COUNCIL POLICY

Sealing of Unsealed Roads

Contents

1. Purpose....4
2. Scope....4
3. Policy details....4
4. Roles and responsibilities....8
5. Breaches....9
6. Human Rights Charter compatibility....9
7. Gender Impact Assessment....9
8. Supporting documents....9
9. Approval....9

DRAFT

DOCUMENT UNCONTROLLED WHEN PRINTED

Document Control		
Policy number 038	Status Draft	Approved by <Council / CEO>
Date approved	Next review date	
Directorate Assets	Department Engineering and Assets	Internal / External Internal and External

REVISION RECORD

Date	Version	Revision description
03/08/1999	1.0	Version 1.0 adopted by Council
04/04/2006	2.0	Version 2.0 adopted by Council
29/03/2019	2.1	Revised draft based on 2006 Policy No. 38
03/03/2020	3.0	Version 3.0 adopted by Council
	3.1	Revised draft based on 2020 Policy No. 038

DRAFT

1. Purpose

To facilitate the development of unsealed roads on an objective basis and within Council's financial constraints. This policy establishes a consistent, transparent and equitable approach to the prioritisation of road sealing projects for potential inclusion in Council's Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all road sealing requests relating to roads listed in Council's Register of Public Roads, including requests received from individuals, businesses and other Government organisations. This policy also applies, in part, to unsealed road segments requiring upgrade. These road segments are identified through Council's road inspection programs and are evaluated for potential inclusion in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List.

3. Policy details

Council aims to provide and maintain infrastructure, including roads, to a standard which meets the needs of the community. Council's Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List contains a list of infrastructure projects for delivery into the future. Council prioritises the delivery of the projects in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List in a way which is financially sustainable and achieves the maximum benefit for our community.

The assessment of road sealing requests is based predominantly on the principle that the standard to which a road is to be constructed and maintained is directly related to the amount of traffic using the road. Roads carrying higher traffic volumes are providing a larger benefit to the community and will be constructed and maintained to a higher standard than those carrying lower traffic volumes. Additional criteria used in the assessment of road sealing requests and internal road upgrades identified through Council's road inspection program include; road class, access to public facilities, tourism value and strategic alignment.

3.1 Methodology

A three-step process is used to assess road sealing requests and to prioritise eligible road sealing projects for future delivery. The steps in this process are:

1. Establish whether the traffic volumes on the road exceed the minimum comparative score of 100.
2. For road sealing requests where the comparative score exceeds 100, establish a provisional prioritisation for the delivery of the Road Upgrade Program relative to the existing projects in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List.
3. Validate the prioritisation of the Road Upgrade Program in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List.

3.1.1 Establishing the comparative score

For each road sealing request which is received, Council will establish the number of vehicles using the road each day, and will then calculate a comparative score to take into account seasonal fluctuations in road usage, the proportion of heavy vehicles using the road, and whether or not the road is considered a strategic route.

For road sealing requests to be considered for assessment, a minimum comparative score of 100 must be demonstrated.

Calculating the comparative score

The comparative score is calculated using the following formula:

Comparative score = VPD x F1 x F2 x F3

- **VPD** - Average number of vehicles per day

  This will be determined using a traffic counter in place for a minimum of 14 days. If seasonal variability is a known factor, traffic counts will be taken during the low season.

- **F1** - Known intensive seasonal traffic

  This could be due to local circumstances or other intensive type usage patterns that can dramatically vary the traffic volume, eg. orchards, tourism etc., at certain times of the year.

  Scoring is as follows:

	High	Medium	Low	Not Applicable
Score	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0

  As a guide to scoring, a high rating will be applied where high season traffic volumes are assessed to be more than double the low season volumes.

- **F2** – Percentage of heavy vehicles

  Freight tonnage increases damage to roads, the percentage of heavy vehicle use will be determined using a traffic counter.

  Scoring is as followings:

	High	Medium	Low	Not Applicable
Percentage	>3%	2-3%	1-2%	0%
Score	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0

DRAFT

- F3 - Strategic Route

  These are defined by the Victorian Grants Commission as follows:

  - Local roads that are tram or bus routes

  For rural roads carrying less than 100 vehicles a day (other than natural surface roads), the following roads are also deemed to be strategic routes:

  - Roads carrying at least 10 trucks a day (on average);
  - Roads with average grades exceeding 6 per cent, carrying at least 50 vehicles a day on average; and
  - Roads carrying at least 50 vehicles a day on average in a drip or flood irrigated horticultural or agricultural areas.

  Scoring is as follows:

Strategic Route?	Yes	No
Score	1.3	1.0

The following table demonstrates the methodology for calculating a Comparative Score (CS) for a number of (fictitious) roads.

