Goderich Street was reconstructed and upgraded to become the Northern Outlet Highway, it was widely advertised that direct access to the new limited-access roadway would be prohibited, and this has been strictly enforced, until now (Example when the adjacent Fairbrother offices and depot was constructed).

Also the avenue of mature trees along the roadway was said to be important, and these mature and new trees, was to be maintained as improvements to the aesthetic quality of this principle highway entrance to the city.

We submit that this proposal to construct a slip road from Goderich Street and to cause the removal of nine mature trees, is in breach of important undertakings by statutory authorities.

The façade of the proposed 'Good Guys' bulky goods outlet, is to be painted in gaudy colours, such corporate colour schemes being contrary to the provisions of the Planning Scheme, and as such were used to cause the proponents of the Office Works to Pet Barn et al developments along the western frontage of the Bunnings carpark, to be changed to a more-subdued colour scheme.

We submit that the proposed colour scheme be prohibited.

The appearance of the façade of this proposal and its carpark area is screened from public view along Goderich Street (Northern Outlet Highway) and beautified by .....a row of shrub rose bushes. This is ridiculously inadequate, given the City Tree Policy and funded campaigns to beautify and enhance principle roads to and from the city, and the fact that the present avenue of trees was planted and maintained as an important section of that policy.

We submit that the landscaping, tree planting and beautification of this development is woefully non-existent, and ought to be required.

The shared pathway along the western side of Goderich Street is heavily utilised, not only by pedestrians, but exercisers/dog walkers/serious and also recreational cyclists including family groups with small children/wheel chair and motorised disability equipment/skateboarders/roller skaters anon. It was built to keep such users off the busy highway, and is an important commuter pathway and principle bikeway to and from the city for the northern suburb residential enclaves, University, Australian Maritime College, Launceston Church Grammar School/ Brooks High School and many factory and industrial/manufacturing operation in the northern suburbs area.

The diversion of the shared pathway at the junction of the proposed access road and round-a-bout whereby users must alight from their contrivances to utilise the proposed pedestrian crossing there, will cause a major hazard by such a diversion, with poor visibility and delays/backing up of traffic to be anticipated. There will be a significant risk of injury and potential loss of life anticipated.

The Traffic Study submitted makes no recognition of the shared pathway or the validity of the traffic on the pathway that will clearly be impacted upon.

We submit that it is a critical and important omission in the Traffic Impact Study that embarrassing disregards the type of traffic using the shared pathway.

Vehicular traffic entering the proposed new road from Goderich Street includes trucks and these will also be accessing yet-to-be disclosed developments in the remainder of the subdivided lots and developments westward and afar. There has not been a detailed or competent assessment of such traffic impacts.

Traffic will back up along the Goderich Street sliproad and potentially into the main traffic lanes, (contrary to assertions to the contrary) and there is no method of preventing it from doing so and obstructing highway through traffic.

This will in no small part be due to the give-way-to-the-right traffic rule for roundabouts, with traffic also approaching from the western end of the proposed new road, as well as traffic leaving the 'Good Guys' carpark itself. For reasons unexplained, traffic from the proposed Lot 2, is excluded from consideration. The management of the (locked?) chain mesh gate on the northern side laneway leading to the proposed ROW exiting to Gleadow St is not explained, neither is the actual control of this gate explained (will a gate keeper be employed to operate the gate during all operating hours ?- unlikely!!)

We submit that the Traffic Impact Study is incomplete and doesn't recognise or satisfy the full range of traffic sequences or movements or types of vehicles, including bicycles and other devices that may be anticipated.

Title Plan – What does the dotted line along the Goderich St frontage mean? This appears to be a road-widening provision that has not been taken into account.

Why is Lot 4 (Australian Car Museum crossed out on the Plan? Yet the TIA refers to Lot 4.

There are detailed covenants granting Taswater access over the proposed roadway entrance in order to maintain/replace pipes and services. This will cause inevitable obstruction /disruption to traffic flow and potentially cause considerable costs to 3, 4, & 5 is inappropriate.

We submit that there are aspects of rights on the Title Plans that have not been taken into account and this will potentially impact of important aspects of the planning assessment.

The signalisation of Gleadow Street is not relevant.

