

Attachment 3 - Summary table of issues raised in YCC submission; and comments by NELA independent traffic expert (GTA Consultants)

Issues raised by Yarra	GTA Consultant comments on YCC issues raised
PROJECT CONCERNS	
Increased traffic	
<p>C1 (pg. 56) Increased traffic in Yarra and subsequent impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • congestion on local roads • delays to PT • increases in heavy vehicles • worsened cycling conditions 	<p>The GTA consultant statement says:</p> <p>that the traffic modelling shows that traffic impacts to Yarra are nominal, and that the Environmental Performance Requirement (EPR) T5 of the project acts as a safeguard which requires traffic monitoring on selected roads identified in consultation with relevant transportation authorities and local council pre-construction, six month intervals during construction, and up to two years after construction is complete’ - also requires that ‘consideration be given to roads that carry PT services’ and local area traffic management works are to be implemented in consultation with the local relevant Councils</p> <p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>What consultation is this referring to/when will Yarra have an opportunity to nominate specific roads?</p>
<p>C2 (pg. 60) Impact of increased demand for cycling to and through Yarra, and concerns about increased maintenance costs for new shared paths, and loss of parking to deliver cycling projects</p>	<p>GTA response argues that acceptability of costs is balanced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased active travel connectivity, consistent with policy • Help facilitate productivity improvements within Yarra <p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>While these are good outcomes, they don’t have a monetary value to offset / help fund future maintenance of paths.</p> <p>Additional funding allocated to maintaining these paths is funding that won’t be used on other important projects for sustainable transport etc. to support the two outcomes mentioned above.</p> <p>Potential removal of car parking – wording in the GTA statement does not reflect what the YCC submission is saying ‘<i>seeks proposals to remove on-street parking directly improve travel conditions for people travelling by non-motorised transport modes</i>’.</p> <p>GTA says that the EES does not highlight any removal of car parking in Yarra, but that during detailed design Council should be consulted with.</p>

	NB. The Yarra CC submission is pre-empting the likely need to remove car parking as a result of cycling upgrades (which there will be increased demand for on specific corridors linking with new NEL paths) and Doncaster busway. That is, it is important to capture the potential future impacts of the project at this stage to appreciate a complete picture of what this means for Yarra.
Modelling approach	
C4 (pg. 61) No independent check of raw survey data	The GTA response notes the VicRoads reviewed the data and did not raise any issues is that considered an appropriate independent check?
C5 (pg. 62) Hoddle/Eastern Freeway intersection was not included in micro-simulation, despite the preceding section of the Eastern freeway having 'the lowest average vehicle speed of all freeways in Melbourne'	The GTA peer review report also raised this. Memo provided to GTA during preparation of the evidence statement, noting consideration was given back-queuing on Hoddle Street. Also notes the forecast increased in transport demand at this location is modest in peak periods and reduces flow on effect of queue. YCC officer comment: However if an existing year assessment was not undertaken, any existing congestion at this location won't be considered in this assessment. Notes that SmedTech agreed with VicRoads not to specifically include Hoddle St interchange – on what basis? Does not explain why this was decided.
C6 (pg. 62) Existing year assessment not undertaken to inform the 2026 road network performance	GTA state that a 10 year post implementation planning horizon is consistent Notes that considerable effort has been exercised on reviewing current network operation and these investigations have influenced coding of model. YCC officer comment: Does not really explain what this has been done / unclear about extent of investigations and if an accurate/complete assessment of existing conditions has informed the model.
C7 (pg. 63) Raises concerns with strategic modelling inputs and assumptions, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about spreadsheet model using 'partially constrained' strategic modelling demand to constrained traffic demand by shifting 	GTA state a separate expert evidence statement for strategic modelling is prepared by another expert

<p>excess demand to either side of peak period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic model did not test multiple scenarios for growth and transport infrastructure improvements • Questions why East West Link was not considered • No review of forecast modelling has been undertaken 	
RECOMMENDATIONS + REQUESTS	
<p>R2 (pg. 63) Project to meet objectives of the Transport Integration Act</p>	<p>GTA state that Section 3 of their comments outlines assessment of project's alignment with key transport policies etc.</p>
Active transport	
<p>R3 (pg. 63) Complementary improvements on cycling routes in Yarra that connect with NEL shared paths – Wellington St, Roseneath St, South Terrace, Trenerry Crescent, Gipps Street</p>	<p>GTA state that Section 5.9.3 discusses the complementary projects and Appendix 3 lists these.</p> <p>Further, that Yarra's proposed upgrades are categorised as 'warranted but out of scope'</p>
<p>R4 (pg. 63) New paths to be minimum of 3m wide and signed off by Council and in accordance with policies/standards</p>	<p>GTA refers to EPR T1 requirement to consultant with appropriate authorities etc.</p> <p>GTA agree that the EPR should be revised to broaden the requirement of project works to meet relevant requirements, not just for interchanges and intersections (as per highlighted changes on pf 64).</p>
<p>R5 (pg. 64) Seeks better opportunities be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to cross major roads connecting with NEL project area – EF, Alexandra Parade and Hoddle Street</p>	<p>GTA consider that it could be complementary active transport project.</p>
<p>R6 (pg. 64) Extend pedestrian crossing times on Hoddle and Alexandra parade</p>	<p>GTA notes that altering pedestrian phasing is subject to assessment by DoT and acknowledge that a separate process would be required for this</p>

