PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON TUESDAY 4 AUGUST 2026.

NORTHERN ROADS STAGE 2 - BASS HIGHWAY - CHRISTMAS HILLS TO DELORAINE

The committee met at 1.30 p.m.

CHAIR (Ms Butler) - Welcome everyone. Before we commence the hearing, I will introduce the members of the committee. To my left I have Mark Shelton, Tania Rattray, myself Jen Butler, Casey Hiscutt, Helen Burnet, and we also have Scott Hennessy on as our Secretary today.

Today we will be looking at the Northern Roads Package, Stage 2, Bass Highway, Christmas Hills. Now, the witnesses giving evidence to the committee today are appearing on behalf of the proponent, Building Tasmania. I'd like to remind you that you are still under oath, as you were sworn in at the hearing held for this reference on 17 February 2026 in Deloraine. Could I ask each of you to introduce yourselves, stating your name, and your position title.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - My name is Jacques van der Hyde; I am the project manager for Building Tasmania, and I will be introducing our team members today as well. So, with me is our project client, Lidiya Hudson, and our project management team leader, Cary Hicks.

CHAIR - Mr van der Hyde, would you like to begin your presentation?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, thank you. So, good afternoon, we thank you for the opportunity today to present an update on the Bass Highway: Christmas Hills to Deloraine project, since its first hearing was held in February 2026. As the committee requested, we will discuss the updated designs and where it has undergone any notable changes since the first hearing. We will also provide a record of the safety risk assessment of the design and we'll summarise the feedback we have received from stakeholders since the first hearing.

Construction is still planned to start in 2027, subject to approvals, the full completion anticipated in early 2029. The estimated cost of the project remains unchanged at $51.2 million. However, we are also pleased to update you on a significant funding milestone reached since the first hearing. In April 2026, the Australian Government approved the Tasmanian government's application for an 80 per cent funding contribution of the project. Consequently, the state is required to fund the remaining 20 per cent, which is currently projected at approximately $10.2 million.

Overall, we submit that this is still an important project that aligns with the department's objectives of improving safety, efficiency, and reliability on the state road network. The proposed works will make the Bass Highway safer for all road users, including freight operators, local traffic and visitors, while supporting economic activity in northern Tasmania. Stakeholder and community engagement has been comprehensive and will continue as the project progresses towards construction. Environmental, heritage and property impacts have

been carefully considered and managed through the design process. The costs are appropriate in relation to the scope of works and available funding.

In conclusion, we contend that the Bass Highway: Christmas Hills to Deloraine project still represents a good use of public funds, and I'll now move over to the presentation. I'll just share my screen.

CHAIR - What we might do for the presentation is, just for the benefits of *Hansard*, if you'd be able to provide a dialogue through that presentation, just so it's on the record for people who may not be watching on the broadcast.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Okay.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Okay, I'll just get this laser pointer working as well. That's going to help with understanding the designs and changes.

Okay, so as the committee requested, today we'll be presenting three topics. The first topic will be the updated designs and drawing comparisons, and we'll cover the changes and refinements that have been made since the first hearing. Secondly, we'll look at the safety risk assessment for the proposed works. And lastly, we'll be looking at a feedback summary from the consultation undertaken with affected landowners since the first hearing as well.

Before we move on to looking at the design drawings, for the purposes of this presentation, we'll be using roll plans to look at illustratively how the designs have changed. Each of you has the printouts of the technical design drawings in front of you, but I do believe it's easier to understand these changes through the contents of this presentation. So, as I'll be moving through the next few pages you'll see the original role plan design would show on the top of the page, that's the original design intent, and at the bottom of each of these following pages will show the updated design since the first hearing.

Just to explain a bit of how we're going read these roll plans, you'll note and I'll use the laser pointer here, the green shaded area all throughout these roll plans that depicts the intended earthworks' footprint or disturbance of the project. We have some coloured lines on the roll plans as well that show the wire-rope median barrier in light blue or cyan colour, a darker blue colour resembles the right or left turn lanes that's designed for throughout the project and you'll also see as we move further ahead, there's some yellow lines shown as where an overtaking lane is depicted. Just to make it easier with some colour coding. Also, these roll plans, because of the length of the site, we found it's easier to cut the site into smaller sections so we can focus on smaller sections at one time to discuss the changes.