Under the heading of Safety of Junctions P12:

- assumption of purpose/function of the proposed link road.
- Heavy vehicles exiting to Gleadow Street
- /limit on parking on opposite side of Gleadow Street is problematic
- there will be 80 carspaces but the taxi exemption has been triggered at just 50 spaces.
- failure of sight distance for Lot 5 (P5)
- The assumption regarding traffic flows for Lots 3,4 & 5 is inappropriate.
- The proposed link road is insufficient in width (p60) and widths are inappropriately measured to the centre line of gutters in any case.

The centre island has to be mountable for trucks to negotiate being unacceptable.

We submit that the TIA is a self-serving document that does not independently or faithfully expose or resolve all relevant traffic matters and cannot be relied upon.

The Hydrological Management Plan (p3) incorrectly states the levees are 1:200 instead of the most-recent admission they are only 1:100. The future threats to climate change and rising sea levels is real and very risky, and it is appropriate that no further capital investment ought to be allowed within this area.

What is the unexplained reference to the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the 1:200 levees etc. and why has this important information not been provided to the public?

Similarly, what is the memo from Pitt and Sherry dated 15 July 2010 regarding Seismic Risk?

We submit that there is a significant and unacceptable future risk to public compensation should the Statutory Authorities allow further capital investments in the flood areas of Launceston.

Accordingly, we implore that this Development Application be refused, Which cannot in any event be in the interests of present retailers operating in Launceston.

Yours faithfully,

Lionel Morrell

For and on behalf of

**NORTHERN TASMANIAN NETWORK PARTNERS & ASSOCIATES**

Enc. By separate cover, Attachments forming part of this representations concerning Retreating from sea level rises and flood plain developments.

[REDACTED]  
20 July 2020.

Michael Stretton,  
Launceston City Council, St John St  
Launceston 7250

Dear Sir,

Re DA 0047/2020 Subdivision, road/highway alterations, Good Guys store

Are you at the Council aware that piles for the Good Guys building facing Goderich St have already been driven? Does that mean that the developer already has the nod of approval from the Council? Or does it mean that the DA will automatically get approval because of the start made with the pile driving?

This is a shocking DA that consists of several separate main aspects that should each be considered individually in separate applications, not as one single DA.

The aspects that should be submitted as separate DAs include:

- the subdivision proposal into 5 new lots
- the plans for Lot 1 as a Commercial tenancy building with all the associated planning issues around the actual building and use, access, parking, signage etc
- adding a new junction, or intersection, slip lane along a busy main highway
- adding a 'proposed public road' and roundabout
- loss of public road reserve (Crown land) and major alterations including reduced pedestrian and cyclists safety with loss of section of walkway/cycle path; removal of nature strip; chopping down/ removal of trees
- addition of a new road and intersection onto Goderich along the Gleadow St boundary of all the intended Lots
- Crown land owner consent has been requested but apparently not yet received, although the applicant seems to assume that the request will

be granted, "Crown land owner consent has been requested and will be provided once received." (see DA, p. 1.3 Title Details)

### Traffic Assessment

The traffic assessment report included with this DA does not account for any real measure of the current traffic situation in the area, let alone any genuine future modelling. This is a 5 Lot DA plus a Good Guys bulky goods store DA. There is no mention of traffic domino effects onto other roads and local streets, only assumptions. The Charles Street Bridge/Lindsay St intersection already has a high level of accidents and approval of this DA, with the increase in traffic and alterations to the highway to allow unnecessary additional traffic to turn off within such a short distance between two major sets of traffic lights will make that far worse.

The Traffic assessment doesn't take into account the domino effect of more traffic in that Lindsay-Goderich-Gleadow St square on that neighbouring streets and roads, including the eastern section of Lindsay St, Invermay Road, the railway roundabout, the Tamar St bridge and Boland St, all of which are already suffering under ever-increasing traffic and congestion generated since 2013-14 by the developments in that Lindsay-Goderich-Gleadow St square, the Silos Hotel and now Riverbend park – not to mention the planned university move and its traffic with at least 4,200 additional daily vehicle movements affecting Invermay Road, Forster and Goderich Streets.

This DA should be dismissed by the Council and more thought given to the people and small businesses of Inveresk and Invermay.

Yours faithfully,

Basil Fitch & J Koshin.



DA0047/2020

Mr Leigh Murrell



To: The General Manager,  
Launceston City Council.

Dear Sir,

I wish to register my opposition to DA0047/2020 - Bulky Goods Sales – Construction of a showroom; installation of signage, subdivide one lot into five and associated works within Goderich Street road reserve for the following reasons...

