



NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that of a meeting of the Manly Tramway Loop Feasibility Working Group will be held:

DATE: Wednesday 17 August 2011

TIME: 2 pm – 4pm

PLACE: Councillors Room, Town Hall, 1 Belgrave Street, Manly

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Councillors

Cllr Hugh Burns

Manly Council

Other Representatives

Council Staff

HT Wong

Anthony Hewton

Ian Abbottsmith

Christina Femia

Michael Giddey

John Gilroy

Andrew Kandelas

Anneli Karlsson

Helen Lever

Jennie Minifie

Param Rajah

Ted Williams

General Manager

Head of Strategy, Convenor

Operations Coordinator

Catchments Project Officer

Building Inspector

Manager, Organisational Development

Ranger

Transport Planner

Manager, General Manager's Office

Manager, Landuse and Planning

Divisional Manager, Civic & Urban Services

Senior Manager, Waste & Cleansing

All other Councillors are invited to attend the Working Group meetings.


Anthony Hewton

Head of Strategy

A/Executive Manager, Corporate Services

Date:



MINUTES OF MEETING

MANLY TRAMWAY LOOP FEASIBILITY WORKING GROUP

HELD 28th JUNE 2011

NOTE: All minutes are subject to confirmation at a subsequent Council or Planning and Strategy Committee meeting.

PRESENT:

Councillors

Cllr Hugh Burns
Cllr Cathy Griffin

Manly Council (Chair)
Manly Council (until 3.10pm)

Council Staff

Param Rajah
Anthony Hewton
Mary Rawlings
John Gilroy
Jennie Minifie
Anneli Karlsson
Michael Giddey
Christina Femia
Kathy Fuller

Manly Council
Manly Council
Manly Council (until 2.38pm)
Manly Council (until 3.20pm)
Manly Council (until 3.12pm)
Manly Council
Manly Council
Manly Council
Manly Council

Invited Guests

Greg Sutherland

Director, Sydney Tramway Museum, Loftus (until 3.05pm)

TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS OF THE COUNCIL

The **Manly Tramway Loop Feasibility Working Group** met on 28th June 2011, to consider the matters referred to it and now provides the following advice to Council.

OPEN The meeting commenced at 2.15pm.

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Jean Hay, Mayor.

ITEM 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Nil.

ITEM 3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Cllr Burns raised the issue of the word "scoping" being replacing the word "feasibility" by the General Manager in the Terms of Reference that were proposed to be adopted by the Working Group. In reply Anthony Hewton noted there was a proposal for an external consultant to be employed to undertake the actual feasibility study on the proposal rather than the Working Group. Cllr Burns considered

ACTION

Secretariat

	this constituted a significant change to the Working Group's role, and noted this matter would be best resolved by him meeting with the General Manager to discuss it at a later date. Therefore, the minutes from the meeting on 18 May 2011 were confirmed, subject to excluding item 4.(i) as it relates to the Terms of Reference. Moved: Anthony Hewton Seconded: Param Rajah Recommendation The Working Group resolved to submit the draft Minutes of 18 May to Council for adoption. Therefore, the minutes from the meeting on 18 May 2011 were confirmed, subject to excluding item 4.(i) as it relates to the Terms of Reference.	ACTION
ITEM 3.1	Verbal Presentation by the Director of the Sydney Tramway Museum Verbal Presentation by the Director of the Sydney Tramway Museum Mr Param Rajah, Divisional Manager of Civic and Urban Services introduced Mr Greg Sutherland, Director of the Sydney Tramway Museum (STM). Mr Sutherland briefed the meeting on his experiences with running a tramway, based on his 23 years with the Tramway Museum at Loftus. He indicated that the most critical issues were determining the requirements for risk assessment and safety and the requirements for disability access. In terms of the proposal he noted it should be presented as a heritage operation in a quiet tourist area. The operation would be a slow speed loop that was pedestrian friendly, running through CBD streets. He strongly recommended Council consider the "Christchurch Model" for the tramway. This was a similar local government initiated heritage tramway proposal driven by Christchurch City Council. This project was considered a success and was well done as regards tourist arrangements and similarly was a one way loop using heritage trams. This was reflected by the route being in the process of extension, just prior to the earthquake which has temporarily closed it. He recommended Council communicate with Christchurch City Council in New Zealand, to discuss their tramway project in detail, including the planning and feasibility assessment processes. The operation web site is http://www.tram.co.nz/ Param Rajah undertook to follow this up with the Christchurch Council contact person provided by Mr Sutherland (David Hinnan). Main points covered by Mr Sutherland included: - Safety / Accessibility requirements (particularly for handicapped persons) are paramount. - There is a need to comply with the Independent Transport Safety Regulator (ITSR): http://www.transportregulator.nsw.gov.au/ - The STM has accreditation under ITSR. - STM happy to provide Council with a copy of their documentation used to obtain accreditation. - He noted ITSA's requirement for trams was much the same as	Secretariat Contact Christchurch City Council PR

heavy rail and that the safety regulators requirements were addressed by having a documented Safety Management System (SMS).