Starting from the right of the roll plans and then looking towards the west with the start of the limit of works on the Bass Highway Christmas Hills site, all we can see at the original P-turn location is, and I'm pointing down at the bottom of the page is where the median barrier has been extended to close the gap a bit further, it's just to maximise the separation of oncoming traffic as much as possible. We're still providing the right turn lane into the P-turn. Just for illustration purposes, it does seem like there's a bit of a change in how the P-turn would look,

but that was just for illustration purposes. The design for the P-turn in this location hasn't changed.

A comment, throughout all of these roll plans going ahead as well, for the updated roll plans, you will also see we've got the accesses to private properties shown on the updated roll plan.

CHAIR - Can I just ask what you refer to this section of the road just for later questioning? There's the Christmas Hill section and what's this section called?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - This is the southern start of works.

CHAIR - Thank you. Please continue.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - For all these properties, there's just a once-off comment throughout the roll plan as well that we'll seal the accesses for these properties up to five metres from the road edge and that will ensure that the road shoulder is protected as well. We will also be modifying some of these relevant accesses to accommodate the heavy vehicle or type of vehicle use for each appropriate land.

Okay, next slide. From the right-hand side of the page, again moving towards our left, as we lead up to the Griffins Road junction, there was no substantial change to the design. You might just note that the original roll plan shows a yellow line for this for the northbound overtaking lane. We've just removed that for the updated roll plan for the purpose of being able to easily see what's depicted. It's because the existing northbound overtaking lane is an existing - so, it's not a newly designed feature. Now, focusing a bit more on the Griffins Road junction, and the road plans have just been rotated for this very purpose, so it aligns with the design drawing for this junction. So, no substantial changes have been made to the junction design itself, but we thought it's good to just show you the signage and line-marking plan (on the right-hand side of the screen at the moment) because, as you can see, as traffic would be moving in a southbound direction, some may be used to turn right to exit the Bass Highway and turn into Griffins Road.

There's a sign that's now provided for road users, to say that Griffins Road access is via a U-turn bay 800 metres ahead. So, that's the U-turn, or P-turn that we've just discussed a few slides back. For traffic that exits Griffins Road to enter the Bass Highway, they will only be able to turn left, or their left (at the right-hand side of this screen). We will also be providing signage to indicate that the U-turn facility or turn facility would be available about three kilometres once they've turned left.

This sign shown here at the moment isn't the final decision on the sign, and we understand that could cause confusion to lead traffic into using the Christmas Hills Road junction, which we don't want to let that happen, and that's for the new P-turn facility that we're designing a bit further north on the site, which we will cover shortly. (Moving again from right to left) leading away from the Griffins Road junction, no substantial changes have been made to the design in this area. So, we're just following the road in a northbound direction (towards the left of the page and again, now starting on to the right). So, some of the changes that have happened near the Christmas Hills Road junction is that the median barrier on the south-eastern end is brought

in a bit closer. You can see how that's been depicted originally as terminating earlier; that's now terminating within the junction. Some line marking configurations and modifications have been made as time went on.

It's also a topic here, where we've investigated the best outcome for the private shared access adjacent to the Christmas Hills Road junction. We have investigated that it's the best safety outcome at the moment for us to relocate that junction, as can be seen where the red pointer is indicating. The original design did show an intended right-turn lane into the existing junction, but safety analysis did show that that was just a crucial safety upgrade that needed to be made. So, we are still liaising with affected landowners for that. We are planning to provide an internal driveway access, as shown by the laser pointer again, and that's at the cost of the project. We've been working with the landowners and their legal representatives, too, to finalise the impacts.

Also (a little bit more further to the left of the screen) you can see a few dots depicted where I'm showing at the moment. We have recently been designing a gabion retaining wall to negate the need to change the existing culvert invert at this location for a drainage culvert; that is to avoid any impact to the platypus in the area. This design that we're working on follows criteria provided by parks and wildlife as well, so we've got high confidence that this outcome will be positive. You can also see how the earthworks is constricted to not need to go out any wider than where that retaining wall is depicted, and so, this Christmas Hills junction is zoomed in a bit further. That was the original design intent; it's just to make it easier to see a bit closer up, and the updated design is now shown.

Ms RATTRAY - Pity you couldn't have put an overlay, like the original one and then the new one so we could -

CHAIR - We could trace.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I could go back to the previous again if you wanted to have a look again.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - That right-turn lane that was proposed initially to service the private accesses within the junction is removed, where that's shown at the moment, and the line marking is being refined; that's the most substantial changes. And again, just that barrier on the right-hand side where it's terminated earlier, it's now brought in closer within the junction to avoid separation.