1/ It is my contention that such a development in that location will only further increase the already growing traffic congestion, none of which will be resolved by the current works in the area. In fact, allowing traffic to enter and exit from this site via a slip road will only contribute to the failure of what the current road changes may have hoped to achieve.

2/ The alterations planned for this development will seriously increase the risk to users of the bike path due to a forced deviation and closer and more dangerous confrontation with traffic when trying to cross over roads. This conflicts with Council's own Bike Strategy of more people on bikes and safer cycling.

3/ There is no denying the miserable state of the centre of Launceston even before the impact of Covid 19 was felt and whilst Councillors rub their hands and shake their heads over what the problem is and what can be done, they continue to allow more and more businesses to develop on the periphery of the city. This current application will also cause serious damage to a long-standing, existing family business, that being Begents. Given how much damage has already been inflicted upon local businesses by the CV pandemic shutdown, and that the years ahead will continue to be a struggle, I believe Council's focus should be aimed at providing whatever possible support they can to locals rather than sending money out of the State.

4/ Approving yet another development within this Tidal Flood Zone will, as you are fully aware, only further exacerbate water-flow and evacuation problems when it next floods. To allow more and more development within this zone is highly irresponsible and insurance claims, potentially against the Council, will not be out of the question because you have placed so much store in the limited value of the levees and encouraged businesses to move into the area.

Yours Sincerely

Leigh Murrell

20 July 2020

Mr Michael Stretton,  
CEO City of Launceston  
St John St Launceston 7250

Dear Sir,

DA 0047/2020 (Traffic report)

On the basis of the Traffic report, the mixture of sections seeking approval under the one banner (ie a single application), including the application to alter the nature strip and trees, the roadway and vehicle access to the entire land on the western side of the East Tamar Highway, between Lindsay and Gleadow Streets, I believe Council should dismiss this DA.

The traffic report accompanying this DA is incomplete and does not present an accurate picture of the traffic situation in and around the Goderich St area. The list of references (1.6 Referenced Materials, p. 2) is a short, limited list of generic traffic texts and minor studies unrelated to the current situation of the Goderich St area. It does not mention the most important traffic study done for Launceston, that is the *Launceston Traffic Review Transport Issues Paper*, November 2012. That study is now 8 years old and Council is, of course, aware of all the developments that have occurred since that time and the resulting addition of vehicle movements associated with those developments.

The 2012 Launceston Traffic Review study was the last independent comprehensive study carried out on traffic in and around Launceston. The 2012 study was, and remains, the only high level traffic review and transport issues paper produced to date, (July 2020). No comprehensive study has been carried out since and nor has the 2012 study been updated by Council with any meaningful or comprehensive traffic numbers or impacts.

The DA "Traffic Impact Assessment report" for this "6-lot commercial/industrial subdivision" at Lindsay and Gleadow Street, as included in the DA document, is not an independent report. It has "been prepared by GHD for King Wharf Developments". Although it states (see



DA 1.2 Purpose of This Report, DA p.1 ) that “The purpose of this report is to investigate the potential traffic and road safety impacts of the proposal in the context of the existing road network and for other approved developments in the immediate area”, the report is not an independent report aimed at finding facts and fact-based modelling. Rather it is specifically written for a client and by its own disclosure the report is based on limitations and assumptions. as indicated in the Sub-headings 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.6 (DA, pp. 1-2),

The Launceston City Council cannot and must not rely on this DA “Traffic Impact Assessment report” for any serious traffic details and/or projections for any part of the Goderich Street area or the wider Invermay-Inveresk area. GHD, the report authors, were engaged by King Wharf Developments, and GHD themselves clearly state the limitations of their report: “This report has been prepared by GHD for King Wharf Developments and may only be used and relied on by King Wharf Development for the purpose agreed between GHD and the King Wharf Developments as set out in Section 1.2 of this report.” (1.2 Purpose of This Report, 1.3 Scope and limitations, DA p.1)

In relation to Appendix C Traffic Impact Assessment “King Wharf Development Proposed Gleadow Street Development Transport Impact Assessment” GHD, June 2020.

Compare the statistics given in Section 2 (pp.5) Goderich Street section of the East Tamar highway as 25,760, with the statistics of eight years ago as per the 2012 study.

In relation to Section 6. Traffic Impacts including Network Performance, traffic volumes and Level of Service (pp. 25-30, how can the public and the Council be confident that the Level of Service tables provide the true picture

Even the data from the 2012 study notes that the intersection is the busiest in Launceston at that time and it remains so. Note also the 2012 study calculated that the annual increase in traffic movement for the area was 0.5%, a rate greater than the accepted standard (assumed) annual increase rate of 0.4%.

