

COUNCIL POLICY

Sealing of Unsealed Roads

DOCUMENT UNCONTROLLED WHEN PRINTED

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Policy number 038	Status Adoption	Approved by Council
Date approved 3 March 2020	Next review date March 2024	
Directorate Assets	Department Asset Maintenance	Internal / External External

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Scope	3
3. Policy details	3
3.1 Methodology	3
3.1.1 Establishing the comparative score.....	3
3.1.2 Establishing the provisional priority for delivery.....	5
3.1.3 Validation of the project priority	5
3.2 Financial contributions	6
3.3 Alternative dust suppression treatments	6
4. Roles and responsibilities	6
5. Breaches	6
6. Human Rights Charter compatibility	6
7. Supporting documents	7
8. Definitions and abbreviations	7
9. Approval	7

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

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 inclusion in Council's Project Pipeline.

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.

3. Policy details

Council aims to provide and maintain infrastructure, including roads, to a standard which meets the needs of the community. Council's Project Pipeline contains a list of infrastructure projects for delivery into the future. Council prioritises the delivery of the projects in the Project Pipeline 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.

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 project relative to the existing projects in the Project Pipeline.
3. Validate the prioritisation of the road upgrade project in the Project Pipeline.

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

Calculating the comparative score

The comparative score is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Comparative score} = \text{VPD} \times \text{F1} \times \text{F2} \times \text{F3}$$

- **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

- **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 project relative to existing projects in the Project Pipeline.

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 sealing projects demonstrating a larger benefit relative to cost over their lifecycle will be given a higher priority for delivery in the Project Pipeline 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 Project Pipeline in order to ensure that the Pipeline accurately reflects the needs and aspirations of the community. Through this process, a provisional priority assigned to a new road upgrade project in the Project Pipeline by Council Officers will be validated by Council.

The delivery of projects listed in Council's Project Pipeline remains subject to Council's annual budget approval processes and the availability of funding.

3.2 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.

3.3 Alternative dust suppression treatments

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

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.

4. Roles and responsibilities

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

Responsibility	Role / Position
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manager Asset Maintenance, Manager Asset Development, Civil Works Coordinator.
Development/Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manager Asset Maintenance.
Interpretation/Advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Director Assets, Manager Asset Maintenance, Manager Asset Development.

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. 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 1989 [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

8. Definitions and abbreviations

Term	Meaning
VPD	Vehicles per Day
CS	Comparative Score - Vehicles per Day weighted to take into account additional factors

9. Approval

THE COMMON SEAL OF THE
ALPINE SHIRE COUNCIL was
hereunto affixed this 3 day of
MARCH 2020 in the
presence of:

Kitty Knappstein

[Signature]

COUNCILLOR

Tony Keeble

[Signature]

COUNCILLOR

[Signature]

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER