

9 September 2021

To:

The Honourable Mark Bailey MP, Minister for Transport and Main Roads

Dear Minister,

I acknowledge receipt of a letter from Les Dunn today (MC120471\_interim).

While I look forward to the results of the Department's detailed assessment of the slip lane crossings at Webster Road, I am curious to see what criteria such an assessment will be made against. The Department has confirmed they have no information or policy at all regarding the safety of signalised slip lanes, and those five words in the Road Safety Policy – "unless signalised with pedestrian protection" – were the sole justification for the project (RTI-1867 DN).

Indeed, it's hard to see how either of the Department's preferred treatments for pedestrian crossings at slip lanes – removal of the slip lane, or a raised priority crossing – can compete with signalisation in the project planning phase. Even in the case of Webster Road, where a major active transport path crosses high-speed slip lanes the Department acknowledges do not meet any current safety standards, signalisation has no criteria or warrants to meet and requires no more justification than the RSP. It's little wonder that local authorities are using signalisation as justification not only to retain existing slip lanes, but to build new ones, including in high-pedestrian inner city areas as at Stanley Place, South Brisbane, and in suburban residential neighbourhoods, as at Norris Road, Bracken Ridge.

The question remains why the Department considers signalisation a valid treatment for pedestrian crossings at slip lanes, given there is no evidence or reasoning to think it is a safer option than other treatments now proven to be unsafe.

Yours sincerely,

David Dallaston  
Aspley, 9 September 2021  
[dfdallaston@gmail.com](mailto:dfdallaston@gmail.com)

PS

I refer to Mr Dunn's letter on behalf of the Minister dated 18 June (MC120130), and documents released under Right to Information on 23 August (RTI-1867). There are assertions made by Mr Dunn in his letter which are not supported, or directly contradicted, by the information released under RTI – specifically, whether:

"several options were considered" for the Webster Road crossings;  
"signals to be installed on the slip lanes will have a short waiting period" for pedestrians;  
"redirecting [traffic by closing the slip lanes] is not considered the most efficient option due to the congestion that would be created".

If your office has any explanation for these discrepancies, I would be glad to hear it.