The daily visual evidence is clear to the naked eye, and without being compiled into numerical tables, is sufficient to justify a halt to any further additions to traffic numbers. When compared to the 2012 Traffic Review

the Level of Service Table in the current DA Traffic Assessment appear to whitewash the real and worsening state of the traffic in the area.

Roadway traffic conditions using Level-of-Service (LoS) ratings, (a grade from A (best) to F (worst), show earlier (c. 2016) LoS ratings for Charles Street and some other approaches as F, the worst level. Based on LoS ratings, even small increases in traffic volumes can result in increases from one level to the next level of intensity. The c. 2016 'Estimated change to LoS' for Lindsay St gave the area a worsening level from B to C for North, left turn, and a worsening level from C to D for East, right turn. As Charles Street for example, is already at the greatest, or worst, level, F, it is irresponsible that the council is prepared to create worsening LoS to any part of this intersection.

In addition to LoS levels, traffic congestion incurs costs: the costs of incremental delay to business and private individuals, vehicle operating costs (fuel and wear) pollution emissions and stress, time costs, reduced reliability (arrival unreliability), reduced well-being and loss of amenity.

The one day study of 9 February 2016 carried the capacity for a high margin of error. Using a contrasting comparison of traffic matters on that February 2016 date with a two hour period on 12 April 2017, from 3.45-5.45 pm, traffic in the two southbound lanes approaching the Charles Street Bridge stretched from the bridge back to the Mowbray Connector without let up. In that time on the red lights, all vehicles from the bridge to Mowbray were at a standstill, with only a few metres for any vehicles turning into the southbound lanes from Forster or Lindsay Streets to 'fit in'/'squeeze in' before the lights changed again. Vehicles attempting to turn from the east and west sides of both Forster and Lindsay Streets into that southbound traffic at the light changes were only able to do so at the rate of approximately 2-3 vehicles at a time. Moreover, the south bound traffic was such that the ability to pass or change lanes was severely constrained and relied on the goodwill of individual drivers to 'let' another car 'in'. That 2017 situation had worsened by mid 2019 with the congested hours during the afternoon increasing with starting times from around 2.pm and extending to 5.45 pm.

There appears to be little, if any, consideration given to the east-west connectivity and the effects that any increase in the north-south traffic associated with Goderich Street will have on the east-west problems that already exist. That is, the domino affect on roads and streets not in the

immediate area of Goderich-Gleadow Streets does not appear to have been addressed.

Extracts from the Launceston Traffic Review Transport Issues Paper 2012 as they relate to traffic in the Goderich St-Lindsay St areas affected by DA 0047/2020

**p.3** The major outcome of this report was the identification four key problem zones: ♣ North Esk river crossing ♣ East-west connectivity ♣ Wellington/ Bathurst Street Couplet ♣ Hobart Road

The two bridges over the North Esk River, Charles Street and Victoria Street bridges, are experiencing relatively high traffic demands. Charles Street Bridge also carries a high volume of freight. The two bridges operate at a relatively high level of congestion during peak periods. The road safety assessment also identified that the junction of Goderich Street/ Lindsay Street/ Charles Street had the second highest crash rate of all junction locations in the study area. With commercial development flagged in Lindsay Street, this junction will be placed under increasing pressure in the future. This report recommends that further investigations be undertaken to determine ways of reducing congestion and crash rates at the two bridges as a high priority.

**pp. 3-4** One of the key findings of this study was the deterioration of travel times along the east-west routes through Launceston. The cause of this increased congestion appears to be linked to several key intersections along these routes. It is likely that the dominance of north-south freight and traffic movements has contributed to the deterioration of east-west traffic flow efficiency. The crash analysis also highlighted that the intersections of the east-west routes with the Couplet Page | 4 had relatively poor road safety performances. This report recommends that further investigations be undertaken to improve efficiency of east-west travel through Launceston.

**pp. 18-19** 1.3.6. Goderich Street/ Lindsay Street Intersection Modelling (2012)  
The Goderich Street/ Lindsay Street Intersection Modelling was completed by Midson Traffic Pty Ltd in March 2012. The report assessed the intersection of Goderich Street, Lindsay Street and Charles Street for present day and forecast traffic volumes taking into consideration future development of the land on the north-western corner of the intersection. A new hardware store, in

addition to a number of other, smaller developments are proposed for the adjacent land.