<p>R7 (pg. 65) Project to not preclude construction of Doncaster rail in future</p>	<p>GTA confirms that future Doncaster Rail option would not be precluded by the project, as corridor dimensions are consistent with those require to accommodate heavy rail, however busway would need to be removed and replaced</p>
<p>R8 (pg. 65) Intersection of Hoddle St/EF and other intersections along Hoddle St and Victoria Parade used by rapid bus services be modelled to understand impacts</p>	<p>GTA statement refers to C5 and R10</p>
<p>Doncaster busway</p>	
<p>R9 (pg. 65) Bus operational plan</p>	<p>GTA refers to operational analysis completed to support EES Notes this is a request for DoT YCC officer comment: Why was this not included in the EES The operation of the busway has potential impacts for the wider network and should be considered.</p>
<p>R10 (pg. 65) Gap in PT provision along Alexandra Parade and improvements to bus operating environment between CBD and EF i.e. full time bus lanes, also noting removal of car parking that would be required and request for compensation</p>	<p>GTA notes that Alexandra Parade and Hoddle St are outside of project scope YCC officer comment: EES concept plan reflects reference design, and there is an opportunity to extend public transport services further west through EPR T1 (second last paragraph pg. 65). Hoddle St streamlining is referred to as an improvement between Eastern Freeway and CBD. While Hoddle St is not within the project corridor and project scoping requirements, increased bus services from the Doncaster busway will have a direct impact on roads between the project corridor and CBD - the issues around this have been raised in Yarra's submission to ensure this is properly planned for in terms of understanding traffic and funding requirements. Regarding loss of car parking, the GTA statement notes that the reference design indicates that there is currently no proposal to remove on-street parking within Yarra. Yarra's submission highlights the potential need to remove parking in the future, as a consequence of full-time bus priority lanes being required for the Doncaster busway. This is a potential issue that needs to be accounted for in the case that it should happen.</p>

<p>R11 (pg. 67) Council to be consulted regarding route options for Doncaster bus services between freeway and CBD</p>	<p>GTA notes that this is considered reasonable if a meaningful change is proposed to the existing route.</p> <p>(Also notes that EPR T1 supports this) and that the reference design does not propose any meaningful change to routes along these routes.</p> <p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>It is understood that the route planning has not been finalised and Yarra has not been informed on options or how this is being assessed... even if the route doesn't change, Yarra should be consulted with as there is likely to be subsequent traffic impacts as a result of more Doncaster bus services to the CBD.</p>
<p>R12 (pg. 67) Clearways</p>	<p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>Yarra notes that there are no current plans to extend hours or length of clearways, the intent of raising this issue is to require any future proposal to extend hours / lengths of clearways as required by Doncaster bus improvements should only be considered after complying with associated legal procedures and industry agreements.</p>
<p>R13 (pg. 68) Compensation for removal of any paid parking</p>	<p>GTA statement acknowledges that the project does not propose to upgrade bus corridors or remove paid parking bays to support upgrades to bus corridors in Yarra</p> <p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>The issue raised in Yarra's submission relates to future bus corridor upgrades that will likely be required for the Doncaster bus services.</p> <p>GTA statement notes that consultation would occur with Council during detailed design, should this be proposed.</p> <p>Yarra is seeking agreement / condition on approvals that Council is compensated for any future removal of car parking as result of NEL and subsequent bus corridor upgrades.</p>
<p>R14 (pg. 68) Project should not result in additional traffic growth or through traffic on local roads / key centres in Yarra and any growth be offset through funding to improve sustainable transport</p>	<p>GTA notes that the strategic model shows impacts of traffic growth at local level, and that meaningful levels of transport activity will be attracted to the corridor and off roads within Yarra when comparing 2036 with project and no project scenarios.</p> <p>EPR T5 provides a mechanism to allow Council to nominate streets of concern and be consulted in relation to local area traffic management works to respond to findings of traffic monitoring where required.</p>

<p>R15 (pg. 68) Implementation of post construction monitoring framework to quantify changes in traffic flow , including measuring traffic volumes, PT delay and other impacts.</p> <p>Funding pool to deliver works to respond to these monitoring outcomes</p>	<p>GTA state that EPR T5 requires traffic monitoring on selected roads identified in consultation with relevant transportation authorities and local council pre-construction, six month intervals during construction, and up to two years after construction is complete’ also requires that ‘consideration be given to roads that carry PT services’ and local area traffic management works are to be implemented in consultation with the local relevant Councils.</p> <p>YCC officer comment:</p> <p>Is two years after construction enough time? What consultation is this referring to?</p> <p>Refers to Traffic Management Liaison Group (TMLG) and says that this group will take a leading role in coordinating and managing this requirement.</p> <p>This item in the submission is specifically about monitoring traffic impacts post-completion of the project. Because Yarra is at the western extremities of the project area, traffic impacts may not appear during construction or immediately following completion of the project.</p> <p>GTA also presume that it is expected that the project proponent will have funds allocated for works required to support treatment or intervention of adverse outcomes associated with the monitoring programme.</p> <p>NB. This is needed to manage/mitigate impacts following completion of the project, and that a robust monitoring framework is required to assist post-completion evaluation and how treatment should be implemented.</p> <p>That is, a lot of the potential impacts raised in Yarra’s submission won’t be known until after the project is completed, and modelling may not be able to quantify / 100% confirm if these issues will occur and to what degree the impacts will be; hence the need for a post-completion monitoring framework and commitment to mitigate and manage the issues raises.</p>
--	---