Mr SHELTON - So, the feedback - and you mentioned you were going to that third point, but the feedback from the owner of the property, what is that? How did they take that change?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - The feedback from the landowners at the moment - they still do want to understand better what the intent for the relocation of that access would be. We have communicated through their legal representatives to explain the intent and the safety benefits

and also the impacts. We've also provided written information to the landowner to understand better how compensation will work due to business - due to property impacts for that.

Mr SHELTON - The resident that's in that property is now going to be enveloped by industrial machinery or agricultural machinery going right around their property. I understand they've got a highway in front of them, but in reality, what's going to happen now is that any of the heavy machinery is going to go - basically, it's going to circumnavigate them, basically isn't it? Anyway -

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, correct. My understanding from that, I have checked the owner within this property, as I'm showing on that screen at the moment, they were in support of this proposal.

Mr SHELTON - One query that I raised initially is on that left turn coming west into those two properties now, the verge of the road, if that's not the right terminology, but a pull-off area for the slowing traffic that has to turn left, how much sealed area have they got to get off the highway to escape the 110 traffic coming up behind them?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Part of the shoulder widening portion that we're providing - from memory, was it 3.5 metres of shoulder? I could come back to you on that again. I can't recall the exact shoulder width that we're widening to, or the design drawings may show, but it's widened sufficiently so that even though it's not a dedicated turning line to within the private access, it's enough for a vehicle to fit well within on the shoulder to evade any traffic behind them.

Mr SHELTON - I understand the difficulties of this design process, and that's fine for a ute pulling in there; when you have a tractor pulling a 3.5-metre disc behind it and slowing, then that 3.5 is only just enough, or if it's any other heavier vehicle - anyway, they are the problems that you face.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, that's the problems that's currently there at the moment, and we are enhancing or improving that safety aspect through this design as well. We will be able to potentially provide you the exact shoulder width again in a moment.

CHAIR - Did any other committee members have questions on this Christmas Hills intersection whilst we're here? Would that be prudent to stick on this for the moment?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, that's fine.

Mr HISCUTT - I believe this was discussed at the last meeting as well, but if I could reiterate it, since I wasn't at that one: I just note that the dual lane eastbound starts just after the Christmas Hill intersection; was there any consideration, given that there seems to be a wide enough space, of having that as a similar situation that happened with the truck station that was recently introduced near Deloraine, that you could come off onto the dual lane while the continuing lane starts on the right-hand lane? Was that being considered at all to allow it to be safe? It's still a pretty sharp turn off there, better than what it currently is, but there was the opportunity, perhaps, with this upgrade to be able to make that a lot safer to enter the highway, if that makes sense.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I'm not too aware personally about the project intent of that truck stop that you might be referring to, but the overtaking lane shift was basically to avoid traffic needing to pass through two lanes of traffic in a southbound direction and then again to the northbound. We wanted to reduce as much lanes as - yes, just reduce lanes so that traffic doesn't cross more than they need to for that speed of that intersection.

Ms HICKS - That option that you just described was considered earlier on in the project phase and our traffic engineering specialists preferred this for the overall safety.

CHAIR - Just on Christmas Hills Road. For traffic turning onto the highway from Christmas Hills Road onto the highway heading north?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Heading north, so turning, this direction? Yes?

CHAIR - Yes. So is that additional space - the lined area, is that to create room for error in case they have pulled out in front of traffic?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes.

CHAIR - What's the basis for that?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, absolutely. That traffic island, the chevron island's to provide, or to instigate more separation for traffic. We looked at this barrier. Just on the corner of that, you can see where the barrier terminates. We couldn't bring this barrier all the way through, which would have been ideal, because of safety sight distances. The barrier is causing some line-sight distance issues and this was the best appropriate way we could find to keep that separation as best as possible.

CHAIR - Is that one of the reasons, or with the data around previous incidents or fatalities on that section - that turning into the oncoming traffic in that area, has that been the main risk factor previously in those incidents?

Ms HICKS - Turning right into Christmas Hills Road?

CHAIR - Or in or out or turning onto the oncoming traffic.

Ms HICKS - One of the primary safety issues with the intersection before this design was that there was an additional lane travelling through there, so there were two live lanes travelling southbound. The passing lane was running through there, so we've removed that to be a conventional intersection, so yes, crossing the two live lanes was the primary issue.