SIDRA Intersection Analysis software was used to model various scenarios and three minor intersection modifications as follows: ♣ Option 1- Existing intersection configuration (i.e. no modifications to the intersection) ♣ Option 2- Ban right turns from Charles Street (south) into Lindsay Street (east) ♣ Option 3- Ban right turns from Goderich Street (north) into Lindsay Street (west) in addition to Option 2 ♣ Option 4- Construct a two-lane roundabout at the intersection The modelling indicated that Option 2 and Option 3 were both viable short-term solutions, providing reasonable reductions in delays for all vehicles. Option 4 (roundabout) was found to result in high delays for vehicles on the Lindsay Street approaches due to the high flow on the Goderich Street-Charles Street through route. The Traffic Impact Assessment report prepared for this development concluded that major infrastructure modifications to the surrounding road network may be required in order to remove traffic from Charles Street and to provide adequate intersection performance in the future.

1.3.7. Charles Street/ Esplanade Intersection Assessment (2012) Midson Traffic completed an assessment of proposed modifications to the Lower Charles Street/ Esplanade intersection in April 2012. The intersection has been identified as a potential Black Spot and modifications are proposed to remove the traffic signals to increase efficiency and reduce the incidence of crashes. The existing Charles Street/ Esplanade intersection is a signalised T-junction. It is proposed to remove the traffic signals at the Charles Street/ Esplanade intersection and change the configuration to a left-in/ left-out only, give-way controlled junction. The existing traffic signals on Charles Street are to be converted to a pedestrian crossing on the northern side of the intersection. A key objective of the scheme is to improve traffic flow along the congested section of Charles Street, immediately south of Charles Street Bridge. SIDRA modelling undertaken indicates the intersection is currently approaching capacity during peak times. The results indicate the proposed configuration will generally reduce delays and queues for Charles Street through movements while improving the level of service on Esplanade Page | 19 and reducing delays for pedestrians. A road safety assessment concluded a 13.5% reduction in total crash incidents is expected as a result of the proposed modifications. The installation of these changes will modify traffic flow patterns on the surrounding road network. Banning right turns at this intersection will have the

impact of redirecting traffic onto William Street and Lindsay Street or Forster Street. This redirection is expected to reduce total traffic on Charles Street to some extent, however modelling of these network impacts has not been undertaken. The report recommends examining the impacts of additional traffic on William Street, Lindsay Street and Forster Street in more detail prior to undertaking the junction modifications. Consultation with road users would also be required to evaluate any potential impacts that may arise from these changes.

**p.24** ...An overall growth rate of 0.5% per annum was noted over the six timeframes, although seasonal variations are relatively significant and may influence these results.

2.3. Impact of Proposed Developments Launceston is experiencing an increased rate of land use development. There are several projects that have relatively large traffic generating potential and are likely to impact on Launceston's transport infrastructure and are therefore discussed in broad terms as follows:

- ♣ Bell Bay Pulp Mill. This potential project, situated in Bell Bay, would likely affect traffic and heavy vehicle movements through Launceston. Detailed impacts on Launceston's transport network were investigated through the Midson Traffic report prepared for Launceston City Council in February 2012.
- ♣ Hardware store and commercial development, Lindsay Street. A large hardware store is proposed in Lindsay Street, along with a commercial subdivision. This is likely to significantly alter the traffic flows at the intersection of Lindsay Street/ Goderich Street/ Charles Street. This intersection is currently operating at a high level of saturation and therefore changes to this intersection may be required as part of the development.

### **pp. 71-72** Conclusions

This report documents the findings of analysis of traffic data and information to identify and quantify transport issues in Launceston. One of the key findings of this study is the deterioration of travel times along the east/ west routes through Launceston. Whilst it is not quantified whether there has been a corresponding increase in traffic volumes along this route, the cause appears to be linked to congestion at several key intersections along these routes. This was noted in the congested minutes analysis undertaken in this report, where a large proportion of signalised intersections with identified delays were

located along the east/ west travel time route. It was clear through the analysis in this report that the route between the Midland Highway (Southern Outlet) and the East Tamar Highway was a dominant freight route. This route also carried the highest traffic volumes and highest reported crash rates within the study area.

Key issues identified are outlined in the following sections. 7.1. Traffic Volumes There are several areas in Launceston that have relatively high traffic volumes, and/ or are experiencing relatively high traffic growth.

