

Fact Sheet 2

Answers to Q's raised during consultation

Cedar Party Creek Bridge replacement

Prepared: 3 May 2017

Community consultation to present and discuss the various options for a Cedar Party Creek Bridge replacement was held between 27 April and 3 May. During this period, a number of valid questions were raised by the hundreds of people who attended. Here we have answered the most common questions, as a means of providing further detail to assist when completing the survey. The survey closes at 5.30pm on Wednesday 17 May 2017.

1. Will the number of B-Doubles using the bridge increase, and will the new bridge allow access for B-Triples?

At the present time B-Doubles are approved for use on the Cedar Party Creek Bridge as this is the approved B-Double route. The only reason for rejecting a B-Double route is for safety reasons and as such the Martin Bridge has been assessed as meeting the required safety standards. Irrespective of what Council does with the Cedar Party Creek Bridge, other than make it unsafe for trucks, B-Doubles will continue to use this route. However, upgrading the bridge will not attract more B-Doubles as there is no latent demand.

There is no intention to allow B-Triples into Wingham. At the present time B-Triples are not even permitted on the Pacific Highway so it is inconceivable that they would be allowed to operate on regional or local roads. Even if this was a future request, the Martin Bridge would not meet the safety requirements for B-Triples.

2. Why a Pop-up consultation rather than a town hall meeting?

Council selected a cross section of the community to meet on two occasions to determine the best way of consulting with the broader community. This group was referred to as the reference group. It was the reference group, consisting of representatives from the school, the pool committee, Chamber of Commerce, industry, bus companies and community representatives that recommended the use of the pop-up consultation rather than a public meeting, and the feedback from the community during the pop-up consultation was that this is the preferred form of consultation.

There have been in excess of 500 people in attendance at the consultation and each of those has had the opportunity to ask questions and receive personal answers to the questions asked. The alternative of a public meeting would probably have attracted significantly less attendees as there would have been a single opportunity rather than 6 separate times. In addition, the concern of the reference group was that members of the public are often reluctant to ask questions in such a forum and such a forum would be dominated by a vocal minority. Comments made to staff over the past week have supported this concern.

3. Will a decision be made based on the survey results?

The purpose of the survey is not to take a vote; it is to obtain the views of the community. Council would not be providing leadership if it abrogated its responsibility to a public vote.

The purpose of the consultation, including the survey, is to inform the community in order to obtain their informed views so that all aspects could be considered in Council's deliberations. Comments received will all be considered but the decisions will not be made on the basis of which option receives the most votes.

4. Is it feasible that grant funding for a replacement pool can be included in a bridge project?

Yes it can, and discussions have been held with RMS prior to tabling the 'Pool Relocation' option. Advice received from RMS confirms that if the best option is to run through the pool, and the replacement of the pool is integral to the project,

the grant will cover the replacement of the pool on a like for like basis. If alternative options provide less benefits or are more costly, why would RMS support such an alternative?

5. Is funding of \$1.5m adequate to replace the existing pool?

At the present time an initial estimate of \$1.5m has been included in the project budget for replacement of the pool, based on advice received and the recently completed Nabiac pool. Nabiac's 20m pool, offering amenities, car park and children's wet play area, was constructed for approximately \$700k by a community group. Should the 'Pool Relocation' option be selected, detailed design work and estimating will confirm this amount, as it will for the cost of the bridge, and the more accurate costings will form the grant application.

6. How often is the Cedar Party Creek Bridge subject to flooding?

An independent flood assessment on the Manning River along with historic records have been used to assess the impact of flooding. In recent history eight flood events have occurred on the Cedar Party Creek Bridge: 1968, 1974, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1990, 1995 and 2011.

7. Where did the figure of 10,000 vehicles per day come from?

This road is a Regional Road and traffic counts are now required to be undertaken every year. Council has counts over the last 4 years which show the traffic volumes are increasing and are currently in excess of 10,000 vehicles per day. These counts are undertaken by a 'classifier counter' which records every vehicle, its size and speed. It is not an exaggerated guess. The printouts were available at the pop-ups and can be provided if anyone would like to examine them.

As a rule of thumb the peak hour traffic volumes is generally about 10% of the daily traffic volume. Also worth noting, 65% of vehicles turn right off the bridge so there is logic in giving this movement priority as is currently the case.

8. Why consider an option that takes out the pool when it's perfectly fine?

Despite it still operating, the pool is on its last legs. It was originally a 33m pool and was extended on each end in 1968 to make it into a 50m pool. The ends have settled - referred to as having "its back broken". It has been leaking constantly for many years and becoming increasingly worse. Drains have been installed to catch the leaking water and recycle it back into the pool but there are now leaks in those drains that cannot be found. This means an entirely new shell is required.

In addition to the pool's shell, there is substantial concrete cancer within the pool and tiles are continually popping off as a result. Inspection of the pool gutters will indicate the extent of silicone repair that has taken place but this is virtually the limit of what can be done without major reconstruction.

We are also looking at a minimum of around \$500K to invest in a new filtration system, given that requirements for pool filtration are about to be upgraded. The current circulation does not meet the current standards, and will not meet the upgraded standards, so there will be a need for upgrading within a short time period.

Based on its current age and condition, it is estimated that funding of at least \$1m will be required within the next 5 years or the pool will potentially close. This funding will need to come from Council if it does not form part of the current bridge proposal.