CHAIR - Thank you. We should probably move on, unless there's any further questions on Christmas Hills? Okay, we'll move on. We're running short of time. Sorry.

Ms HICKS - Can I just quickly respond to a question Mark had earlier about the verge width to access that property? Our typical cross section shows a 3.5 metre traffic lane and then 3 metres for vehicles to be able to turn -

Mr SHELTON - Three metres, okay.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - As we move away from Christmas Hills Road further to the north-west, no notable design changes occurred for this section leading up to the northern limit of works, but then a gap starts up to where we get the Bengeo Road junction.

We wanted to provide you an update again on the Bengeo Road junction because throughout the first hearing we also stopped there for our site inspection and we had a look at the P-turn or the - it was previously also scoped as a potential New Zealand style turning or roundabout facility within the Bengeo Road area. Following stakeholder feedback during the design process, many drivers actually showed that they are having some difficulty to exit Bengeo Road and to turn into Bass Highway, specifically turning right into Bass Highway due to sight distances and traffic moving quickly through those parts. So the P-turn's been relocated further to the north-west, which I'll cover in just a moment. The new design will show basically that there's no intent to change anything on Bengeo Road for this project.

So, in the zoomed-out image you can see Bengeo Road on the right-hand side and approximately 750 metres further north-west is where we found the safest closest location for a new P-turn facility to be installed. It's also a nice straight piece of road, so it's nice in terms of safe-sight distances. Also, again, same safety factor as with the Christmas Hills junction is that traffic now needs to only cross one lane of opposing traffic instead of two.

That's a close-up zoomed-in image of the P-turn. This is the northern P-turn location. We've got the one on the south, which we've covered, and this is the one on the north.

Ms RATTRAY - How far away from Samuel Road is that?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - From Samuel Road?

Ms RATTRAY - Samuel Street.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I'll need to check where Samuel Road is.

Mr SHELTON - It'd be a couple hundred metres. You've got the gravel - DMR gravel pit - called the DMR - just there where the ‘own’ is, and there's Bengeo Road - Samuel Street - just - is that off the screen?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Okay. Not too sure, but we could look at the map. Are you saying it's just where I'm pointing or that should be an access?

Mr SHELTON - I understand this was - I mean this was instigated because of the issue of Meander Valley Council and the safety of that intersection and the community around that area as far as the raspberry farm goes. But has there been any - given this design, it's my understanding that the next stretch of highway to be upgraded is Launceston to Deloraine and then beyond down to where it meets up heading to Devonport. This straight, I've always envisaged it as a nice long straight to have overtaking lanes in it. The fact that this P-turn is there and if that upgrade happens, this P-turn will have to move or change. We're just looking

at this issue and not what might happen in the future, I guess. No-one's got a crystal ball, but I wouldn't like to see things develop to a point where in two years' time this design is no longer relevant and something else comes along. How do you manage that, as a department?

Ms HICKS - Lidiya might be able to talk to this one as well, but we've got a number of packages that have been identified for upgrades on the Bass Highway between Launceston and Devonport. A number of those packages, all combined, are in excess of a billion dollars as they're currently intended. So, any other projects that might ultimately link up the gaps would be beyond those because these are the priority for safety and freight efficiency for the network. So, proceeding with further duplication or two-plus-one widening in this area will be a lot further behind those other priority projects that are likely to be funded in the next five to 10 years at least.

Mr SHELTON - Who can guess what might happen in another federal election.

Ms HICKS - Exactly. You have a few billion for us.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I'm just aware of time, but I'll quickly touch on the next topics. So, the safety risk assessment for the proposed works, we've got various risk assessments for different aspects of the project, but we thought it might be the most appropriate to provide you the road safety audit because that's a risk assessment that's done on the actual design at the moment. We've also got a risk assessment for the proposed physical construction works, too, and how that could be managed. So, a construction contractor would benefit from that and enhance it further once they are awarded the project. We've also got an overall project risk register. So, those printouts have been provided to you. Would you like me to touch on that or did you want me to move on to the next topic? Because I can show a - well, there's an example on screen at the moment of some of the extracts from that road safety audit.