Some key identified areas were as follows:

Charles Street Bridge. The capacity of Charles Street is constrained by the intersection of Lindsay Street and Goderich Street. Queuing often extends on the Charles Street approach from the right turn lane that services Lindsay Street, blocking through traffic on the Charles Street Bridge. Queuing also frequently extends along Goderich Street during peak periods.

Hobart Road. High levels of traffic volume coupled with associated side friction in the form of parking activity and access manoeuvres causes general congestion along this route. Commercial development in this area is exacerbating this issue over time.

Victoria Bridge. This route is carrying a relatively high volume of traffic and links to the eastern end of the CBD and some key industrial sites. Queuing often extends over the bridge, and some side roads have poor levels of service that connect to Invermay Road and Tamar Street on either side of the bridge.

7.2. Road Safety Performance A total of 4,874 crashes were reported in the Launceston local government area between 2007 and 2011. Of these crashes, 775 resulted in injury. The majority of crashes occurred on the arterial road network. The intersection locations with crash frequencies of 20 or more reported crashes are summarised as follows

Brisbane Street/ Wellington Street 28 crashes (1 injury)

Goderich Street/ Lindsay Street/ Charles Street 27 crashes (5 injury)

Bathurst Street/ Brisbane Street 24 crashes (3 injury)

Forster Street/ Goderich Street 24 crashes (4 injury)



Howick Street/ Wellington Street 21 crashes (4 injury) v Howick Street/ Southern Outlet 21 crashes (1 injury) v Wellington Street/ York Street 20 crashes (3 injury)

In most cases, the dominant crash types at the intersections were cross-intersection and rearend related crashes, which are considered typical for busy urban junctions. Generally, crashes at high frequency crash sites had crash types that were typical of busy urban junctions. Similarly, crashes involving heavy vehicles were located along the key freight corridors, particularly along the Southern Outlet/ Charles Street/ East Tamar corridor. Heavy vehicle crashes represented around 6% of all reported crashes, which is approximately the same proportion of this user group in the traffic system.

**pp.73-74** The analysis undertaken in this report identified a number of key issues that require further investigation. These issues are summarised in the following sections. Figures 47 and 48 show combined data of crashes, congestion and freight volumes, highlighting the key problem areas.

8.1. North Esk River Crossing There are two main road bridges over the North Esk River near Launceston CBD. These are Charles Street and Victoria Street bridges. These form the primary crossing locations for traffic travelling from the city to East Tamar Highway or Invermay Road. The limited locations for traffic to cross the North Esk River places relatively high traffic demands at these two locations.

Charles Street Bridge carries approximately 29,400 vehicles per day, and Victoria Street Bridge carries approximately 19,300 vehicles per day. The Charles Street Bridge carries a very high volume of freight, carrying the second highest volume of freight within the study area (Southern Outlet carries the highest volume). The two bridges operate at a relatively high level of congestion during peak periods. This is largely due to the high traffic volumes utilising the bridges, as well as the relatively high side road traffic volumes at the junctions at either end of both bridges.

To highlight this, the junction of East Tamar Highway (Charles Street) and the Esplanade recorded the third highest congested minutes result during the PM peak period.

The road safety assessment also identified that the junction of Goderich Street/ Lindsay Street/ Charles Street had the second highest crash rate of all junction locations in the study area.

With commercial development flagged in Lindsay Street, this junction will be placed under increasing pressure in the future. This report recommends that further investigations be undertaken to determine ways of reducing congestion and crash rates at the two bridges as a high priority.

8.2. East-West Connectivity One of the key findings of this study was the deterioration of travel times along the east-west routes through Launceston. The cause of this increased congestion appears to be linked to several key intersections along these routes. Travel times along these routes were measured in 2005 and 2012. Results indicated that traffic performance along these routes has deteriorated during this timeframe. It is likely that the dominance of north-south freight and traffic movements has contributed to the deterioration of east-west traffic flow efficiency. The crash analysis also highlighted that the intersection of the east-west routes with the Couplet had relatively poor road safety performance. Specifically, high crash rates were reported at the York Street and Brisbane Street junctions with the Wellington Street/ Bathurst Street couplet. The road links of York Street and Brisbane Street also had relatively poor road safety performances in terms of non-intersection crashes.

----- End of Extracts-----

Trusting your Council officers and the Councillors will take note of all the submissions from ratepayers and residents and give them full consideration in their deliberations,

Yours sincerely,  
Dr Jillian Koshin.