Road Name	Strategic Route	Segment Length (m)	Traffic Study Date	Traffic Study Duration	VPD	% Heavy	F1	F2	F3	CS	Rank
Brick Lane	No	770	24/12/18	2 weeks	112	0%	1.3	1.0	1.0	146	2
Route 66	Yes	1062	12/05/19	2 weeks	48	1%	1.1	1.1	1.3	76	N/A
Champs-Élysées	No	1469	3/03/18	2 weeks	40	1%	1.2	1.1	1.0	53	N/A
Hollywood Boulevard	No	1815	17/08/18	3 weeks	54	1%	1.3	1.1	1.0	77	N/A
Wall Street	Yes	1748	11/02/18	2 week	75	1%	1.3	1.1	1.3	138	3
Abbey Road	No	1296	12/05/19	4 weeks	123	0%	1.2	1.0	1.0	148	1

Based on the example, the roads which have met the threshold to be considered for sealing include:

1. Abbey Road
2. Brick Lane
3. Wall Street

The remainder of the example roads have not met the threshold to be considered for sealing having demonstrated a Cumulative Score which is less than 100.

3.1.2 Establishing the provisional priority for delivery

For roads which meet the threshold to be considered for sealing, a cost-benefit analysis will be carried out in order to establish the provisional prioritisation of the Road Upgrade Program relative to existing projects in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List.

The following variables will be considered in this analysis:

- The annual maintenance cost of the unsealed road based on actual expenditure;
- The estimated useful life and renewal cost of the unsealed road;
- The estimated capital cost to upgrade to a sealed road, considering the length of road proposed for sealing and the standard to which the sealed road will be constructed;
- The estimated annual maintenance cost of the sealed road; and
- The estimated useful life and renewal cost of the sealed road.
- Road class, access to public facilities, tourism value and strategic alignment.

Road sealing projects demonstrating a larger benefit relative to cost over their lifecycle will be given a higher priority for delivery in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List that those demonstrating a lower benefit relative to their cost.

3.1.3 Validation of the project priority

Council regularly reviews the priority assigned to projects in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List in order to ensure that the list accurately reflects the needs and aspirations of the community. Through this process, a provisional priority assigned to a new Road Upgrade Program in the Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List by Council Officers will be validated by Council.

The delivery of projects listed in Council's Road Upgrade Program Prioritisation List remains subject to Council's annual budget approval processes and the availability of funding.

3.2 Alternative dust suppression treatments

Sealing of unsealed roads is recognised to be the most effective long-term treatment to address nuisance dust, however Council also recognises that not all unsealed roads will meet the traffic volume threshold to be considered for sealing.

Council does not currently use dust suppressants on its unsealed road network. Current dust suppressant treatments are not considered cost effective due to their short-term effectiveness. Dust suppressant technology is constantly evolving, and Council continues to monitor the available technologies.

Implementation of appropriate signage can have a benefit in modifying driver behaviour to reduce the generation of dust on unsealed roads.

3.3 Financial contributions

Road sealing requests which include a proposed financial contribution from the applicant towards the cost of sealing works will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, with the impact of the proposed financial contribution on the results of the cost-benefit analysis being tested.

3.4 Residing on an unsealed road/rural living

Council recognises that the amenity of residents who choose to live in close proximity to unsealed roads can be impacted by dust.

Council assumes that careful consideration to the environmental factors associated with residing, adjacent, or on unsealed roads has been taken into consideration by the resident prior to the occupation of the residence or property.

4. Roles and responsibilities

The following positions are responsible for implementing, reviewing and advising on this policy:

Responsibility	Role / Position
Implementation	Manager Operations, Manager Engineering and Assets, Civil Works Coordinator.
Development/Review	Manager Engineering and Assets.
Interpretation/Advice	Director Assets, Manager Operations, Manager Engineering and Assets.

DRAFT

5. Breaches

Failure to comply with Council policy, supporting procedures or guidelines, will be subject to investigation which may lead to disciplinary action.

6. Human Rights Charter compatibility

This policy has been assessed as being compatible with the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 [Vic]*.

7. Gender Impact Assessment

The implications of this policy were assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Gender Equality Act 2020. As a result of the assessment, gender and intersectional issues are not seen to either limit or change the way in which all persons are affected by the Councillor and Staff Policy. No further gender or intersectional analysis was deemed to be required.

8. Supporting documents

This policy should be read in conjunction with all other relevant, Council policies and procedures, as well as relevant legislative requirements.

Related Legislation

- *Local Government Act 2020 [Vic]*
- *Road Management Act 2004 [Vic]*
- *Victoria Grants Commission Act 1976 [Vic]*

Related Guidelines, Operational Directives or Policies

- *Annual Budget: Rating Policy and Fee Schedule*
- *Road Management Plan*
- *Road Register*

Related Procedures

- Add applicable

9. Approval

THE COMMON SEAL OF THE
ALPINE SHIRE COUNCIL was
hereunto affixed this XX day of

DRAFT

<Month> 20XX
in the presence of:

COUNCILLOR	SIGNATURE
COUNCILLOR	SIGNATURE
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	SIGNATURE

DRAFT