CHAIR - If you could probably, just because of the timeframes that we have, maybe talk to us about No. 16 because there's a 'no' with that, as a starting-off point and any other areas that you feel are pertinent to this discussion.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yeah, sure. How this safety risk assessment works is it describes the location; so, for No. 16, it describes the entire study location, so this comment from the auditor would apply across the whole run. The comment for this specific issue was that the corridor runs through an agricultural interface with frequent wallaby sightings. Numerous animal strikes were noted, and these carry high-risk injury risk for occupants and wildlife, and a level of risk has been allocated for that.

The auditor has provided recommendations and noting too that the auditor isn't always aware of the project objectives; it's just their independent assessment on the design, and that was to erect wildlife warning signs with seasonal flashing beacons and consider outside fencing and fauna underpasses at high-strike locations. The designers, at this point in time, have decided not to undertake that recommended work following their own assessment and commented that the corridor is fenced, and this project maintains the same user environment as the surrounding corridor. No additional signage or fencing is warranted. At the moment, this road safety audit is still an ongoing audit until the design is finally complete and the department will also have an opportunity to provide comment to each of these findings.

Ms RATTRAY - On No. 7, you also have to know, and when I read the explanation it talks about potential for black ice, and you've had discussions with the landowner, and the ice is caused by the shadow of adjacent eucalyptus something-or-other wet forest, which are critically endangered. That means that you'll just have to deal with the black ice because the trees get precedent?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes, I can see No. 7. I do note that the level of risk noted by the auditor was unlikely.

Ms RATTRAY - It says, according to the landowner, so wouldn't they have a fair idea of where black ice was? I might be wrong.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Because the department will still have the opportunity to address all of these findings through our traffic engineering branch, that's where we'll be able to decide what's acceptable risk.

Ms RATTRAY - But effectively you can't reduce the risk because of the eucalyptus wet forest?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - We'll be able to ask questions to the designers on, for instance, do we change the surface design from asphalt in that location to maybe chip seal or spray seal to provide a rougher sealed surface as well? That's part of the considerations that we'll still talk through, because once you have a rougher surface and there's a bit of black ice, the tyres from the vehicles grab a hold on the road much easier.

But it's great that these have been questioned by the auditor and the consultant has been able to comment by now on that. We just are yet to provide our own assessment on that, too.

CHAIR - Any other questions from the committee on the risk assessment?

Mr SHELTON - I have a couple of questions, but it's not on that risk. I haven't had a chance to thoroughly read it at this point in time.

CHAIR - We might move on to Mr Shelton's question.

Mr SHELTON - Three quick questions and that is when we had the design up of Bengeo Road. Is it left turn only coming out of Bengeo Road now that you've shifted the P-junction? When you come out of Bengeo, can you go both directions, east and west?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I believe yes. Everything's retained at the moment, so you'll be able to turn left and right out of Bengeo Road onto the Bass Highway.

Mr SHELTON - I couldn't quite pick it up on the picture. The next one was that we talked about that sealed edge of the road. Is that for the full length of this section that we're talking about?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes.

Mr SHELTON - The difficulty in this area compared to - it's a national highway and all that sort of thing, but you actually have a property every half a kilometre or a kilometre and there's another intersection and another pull-off, and another one is provided that there's plenty of space for those vehicles to get off into their driveways and that, which was the criticism of the neighbours or the owners when we met them. The third one is on the feedback. What sort of feedback on this redesign has there been in a general sense from particularly those three people that were at the -

CHAIR - Affected landowners.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I'll be able to touch on the feedback in just a moment because I'll be able to have it summarised on screen. But the shoulder width, yes, that does apply to the complete design of the project and that will comply with the department's design standards for Category 1 highways, essentially. So, it's a requirement for us to provide that wider shoulder.

Just quickly, this is an example image at the moment. This junction is recently constructed. It's the Midland Highway and Highland Lakes Road junction. It's just a very similar design to the one that we've got at Christmas Hills Road, so we forward it just to show you. It's quite a well-known one on the Midland Highway.

The only difference here is that the wire-rope barrier has actually been able to get pulled up right to within the junction, where, with our design, it's terminated earlier and the difference is that this junction sits more within a sag, so you're not constricting the site distances as much. With the Christmas Hills Road junction, you've got more of a crest and that's the reason for the difference, but it's a well-known performing junction example.

And so, our third topic, just touching on the feedback and consultation with landowners since our first hearing: so, we've counted about 61 interactions since the first hearing date. The first few months weren't too busy, but then things picked up within the month of June when we issued a general project update letter to landowners as well as issuing notice of accommodation works letters. So, if I'm talking about the notice of accommodation works letters - or I'll refer to a NOA - that's the letter or document that perfectly outlines to a landowner exactly what kind of works we'll be undertaking on their property, such as fencing relocation or access upgrading or access relocation or any of that kind of work. And the landowners are being given an opportunity to respond to that.

