

**THE WOOLLOOWIN COMMUNITY SUBMISSION
NUMBER 2**

In Response to

**Airport Link
Woolloowin Worksite Modification
Request for Project Change**

17th July 2009

Submitted to:

The Coordinator-General
C/- Project Manager – Airport Link Project
Significant Projects Coordination
Department of **Infrastructure and Planning**
PO Box 15009 City East QLD 4002
fax +61 7 3225 8282
email: airportlink.manager@dip.qld.gov.au

Background

On 22 June 2009, the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, The Honourable Stirling Hinchcliffe, released a Ministerial Media Statement urging residents to have their say on the Airport Link change proposal.

Residents had access to the proposal document from 24 June 2009 and submissions close at 5 p.m. on 17 July 2009. Submissions are to be made to the Coordinator-General.

In line with the Submission form available from the Coordinator-General's office, this response will nominate the section of the proposal document referred to, it will describe the issue and it will suggest a solution to the issue.

Issues

1. **Section:** 3.1.2 Geological Conditions.

Issue: There is a discrepancy between the two graphs on page 38 of the Request for Change document. These two graphs show the geological conditions and core-samples taken at Tender Stage (lower graph) and as found after work commenced (upper graph). Core sample number APL06 is represented on both graphs, yet the geological conditions represented in the respective graphs are different to each other. This is not possible and requires explanation by the CNI, TJH or BC.

Requests have been made to CNI, TJH and BC for information relating to the core sample locations and their logs to be provided for our consideration, but as yet no data has been provided.

The core sample locations and their results are being requested under the provisions of the Right To Information legislation. Until such time as the information has been provided, an accurate and intelligent response which addresses this section is unable to be made.

Solution: We respectfully request that a delay be imposed on the assessment of the proposal until such time as this information is supplied to us and we may make an informed response. If the core sample logs reveal that the geological conditions were known to be as they are now, this will fundamentally change the position of the proposer as they will be bound to explain the discrepancy.

2. **Section:** 5.2.2 Potential Construction Traffic Impacts.

Issue: The size and frequency of the spoil haulage trucks will have a greater impact on traffic and pedestrians than indicated in the Request for Change. Independent assessment by a driving professional indicates that the trucks will not be able to execute the turning circle required at the nominated ingress and egress points, without crossing the centre line.

This will require that a traffic control monitor will need to stop traffic in both directions at both the ingress and egress points whilst the trucks execute the wide turn. With an anticipated volume of one truck every 10-12 minutes, this will cause a significant impact on the traffic flows on Rose Street, Kent Road and Park Road. Rose Street is the only connecting road in the area for traffic moving from the west of Gympie Road to the airport and suburbs to the east. It is already a major arterial road.

Pedestrians, particularly school children, will be at greater risk of injury from the increased size and volume of vehicles operating throughout the area.

Solution: It is our assessment that there is no solution to preventing the trucks from crossing the centre line whilst ingressing and egressing from the proposed site. The pedestrian safety issues could be solved by providing safe crossing points or an overpass in identified danger areas.

3. **Section:** The whole Request for Change document.

Issue: The 24 days allowed to formulate a response to the proposal is too short a time-frame to permit thorough analysis of the document. The size and technical content of the document is larger and more detailed than could be reasonably expected to be addressed in 24 days by non-experts in the field.

Solution: Allow an additional period of at least two months to provide a detailed response based on sound reasoning and assessment of the proposal's content. Some issues in the document require technical data to be supplied by City North Infrastructure (CNI), Thiess John Holland (TJH) and BrisConnections (BC). To date, requests to all three of these entities have not yielded any information.

Conclusion

The proposal is obviously the result of a significant amount of work over many months. It is unreasonable to expect the residents of Woolloowin to be able to absorb, analyse and comment accurately on such a large volume of technical information in as little as 24 days.

We therefore request that the deadline for submissions be extended by at least two months in order to allow CNI, TJH and BC to provide the technical information upon which we may formulate an accurate response.