- STM has public liability of \$20M.
- The noted insurance and regulatory costs constituted one third of the fare collected at the museum.
- Recommended that the tramway line preferably have its own dedicated reservation, for safety and to enable a schedule to be maintained more reliably.
- Trams are simple to drive. Staff training and assessment was a key part of their Safety Management System. Their training program has been signed off by ITSR.
- He noted the museum had been running trams for 50 years.
- Operating risks were noted to be vehicle to vehicle collisions, including incidents caused by motorists failing to stop at stop signs etc.
- The Christchurch Model involved outsourcing the actual tram operation to a tourism operator.
- That a similar proposal was being set up in Auckland for the Rugby World Cup. This involved drivers being selected and trained to point out local features of interest, having a passenger focussed attitude and extensive use of casual staff.

Council's Risk Manager, Mary Rawlings, suggested that, as a priority, the legislative requirements for heritage tram accessibility need to be ascertained. As a second step, Council would need to find out if it would be able to comply with all necessary regulations, e.g., RTA requirements for use of public roads for tramway.

Param Rajah undertook to follow this up.

Other points covered by Mr Sutherland included:

- Track construction methods. He recommended concrete track as the most cost effective. Construction of the project was best done in small steps, in terms of track lengths, at night. The process involved setting up the rail steelwork and pouring concrete so as to form a mass concrete structure in the roadway.
- Mr Sutherland was unable to provide reliable cost indicators for construction, as most of the work done at Loftus uses volunteer labour and often materials (including concrete) are provided at no cost.

However he noted track construction costings could be estimated by basing them on a comparable 2m wide concrete footpath typically constructed by Council staff, with additional costs of the track steelwork and associated installation and setting out labour and supervision.

- Power supply. He recommended overhead supply as it is easier for maintenance, and cheaper than ground level power supply, and there are local technical experts (e.g. State Rail) available to carry out maintenance and repairs. Overhead power wiring should be strung from buildings if possible and wiring size can be kept down, to be less obtrusive, by using regular underground feeders to the overhead. On streets without suitable buildings, decorative street lights with bracket arms could be used. With sensitive design work, the visual impact of overhead wiring could be made fairly low. Melbourne overhead work had some particularly good examples of this.
- Control of traffic lights was considered desirable to simply increase the service operating speed and eliminate passenger frustration. The

Research
legislative
requirements
and regulations
to be complied
with.

location of the proposed Manly route was noted to be in a people friendly area

- Noting the transformer and rectifier unit cost was in the order of \$40,000 each, and these were typically the same size as the small green electricity transformer kiosks.
- A depot storage shed for overnight housing and maintenance/servicing of trams was required. This included having a maintenance pit for running gear inspection. There was discussion on the feasibility of housing the trams in the proposed underground carpark.
- Ticketing issues. Consider a combined ferry / heritage tram ticket, or a two day ticket (e.g. \$20 for two vs \$15 for 1 day). Weekly tickets were important for locals. For the carpark, the parking charge could include use of the tram. Day tickets could include free deals from local businesses. The importance of having combined tickets to boost patronage was emphasised.
- A restaurant tram operation was noted to be a feature on most heritage tramway systems and could easily be operated in Manly.
- The Sydney Tramway Museum was in a position to lease some Sydney trams for operation of the proposed heritage service including constructing of a restaurant tram.
- The STM invited the Working Group to visit the Sydney Tramway museum at Loftus (Wednesday being the preferred day) to see the operation first hand.

Recommendation

The Working Group resolved to receive and note the information.

All to note

ITEM 4 FRAMEWORK FOR SCOPING REPORT TO COUNCIL

Head of Strategy suggested that the Working Group should start to focus on the drafting of a scoping paper once the preliminary research has been finalised. Members of the Working Group to consider headings, such as Options Considered; Estimates of Costs for Various Options; Summary of Findings; Executive Summary (for non technical readers) and allocation of authors for various sections.

Recommendation

Working Group members consider content and layout of a draft Scoping Paper.

All to note

ITEM 5 TASK ANALYSIS

A. Land Use considerations - Jennie Minifie, Manager Strategic Land Use Planning

Manager Strategic Land Use Planning updated the meeting and provided a contact person at the City of Sydney for the Transport Planner to follow up.

B. Traffic issues – Anneli Karlsson, Traffic Planner

Council's Transport Planner updated the meeting with a handout (attached) on public transport accessibility and the proposed scoping study.

Recommendation

Working Group members to note tasks assigned to follow up. Report back next meeting.

All to note

ITEM 6 GENERAL BUSINESS

To wrap up the meeting, Cllr Burns suggested that a list of follow up actions, and other issues to be considered, should include:

- Legislative requirements for heritage trams;
- Legislative requirements re disabled access;
- Steps involved in obtaining accreditation with Independent Transport Safety Regulator;
- RTA requirements re Belgrave Street;
- Cost estimates of concrete track;
- Feasibility of housing trams overnight in the proposed underground carpark;
- Feasibility of a Raglan St or Carlton Street extension;
- Check with service providers such as Energy Aust, AGL, Sydney Water;
- Investigate any issues regarding electrolysis & problems with leakage of energy from the system;
- Carry out desk research on other proposed tramways in Australia, eg Adelaide, Glenelg, Gold Coast, Fremantle to check on the type of systems they are planning to use.
- Check the following website which provides links to other tramway systems or museums:
<http://www.sydneytramwaymuseum.com.au/links.html>
- Communications strategy;
- Community consultation amongst affected residents.

Recommendation

Working Group members to note tasks assigned to follow up.
Report back next meeting.

All to note

ITEM 7

NEXT MEETING DATE:

Date: Tuesday 16 August 2011

Time: 2pm

Venue: Councillors' Room

All to note

The meeting closed at 3.37pm