We're also providing draft documents to them for the moment, with a watermark showing draft so they can be assured that there is ample opportunity for comments from them. And just the interactions, the mediums in how we interacted was mostly through email of these, some phone calls, SMSs and one letter.

So, this looks just daunting at first glance, but this is the summary of feedback we've received since the first hearing. We've just removed the landowners' names from this table on the first column, just for confidential purposes. So we'll refer to landowner A, B and C. But the feedback-received column, a middle column and then the status or action on the last column.

So, I'll touch on a few of them. Land owner A: the owners do not support the proposed location of the new northbound turning facility based on initial information received. This is where your question comes in of how is it being received, these updated designs. We received

an initial contention, for why the change is necessary and that's due to perceived impacts on their property and they believe it will create more traffic and more traffic noise at their residence, and they are also concerned that it will increase the likelihood of crashes as vehicles turn into the P-turn. Our action, to date, then was that we've acknowledged the concerns and we've responded, on two occasions, with property impact details.

We've also provided a citing rationale explanation to the landowners. Therefore, we haven't made any changes to the design, especially for the new northern P-turn, but the engagement is ongoing and we'll be issuing a draft NOA to the landowners soon.

Landowner B: ongoing engagement regarding various property impacts are occurring as well. The draft NOA has been issued to the landowner on 17 February. The project team has made a follow-up call on 2 July to the landowner, in which the landowner indicated that they've received the document but are yet to review. So, ongoing consultations are happening for landowner B as well.

Landowner C: owners do not support the proposed location of the new relocated access point due to various property and business impacts, specifically at the Christmas Hills junction. So, the latest correspondence to the owner's legal representation has been issued directly by Building Tasmania, which further explains the rationale and the need for the access relocation, which is primarily to prioritise safety for all road users. A draft NOA has also been issued to the landowner on 25 June, and for the legal representatives to review, and it also includes clear information to the owner to understand how the compensation process will work for any business impacts that are undesired. So, landowner feedback is pending for that situation.

Landowner D confirmed acceptance, and so that's a resolved issue now, as with a few others too; landowner G, we've received inquiry regarding distances from the property, accesses to the new turning facilities, and details about their property access licences. That information has also been provided to landowner G, and a copy of the access licence has been provided as well. Just the next page, landowner H confirmed acceptance to the relocation of the letterbox, and so the matter is resolved as well, and the draft NOA was issued on 14 July.

Landowner I: feedback received on various items on the draft NOA, which was issued on 15 July, and the project team issued revised changes which will be reviewed. So, we do - after the landowner has reviewed, we look at those comments and make changes where appropriate as well. Landowner J confirmed acceptance of the NOA, and so that matter is resolved, and then all other adjacent landowners have either provided positive or neutral feedback with no objections for that, but property-specific engagement is ongoing for them; 11 NOAs have been issued to date for landowners' access reviews, and we're working on another six at the moment. It's quite substantial documents, with a lot of details on there, which we'd like to get right first time, and then that will be issued to the landowners as well.

Ms RATTRAY - Because you haven't identified the landowners, how do we actually know who's a substantial landowner, and who's just got half-acre block?

Mr VAN DER HYDE - I can provide that information to the committee, maybe on a different medium, rather than through this public - if that's okay?

Ms RATTRAY - Yes, that would be appreciated.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - There's some information within these tables that could hint to the location that we're talking about as well, but it's a good record to show what kind of feedback we've been receiving, and how we're dealing with that.

CHAIR - Thank you. Any further questions from the committee in relation to the consultation? Okay, any further questions, overall questions? Just mindful of that - we've run out of time.

Mr VAN DER HYDE - Yes.

CHAIR - Can I just thank you, Jacques, Cary and Lidiya, for coming in to meet with us today, and going to all this effort, with this additional work for our committee, and helping enable us to make a really well-informed decision. So, we appreciate the time that you've put into this.

Before you leave the table, I would like to reiterate the statement about committee proceedings: as I advised you at the commencement of your evidence back in February, if you can remember that, what you have said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that this privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand that?

WITNESSES - Yes.

The witnesses withdrew.

The committee adjourned at 2.14 p.m.